

First, allow the NRC to retain its current workforce and attract new talent to license new reactors;

Second, lower the regulatory costs imposed upon new reactor developers so they are only paying for the expenses they are directly incurring;

Third, ease the processes allowing for demonstration reactors at Department of Energy sites, sites with critical national security infrastructure, and brownfield sites;

Fourth, make it easier to co-locate new nuclear reactors on sites with currently operating reactors; and

Fifth, allow for DOE to enter into long-term agreements to purchase electricity from a new nuclear reactor.

Now, I would say nuclear energy is a vital source of zero-carbon baseload power. It is imperative in our fight against the worsening climate crisis that we strengthen the NRC's regulatory processes so the agency is prepared to license 21st century reactors in a timely fashion that does not compromise on safety or public health. H.R. 6544 will do just that.

Again, I intend to vote for the bill while it is on the floor under suspension, and we urge all Members to join us in supporting the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), who represents Augusta, Georgia, where Plant Vogtle is.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6544, the bipartisan Atomic Energy Advancement Act, which aims to incentivize and advance nuclear energy production in the United States.

An all-of-the-above strategy is critical to reclaiming American energy dominance. As the Nation's largest source of clean energy, nuclear has a pivotal role to play.

Included in today's legislation is a bill I sponsored, the Nuclear Licensing Efficiency Act, which would improve the licensing review process for future nuclear projects by establishing updated procedures and timelines for reviewing nuclear licensing applications.

With the first two nuclear reactors built in over three decades in the United States located at Plant Vogtle, in my district, Georgia 12, we are leading our Nation's nuclear future. As we saw through the construction process, nuclear projects in the U.S. are often bogged down by burdensome licensing and permitting processes that result in unnecessary delays and cost overruns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, by modernizing the inefficient procedures that hamper our nuclear energy expansion, we can fully embrace the reliability of clean, 24/7 nuclear energy.

I am proud to have my bill as part of this broader, bipartisan Atomic Energy

Advancement Act to improve our nuclear energy regulatory process.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 6544.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I am thankful, once again, for the bipartisan nature of this legislation. I thank Ranking Member DEGETTE on the subcommittee and Ranking Member PALONE and their staff for all they have done. Let's get this passed. Let's work with our Senate colleagues. Let's get something to the President's desk and get something signed into law to move the Nation forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the Energy and Commerce Committee and Subcommittee Chairman DUNCAN for leading on this issue.

The Atomic Energy Advancement Act is an urgent and necessary package of bipartisan, commonsense reforms that will help unleash the full potential of America's commercial nuclear energy.

According to the Department of Energy, the United States will require at least 200 gigawatts of new electric power generation by 2030 to replace aging infrastructure and to meet growing energy needs. This demand will be impossible to fulfill without federal support for nuclear energy.

The Atomic Energy Advancement Act contains numerous, sensible regulatory reforms and market incentives that will empower the nuclear industry to provide affordable, resilient, reliable, and responsible power for Americans. Among these much-needed provisions are requirements that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission commits to efficiency and streamlines the licensing of safer and more affordable nuclear reactors.

Right now is the time for America to go all-in on nuclear power.

This package gives a modern regulatory framework to bring safe, clean, and affordable power. It unleashes American innovation, ensuring future generations of Americans energy abundance and energy independence.

I look forward to voting in support of this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6544, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### D.C. ROBERT F. KENNEDY MEMORIAL STADIUM CAMPUS REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the District of

Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus to the Administrator of General Services and the leasing of the Campus to the District of Columbia for purposes which include commercial and residential development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4984

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act".

#### SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OVER RFK MEMORIAL STADIUM CAMPUS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) EXERCISE OF TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(1) TRANSFER.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary"), acting under the authority of section 8124 of title 40, United States Code (except as provided under paragraph (2)), shall transfer administrative jurisdiction over the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus (hereafter referred to as the "Campus") to the District of Columbia (hereafter referred to as the "District"), subject to a Declaration of Covenants with the District which is consistent with the succeeding provisions of this Act and which includes such other terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the Secretary and the District.

(2) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR PRIOR RECOMMENDATION OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION.—The second sentence of section 8124(a) of title 40, United States Code, shall not apply to the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section.

(3) NO EFFECT ON STATUS OF OWNERSHIP OF CAMPUS.—Consistent with section 8124 of title 40, United States Code, the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section does not change the status of the ownership of the Campus by the United States.

(b) DEVELOPMENT AND USES OF CAMPUS.—After transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section, the District may develop and use, and permit the development and use of, the Campus for any of the following purposes:

(1) Stadium purposes, including training facilities, offices, and other structures necessary to support a stadium.

(2) Commercial and residential development.

(3) Facilities, open space, and public outdoor opportunities, which may include supporting cultural activities, educational activities, and recreational activities, as such terms are defined in section 3306(a) of title 40, United States Code.

(4) Such other public purposes for which the Campus was used or approved for use prior to June 1, 1985.

(5) Demolition purposes to facilitate development and use of the Campus under subparagraphs (1) through (4).

(c) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF CAMPUS.—The Declaration of Covenants entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall include provisions to require the District to meet the following requirements as a condition of the development and use of the Campus as set forth

under subsection (b) after transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section:

(1) The District shall ensure that the development and use does not materially degrade or adversely impact any lands under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the restoration of the wetlands south of Kingman Island.

(2) The District shall designate, develop, operate, and maintain at least 30 percent of the Campus (excluding the riparian area of the Campus as defined in subsection (g)(2)) as the "Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Park" as parks and open space to provide land for passive and active outdoor recreation and shall require that portion to be reserved for such purposes for the duration of the transfer.

(3) The District shall ensure that the development and use provides for improved public access to the Anacostia River and shall not interrupt the Anacostia River Trail.

(4) The District shall, to the extent necessary, ensure that parking facilities are provided to accommodate the development.

(5) The District shall provide for adequate public safety and security measures and resources in the planning and ongoing management of the development.

(6) The District shall carry out measures that, to the greatest extent practicable, will reduce the impact of noise and traffic of the development on surrounding residential areas in the District.

(7) The District shall operate and maintain the riparian area of the Campus in accordance with subsection (g).

(8) The District shall ensure that no Member of Congress, Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, or any other official of the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia shall be admitted to any share or part of any lease entered into by the District in the exercise of the administrative jurisdiction over the Campus transferred under this section, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom, including any contract or agreement made, entered into, or accepted by or on behalf of the District as a result of this section. Nothing in the previous sentence may be construed to apply to a person who is a shareholder or other beneficial owner of any publicly held corporation or other entity, if the lease is for the general benefit of such corporation or other entity.

(d) SURVEY.—

(1) REQUIRING SURVEY.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the District shall conduct a survey of the Campus, which shall determine the exact acreage and legal description of the Campus by a boundary survey prepared by a qualified Federally-, State-, or District-licensed surveyor who is approved by the Secretary.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion, the survey conducted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted to—

(A) the Committee on Oversight and Accountability and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(3) INCORPORATION IN DECLARATION OF COVENANTS FOR TRANSFER.—The survey conducted under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated in the Declaration of Covenants entered into under subsection (a)(1).

(4) AVAILABILITY OF SURVEY AND MAP FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—The survey conducted under paragraph (1), together with the map of the Campus referred to in subsection (m), shall be kept on file and available for public

inspection in the appropriate offices of the Secretary.

(e) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—As a condition of the development and use of the Campus after transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section, the Secretary and the District shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to determine an allocation of the costs of carrying out all responsibilities of the United States and the District with respect to the Campus under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), including any costs of any response action with respect to any contamination present on the Campus.

(f) COSTS.—

(1) COSTS OF TRANSFER.—The District shall be responsible for payment of any costs of carrying out the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section, including—

(A) any costs of carrying out the survey under subsection (d); and

(B) any costs of carrying out any environmental analysis required under Federal law.

(2) COSTS AFTER TRANSFER.—Except as provided under the memorandum of understanding entered into under subsection (e), the Secretary shall not be responsible for payment of any costs or expenses that are incurred by the District or any other party (other than the United States) associated with the Campus after the transfer of administrative jurisdiction under this section.

(g) SPECIAL RULES FOR RIPARIAN AREA.—

(1) RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT AND USE.—The Declaration of Covenants entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall include provisions to ensure that the riparian area of the Campus may not be developed or used for any purposes other than the continuing maintenance of any development, use, or infrastructure (including roads and pathways) existing at the time of the execution of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section.

(2) RIPARIAN AREA OF THE CAMPUS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "riparian area of the Campus" means the area designated in the map referred to in subsection (m) as "Riparian Area (Area F)".

(h) PROHIBITING USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR STADIUM.—The Declaration of Covenants entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall include provisions to ensure that the District may not use Federal funds for stadium purposes on the Campus, including training facilities, offices, and other structures necessary to support a stadium.

(i) TERM.—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section shall be in effect for a term of not less than 99 years, and may be renewed for subsequent periods agreed to by the Secretary and the District.

(j) REVERSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) GROUNDS FOR REVERSION.—The Declaration of Covenants entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall include provisions stating that administrative jurisdiction over the Campus transferred under this section shall revert to the Secretary if each of the following occurs:

(A) The terms and conditions of the Declaration of Covenants have not been complied with, as reasonably determined by the Secretary.

(B) Such noncompliance has not been corrected within 90 days after written notice of such noncompliance has been received by the District. Such noncompliance shall be treated as corrected if the District and the Secretary enter into an agreement that the Secretary finds adequate to ensure that the

Campus will be developed and used in a manner consistent with the purposes referred to in subsection (b).

(2) TIMING.—The Secretary may not seek the reversion of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this subsection before the expiration of 90 days after the date on which written notice of the alleged violation is received by the District. The notice shall include notice of the Secretary's intention for administrative jurisdiction over the Campus to revert to the Secretary.

(3) COST OF REHABILITATING PROPERTY.—The Declaration of Covenants entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall include provisions requiring the District to bear the actual cost of removing structures from or rehabilitating the Campus if administrative jurisdiction over the Campus reverts to the Secretary under this subsection.

(k) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO THE APPLICABILITY TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TRANSFER.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect or limit the application of or obligation to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(l) CONFORMING AMENDMENT; TERMINATION OF EXISTING LEASE.—Effective on the date of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Campus under this section—

(1) the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 (sec. 3-321 et seq., D.C. Official Code) is repealed; and

(2) the lease dated January 14, 1988, between the United States and the District for the use of the Campus, as authorized by section 7(b)(1)(B) of such Act (sec. 3-326(b)(1)(B), D.C. Official Code), is terminated.

(m) DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term "Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus" means the approximately 174 acres of Federal land as generally depicted on the map entitled "Anacostia Park, Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus - Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction", numbered 831/189,767, and dated January 2024.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1630

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4984, a bill that will provide economic opportunities to an area of our Nation's Capital in dire need of revitalization.

The bill transfers administrative jurisdiction over the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium campus from our National Park Service to the District of Columbia.

Under H.R. 4984, the Federal Government will retain ownership of the land while the District of Columbia manages the development, costs, and the use of the land.

Transferring administrative jurisdiction over property is a unique tool for the Congress, which allows the Federal Government to retain title to lands while the district assumes the responsibilities of administration and maintenance.

This tool has already been used multiple times to great effect in our Nation's Capital.

Under the current law granting D.C. a 99-year lease of land, the District cannot engage in any commercial or residential development of the land. With the lease set to expire in 2038, there are few options for future use of the property without congressional action.

This status quo is untenable.

H.R. 4984 fixes this problem by allowing stadium purposes, recreational purposes, and residential and commercial development. This allows the District of Columbia to revitalize this site, turning what was once a blight on our Nation's Capital into a thriving area of commerce and community.

Importantly, the bill also imposes any remediation or environmental costs onto the District of Columbia, saving taxpayer dollars that would otherwise be spent by the National Park Service.

As Congress continues to carry out its oversight duties over our Nation's Capital, this bipartisan bill will help create jobs and improve our great Capital City.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan bill. This bill would allow the District of Columbia to transform the RFK Stadium campus, 174 acres of underutilized Federal land in D.C. that primarily consists of parking lots, sports fields, and a long-vacant stadium in the process of being demolished, into a thriving mixed-use development.

The National Capital Planning Commission, the central planning agency for the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, has long called for the revitalization of the campus, and the Department of the Interior testified in support of the goals of this bill.

During my tenure, Congress has passed several bipartisan bills to transform underutilized land in D.C. into thriving mixed-use developments, including The Yards on the southeast waterfront and The Wharf on the southwest waterfront. Reservation 13, 67 acres next to the RFK campus, is now being transformed into a mixed-use development.

Since 1988, D.C. has leased, without consideration, the RFK Stadium campus from the Department of the Interior. The lease only permits D.C. to use

the campus for recreation, a stadium, and open space. The lease expires in 2038.

This bill would give D.C. administrative jurisdiction over the campus for at least 99 years and permit D.C. to use the campus for commercial and residential development, recreation, a stadium, parks, and open space.

This bill would require D.C. to preserve 30 percent of the campus for parks and open space, and prohibit D.C. from building along the waterfront.

This bill is a win-win for the Federal and D.C. Governments. As the Department of the Interior testified, this bill would allow D.C. to transform the campus from "acres of asphalt to a complex focused on community sports, recreation, park space, and community amenities" and would "guarantee public access to a sizable amount of park land and outdoor recreation areas."

At the same time, this bill would allow D.C. to create a mixed-use development and to generate significant revenue for D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman COMER for his leadership and partnership on this bill, and I also thank Chairman WESTERMAN and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), the sponsor of the bill and the great chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) for yielding, and I thank my cosponsor, the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., (Ms. NORTON).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4984, which repurposes approximately 174 acres of unused Federal land in Washington, D.C.

Despite its long history and importance to D.C. residents, the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium campus in southeast D.C. has been abandoned to become unused parking lots, open fields, and a deteriorating stadium that is being demolished.

The campus is currently under a lease that requires the land to be used for stadium purposes, recreational purposes, or other public purposes. Under current law, the campus cannot be used for commercial or residential development.

Absent congressional action, this land in our Nation's Capital will remain unused with ongoing maintenance costs and environmental liabilities remaining the full responsibility of the National Park Service—an ongoing burden for the American taxpayer.

My bill, H.R. 4984, will change that.

The bill transfers administrative jurisdiction from the National Park Service to Washington, D.C., while preserving the Federal Government's ownership of the land. This allows Wash-

ington, D.C., to use the land for stadium purposes, commercial and residential development, recreational facilities, open spaces, or additional public purposes.

However, D.C. may not use Federal funds for any potential future development of a sports stadium. The bill enables D.C. to transform the unused RFK campus into stores, restaurants, office buildings, and apartment complexes.

This economic development will help revitalize the RFK stadium campus, creating new jobs and tax revenue for the District's residents.

Let me be clear. Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee the Nation's Capital City. We have diligently exercised this role by holding numerous oversight hearings in the Oversight Committee this Congress with the Mayor of D.C., and the D.C. City Council.

We have also successfully blocked, in bipartisan fashion with the President's support, the city council's ill-advised criminal reform legislation from going into effect last year—the first law of the 118th Congress.

We will continue looking for legislative opportunities to return order to the District by addressing the rising crime crises, returning Federal workers to their offices in the District to contribute to the local economy, and seeking ways to bolster the educational system.

The D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act also represents Congress doing its job to oversee the District by authorizing the best utilization of area land to help the city thrive.

We should want this for our Nation's Capital City—a home to the taxpayer's Federal workforce and a city that hosts millions of American visitors and global tourists each year.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my committee colleague, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, for working with me to write this smart, bipartisan legislation. I thank the Natural Resource chairman, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ranking Member GRIJALVA, and their staff, for working with my staff to write the improved bill we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill so that we can help revitalize our Nation's Capital.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act.

Just 2 miles from Capitol Hill, the RFK Stadium was a prime sports and entertainment venue for almost 50 years. Today, the stadium and the land that surrounds it sits vacant on the shore of the Anacostia River.

This long-awaited bill would permit the District of Columbia to revitalize the underused Federal lands of the

RFK Stadium, enriching the culture of our Nation's Capital and making good on our responsibility to be good stewards of the land for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing the plans that Mayor Bowser and the D.C. leaders are developing to make good use of the space and better meet the needs of the local community.

I acknowledge and thank the tireless advocacy of our colleague, Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, on this issue, and I applaud the bipartisan collaboration that made this legislation possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this timely legislation.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4984, which is bipartisan legislation that I am cosponsoring to allow development of the RFK Memorial Stadium campus in the heart of Washington, D.C.

As a former football player at the University of Arkansas, I know the powerful ways that sports can bring communities and even States together.

The current RFK Memorial Stadium, located just down the road from the Capitol, has had a long and complex history but is now decrepit and falling apart. The legislation before us today will allow D.C. to mark the end of decades of legal limbo and the start of an age of economic revitalization.

Under the bill, the National Park Service will no longer have to maintain and operate the campus, freeing up finite resources to focus on their deferred maintenance backlog. In turn, D.C. will be able to revitalize this area and create thousands of jobs with new commercial, residential, and recreational facilities. This can serve as a model going forward for other communities, particularly those with large footprints of Federal land, and represents a win-win for both the Federal Government and D.C.

I would take a moment to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to this legislation and the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

Over the course of several months of bipartisan negotiations that involved the Natural Resources Committee, the Oversight and Accountability Committee, as well as the city of D.C., and the National Park Service, several improvements were made to the bill. During these negotiations, we reached a bipartisan consensus that after this bill passes, the National Park Service will conduct a NEPA analysis on the transfer of administrative jurisdiction itself. After the transfer, NEPA will no longer apply to D.C.'s development and use of the site because those activities will not be considered major Federal actions.

This follows decades of precedent with previous administrative jurisdiction transfers, as well as technical as-

sistance and advice provided by the Department of the Interior. The National Park Service also provided several examples of instances in which the agency transferred administrative jurisdiction of land to D.C., including as recently as 2022. In none of these instances did NEPA apply after the transfer of administrative jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, the examples below were provided by the National Park Service (NPS) to the House Committee on Natural Resources during the consideration of amendments to H.R. 4984 of instances in which NPS transferred administrative jurisdiction of NPS lands within the District of Columbia. According to NPS, "in executing each transfer, the NPS complied with all applicable laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act. After transfer of administrative jurisdiction under this authority, the District of Columbia assumed the management and legal responsibilities for the properties."

1. 2010 transfer of approximately 15 acres in the northern section of Fort Dupont Park

Prior to the transfer, NPS issued a finding of no significant impact (FONSI), which stated: "After the transfer of jurisdiction, the property will be the responsibility of the District since it will no longer be managed by NPS and will no longer be a part of Fort Dupont Park, and District environmental standards will apply."

2. 2014 transfer of a portion (Reservation 520) of Fort Lincoln

Prior to the transfer, NPS issued a finding of no significant impact (FONSI), which stated: "After the land transfer, the property would no longer be owned by the NPS and would be the responsibility of the District. Consequently, the District's environmental standards would apply."

<https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=198&projectID=44032&documentID=100579>

3. 2022 transfer of another portion (Reservation 405) of Fort Dupont Park

Prior to the transfer, NPS issued a decision form finding that the transfer was categorically excluded from further analysis under NEPA.

[https://www.nepc.gov/files/projects/2021/8324 Reservation 405 - Portion of Fort Dupont Park Transfer of Jurisdiction - NEPA Document - CATEX Nov2021.pdf](https://www.nepc.gov/files/projects/2021/8324%20Reservation%20405%20-%20Portion%20of%20Fort%20Dupont%20Park%20Transfer%20of%20Jurisdiction%20-%20NEPA%20Document%20-%20CATEX%20Nov2021.pdf)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, because there was a clear consensus and prior historical evidence demonstrating that NEPA would not apply to the development of the campus after the administrative jurisdiction transfer, the legislative text did not include superfluous savings clauses regarding NEPA's applicability.

In addition to this, it is my hope that both D.C. and the Department of the Interior will abide by Congress' 6-month timeframe provided in the legislation to reach all necessary agreements and complete the transfer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the hard work and collaboration of Chairman COMER, Delegate HOLMES NORTON, and the entire staff of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

I would also thank Ranking Member GRIJALVA and his team, the Energy and Commerce Committee, and the Trans-

portation and Infrastructure Committee for their assistance in getting this legislation to the floor today.

Finally, I would recognize several people without whom this legislation would not be possible: Beverly Perry, Tara Hupman, Jerry Couri, and Lisa Pittman. From the House Natural Resources Committee staff, I thank Aniela Butler, Brandon Miller, Colen Morrow, and Taylor Wiseman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the legislation.

□ 1645

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act.

This legislation presents an opportunity to revitalize the RFK Stadium Campus, a historic site that has served as a cornerstone of our Nation's Capital sporting legacy for over five decades. However, over the past two decades, the campus has sadly remained underutilized due to outdated statutory restrictions.

These restrictions have limited the use of the RFK campus to stadium purposes only, leading to a gradual decline and erosion. This legislation focuses on transforming the RFK campus into a mixed-use site, which will create thousands of jobs.

Additionally, it ensures that District residents gain direct access to premium recreational opportunities, including green spaces and scenic walking trails along the riverfront.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act.

Like other members of the Maryland delegation, I believe Prince George's County and Maryland should be able to compete on a level playing field to keep the Washington Commanders, but this bill would give an unfair advantage to D.C. It is most certainly not a level playing field when one interested jurisdiction receives a free transfer of Federal Government-subsidized land.

I am not opposed to D.C. bidding to be the new home of the Washington Commanders, but its pursuit of the Commanders should be no different than its efforts to compete with Virginia for the Wizards and Capitals.

This is also a bad deal for Federal taxpayers. This bill transfers control over Federal Government property at no apparent cost to the District of Columbia so that private ownership can

build a football stadium. This is not a District of Columbia home rule issue. This is no different than any other city or State competing for a sports franchise or stadium, no different than the State of New Jersey competing with the State of New York for the Jets or the Giants.

I also do not object to the redevelopment or renovation of the current RFK campus. I think it would be outstanding to have new housing, retail use, and park space there. As a matter of fact, I live near the stadium and drive by it every day, but I do not believe a cost-free land transfer largely for stadium purposes provides the best opportunity to achieve these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments from my friend from Maryland.

The National Park Service has a maintenance backlog of \$23 billion, including \$2 billion in the District of Columbia alone. The National Park Service does not have the money to transform the RFK Stadium site from acres of asphalt into parks or mixed uses.

There is precedent for Congress giving title to or administration jurisdiction over Federal land to States and other jurisdictions for no consideration. We do not have to look far for examples. Let's look at two of the many examples in D.C.

First, section 8124 of title 40 of the U.S. Code has long permitted the Federal Government to transfer administrative jurisdiction over Federal land in D.C. to the D.C. government for no consideration. Second, in 1986, Congress directed the Department of the Interior to enter into a 50-year lease with D.C. for the RFK Stadium site for no consideration.

While it is true that H.R. 4984 does not require D.C. to pay the Federal Government for administrative jurisdiction over the RFK Stadium site, it is expected D.C. will spend hundreds of millions of dollars transforming the site from acres of asphalt into mixed-use development.

This bill would not require a stadium to be built at the site. Whether to build a stadium would be a decision for the elected D.C. government. Several members of the D.C. Council have expressed opposition to a new football stadium at the site.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act will allow D.C. to develop the vacant RFK Stadium site.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill that will promote economic growth and revitalization for Southeast D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, while Chairman COMER and I often have plenty to disagree on, today I join him and Delegate NORTON to rise in support of H.R. 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act.

This bipartisan bill will allow the District of Columbia to reenergize Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium campus and redevelop the 174 acres of underutilized federal land into a new stadium, additional housing units, and green spaces.

As a result, these developments will spur economic growth, improve the surrounding infrastructure, and substantially transform the neighborhood.

H.R. 4984 represents the fight to protect and expand Home Rule.

As a former local government official having served on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors for 14 years, including five as chairman and as a former chairman of the Council of Governments I have consistently supported autonomy for the District.

Congress must do the same to uphold the will of thousands of constituents and civil servants who live and work in the District.

Let me remind my colleagues of what my fellow Virginian, James Madison, said in the Federalist Papers, Number 43, with respect to the intent of the Congressional authority.

In referring to the residents of this federal District, Madison said "they will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes."

There is no more basic exercise of municipal authority than planning critical investments for the community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4984, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

#### SERVICE-DISABLED VETERAN OPPORTUNITIES IN SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3511) to amend the

Small Business Act to require training on increasing contract awards to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3511

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Service-Disabled Veteran Opportunities in Small Business Act".

#### SEC. 2. TRAINING ON INCREASING CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SERVICE-DISABLED VETERANS.

Section 36 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) TRAINING ON INCREASING CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SERVICE-DISABLED VETERANS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Office of Veterans Business Development, shall provide to covered employees at each Federal agency that has not met the goal established under section 15(g)(1)(A)(ii) training on how to increase the number of contracts awarded to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans.

"(2) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Office of Veterans Business Development, shall issue guidance and best practices on increasing the number of contracts awarded to small businesses owned and controlled by service disabled veterans for Federal agencies to which the goal established under section 15(g)(1)(A)(ii) applies.

"(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administration shall submit to Congress a report detailing, for the fiscal year covered by the report—

"(A) a list of each Federal agency that failed to meet the goal established under section 15(g)(1)(A)(ii);

"(B) the number of trainings provided to each Federal agency described in paragraph (1); and

"(C) an overview of the content included in such training sessions."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this is the first of eight bills from the Committee on Small Business that we will