

## CHICANO PARK PRESERVATION ACT

DECEMBER 5, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Natural Resources,  
submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 3711]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Natural Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3711) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park, located in San Diego, California, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Chicano Park Preservation Act”.

**SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park and its murals located in San Diego, California.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

- (1) evaluate the national significance of the site;
- (2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a National Historic Landmark or Affiliated Area of the National Park System;
- (3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of Chicano Park and its murals by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;
- (4) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations or any other interested individuals; and
- (5) identify cost estimates for any development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code, except that the study shall not consider any options that involve Federal acquisition of lands, interests in lands, or any other property related to the Chicano Park and its murals.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the

Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 3711 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park, located in San Diego, California.

#### BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Located in the Barrio Logan community of San Diego, Chicano Park is a 7.4 acre parcel known for its display of nearly fifty vibrant murals depicting the history of Chicano culture and the Chicano Civil Rights Movement. Residents secured the creation of the park in 1970 by protesting the construction of a parking lot on vacant land the city previously promised for the development of a community park. After successfully taking over the land, artists painted dozens of vibrant murals on the pillars and ramps of the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge located in the park, creating the largest concentration of Chicano murals in the world.

H.R. 3711 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to evaluate the national significance of Chicano Park and determine the suitability and feasibility of designating it as a National Historic Landmark or Affiliated Area of the National Park System through a special resource study. The bill specifically prohibits the Secretary from considering any options that result in the Federal acquisition of Chicano Park.

#### COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 3711 was introduced on October 8, 2015, by Congressman Juan Vargas (D-CA). The bill was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on Federal Lands. On November 15, 2016, the Natural Resources Committee met to consider the bill. The Subcommittee was discharged by unanimous consent. Congressman Rob Bishop (R-UT) offered an amendment designated #1 to the bill; it was adopted by unanimous consent. No further amendments were offered, and the bill, as amended, was ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by unanimous consent on November 16, 2016.

#### COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regarding clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Natural Resources' oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the body of this report.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII

1. Cost of Legislation and Congressional Budget Act of 1974. With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(2) and (3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and sections 308(a) and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the enclosed cost estimate for the bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
*Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.*

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 3711, the Chicano Park Preservation Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Jon Sperl.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL.

Enclosure.

*H.R. 3711—Chicano Park Preservation Act*

H.R. 3711 would require the National Park Service (NPS) to conduct a special resource study of the Chicano Park located in San Diego, California. (The park and its murals depict the history of Chicano culture and the Chicano Civil Rights Movement.) The study would determine whether the site meets NPS criteria for inclusion in the National Park System. Based on information provided by the NPS, CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would cost \$250,000 over the 2017–2021 period; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting the legislation would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 3711 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2027.

H.R. 3711 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jon Sperl. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

2. General Performance Goals and Objectives. As required by clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII, the general performance goal or objective of this bill is to conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park, located in San Diego, California.

EARMARK STATEMENT

This bill does not contain any Congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined under clause 9(e), 9(f), and 9(g) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104–4

This bill contains no unfunded mandates.

COMPLIANCE WITH H. RES. 5

Directed Rule Making. The Chairman does not believe that this bill directs any executive branch official to conduct any specific rule-making proceedings.

Duplication of Existing Programs. This bill does not establish or reauthorize a program of the federal government known to be duplicative of another program. Such program was not included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139 or identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220, as amended by Public Law 98-169) as relating to other programs.

PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL OR TRIBAL LAW

This bill is not intended to preempt any State, local or tribal law.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

If enacted, this bill would make no changes in existing law.

