

Legislative Bulletin.....September 29, 2009

Contents:

- H.R. 685** - United States Civil Rights Trail System Act of 2009
- H.R. 2442** - Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program Expansion Act of 2009
- H.R. 2950** - To direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District
- H.R. 3123** - Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel Remediation Act of 2009
- H.R. 905** - Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve Boundary Modification Act
- H.R. 1771** - Chesapeake Bay Science, Education, and Ecosystem Enhancement Act of 2009
- H.R. 1053** - Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2009
- H.Res. 16** - Supporting the goals and ideals of National Life Insurance Awareness Month
- H.Res. 693** - Honoring the life and accomplishments of Jim Johnson and extending the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family on the occasion of his death.
- H.Con.Res. 186** - Supporting the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month
- H.Res. 725** - Congratulating the Chula Vista Park View Little League team
- H.Res. 734** - Expressing the support for and honoring September 17, 2009 as "Constitution Day"
- H.R. 3614** - Providing for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended

H.R. 685—United States Civil Rights Trail System Act of 2009 *(Rep. Clay D–MO)*

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 685 directs the Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture to conduct a study of the feasibility to establish the United States Civil Rights Trail System marking the geographic locations in the United States of historically significant events related to struggles for civil rights based on racial equality. The bill allows the Secretary to establish trails in each State where a significant civil rights event occurred and establish at least 6 such trails as soon as practicable after the act is passed into law. The bill authorizes “such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 2010 through 2016.”

Additional Information: The National Trails System was first created in 1968 to “promote the preservation of, public access to, travel within, and enjoyment and appreciation of the open-air, outdoor areas and historic resources of the Nation.” National recreation trails and connecting-and-side trails do not require Congressional

action, but are recognized by actions of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture. All of the national trails and national recreational trails are combined under the Partnership for the National Trails System (PNTS).

Committee Action: On January 26, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On September 10, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 685 “estimates that conducting the study would cost about \$500,000 over the next three years. Enacting the bill would not affect revenues or direct spending.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 685.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 2442—Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program Expansion Act of 2009 (Rep. Miller, D-CA)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 2442 amends the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to permit the Secretary of Interior to work with the six different local water districts in California to participate in the design, planning, and construction of recycled water distribution systems. The areas include the City of Redwood City, the City of Palo Alto, the Ironhouse Sanitary District (ISD), City of Petaluma, Dublin San Ramon Services District, and Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. The total authorizations for the projects total \$32.2 million with the Federal cost share for each project not exceeding 25% of the total cost of the project. Additionally, the bill amends current law to raise the authorizations under the Antioch Recycled Water Project from \$2,250,000 to \$3,125,000

and the South Bay Advanced Recycled Water Treatment Facility from \$8,250,000 to \$13,250,000.

Additional Information: Established by Congress in 1992, the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act, authorizes the federal government to fund up to 25% of the capital cost of authorized recycling projects, with a large number located within the State of California.

Committee Action: On May 14, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On September 10, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO cost estimate report for H.R. 2242 is unavailable. However, the bill authorizes a total for \$38.075 million.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 2242.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 2950—To direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District (*Rep. Matheson, D-UT*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 2950 allows the Secretary of Interior to enter into a repayment for a contract rendered to the Uintah Water Conservancy District under section 210 of the [Central Utah Project Completion Act](#). H.R. 2950 would amend current law to change the date of repayment to 2019 from 2037 and allow repayment to be provided in several installments and at adjusted to conform to a final cost allocation.

Additional Information: According to the Department of Interior, “The District entered into a repayment contract dated June 3, 1976, in which they agreed to repay all reimbursable costs associated with the Jensen Unit of the CUP. However, the District’s contract was amended in 1992 to reduce the project M&I supply under repayment to 2,000 acre-feet annually and to temporarily fix repayment for this supply based upon an interim allocation developed for an uncompleted project. The 1992 contract required the District to repay about \$5.545 million through the year 2037 at the project interest rate of 3.222% with annual payments of \$226,585. The net present value of the amount remaining from this income stream starting in 2009 is \$3,887,364.

However, the costs allocated to the contracted M&I supply, and the M&I supply available through additional contract amendments, may be significantly revised in the future upon project completion and Final Cost Allocation. An additional currently unallocated cost of \$7,419,513 is expected to be allocated to the contracted 2,000 acre-feet. Assuming that the costs allocated to the contracted 2,000 acre-feet will be increased by \$7,419,513 with the reallocation in 2019, the net present value of the stream of benefits from this reallocation is \$4,654,454. Therefore, under Reclamation’s assumptions, the net present value of the total stream of benefits anticipated under this contract is \$4,654,454 plus \$3,887,364, or \$8,541,818. The contracted M&I amount is \$4.1 million and the adjustment amount is \$7.4 million. In total non-discounted dollars, the Conservancy District owes the Federal government \$11.6 million.”

Committee Action: On May 14, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On September 10, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO cost estimate report for H.R. 2950 is unavailable.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 2950.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 3123 - Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel Remediation Act of 2009 (Lamborn, R-CO)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Major Changes Since the Last Time This Legislation Was Before the House: None, the bill was considered in the 110th (H.R. 5511) Congress and passed by a voice vote. On September 8 of this year, the bill was considered under suspension of the rules and failed by a vote of [206 – 191](#). The bill was primarily defeated in part of retaliation by House Democrats for the Republicans voting down an unrelated suspension (H.R. 324) earlier in the vote series.

Summary: H.R. 3123 would amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to require the Secretary of the Interior to fix problems caused by a collapsed drainage tunnel in Leadville, Colorado. The bill would require the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), to participate in the clean-up and repair of the Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel (LMDT) in Leadville, Colorado. The bill would require the BOR to participate in a remedy devised by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2003. The BOR would be required to treat water trapped behind blockage in the LMDT and maintain the mine pool behind the blockage at a level that prevents runoff and releases tunnel pressure. The bill would also require the BOR to repair and maintain the structural integrity of the LMDT as much as necessary to prevent tunnel failure and to prevent the uncontrolled release of water from the tunnel.

Additional Information: The Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel (LMDT) was created by the U.S. Bureau of Mines in order to drain water from mines near Leadville, Colorado. According to the Committee on Natural Resources, when the LMDT was completed it extended 11,299 feet and sent water from the Colorado mines to the Arkansas River. Over the years the mines that utilized the LMDT shut down and the drainage system was no longer beneficial to the Bureau of Mines. In 1959, the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) took control of the LMDT with the intention of using the tunnel as a means of drawing water from the Arkansas River for use in Eastern Colorado. However, the BOR was never able to utilize the LMDT and the tunnel sat unused. Since that time several tunnel collapses have occurred and trapped water within the tunnel. These water blockages have slowed the flow rate of the LMDT and led to higher water levels in the tunnel's "mine pools." The blockages have also sparked concerns that added pressure within the tunnel may lead to a spill or burst which could threaten residence and wildlife with mine-contaminated water seeping into drinking sources.

In 1983, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated the LMDT as a Superfund site, which made the tunnel eligible for priority environmental funding. However, under the Superfund law, the EPA is not authorized to use Superfund money on projects that are owned and managed by another federal agency. H.R. 3152 would require the Department of Interior, which still maintains possession of the LMDT through

the BOR, to take steps to treat the blocked water in the LMDT and ensure tunnel's structural integrity.

Committee Action: On July 8, 2009, the bill was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On July 10, 2009, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, which took no subsequent public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: While no CBO cost estimate for H.R. 3123 is available, the cost of implementing similar legislation considered in the 110th Congress would be \$90 million over the 2009-2013 period.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? A Committee Report citing compliance with rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. Such a report is technically not required because the bill is being considered under a suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A Committee Report citing constitutional authority is not available.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 905—Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve Boundary Modification Act (*Rep. Stupak, D-MI*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 905 would expand the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve boundaries to encompass the offshore waters of Presque Isle and Alcona Counties, Michigan and outward to the international border between the United States and Canada and provide underwater cultural resources of those areas equal protection to that currently afforded to the Sanctuary. Additionally, the bill would require for updated charts for the area in which the Sanctuary is located and management plan for the area. Based on information provided by the NOAA, the CBO estimates this boundary expansion to encompass about 4,000 square miles.

Additional Information: One of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration thirteen National Marine Sanctuaries, [Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary](#) was established to protect a nationally significant collection of over 100 shipwrecks, spanning over a century of Great Lakes shipping history. The mission of National Marine Sanctuaries program is “to serve as the trustee for the nation's system of marine protected areas, to conserve, protect, and enhance their biodiversity, ecological integrity and cultural legacy.”

Committee Action: On February 4, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On July 29, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, “managing a sanctuary of that size would cost \$2 million a year—about \$1 million more than the agency currently spends at the sanctuary—beginning in fiscal year 2010.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 905.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 1771—Chesapeake Bay Science, Education, and Ecosystem Enhancement Act of 2009 (*Rep. Sarbanes, D-MD*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: Authorizing \$78.897 million from 2011 through 2014, H.R. 1771 would reauthorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) Chesapeake Bay Office. H.R. 1771 requires the Director of NOAA to implement specific programs to support the activity of the Chesapeake Executive Council including the coordination of existing monitoring and observing activities in the Chesapeake Bay, interpreting data and information for use by educators and students to inspire stewardship

of Chesapeake Bay, and incorporating the Chesapeake Bay Interpretive Buoy System into the Integrated Ocean Observing System regional network of observatories.

Additional Information: Congress formally authorized NOAA's participation in the restoration activities for the Chesapeake Bay in 1984 and last reauthorized the program in 2002. That authority expired in 2006 and must be reauthorized to allow the NOAA to partner with other Federal agencies and non-government entities in efforts to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. NOAA's work in the Chesapeake Bay has primarily focused on the subjects of ecosystem science, coastal and living resources management, and environmental education. The agency's science and research programs assist with efforts to evaluate and assess trends in living resources, changes in environment, and establish management goals and progress indicators.

Specifically, the NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office's fish, shellfish and habitat restoration program are aimed at protecting the habitat of native oysters, blue crabs, and bay grasses throughout the watershed. The NOAA's Bay Watershed Education and Training program (B-WET) is intended to help make watershed education available to students and teachers throughout the in the regions to promote stewardship of the Bay.

Committee Action: On March 26, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On July 29, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, assuming appropriations, "implementing H.R. 1771 would cost \$68 million over the 2010-2014 period and \$11 million after 2014."

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 1771.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 1053—Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2009
(Rep. Wittman, R-VA)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 1053 requires the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Additionally, the bill would require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an adaptive management plan for the Chesapeake Bay Program and specific restoration activities defined in the bill.

Additional Information: According to the bill’s sponsor, “the Chesapeake Bay partnership includes 10 federal agencies, 6 states and the District of Columbia, thousands of localities and many non-governmental organizations. A crosscut budget can also track program accomplishments, measure progress towards achieving program goals, or compare activities conducted by various agencies with the same goal. The purpose of a crosscut budget is to present budget information from multiple agencies whose activities are targeted at a common policy goal or related policy goals. Crosscut budgets assist in making data from multiple agencies more understandable, and can be used to inform congressional oversight committees, participating agencies, and stakeholders implementing complex ecosystem initiatives.”

Committee Action: On February 4, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On July 29, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, “implementing this legislation would cost about \$1 million in 2010 and less than \$500,000 annually in subsequent years.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 1053.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.Res. 16 – Supporting the goals and ideals of National Life Insurance Awareness Month (Biggert, R-IL)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 16 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- “Supports the goals and ideals of ‘National Life Insurance Awareness Month’; and
- “Calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the citizens of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “Life insurance is an essential part of a sound financial plan;
- “Life insurance provides financial security for families by helping surviving members meet immediate and long-term financial obligations and objectives in the event of a premature death in their family;
- “Approximately 68,000,000 United States citizens lack the adequate level of life insurance coverage needed to ensure a secure financial future for their loved ones;
- “Life insurance products protect against the uncertainties of life by enabling individuals and families to manage the financial risks of premature death, disability, and long-term care;
- “Individuals, families, and businesses can benefit from professional insurance and financial planning advice, including an assessment of their life insurance needs; and
- “Numerous groups supporting life insurance have designated September 2009 as ‘National Life Insurance Awareness Month’ as a means to encourage consumers to--

(1) Become more aware of their life insurance needs;

(2) Seek professional advice regarding life insurance; and

(3) take the actions necessary to achieve financial security for their loved ones.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 16 was introduced on January 6, 2009, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The amendment was considered en bloc and passed committee by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution authorizes no expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: A committee reporting citing compliance with the rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. However, the resolution does not contain any earmarks.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576

H.Res. 693 - Honoring the life and accomplishments of Jim Johnson and extending the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family on the occasion of his death. (*Brady, D-PA*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 693 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- “Honors Jim Johnson and extends condolences to his family on the occasion of his death.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the NFL lost one of our greatest treasures yesterday;
- “Philadelphia Eagles Defensive Coordinator Jim Johnson passed away on July 28, 2009, after a courageous battle with cancer;
- “Johnson is regarded as one of the top defensive masterminds in NFL history;
- “a native of Maywood, Illinois, Johnson earned a bachelor's degree in education and a master's degree in physical education from Missouri;
- “Johnson is survived by his wife, Vicky, 2 children, Scott and Michelle, and 4 grandchildren, Katie, Justin, Brandon, and Jax.”

Additional Background: Born May 26, 1941, Jim Johnson was involved in coaching for more than 40 years. He played football while at college at the University of Missouri from 1959 to 1962 and went undrafted in the 1963 NFL Draft. Mr. Johnson began coaching at Missouri Southern, and then moved to Drake University, followed by Indiana University and then Notre Dame. He was defensive coordinator for Notre Dame from

1981 to 1983, for the Indianapolis Colts from 1996 to 1997, and the Philadelphia Eagles from 1999 to 2009. Mr. Johnson also held coaching positions with the [Oklahoma Outlaws](#), [Jacksonville Bulls](#), Arizona Cardinals, and the Seattle Seahawks. Mr. Johnson died on July 28, 2009 after a battle with melanoma.

Committee Action: H.Res. 693 was introduced on July 29, 2009, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The amendment was considered en bloc and passed committee by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution authorizes no expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: A committee reporting citing compliance with the rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. However, the resolution does not contain any earmarks.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576

H.Con.Res. 186 - Supporting the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month (*Davis, D-IL*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Con.Res. 186 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- “That the Congress supports the goals and ideals of Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “Sickle Cell Disease is an inherited blood disorder that is a major health problem in the United States and worldwide;
- “Sickle Cell Disease causes the rapid destruction of sickle cells, which results in multiple medical complications, including anemia, jaundice, gallstones, strokes, and restricted blood flow, damaging tissue in the liver, spleen, and kidneys, and death;

- “Approximately 1,000 babies are born with Sickle Cell Disease each year in the United States, with the disease occurring in approximately 1 in 500 newborn African-American infants, 1 in 1,000 newborn Hispanic-Americans, and is found in persons of Greek, Italian, East Indian, Saudi Arabian, Asian, Syrian, Turkish, Cypriot, Sicilian, and Caucasian origin;
- “Congress recognizes the importance of researching, preventing, and treating Sickle Cell Disease by authorizing treatment centers to provide medical intervention, education, and other services and by permitting the Medicaid program to cover some primary and secondary preventative medical strategies for children and adults with Sickle Cell Disease;
- “The Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Inc. remains the preeminent advocacy organization that serves the sickle cell community by focusing its efforts on public policy, research funding, patient services, public awareness, and education related to developing effective treatments and a cure for Sickle Cell Disease; and
- “The Sickle Cell Disease Association of America, Inc. has requested that the Congress designate September as Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month in order to educate communities across the Nation about sickle cell and the need for research funding, early detection methods, effective treatments, and prevention programs.”

Committee Action: H.Con.Res. 186 was introduced on September 16, 2009, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The amendment was considered en bloc and passed committee by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution authorizes no expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: A committee reporting citing compliance with the rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. However, the resolution does not contain any earmarks.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576

H.Res. 725 – Congratulating the Chula Vista Park View Little League team of Chula Vista, California, for winning the 2009 Little League World Series Championship. (Filner, D-CA)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 725 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- “Congratulates the Chula Vista Park View Little League Baseball Team from Chula Vista, California, on winning the 2009 Little League World Series Championship;
- “recognizes and commends the hard work, dedication, determination, and commitment to excellence of the members, parents, coaches, and managers of the Chula Vista Park View Little League team;
- “Recognizes and commends the people of Chula Vista, California, for the outstanding loyalty and support that they displayed for the Chula Vista Park View Little League team throughout the season; and
- “Respectfully requests that the Clerk of the House transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the City of Chula Vista and each player, manager, and coach of the Chula Vista Park View Little League Baseball Team.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “On Sunday, August 30, 2009, the Chula Vista Park View Little League Baseball Team from Chula Vista, California, rallied to defeat the Taoyuan, Taiwan (Chinese Taipei) Little League Team by a score of 6 to 3 to win the 2009 Little League World Series Championship at South Williamsport, Pennsylvania;
- “Chula Vista Park View is in its 41st season of playing little league baseball and is the fourth team from San Diego County to play in the Little League World Series championship game;
- “The 2009 Chula Vista Park View Little League World Championship Team consists of players Isaiah Armenta, Oscar Castro, Jr., Nick Conlin, Kiko Garcia, Bulla Graft, Seth Godfrey, Markus Melin, Jensen Petersen, Daniel Porras, Jr., Luke Ramirez, Andy Rios, and Bradley Roberto;
- “The 2009 Chula Vista Park View Little League World Championship Team is led by Manager Oscar Castro, Coach Ric Ramirez, and Park View Little League President Rod Roberto;
- “The achievement of the Chula Vista Park View Little League Baseball Team is the cause of enormous pride for the Nation, the State of California, and especially for the city of Chula Vista.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 725 was introduced on September 9, 2009, and referred to the House Committee on Government Reform, which took no public action.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution authorizes no expenditures. The resolution does request that the Clerk of the House transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the City of Chula Vista and each player, manager, and coach of the Chula Vista Park View Little League Baseball Team.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: A committee reporting citing compliance with the rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. However, the resolution does not contain any earmarks.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576

H.Res. 734 – Expressing the support for and honoring September 17, 2009 as “Constitution Day.” (Latta, R-OH)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 734 resolves that the House of Representatives:

- “Supports ‘Constitution Day’; and
- “Calls upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”

The resolution lists a number of findings, including:

- “The Constitution of the United States was signed on September 17, 1787, by 39 delegates from 12 States;
- “The Constitution was subsequently ratified by each of the original 13 States;
- “The Constitution was drafted in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for the citizens of the United States;
- “The House of Representatives continues to strive to preserve and strengthen the values and rights bestowed by the Constitution upon the United States and its citizens;
- “The Constitution is recognized by many to be the most significant and important document in history for establishing freedom and justice through democracy; and

- “The preservation of such values and rights in the hearts and minds of United States citizens would be advanced by official recognition of the signing of the Constitution.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 734 was introduced on September 17, 2009, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The amendment was considered en bloc and passed committee by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution authorizes no expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: A committee reporting citing compliance with the rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. However, the resolution does not contain any earmarks.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov (202) 226-8576

H.R. 3614—To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (*Velazquez, D-NY*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, September 29, 2009, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Difference since last time the bill was considered in the House: H.R. 3614 passed under suspension of the rules on September 23, 2009 by a vote of 417 – 2. The Senate amended the bill striking sections two and three and passed it on September 25, 2009. The amendment now makes H.R. 3614 a “clean” extension and does not amend section 355 of the Small Business Investment Act involving venture capitol or a section dealing with access to “stimulus” funds.

Summary: H.R. 3614 will extend programs covered under the Small Business and Small Business Investment Acts through October 31, 2009. Both of these acts were previously extended in 2007 and are now set to expire without reauthorization on September 30, 2009. This is the second temporary extension passed for these programs during the 111th Congress.

Additional Information: The Small Business Act (SBA) established the Small Business Administration to "encourage" and "develop" small business growth, and to aid minorities and other disadvantaged peoples in securing loans and learning management techniques in 1953. In 1958, Congress passed into law the Small Business Investment Act to ensure a "fair proportion" of government contracts and sales of surplus property include privately operated small businesses.

Committee Action: On September, 22, 2009 the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Small Business, which took no further subsequent public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO score of cost to tax payers is not available.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? A Committee Report citing compliance with rules regarding earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits is not available. Such a report is technically not required because the bill is being considered under a suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A Committee Report citing constitutional authority is not available.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.