United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2013 No. 149

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 28, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 23, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEIRUT BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today in remembrance of the bombing of the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, 30 years ago.

On October 23, 1983, at approximately 6:20 in the morning, a truck packed with explosives broke security and detonated outside of the barracks, killing 241 Americans and wounding 128 more.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that, on the 30th anniversary of this act of terrorism, we recognize the sacrifice of the individuals who lost life and limb, and join with the families and friends of the victims in mourning their loss.

Furthermore, I believe that we should learn from the example of America's leader at the time of the bombing, President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan appreciated the sacrifice made by our servicemembers and was deeply pained by the loss of life.

While many other Presidents would have continued sacrificing young men and women for the sake of the mission in Lebanon, President Reagan acknowledged his mistake. I would like to take a moment to read a statement he made regarding the bombing:

> Perhaps we didn't appreciate fully enough the depth of the hatred and the complexity of the problems that made the Middle East such a jungle. Perhaps the idea of a suicide car bomber committing mass murder to gain instant entry to Paradise was so foreign to our own values and consciousness that it did not create in us the concern for the marines' safety that it should have.
>
> In the weeks immediately after the bombing, I believed the last thing we should do was to turn tail and leave. Yet the irrationality of Middle East politics forced us to rethink our policy. If there would be some rethinking of policy before our men die, we would be a lot better off. If that policy had changed toward more of a neutral position and neutrality, those 241 marines would be alive today.

I have read these quotes from President Reagan to honor the sacrifice of the 241 marines and their families. They did not die in vain, but gave their lives to bring peace to a troubled area.

The leaders of our country must learn from tragedies like Beirut that our men and women in uniform are very precious. Our foreign policy must be formed with a better understanding of the commitment and purpose in a mission before we risk the life of one single American.

I believe sincerely that this was the point President Reagan was making as he remarked with remorse on the bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23 of 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to represent Camp Lejeune Marine Base and other bases in eastern North Carolina, and I have visited the Beirut memorial many times to look at the names, certainly people I never knew and probably would not have known.

But the point is that our foreign policy continues today in Afghanistan. We have had six Americans killed in the last week. In the bill that passed recently to raise the debt ceiling, there was $30 billion for Karzai, who is a crook.

I do not understand this Congress, why we continue to sacrifice our young men and women, and why we continue to send money that we do not have to a foreign dictator and we cut programs

Printed on recycled paper.

for children and seniors who want to have a meal.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I honor the 241 who died by saying I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And Dear God, I ask You to continue to bless America.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is news to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that you don't win every battle around here. The place is tough, and occasionally you get knocked down. The measure of a man or woman in Congress, or anyplace for that matter, is what do you after.

We all witnessed a political showdown over the past several weeks, and now it is time to put it behind us. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to step up and show the country what you are made of, and let us actually legislate on behalf of the American people.

I have heard a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say things like, We don't trust that President; we can't work with this President.

So, Mr. Speaker, does this apply to everything?

Will there be no legislation until there is a different President in 2017?

Well, that doesn't sound very realistic.

On my side of the aisle, they are already saying, oh, those Republicans, they are hard-liners; they will not compromise on anything. And when someone does reach across the aisle to say, hey, let's work on an issue together, what do we get?

Hey, why are you helping them?

I have heard it. When I stood with DAVID VALADAO in California, or PAUL RYAN in Chicago to say immigration reform is an objective we can reach in a bipartisan manner, I heard from the Democrats: stop working with them, we're trying to defeat them. We want to take the House back.

Look, I get it. There are millions of dollars to be raised by partisan bickering. Your side raised a ton of money off the past battle, and my side has too.

The fact is that if two of us get into a shouting match, it is news; and if it gets bad, it will be shown on every channel. But if two of us reach an agreement on something, it's not news.

You know, bipartisanship is something that is much lauded here, but it is infrequently applauded and rarely rewarded.

But here is the thing. The only way we actually get anything done is to put aside the shouting matches and work together. I want immigration reform to pass; and even though I think almost every single Democrat agrees with me, it is still not enough because there are only 201 of us.

We don't run the Rules Committee or set the agenda. The Republicans are the majority in the House, so I know I have to work with the other side.

On your side, you say you don't like what the Senate passed. Let's not just respond with nothing. Let's craft a House response and put our own proposal on the table.

Those on the other side of the aisle say they don't trust the President and can't work with him. Well, okay. Fine. Then work with your colleagues on this side of the aisle.

You know, there are 435 of us. We need 218 votes to pass a bill, and the President doesn't get a vote.

The truth is that even during the shutdown, many on your side of the aisle have been drafting proposals that many of us on this side of the aisle are willing to work with you on. The question is whether the work on a bipartisan basis will be allowed to flourish.

I want to spend the rest of this Congress working with whoever wants to join, in either party, to get immigration reform done.

Your side needs a little time to recover from the last fight? I get that. But with 1,100 deportations every day, we can't wait forever. The kids who are losing their moms are not going to wait for you or for me. The husbands and the fathers who die in the desert because their wives and kids live here don't have any more time to give.

But you probably ask, LUIS, after the battle over health care and budget, how can two parties ever work together?

But, you know, that is exactly what I thought in 1996: How can we work together?

I was here 17 years ago. In 1996, it was Speaker Gingrich who shut down the government. But after that, let's remember what happened. We passed a series of major bipartisan bills on difficult policy issues.

Welfare reform was crafted, in part, by a very conservative House, and signed by a very liberal President Clinton. He had vetoed the bill twice before but, after the shutdown, reached an agreement with the Republican majority.

The Kennedy-Kassenbaum bill was historic, bipartisan legislation on health care, and we passed it after the shutdown. We can do the same if politicians in both parties are committed to accomplishments over campaign talking points. We can pass immigration reform this year.

We all know that immigration reform is immensely popular with voters in both parties who want a political solution to fixing our broken immigration system. Diverse constituencies back immigration reform, like labor unions and business owners and evangelical leaders and Catholic bishops and leaders across the political spectrum.

Don't think of it as working with President Obama if it makes it easier for you. Think of it as doing your job. Think of it as working on behalf of the American people, not for an Obama solution, not for a Tea Party solution, but for an American solution.

POLITICAL DOUBLE STANDARD AT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, if you missed this past Sunday morning TV talking heads shows, you missed the political double standard at work. Time and again, the hosts of the aforesaid programs referred to the recent ''Republican government shutdown.''

Wait a minute. Republican government shutdown?

There were two advocacy groups to this affair: one, President Obama and the Democratic administration and, two, the Republicans.

So it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that a more accurate description would be the Republicans, President Obama and the Democrat administration and the government shutdown.

The Republicans, in spite of the President's adamant refusal to negotiate, requested a 1-year delay for the controversial health care proposal. The President rejected that proposal but, considering the reviews surrounding his health care proposal, which are, at best, dismal, it was an offer the President should have embraced.

All of us, in and out of the political arena, should dismiss the application of the double standard that oftentimes is used in this town, and we should encourage objectivity to prevail over subjectivity; and, in so doing, our country will become the beneficiary of good government, of fair government. Good government finally will be promoted in the end, and we will all benefit therefrom.

THE NATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the House begins consideration of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which includes in the title the word ''reform'' but would represent a huge step backwards.

This legislation would have significant impact on the way the Army Corps of Engineers conducts projects that are critical to the Nation's environmental and economic health. I have long worked to help the Corps be a better partner which, in times past, has proved troublesome.

It was my pleasure to work with the head of the Corps previously, General Robert Flowers, and his staff to change the way the Corps does business. Otherwise, we can waste a lot of money and

inflict unnecessary environmental damage.

One of the ways the Corps meets its environmental responsibilities is by compliance with the National and Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, signed into law on New Year's Day in 1970 by President Richard Nixon.

Earlier this year, Glen Bowman, an official with the Georgia Department of Transportation, shared with Georgia legislators President Nixon's observation that clean air, clean water, open space should be the birthright of every American. Through our years of past carelessness, we have incurred a debt to nature that is now being called.

Mr. Bowman told the legislators that 43 years later the price tag is even higher, some problems remain, and daunting challenges loom, but that NEPA's impact is unquestionable. It remains the Nation's guiding environmental star.

He observes that environmental needs and protecting the environment are not mutually exclusive, and it is important to work together to achieve those objectives.

□ 1015

Sadly, for me, the most critical element in a bill that I would like to support is the damage to the NEPA process. Placing an artificial time limit of 150 days, restricting the internal activities of the agencies, giving them limited time to move the process along, interfering with the chain of command, cutting out the public from the process, and forcing a shorter time for litigation is unnecessary. It is ill-advised, and it is not going to solve the problem. Project delays are not a result of the NEPA process. There are billions of dollars of projects that are already approved and ready to go—$60 billion by some estimates. The problem is that Congress has not adequately funded the Corps.

I will be offering an amendment with the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman DEFAZIO, that simply suspends this ill-advised amendment to NEPA, seriously compromising it and the public process, until the project backlog disappears in order to move forward with the already approved projects. Ironically, this bill would add to the backlog while it truncates the NEPA process.

NEPA protects community values. It can often result in alternatives that are even less costly as well as less damaging to the environment. Before we rush to implement ill-advised changes under the guise of reform, let's get rid of the backlog of already approved projects first and be able to work through the consequences.

Forcing more projects that will be ill-considered will make them less worthy of funding. For agencies that are chronically underfunded and are facing further budget cuts, imposing artificial time limits on an already overwhelming backlog is not a prescription for more development projects being completed and better performance. It is a prescription for sloppy work, ill-advised approvals, and more litigation when we should be concentrating on getting the job done. It will make it harder to serve the public and get the financial support to build vital projects.

I urge my colleagues to support the DeFazio-Blumenauer amendment to reduce the backlog of projects ready to go before complicating and weakening environmental protections and the public's right to participate.

I now would like to enter into the RECORD the comments of Mr. Glenn Bowman from the Georgia Department of Transportation.

NEPA IS THE GUIDE STAR

(By Glenn Bowman)

Shortly after signing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) into law on New Year's Day in 1970, President Richard Nixon discussed it in his State of the Union Address:

''The great question . . . is shall we make peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water? . . . Clean air, clean water, open spaces—these should once again be the birthright of every American. . . . The price tag is high. Through our years of past carelessness, we have incurred a debt to nature. Now that debt is being called.''

Now, 43 years later, that price tag is even higher. Some old problems remain, and daunting new challenges loom. Still, NEPA's impact is unquestionable; it remains the nation's environmental guide star.

At Georgia's Department of Transportation—the entity responsible for more earth work in this state than any other—NEPA has a huge impact on planning, designing and building transportation infrastructure. Virtually everything we do begins with ''complying with the NEPA process.''

We must:

Protect water quality, air quality, endangered plant and animal species and their habitats, migratory birds, wetlands, streams, rivers, harbors, flood plains, farmlands and the soil itself;

Preserve historic and culturally significant buildings and places;

Save archaeologically significant resources;

Guard against noise pollution;

Make certain native peoples and the disadvantaged are treated equitably;

Mitigate for unavoidable impacts, and always engage the public in our decision-making process.

This requires a considerable investment in time, staff and money. Making a project NEPA-compliant sometimes requires rerouting; re-locating cemeteries and historic structures; and archaeological ''digs'' to recover important artifacts. We create or improve wetlands and streams to mitigate for like areas that need to be altered. We work with affected residents to help offset impacts to their neighborhoods and lives.

Recently, the need to study areas of North Georgia for the presence of the endangered Indiana and gray bats has garnered attention. Such examination simply is part of a process we are required by law to undertake for numerous plant and animal species, be they cuddly or creepy.

With as many as 700 projects ongoing at any time, not everyone is always going to be satisfied. But our foremost mission is to help make those 700 projects realities; keep motorists safe and moving, and grow that network as Georgia grows.

Meeting our transportation needs and protecting our environment are not mutually exclusive objectives; doing both does not have to be a contentious, adversarial struggle. Working together—internally, with partner agencies, businesses, local governments and citizens—we can repay our debt to nature, have a world-class transportation system, and preserve the beauty and many wonders of Georgia for generations to come.

AMERICA'S OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, in just a few short months, we will again find ourselves debating how to not shut down the Federal Government. Our Nation's fiscal woes are not temporary. In fact, they have plagued us for many years, and we have got to stop trying to solve these problems with temporary solutions.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we are now $17 trillion in debt, and our government continues to spend and spend and spend. Last Thursday, our Nation's debt jumped $328 billion in just 1 day. This surpassed the previous high set 2 years ago by over $100 billion. It is time Congress breaks this pattern. We do not want to be a Nation drowning in debt but, rather, one of economic leadership throughout the world, pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend. It is simply not the way to run a government, a business, or a family budget. Yet the Federal Government continues to borrow without addressing what got us here in the first place, which is out-of-control spending.

Mr. Speaker, the deal agreed to last week didn't do a single thing to cut spending or tackle the real drivers of our debt; and if we do not change this, we will never get ourselves out of the fiscal rut but, instead, find ourselves repeating history over and over and over again, governing and spending by continuing resolutions. Rather than passing temporary spending bills and short-term extensions to the debt ceiling, we should be working to pass all 12 appropriation bills and a real budget. This doesn't need to be a deal at the eleventh hour. If we go through a regular budgetary process, we will most certainly find areas to eliminate wasteful spending, shore up entitlement spending, and achieve comprehensive tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is already spending too much, and ObamaCare will only make things worse. It is estimated that ObamaCare will increase taxes over $1 trillion and add $6 trillion to the deficit. Putting aside the countless policy issues associated with ObamaCare, the law, from a purely numerical economic standpoint, is a prime example of out-of-control spending. Overall, ObamaCare is expected to increase health care spending

by $621 billion over the next 10 years. We cannot afford this. Our children cannot afford this, and the economy will crumble underneath it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are frustrated with seeing their elected officials in Washington sit on either side of the wall and refuse to make real spending cuts. It is time to sit down and have a conversation about how we get our fiscal house in order and get our spending addiction under control. We cannot continue to jeopardize our economy and our Nation's future by spending more than we take in.

CONGRATULATING THE BOSTON RED SOX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, while typically I would address the House on much more serious subjects, today it is a slightly lighter subject that I am here to address. Much to my regret, I am here standing before you to congratulate my dear friend and classmate from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and his Boston Red Sox on their American League Championship Series win over my beloved Detroit Tigers. And in accordance with our agreement, today I am wearing the gentleman's rather unsightly Boston Red Sox tie, which is painful to say the least.

Although the Tigers did not make it to the World Series this year, I do want to say how proud I am of our players, of our team, of our State, and specifically of Jim Leyland, who, after two World Series, four American League Championship Series, and 8 years as our manager, announced his retirement this week.

Jim, I am sure I speak for all Michiganders and all baseball fans in saying that we are proud to have you retire as a Detroit Tiger.

To Michigan, and specifically to Detroit, the Tigers have always meant more than just baseball. Year after year, their perseverance and grit, even through really tough times for both the team and for the city, that perseverance has been emblematic of the determination and resilience of Detroiters and Michiganders. Tigers baseball has provided hope and instilled a sense of pride in a city and State that has surely seen its share of difficulties. Their performance and their wins have certainly not erased the challenges that we face, but it has given the community and our State a lift.

Like the team, Detroit and Michigan have always had hope for the next season. I love my Detroit Tigers and appreciate all they mean to the great State of Michigan.

And to Jim Leyland and our amazing team, bless you, boys.

So, today, regrettably but sincerely, I salute my colleague from Massachusetts and his winning team, the Boston Red Sox. I had hoped for a different outcome, but, nonetheless, a win is a win.

JOE, congratulations to you and to the Red Sox.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

WHEN PROPAGANDA TRUMPS REALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has gone through 18 government shutdowns in the last 37 years. Fifteen of those 18 shutdowns occurred when Democrats controlled the House. In those 15 shutdowns, the Democrats demanded increased abortion services and labor and environmental policy concessions.

Perhaps the reason we don't remember those shutdowns as vividly is because, in those days, Presidents negotiated around the clock to resolve the disputes that caused them and did everything that they could to minimize the public's inconvenience and suffering.

This time was different. This time, the President refused to negotiate, and he took unprecedented steps to amplify the pain and suffering that the public endured. A senior administration official told The Wall Street Journal, ''We are winning . . . It doesn't really matter to us how long the shutdown lasts because what matters is the end result.'' A park ranger said, ''We've been told to make life as difficult as we can for people. It's disgusting.''

This administration barricaded open-air venues like the World War II Memorial for Honor Flights by World War II veterans, yet it opened The National Mall for an amnesty rally by illegal immigrants. It closed simple parking lots and roadside turnouts that merely offered passers-by distant views of Mount Rushmore and Yosemite. It ordered businesses to close just because they leased land from the Federal Government. It even tried to close the ocean to Florida fishermen. These measures had never been taken in prior shutdowns, and they often cost more than simply leaving these venues open.

A constituent of mine in Hume, California, wrote, ''To get to my place of residence and work, I have to travel through the Big Stump entrance station of Kings Canyon National Park on Highway 180. Currently, the entire roadway is barricaded, and it appears as though the Park Service is attempting to prevent anyone from traveling to or through the national park. I was in the area 17 years ago as a young adult during the last government shutdown, and this type of thing didn't happen. Sure, the facilities at the visitor centers were closed, but the land was still accessible.''

Now, why would the administration do this? Why would it deliberately order our public servants to ''make life as difficult as possible for people''? They told us why—because they were winning politically.

On October 2, House Republicans, joined by 23 Democrats, passed H.J. Res. 70 to open the national parks, but the bill was killed in the Senate. Why? Well, they told us why. They were winning politically.

When Republican Governor Jan Brewer stepped forward to use State funds to staff the Grand Canyon National Park—as Arizona had done in previous shutdowns—she was stonewalled by the administration for 10 days. Why? Well, they told us why. They were winning politically.

Now what was the outrageous Republican demand the Democrats refused even to discuss during the 16-day shutdown while they ordered our public servants to make life as difficult as possible for people? Well, on September 30, with the deadline just hours away, House Republicans had dropped all conditions to fund the entire government with one substantive exception: delay the individual mandate that forces people to buy policies against their will. Democrats summarily rejected this proposal and, for 16 days, refused to negotiate on this single point while literally accusing Republicans of sedition.

Then, this past Monday, the President's press secretary made this stunning admission: the administration may, itself, seek to delay the individual mandate by dropping the penalty for noncompliance. They have got to be kidding.

For the 16 days of the shutdown, the only substantive dispute was the Republican plea to delay the individual mandate for the millions of Americans who couldn't find or afford ObamaCare policies. Doing so would have ended the impasse instantly. During those 16 days, it was clear to everyone that the exchanges weren't working. Yet for 16 days, the President and congressional Democrats refused even to discuss the matter while they turned their formidable propaganda machine to the task of winning politically. Then, just 4 days after Republicans capitulated on all points, including dropping our single substantive request to delay the individual mandate, the administration is now, itself, considering delaying the individual mandate.

Mr. Speaker, these facts speak for themselves and need no embellishment from me. John Adams once observed, ''Facts are stubborn things.'' As passions cool and reason resumes its rightful place in the Nation's discourse, these facts will speak eloquently and stubbornly of what happens when politics trump policy and propaganda trumps reality.

JPMORGAN CHASE SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. The greatest power a banker has is to create money. Banks

can also abuse that awesome power. And it seems like the bigger the banks are the more they abuse that power. Let me relate a vivid example:

It was over 5 years ago that America was hit with the great Wall Street-induced recession. Five years later, those banks are still paying our people—their customers—almost nothing if customers have deposits or certificates of deposit with those institutions. That is harming seniors across this country. That is harming people who are trying to make a go of it. It is harming investors. Meanwhile, banks continue to post huge profits, especially the very biggest ones that are market controllers—for example, JPMorgan Chase, just in the last year, took $21 billion in profit; Wells Fargo, $19 billion; Goldman Sachs, $7.5 billion in profits; Citigroup, $7.5 billion; Bank of America, $4 billion—while Americans continue to struggle to make ends meet and recuperate from that Great Recession.

Now, it has been reported this week that JPMorgan Chase will agree to a $13 billion settlement of the civil suit filed by the United States Department of Justice and the Federal Housing Finance Agency in order to resolve several investigations into their fraudulent mortgage securities business. One question I have with that $13 billion: Are they actually going to pay it, or is JPMorgan Chase going to use it as a deduction on their taxes as a business expense or some other tax dodge that their accountants and lawyers figure out?

□ 1030

From September 7, 2005, through September 19, 2007, JPMorgan and its affiliates knowingly misrepresented the value and quality of their mortgage bonds that it sold to the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The result of their actions are reverberating still throughout our economy, as foreclosure rates in places like Ohio continue to go up. They are still above the national average. In August, foreclosure starts in Ohio were up 44 percent from the previous month, for a total that month of 9,542 foreclosure filings. Tens of thousands of people are being affected from coast to coast.

Minority neighborhoods were especially harmed by the financial crisis. A report by the Urban Institute estimates the loss of home equity in African American households as a result of the foreclosure crisis is at $194 billion. All the wealth that was accumulated since World War II vaporized. They were hit very hard.

Hispanic communities lost $177 billion in home equity during the same time period. Awesome.

Although a settlement has been reached in this particular case, this should not be the end of the investigation into Wall Street banks because JPMorgan and their brethren have proven to be repeat offenders. Criminal charges should be pursued, not just civil.

This settlement is just one of many recent penalties that JP has had to pay. In June 2011, JPMorgan had to pay $153 million in penalties to the Securities and Exchange Commission for misleading investors about a collateralized debt obligation. In August 2012, the bank had to pay $1.2 billion for what it had done to conspire with VISA and MasterCard to set the price of credit card and debit interchange fees.

In July of this year, JPMorgan had to pay $410 million in penalties and repayments to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for revealing that the bank had been manipulating the California and Midwest electricity markets from September 2010 to November 2012. JPMorgan Chase had to pay a $100 million fine for reckless conduct and market manipulation in connection with its 2012 London Whale trading scandal.

The question I have: Can they deduct any of these penalties from the taxes they pay, or are they really paying back in full those penalties to the government of the United States free and clear to pay back the American people for their criminal behavior?

In the past 3 years, JPMorgan has posted year-after-year record profits, driven by their stock prices. Last year, the firm made $21.3 billion. Therefore, with this recent settlement, it would be about only half of their most recent profits. For a frame of reference, there are only seven Dow Jones Industrial Average companies that made more than $13 billion profits last year.

We can say to ourselves, Would these fines, if they were really paid, do any harm to JPMorgan? Think about this. They have $87 billion in reserves and their total assets are valued, by their own accounts, at over $2.25 trillion. That is a ''wow,'' by any account.

The result of all of this misbehavior is many Americans have lost all of their accumulated equity.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore prudent banking. I ask my colleagues to sign on to H.R. 129, the Return To Prudent Banking Act of 2013. Let's restore the Glass-Steagall Act and the value of our money.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, for months, President Obama promised he would initiate long-overdue negotiations on issues from health care to tax and regulatory reform, all factors holding back economic growth. But he linked this pledge to Congress reopening the government and raising the debt limit.

His promise to address the critical drivers of our economy is why last week I voted to end the budget impasse and tentatively agree to cooperate with the President. With the government reopened, it is time for those promises that he made to be upheld and for negotiations to begin.

Our economy is still way too weak. Let's look at the facts:

Ninety-seven percent of all the jobs created in America this past year have been part time;

Millions of our workers are seeing their hours cut;

Participation in the workforce is at an all-time low the last 35 years, with 90 million adults sitting on the sidelines.

Our neighbors and our friends are struggling and are uncomfortable about their future. Our latest college graduates can't find jobs, and millions more of our country's youth have quit searching for employment. It is time to reduce the uncertainty and help these families.

The House has already passed dozens of bills to help grow the economy, including tax reform, limiting excessive regulations, debt reduction, and yes, reforming ObamaCare.

The President has repeatedly said he is willing to negotiate on all of these economic issues. As recently as October 3, he stated:

> I'm happy to negotiate with you on anything. I don't think any one party has a monopoly on wisdom.

Then, on October 8, the President said:

> Serious negotiations could proceed around every item in the budget.

He then went on to say that negotiation would not be limited just to the budget. He said:

> I will sit down and work with anyone of any party, not only to talk about the budget . . . about ways to improve the health care system . . . and about ways that we can shrink our long-term deficits.

Congress has now upheld its end of the bargain. The American people can now judge whether the President will uphold his.

In the next 90 days, let's demonstrate that Congress can indeed work in a bipartisan fashion and tackle our most serious problems now: a weak economy, a growing national debt, and a health care law that isn't ready for implementation.

It is important to note that the House took steps necessary to initiate negotiation. Therefore, in fairness, the President and the Senate need to come to the table. History will record whether the President fulfills his repeated pledges and addresses these barriers to America's economic exceptionalism.

Last week, many of us in the Chamber extended a hand of bipartisan cooperation to the President. But as President Reagan once said:

> Trust, but verify.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an important provision that I worked hard on with a bipartisan group of Illinois Senators and

House Members to have included in the new Water Resources Reform and Development Act. This bill, also known as WRRDA, is a vital piece of legislation that Congress will consider later today.

Our provision would help improve the Nation's water infrastructure, including the aging locks and dams along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, through public-private partnerships that would expedite projects and save taxpayers money. It comes from a House and Senate, Democrat and Republican bill called the Water Infrastructure Now Public Private-Partnership Act.

I was proud to introduce this bill earlier this year with Senators Durbin and Kirk and Representative RODNEY DAVIS, all proudly of Illinois. Our provision would help clear a $60 billion backlog in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects that will take decades to complete without outside investment. It does this by creating a pilot program to explore agreements between the Army Corps of Engineers and private entities as alternatives to traditional financing, planning, design, and construction models.

The Mississippi and Illinois Rivers are absolutely critical to the economic well-being of my region in Illinois, the entire Midwest, and the United States and the world. These locks and dams were built during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and are now close to 80 years old. This is why action must be taken to expand and modernize the locks and dams that help transport our goods and products worldwide.

By encouraging public-private partnerships, our bipartisan effort will help make the movement of the high-quality goods of our region, whether they be from any of the numerous farmers and manufacturers that call Illinois home, more swift, efficient, and safe.

To put this in perspective, the Mississippi River is the world's largest navigable inland waterway. Just on the Mississippi River alone, 60 percent—well over half—of the Nation's agricultural goods are transported. It is absolutely critical to American commerce and the smooth movement of goods that this is made as efficient as possible.

Our bill fits perfectly into that equation, and it is good for the taxpayer, the farmer, and industry. I am very proud of that.

In addition to our efforts to improve our Nation's locks and dams, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act also contains many provisions that will boost local economies across our country. The WRRDA bill will lead to upgraded water transportation systems and offer vulnerable communities better protection against flooding, which is very important to the region that I represent. It will promote America's competitiveness, prosperity, and economic growth for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to work with those I don't always agree with and who don't always agree with me, but as a way to find commonsense, reasonable solutions to create jobs and lay the foundation for a stronger middle class.

I was proud that the WRRDA bill passed out of the House Transportation Committee on a bipartisan, unanimous basis. I give a great deal of credit to Transportation Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER, Ranking Member NICK RAHALL, Subcommittee Chairman BOB GIBBS, Subcommittee Ranking Member TIM BISHOP, and all of my colleagues on the committee for their hard work over the last year. It is truly an example of congressional Republicans and Democrats working together, and I hope it is something that we will see a lot more of.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important job-creating bill when it comes to the floor later today.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: THE BATTLE RESUMES IN 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once advised:

> When you run in debt, you give to another power over your liberty.

Washington is in an epic political battle that controls America's destiny for decades to come. The fight is between those who are financially responsible and have the understanding and backbone needed to prevent an American bankruptcy, and those who do not.

Last week, mainstream news media pundits declared a great win for Democrats and President Obama when the Federal Government reopened and the debt ceiling was raised. To the contrary, and for reasons I will explain, last week was a major loss for the American people.

America's economy suffers from a $17 trillion debt—the worse in history—and 5 years of deficits averaging more than a trillion dollars per year. Again, the worst in history.

During the past 5 years, the Federal Government borrowed 30 percent of its spending. How many families and businesses can avoid bankruptcy if, year after year, 30 percent of their spending is borrowed money? Not many, and not for long. Yet that is exactly what our country, America, is doing.

Economic principles don't care if you are a family, a business, or a country. If you borrow more money than you can pay back, you go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, America has been warned.

President Obama's Comptroller General Dodaro warns America's finances are on an ''unsustainable path.'' Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen warns that our greatest national security threat is not Iran, al Qaeda, China, or Russia; it is our debt burden that undermines our ability to pay for America's national defense and thus risks our national security.

Detroit and Stockton bankruptcies mean retirees may lose their pensions. Greece, another debtor nation, has a 27 percent unemployment rate—worse than any year in America's Great Depression.

There are good and bad ways to fund the Federal Government and raise the debt ceiling. Last week, Washington chose the worst way by not fixing the underlying problems: deficits and debt. Instead, Washington again kicked the can down the road, forcing America to revisit government funding issues in January and the debt ceiling issues in February, with one major difference: America will be financially weaker and less able to face the problem because we will be burdened by another half-trillion dollars in debt.

Mr. Speaker, another half-trillion dollars in debt. I wonder why you didn't hear that from the media pundits.

What did America get for another half-trillion dollars in debt? Not one penny in spending cuts, not a single economic policy that creates jobs and grows our economy, and nothing that fixes our deficit and debt problem.

□ 1045

What Washington did last week is akin to a sick patient going to the emergency room and getting pain-killing drugs that help the patient feel good, yet do nothing to cure the disease that ultimately kills the patient. In the real world, that is medical malpractice. Similarly, Washington's refusal last week to cure our deficit and debt disease was governing malpractice.

Mr. Speaker, America enjoys prosperity today because past generations sacrificed to make us who we are. We have the same obligation to our descendents.

President George Washington once advised Congress:

> No pecuniary consideration is more urgent than the regular redemption and discharge of the public debt. On none can delay be more injurious.

George Washington gave prudent advice in 1793. It is prudent advice now. Washington must cut out-of-control spending and balance the budget before America's debt burden spirals out of control and is so great that we cannot recover. Failure risks a bankruptcy that will destroy the America it took our ancestors generations—centuries—to build.

Mr. Speaker, the fight for America resumes in January on properly funding the government and in February on properly raising the debt ceiling. Ours is a fight America must win. Congress and the White House must rise to the challenge and be financially responsible when funding the government and raising the debt ceiling. America's future as a great Nation and a world power depends on it.

IN HONOR OF LUIS FERRE ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS PASSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 10th anniversary of the passing of Luis Ferre. I rise this morning to pay tribute to this giant of a man whom The New York Times called the ''dominant force in the politics, economy and culture of Puerto Rico'' for much of the 20th century.

In a real sense, Don Luis personified his beloved Puerto Rico, embodying both its progress and its struggles. He was born in Ponce in 1904, a few years after Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory; was a teenager when island residents were granted American citizenship in 1917; served as a delegate to the convention that drafted Puerto Rico's local constitution in the early 1950s; was elected as the island's governor in 1968; served as a member of the Puerto Rico Senate, including as its president, in the late 1970s and early 1980s; and remained engaged in public life as a revered elder statesman well beyond his formal retirement from politics.

Don Luis lived to age 99, but it was the fullness of his life, not its length, that is so remarkable. Trained as an engineer at MIT and as a classical pianist at the New England Conservatory of Music, Ferre was a true renaissance man. He loved ideas, intellectual debate and culture, founding the renowned Ponce Museum of Art; but he was also at home in the practical world of business, taking a small company and transforming it into one of Puerto Rico's most successful conglomerates. He published a newspaper, now called El Nuevo Dia, which is run by his grandchildren, and has the largest circulation of any periodical on the island. Don Luis was also a committed philanthropist, who took to heart the biblical axiom: to whom much is given, much is expected.

In 1991, Ferre was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor, by President George H.W. Bush, who called Ferre ''a public servant of the first order'' and an ''extraordinary leader in the life of Puerto Rico.''

On a personal level, Ferre refuted the notion that great men are seldom good men. Like any effective leader, he was tough when he needed to be, but he was also kind, warm and generous, inspiring affection and loyalty as well as respect. Don Luis was a gentleman through and through. He was ''old school'' in the best sense of the term.

Few, if any, Puerto Ricans have accomplished as much in their lives as Don Luis or have left behind such a lasting legacy. A proud Republican and founder of the local New Progressive Party, Ferre did not live to see his goal of statehood for Puerto Rico realized, but he encouraged and mentored a new generation of leaders who understand that Puerto Rico's ''colonial status,'' as Don Luis called it, deprives island residents of political and civil rights, hinders their economic progress and harms their quality of life. As I and other pro-statehood advocates work to perfect Puerto Rico's union with the U.S., we are guided by Don Luis' example and draw strength from his memory.

Ferre once described himself as revolutionary in his ideas, liberal in his objectives, and conservative in his methods. Thanks to Don Luis and others, statehood is no longer a revolutionary idea. It has become the predominant force in Puerto Rico politics while support for the status quo continues to decline and support for separate nationhood remains slight.

Last November, a clear majority of voters in Puerto Rico rejected territory status, and more voters expressed a preference for statehood than for any other status option. I wish Don Luis had been alive to witness this historic event. When Puerto Rico does become a state, as I know it will, we will look back upon Luis Ferre's life and say that this man, as much as any other man, was responsible for this crowning achievement.

ACCELERATING THE END OF BREAST CANCER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

It is estimated that almost 40,000 women in the United States will die of breast cancer this year. Those are mothers, sisters, grandmothers, wives, daughters. We will miss them, and it shouldn't be. Thousands of men will be diagnosed with breast cancer as well.

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States. Globally, breast cancer accounts for one-quarter of all cancers suffered by women. Every family probably in this Chamber today and across America has been touched in its life by somebody who has had breast cancer, and I am certainly no exception. My mother-in-law, Ruth Eskew Capito, died tragically at age 51—diagnosed with breast cancer. I never knew her as a mother-in-law, and my children never got to enjoy the pleasures of having her as their grandmother. The emptiness and the hurt never go away.

With the efforts of many dedicated to fighting breast cancer, we are making some progress—but limited progress—in stopping premature deaths caused by this terrible disease. In 1991, an average of 119 women in the United States died of breast cancer each day. Today, more than 20 years later, an average of 108 women will die of the disease each day. So between the years of 2000 and 2009, the cancer mortality rate for women has declined by 1.9 percent annually.

We must accelerate the progress we are making in finding new lifesaving treatments for breast cancer. That is why I, along with a bipartisan group of cosponsors, introduced H.R. 1830, the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act. The Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act sets a national goal of ending deaths from the disease by 2020. This bill would establish a commission that would direct Federal and private sector resources towards the promising treatments aimed at stopping metastasis, or the spread of breast cancer, to other parts of the body.

The legislation is not designed to spend more taxpayers' dollars. In fact, the bill does not authorize any new Federal spending. Instead, it is designed to direct our existing research dollars in the most efficient way possible. The Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act will not duplicate the efforts of existing government agencies and programs. It will, instead, provide a vital check and balance and will help ensure our limited research dollars are funding the most promising science in the area of breast cancer research. In working in this way and in building on the decades of Federal investment and achievement in breast cancer research, we can move forward to end breast cancer and learn how to prevent the disease within the next decade.

So far, there are 172 House Members from both parties and all ideologies who have cosponsored this legislation. I invite my colleagues today, in this month of October—National Breast Cancer Awareness Month—who have not yet cosponsored, to join us in a cosponsorship. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to spur the development of new lifesaving treatments for those with breast cancer. The hope to end breast cancer can become a reality. Let's join together to make that happen.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my concerns about provisions in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act that put communities, taxpayers and the environment at risk by undermining the National Environmental Policy Act.

NEPA reviews have been useful for identifying potentially costly problems with water projects, allowing changes to save taxpayer dollars and avoid delays. This bill contains so-called ''streamlining'' provisions based on the flawed notion that NEPA is causing project delays; but studies have shown that other factors, like insufficient funding for the Corps, are the cause of delays. The bill limits public participation in the decision-making process, which will deny the Corps the benefit of public and expert input.

I ask the chairman to work, as this bill moves forward, to ensure that the bill does not degrade the NEPA process. I also hope that the chairman will work with me to provide the Corps the authority to perform ecosystem restoration work on lands owned by other Federal agencies, which is needed to complete important projects such as the South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project. I tried to offer a simple amendment to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act today, but the Rules Committee did not make my amendment in order.

Currently, the Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to use construction funds to perform flood protection work on lands owned by other Federal agencies, but the Corps does not have the legal authority to use construction funds to perform ecosystem restoration work on lands owned by other Federal agencies. In 2013, we all believe that good flood protection projects must incorporate ecosystem restoration, and the Corps has the ability to do integrated projects like this everywhere else except on lands owned by another Federal agency. This poses a significant hurdle in the case of the South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, which seeks to return the San Francisco Bay to its natural state and provide flood protection and wetlands restoration.

In this case, the State of California and the United States Government, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, own the land on which the project will be performed even though most of the funding to buy the land came from the State and non-Federal interests. The Corps has told the local partners that it does not have the legal authority to perform the ecosystem restoration aspects of this work on lands owned by the Fish and Wildlife Service and that it needs Congress to provide that authority. My amendment simply sought to fix this situation by granting the Corps that authority so it could pursue this joint flood protection and ecosystem restoration project.

I ask Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP to work with me as this bill goes to conference with the Senate in order to provide the Corps with the authority it needs to carry out this project and projects for which it has already been authorized to perform feasibility studies.

A TRIBUTE TO A TEXAS LEGEND, BUM PHILLIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Houston, Texas, lost an icon last week, Bum Phillips.

Bum coached the Houston Oilers in their heyday, 1975 through 1980.

□ 1100

Twice during that tenure, they came within one game of going to the Super Bowl.

Bum was loved because he was more than a football coach. He was a true Texan who happened to be a football coach—a Houston, Texas, football coach.

Bum understood the rivalry between Dallas, Texas, and Houston, Texas. He said:

> The Dallas Cowboys may be America's team, but the Houston Oilers are Texas' team.

He knew football was just a game.

As he said:

> Winning is only half of it. Having fun is the other half.

And he had fun.

In 1977, the Oilers drafted a star running back from Texas, Earl Campbell, a Heisman Trophy winner, a University of Texas graduate, a Longhorn from Tyler, Texas. In their first practice, Earl finished dead last in the mile run of the whole team. A reporter asked Bum if he was worried about Earl, could he perform in the NFL. Bum dead-panned:

> When it's first and a mile, I won't give it to him.

He loved his players, nobody more so than Earl Campbell. Bum showed his love for Earl by saying:

> I don't know if Earl is in a class by himself, but I do know that when that class gets together, it sure don't take long to call the roll.

Love ya, Blue; love ya, Bum. Thanks for the memories. God has a small class waiting for you in Heaven, and, yes, it won't take long to take the roll.

God bless Bum Phillips.

SUSTAINING THE ARAB SPRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, when a Tunisian fruit vendor set himself on fire nearly 3 years ago to protest his lack of economic opportunity and maltreatment at the hands of local police, his desperate act touched off a political revolution that has convulsed the Arab world from the Maghreb to the Gulf.

First in Tunisia and then in Egypt, popular protests toppled long-serving autocrats while Libyan dictator Muammar Qadhafi was ousted by NATO-backed rebels. Elsewhere, from Bahrain to Syria, regimes have proven more resilient and, in several cases, willing to use extreme levels of violence to maintain their survival.

So, in the waning months of the third year of what has been dubbed the ''Arab Spring,'' the future of a large swath of the global community remains uncertain. With Egypt under military control and Syria ablaze, it is not surprising that many here in the United States and elsewhere in the West view each new development with concern that an already volatile region could spiral completely out of control.

The situation in Syria is undoubtedly grim and Egypt faces a prolonged period of instability, but the news is not uniformly bad. In Tunisia, the Islamist government, headed by the Enhadda Party, has acceded to opposition demands that it hand over power to a caretaker government and schedule new elections.

Tiny Tunisia could again show its larger neighbors that a democratic transition—even an extended one of several intermediate steps—is possible in a region buffeted by the crosscurrents of religion, tribalism, and authoritarianism, and fueled by a huge demographic bulge of young people who are better educated and more connected to the world than their parents but who lack jobs and hope.

But even if Tunisia's next government is more reflective of the desires of the Tunisian people and is able to attack the problems that have retarded the country's progress, the pace of change will be slower than many Tunisians will desire. Entrenched interests and institutions connected to the ancien regime, what Egyptians have dubbed the ''deep state,'' will conspire to stand in the way of a brighter future for Tunisia's people and slow the pace of change throughout the region.

Around the world, but especially here in Washington, the regional developments have fostered unease as events on the ground have proven less than amenable to external ''management.'' The power of entrenched interests was more than offset by the early strength of Islamist parties in Tunisia and Egypt, giving rise to the fear of secular autocracies being supplanted by theocratically-oriented governments that would embrace the principle of ''one man, one vote, one time.''

This fear of an Islamist takeover has had two main effects in the first years of the Arab transition. The first is that it served to inhibit the American response for fear of strengthening the Islamists' hold or provoking a popular backlash. The other has been to drive a wedge between the United States and the Gulf Arab monarchs, who have been the most resistant to change and accommodation and understand fully the implications for their rule.

But change will be hard to resist. The same forces that swept aside Egypt's Mubarak and Tunisia's Ben Ali are at work throughout the region. The United States needs to craft policies that acknowledge the centrality of that fact, as well as the reality that this is a process that will play itself out over a generation and perhaps longer. We need to build mechanisms capable of supporting a transition in the Arab world in three dimensions: political, economic, and civil society.

Next week, I will discuss how the U.S. can help foster these three pillars of democratic development in a way that can be sustained without requiring an outsized share of our limited resources. In the weeks to come, I will be sharing a few more detailed thoughts

on the struggles going on in Egypt, Tunisia, Syria, Iran, and elsewhere in this critical and dangerous part of the world.

The yearning for freedom is a universal one, but getting there has never been easy. The Egyptians, Syrians, Tunisians, and others have taken the first step towards taking their societies back. We must stand ready to help, and we must be prepared for a long and uneven journey.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great State of Michigan, also known as the Great Lakes State, and I have lived my entire life along the shores of this national treasure. For those of us in Michigan and the other Great Lakes States, the Great Lakes are not just a source of much of our drinking water or a place that we go to enjoy their natural beauty or recreational opportunities or where so many work and make a living; they are central to our very identity. That is why I have made the protection of the Great Lakes a principal advocacy during all of the years that I have been in public service.

The Great Lakes actually represent fully one-fifth of the freshwater drinking supply on the entire planet. They provide the drinking water supply to tens of millions in our Nation and millions more in Canada as well. They are also vital to our economy. Over 160 million tons of commercial cargo is shipped on the Great Lakes. This commerce supports over 227,000 jobs and contributes over $33 billion to the economy.

The recreational aspect of the Great Lakes also builds our economy. Recreational boating on the Great Lakes supports over 100,000 jobs and $16 billion in economic activity. The secondary effect of all of that means an additional 244,000 jobs and $19 billion in additional economic activity. Of course, that includes boat manufacturers, marinas, charter operators, and other businesses as well. So, a healthy Great Lakes system is not only important to our economy in Michigan or the Great Lakes States, it is important for the entire Nation.

Today, unfortunately, the use of those waters is threatened by our inability to maintain our ports, our channels, and our harbors. A decade—we have had actually a decade—of below normal water levels and very limited or uncoordinated Federal funding for harbor dredging and infrastructure repair has dramatically curtailed shipping, and it has made, actually, some of our recreational harbors almost inaccessible. In fact, this year, many of our recreational harbors were really in crises as low water levels made the need for dredging vital to the economic survival of so many communities.

We as a Nation, Mr. Speaker, must recognize the importance of the Great Lakes and give this natural wonder the properly coordinated support that it needs. That is why I have joined with several of my Michigan colleagues—BILL HUIZENGA and DAN BENISHEK—to introduce the Great Lakes Navigation System Sustainability Act. Our legislation is supported by the Great Lakes Maritime Task Force, the Great Lakes Metro Chambers of Commerce, the Lakes Carriers Association, the American Great Lakes Port Association, the Great Lakes Small Harbors Coalition, the National Marine Manufacturers Association, the United States Great Lakes Shipping Association, and the Great Lakes Commission, as well as the Great Lakes Governors Association.

I am very pleased that the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, BILL SHUSTER, worked with us to include important provisions of that legislation in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, also known as WRRDA, which we will be voting on in this House later on today.

The most important of these provisions will establish the Great Lakes Navigational System and require the Army Corps of Engineers to look at the Great Lakes system in its entirety rather than looking at it port by port when they are thinking about dredging and maintenance. This would really end the practice of pitting one port in the Great Lakes against another, and, instead, it focuses on the interdependence of all of them.

The WRRDA bill also helps recognize our recreational harbors by providing 10 percent of all the funds authorized by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to be directed to recreational harbors. This type of funding will allow recreational harbors across the Great Lakes to have another opportunity for needed dredging support, places like Port Huron, Lexington, Port Sanilac, Harbor Beach, Port Austin, Sebewaing, and many others—those are just in my district—but there are so many others throughout the entire basin as well.

Mr. Speaker, if you travel to the State of Michigan and visit the shores of the Great Lakes, you will find the magnificence of what we call ''pure Michigan.'' But, as possessive as those of us from Michigan are of the Great Lakes, we also recognize that they are ''pure American,'' so this incredible natural wonder deserves the recognition and protection from our entire Nation. Today, we can take a very important step forward in the protection of the Great Lakes, our magnificent Great Lakes, by passing the WRRDA bill.

I certainly urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to submit for the RECORD a summary of the transcript of the bipartisan briefing I recently hosted along with my good friend from the great State of Florida, TREY RADEL, on the crucial environmental issues facing our waterways in Florida. During a time of the most discouraging examples of partisan gridlock, we were able to come together with many people on both sides of the aisle to work toward solutions to the ongoing crisis in our waterways.

There is no denying that an environmental crisis is taking place up and down the Indian River Lagoon. Record-breaking rainfall, out-of-date engineering, and urban and agricultural runoff are all damaging our waterways. To bring attention to this important matter, we invited community members who have been directly impacted by the water so polluted with bacteria and toxic algae that health officials told people to avoid contact with the water. In an area where the economy depends on water for our local livelihood, this pollution is having devastating effects.

Members of our community took great lengths to make their voices heard in Congress. Many flew up here, others fundraised to take a bus, using money out of their own pocket to make sure that Washington heard how they have been directly impacted by polluted and toxic waterways.

Despite the government shutdown and the inability of any Federal agency officials to attend, we were pleased to see so many engaged constituents in the room with us as we spoke to many Members who have important leadership roles in the House itself—the Appropriations Committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and many among the Florida delegation.

At the briefing, we not only discussed the problems but the solutions, both short-term and long-term, that can only come from a mutual understanding of the problem and cooperation of local, State, and Federal entities. Solutions such as completing Everglades restoration projects like the Indian River Lagoon-South project and funding the completion of C–44 components of this project as soon as possible to grant relief to the already battered St. Lucie Estuary are critical. We must also fight for quick and effective repairs to the Herbert Hoover Dike that will allow for the safe retention of more water in Lake Okeechobee.

There was also broad agreement on the importance of passing WRRDA so we can move forward with Everglades restoration efforts that will benefit all of our communities. Additionally, WRRDA will streamline processes so ongoing and future projects can advance more efficiently and expeditiously.

□ 1115

It has been almost 7 years since the last water resource bill was authorized, stalling progress on local environmental projects, so I am beyond pleased to see the House take up this important bill today.

After passing WRRDA, we need to continue to pressure for the chief support for the Central Everglades Planning Project so that these important projects can move forward as well. In the current no-spending climate in Congress, it is difficult to fight for funding for these critical projects to address the pollution impacting our local waterways, but there is a difference between smart investments and wasteful spending, which is something I have been working hard to tackle these past 10 months.

Infrastructure and environmental projects are not only crucial to improve the health of our waterways but to provide a 3 to 1 return on investment. Furthermore, funding for Everglades projects is equally matched by the State so they, too, have skin in the game, highlighting the importance of cooperation across all levels of government to work towards real solutions to address the challenges facing our waterways.

Mr. Speaker, these issues are simply too important to ignore. That is why I am here today with this bottle of polluted water behind me to show the severity of this ongoing crisis. I remain focused on this issue of great concern to our community, our environment, our economy, and our entire way of life. No one person can make all these things happen. It takes advocacy and action at all levels of government. To that end, I will include a summary of this briefing to be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to educate all Members of Congress on this important issue and the role we all play in addressing it.

OBAMACARE EXCHANGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the failures taking place with the launch of the ObamaCare exchange through healthcare.gov. Since October 1, this Web site has been plagued with delays, errors, and fundamental flaws in the Web site design. This prompted USA Today to call it an ''inexcusable mess'' and ''nightmare.'' In addition to the technological failure, the Web site leaves Americans open to exposure of privacy information. Buried in the source code of healthcare.gov, a paragraph reads:

> You have no reasonable expectation of privacy regarding any data stored on this information system. At any time, the government may monitor, intercept, search, and seize any data stored on this information system. Any data stored on this information system may be disclosed or used for any lawful government purpose.

Consumer Reports states:

> It's not worth the hassle, at least not for now. Stay away from healthcare.gov for at least another month if you can.

This is not reassuring for Americans entering personal, medical, and financial information onto a government Web site, especially when Congress is still reviewing the IRS for gross mismanagement in collecting private individual information.

John McAfee, founder of McAfee Antivirus, emphasized last Wednesday:

> Millions of Americans could have their identities stolen as a result of signing up for ObamaCare.

Despite these major malfunctions and structural defects, the administration still has penalties in place for individuals that don't obtain coverage.

Mr. Speaker, this is not acceptable.

Prior to October 1, my colleagues and I emphasized the inability of the Department of Health and Human Services to implement these exchanges. Therefore, if an individual does not wish to subject themselves to the risk of identity theft, they should be allowed to make that decision without the consequence of fines forced by the Federal Government. That is why I am working on legislation right now to ensure that Americans are not being punished for failing to buy a health care plan from a dysfunctional system.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reported that, to date, only 476,000 people have enrolled. Mind you, that is 476,000 Americans that are left open to identity theft. I would like to point out that this is out of 36 States enrolled in the Federally-Facilitated Marketplace—36 States. At one point, healthcare.gov posted error messages in at least 24 of those 36 States.

Further, according to the USASpending.gov, over $600 million of taxpayer dollars have been spent setting up these failed exchanges. Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to the American taxpayers.

CGI Group, one of the main contractors for healthcare.gov, reported that the site's design was changed about a month before its debut to prevent users from comparing prices without registering for an account. Why would the administration agree to remove the price comparison option when the President has promised the country affordable health care? It is because, for some, health care rates may become simply unaffordable.

The administration announced they would provide a new ''shop and browse'' feature to the Web site. However, this new feature is not giving consumers the real price. In some cases, people could end up paying double what they see on the Web site. For example, CBS News ran the numbers for a 48-year-old woman in Charlotte, North Carolina, who is ineligible for subsidies. According to healthcare.gov, she would pay $231 a month, but the actual plan on the Blue Cross and Blue Shield North Carolina Web site costs $360 a month. This is more than a 50 percent increase. The difference: Blue Cross and Blue Shield requests your birth date before providing more accurate estimates, further proving the point that monopolies are problematic as well, especially in North Carolina.

Hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars are being spent on a system that does not work. Therefore, there is one question we must all ask ourselves: Is the Affordable Care Act really affordable?

CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important before we move into the weeks ahead that we take a minute and ask ourselves what happened last week during the shutdown? What were the consequences of the shutdown? What did the shutdown mean to Americans? It is important to pause and ask, What really happened? Because as the days roll by, people are going to just move on to the next thing.

Let's be clear: this irresponsible shutdown cost the economy $24 billion in lost economic output, or about 0.6 percent of annualized growth, according to Standard & Poor's. That is $24 billion of people not making purchases that they had planned to because they thought they had better hold on to their money because they didn't know what was going to happen. That is $24 billion of businesses that did business with people who were Federal employees who didn't have their check or didn't know if they were going to have it.

I mean, the untold damage that the Republican majority in the House did to this economy is a shameful thing, and they did it for one reason and one reason only: to deny millions of Americans affordable health care. Now, I think that it is important to mark this moment and to be very clear about what happened and the losses we incurred. This economy lost 120,000 jobs, according to the Council of Economic Advisers; 120,000 jobs because of lower demand, because of a number of things. A number of people were losing their livelihood because of the shutdown, again, because the majority in the House sees fit to deny millions of Americans affordable health care.

Now, in the days to come now that the shutdown is over, there is no question they will try to amp up and build up the bugs in the computer system, but thousands of people are getting health care and signing up right now. The news is actually good, and there has never been a system that is new that didn't have problems. In fact, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, I invite them to go back to Medicare part D, the prescription drug benefit in which they said that Big

Pharma didn't have to compete for prices, they just could demand the price and we had to pay it, the one that created the doughnut hole. In the beginning, there were all kinds of glitches associated with that system.

So, yes, we are working out bugs, but they are being worked out, and there are thousands of people every day who are getting the health care access they never would have had and insurance reform that they never would have had if the Republicans would have had their way.

Also, I just want to make clear that people should know that there were individual stories that occurred that people should never forget. Hundreds of people were furloughed, and thousands more didn't know if they were going to get paid in the month of October. Consider the anxiety that the Republican majority needlessly inflicted on American families, and inflicted it on public employees who serve our country every single day to the best of their ability. People seeking new Social Security cards in Minneapolis found the office closed. That is my district. People saying, Wait a minute, I need a new Social Security card and can't get one because of the Republican shutdown—that was wrong.

The Veterans Administration offices were understaffed, and school trips were canceled because national parks were closed. It was galling to me that as the Republicans shut down the national monuments, they had the audacity, the unmitigated gall, to go to the World War II Memorial and act like somebody shut that memorial down other than them. It is amazing.

I can tell you that this moment, these last 2 weeks that we saw, shouldn't be forgotten. They should be remembered.

I want to thank the 87 sensible Republicans who voted with the Democrats in order to reopen the government, and I just want to let everyone know that we can debate things here. We can try to improve the Affordable Care Act. We can talk about parts that could be better, and we can make it better. I encourage us to do that.

But can we not shut down the government and do damage to the American economy just so we can score a political point and deny health care to thousands of people, perhaps millions of people? Can we work out our differences in the normal course of legislating?

The Republicans know how to change the Affordable Care Act. They even know how to legitimately try to get rid of it through the 45 ways that they offered legislation to destroy or defund or delay ObamaCare. They have done it before, but this time, they didn't go through the normal course. They shut down the government and threatened default, and that was wrong.

I just want people to remember what happened. Maybe we can avoid it in the months ahead, and I certainly hope you will.

OBAMACARE IS DISASTROUS LAW FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to actually agree with President Obama that his signature health care law is indeed much more than a Web site riddled with technical glitches. Just ask any hardworking family in the Second District of Missouri who have seen their premiums skyrocket, wages decreased, insurance coverage canceled of late, and hours cut back at work. The simple truth is the President's Web site is just a sign of what is to come: ObamaCare is a disastrous law for the American people.

One of the most valuable lessons that I have learned over the last 9 months as a new Member of Congress is that more government is never the answer to the problems facing our Nation. ObamaCare makes the real problem of health care costs worse. ObamaCare has made offering health care for small business worse. ObamaCare raises premiums, destroys the doctor-patient relationship, and makes the quality of our health care worse.

When President Obama promised the American people in 2009: ''If you like your health care plan, you can keep it,'' well, we now know that this claim was a blatant falsehood.

Time and time again, the President has only offered broken promises to the American people. President Obama recently spoke in the Rose Garden about who is benefiting from government-run health care; yet he failed to talk about the millions of Americans who are suffering from it.

I would like to take a moment to talk about a small business owner from Missouri's Second District who is facing the harsh realities of ObamaCare. Jenn is the owner of Cotton Babies, a small business that makes high-quality diapers for consumers all over the world. As a result of ObamaCare, her premiums are projected to double, not only putting her livelihood in jeopardy, but her employees' as well. Now Jenn is facing a difficult business decision regarding the employment opportunities and the price of her products going forward.

□ 1130

Jenn wrote to me recently and said:

> We can't afford the change in health care premiums. We manufacture in the USA. We collectively cause the employment of thousands all over the United States. Hundreds of small retailers depend on my brands for revenue. We make American-made cloth diaper brands that help families who literally choose between diapers and food.

Jenn later went on to say:

> I believe in affordable health care. I believe in taking care of the needy. We provide great health care insurance to our staff. We pay for 70 percent of the premium for the staff members and their entire family. We operate on microscopic margins and have valued taking care of our employees over taking a profit. I simply don't know how we, as a small business, are going to be able to shoulder the load with these changes.

Madam Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, this is just one of the many examples of real people being hurt by ObamaCare. It is time we realize that no matter how many tech experts President Obama hires to fix his $600 million-plus taxpayer-paid Web site, it will never stop ObamaCare from hurting the American people.

As your Representative, I will never stop fighting until ObamaCare is replaced with free market-based solutions that expand access without destroying our economy and lowering the quality of care.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition to express my strong opposition to provisions in the bill before us today that will vastly limit public input and curtail opportunities to save taxpayers money.

The provisions I am speaking about in the WRRDA bill aim to decrease delays and help move projects forward, which sounds great in theory. Who doesn't want to remove bureaucrat red tape? But in reality, what the bill does won't actually fix the problem that holds up so many Army Corps projects.

This bill would strictly limit the environmental review process that has proven time and again to save taxpayer dollars. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works has even testified about this fact before the United States Senate. The real reason for projects being delayed is simply that the Congress authorizes around $20 billion worth of projects but then only appropriates the funds to cover just $1 billion in projects.

So let's not try to place all the blame on the environmental review process, a review process that has time and time again saved taxpayer dollars, preserved historic sites, and protected endangered species, all while producing better projects with more public support.

I appreciate the bipartisan work that Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL have done to put together this bill. This is an important piece of legislation that we consider in this House today.

Once the bill has passed in the House, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we conference with the Senate to improve these provisions that will limit public input, increase taxpayer costs, and harm the environment.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The Chair recognizes the

gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, October is a time to highlight the corrosive effects that domestic violence has on our country and to remind our fellow citizens of the work that still needs to be done to reduce and, indeed, eliminate violence against women and girls.

Earlier this year, I was proud to support the bipartisan efforts to pass the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. One of the new provisions included in this bill will open up funding for organizations that provide employment placement and training programs for domestic violence victims.

I would like to highlight the work of Second Chance Employment Services, the first and only nonprofit in the United States that focuses exclusively on empowering women by helping them find stable jobs. Dr. Ludy Green is the founder of Second Chance, and this organization and many others like it promote financial security for at-risk women. I believe that employment is a key component needed to break the cycle of violence that plagues too many women in too many homes in too many neighborhoods.

I acknowledge the work that Ludy and so many do each and every day to make a positive difference in the lives of women, and I will continue to support their work. We must all do everything possible to reduce domestic violence in America, as well as to end the human trafficking of vulnerable girls and young women. Sexual trafficking is modern-day slavery, and this scourge, along with domestic violence, must be eradicated before further harm is done in our communities, our Nation, and worldwide.

Madam Speaker, young girls and women deserve better. We must do better.

THE IMPACT OF OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I want to visit with my colleagues this morning for a few minutes about the impact of our Federal Government and what it is doing to our country's future and to future generations. That is something that has been foremost in my mind this week.

This week, our family has welcomed a new baby. Georgia K. Graham was born in New York City at 2:25 Monday morning. So as we have welcomed her, as we think about her future, one of the things we are discussing is: What kind of America will she have to grow up in? How solvent will we be? Will we still be the country that celebrates the American Dream? Will we be the country that focuses on opportunity, that looks to entrepreneurs and innovators to create a better day, not only for America, but for the entire world?

This is also the time, Madam Speaker, as we look at what has happened with our Nation's budget, with our Nation's spending, that we look at the long-term effects of so many of the programs and entitlements that are placed before us. One of those is a program that is commonly known as ObamaCare, and some of my colleagues say: Why is it that we talk about ObamaCare in conjunction with the budget? I would like to remind my colleagues it is because it is a very expensive program. And I have a chart that shows what has happened with the cost of that program since the law was passed and now as we are focusing on implementation.

You will see we were told this was to be a program that would run about $900 billion over a 10-year period of time. It was to be access to health care insurance for those that did not have that access. But when we look at the chart that reflects the Congressional Budget Office's findings—this is a chart that was prepared on the Senate side—what we see is the cost estimate over that same 10-year period of time from when the law was passed. Remember, we had to pass it in order to read it and find out what was in it? From when it was passed, there at $900 billion, to today, as we look at the implementation of ObamaCare, it has become a $2.6 trillion-over-10-year program. It is a tripling of costs, and we don't even have it out of the starting gates yet. This is why we are looking at the total cost of health care.

In the Budget Committee, as we look at the long-term outlook for our Nation and the implications that our budget will have on the private sector, on hardworking taxpayers, what we find with the cost of health care is that those programs are expected to double in their impact on the budget. We have to remember that every single dollar the Federal Government has comes out of the pocket of taxpayers, men and women who go to work every day and earn that dollar and then have to send more and more of that dollar to the Federal Government.

As we look at the challenges that face this Nation, we focus on what we will spend, how we will use that money, and we think about the children, the grandchildren that we have and their future and the impact our spending habits today will have on their tomorrows.

THE CONSTITUTION AND OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, in 1776, with only 1,458 words, our Founding Fathers declared our Nation's independence from an overreaching government that had limited individual freedom. A year later, in 1787, with 4,543 words, our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution that established our representative democracy, protecting individual rights, and set in places roles for states' rights and a limited Federal Government based on enumerated powers.

Fast-forward to 2010, from 1776 to 2010, and the President and Democratic-controlled House and Senate established ObamaCare without a single Republican vote. This government takeover of health care is so overreaching. The law contains 381,517 words. That is over 83 times as many words as the Constitution, which only had 4,543 words.

In addition to the law, the administration has published 109 regulations to implement the law, regulations not voted on by the Congress, which contain a massive 11,588,500 words, according to ENSnews.com. According to Forbes, the average adult reads about 300 words a minute. That means it would take the average person 38,628 minutes just to read the regulations. If someone read 8 hours a day, it would take them 80 days to read all of the regulations, let alone understand them.

We are just beginning to see the negative consequences of this Federal outreach in all Americans' health care decisions. My constituents remain adamantly opposed to ObamaCare. They continue to write and call my offices, asking me to destroy as much of this law as possible because it is raising premiums, copays, and deductibles. Many small business owners also tell me they have stopped hiring workers and are in the difficult position of cutting hours or employees due to the uncertainty with the law and its regulations.

In closing, let me just say that we will continue to see the negative impacts of ObamaCare as more of this law is implemented in the coming months. The President needs to recognize how harmful the health care law is and help us craft better and more responsible health care reform.

IN MEMORY OF U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST PAT TINNELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, today I stand to recognize the memory of U.S. Army Specialist Pat Tinnell, and to say thank you to all those involved in creating the Pat Tinnell sports complex in Lake Havasu City, Arizona. The world-class skate and bike park, which is nearly the size of a football field, is dedicated to the 25-year-old American hero, Pat Tinnell, who loved his family, his community, and BMX bike riding.

Pat volunteered to serve our Nation and gave his life in Iraq in April of 2006, protecting the freedoms we hold dear.

□ 1145

A special thank you to those who made this park a reality through

countless fundraising events. Everyone in the community deserves a thank you, including Lake Havasu City Mayor Mark Nexsen and those who served on the Memorial Sports Park committee and gave of their time and talent, national figures like skateboarding legend Tony Hawk, BMX rider and philanthropist Rob Dydrik, and Joe Ciaglia from California Skate Parks, who designed this beautiful facility.

Finally, thank you to the family and loved ones of Pat Tinnell and young Colin Sasseen, who both lost their lives all too soon. I hope this park serves as a reminder that your sons' memories will not be forgotten.

Today's youth are our greatest asset as a Nation. It is the youth who will continue to lead this Nation in the coming years, serve in our Armed Forces, fight fires, be teachers, doctors, and maybe you will even be our next BMX superstar, have a show on MTV, and make your mark in philanthropy.

Leadership comes in all forms. In fact, Rob Dydrik said that his success was the American Dream. The American Dream looks a lot like work, and work results in success.

It is my hope that the memories of Pat and Colin are honored by all those who visit the park.

Thank you and God bless.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Give the Members of this House strength, fortitude, and patience. Fill their hearts with charity, their minds with understanding, their wills with courage to do the right thing for all of America.

In the work to be done in the weeks to come, may they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation.

Just as we remembered yesterday the passing of two former Members of the people's House, Tom Foley and Bill Young, we pray today for the Honorable Major Owens. We thank You for the service he rendered to his constituents and to our Nation and ask Your blessing upon those who mourn his passing.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

A WEB SITE IS THE LEAST OF OBAMACARE'S PROBLEMS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, President Obama made some big promises with regard to ObamaCare: if you like your doctor, you can keep them; same if you are happy with your insurance. Somehow, even with new taxes and thousands of pages of regulations, government would be able to mandate universal coverage and simultaneously save everyone money. That is not panning out in America.

North Carolinians tell me their policies are being canceled and their prices are set to double. Experts are even advising some Americans to find a way to lower their incomes to help pay for ObamaCare. For one family in California, if they don't find a way to earn $2,000 less, they will pay $15,000 for health care. If they make less money, they pay just over $1,000.

It is easy to blame technical glitches for ObamaCare's problems. It is harder to own up to the costly consequences of forcing a one-size-fits-all health care prescription onto one-sixth of the American economy.

As President Obama presses forward with ObamaCare, a broken Web site is certainly the least of his problems.

JOBS

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the folks in my Arizona district have seen enough of the partisan nonsense in Washington. The distractions here help no one, but jobs do, and that is why we have to stay focused on economic development.

In my district, those opportunities include strengthening our infrastructure:

At the Grand Canyon, the trans-canyon pipeline is in desperate need of repair, and the Canyon's maintenance backlog continues to grow;

In the White Mountains, we can revive the timber industry by building on the momentum of the Eagar sawmill and the Fort Apache Timber Company;

And with a new contractor onboard, it is time to shift the Four Forest Restoration Initiative into high gear and help our forests.

Projects like these create jobs and improve the quality of life for folks in rural Arizona. I urge my colleagues to work together on commonsense efforts to create jobs.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT JOSHUA BOWDEN OF VILLA RICA, GEORGIA

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in August, the explosive ordnance disposal community lost one of its best and brightest. Staff Sergeant Joshua Bowden of Villa Rica, Georgia, was killed in action on August 31, 2013, at the age of 28, while serving his country in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Bowden joined the United States Army in 2005 and was on his second deployment to Afghanistan. His awards included the Joint Service Commendation Medal with Valor, Purple Heart, Joint Defense Meritorious Service Medal, NATO Medal, Combat Action Badge, Senior Explosive Ordnance Disposal Badge, Parachutist Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

As cochairman of the House EOD Caucus, along with Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, I was honored to meet Staff Sergeant Bowden in 2011 during our caucus' first annual EOD Day on the Hill. The purpose of this event was to educate Members and staff about the

critical mission EOD forces play in defending American interests, both at home and abroad. Staff Sergeant Bowden was a patriot who was willing to put himself in the line of fire to defend our country's way of life, and I am proud to have met him.

In September, Staff Sergeant Bowden was laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. It is important that we regularly take time to reflect on the sacrifices made by our Nation's servicemen and -women and the veterans who preceded them.

I am honored to have met Staff Sergeant Joshua Bowden, and my thoughts and prayers are with his friends and family.

DELAY THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since October 1, millions of Americans have attempted to access Healthcare.gov to try to learn about the health insurance coverage they are required to buy; and every day, we are learning more and more about the problems they are facing. Folks are frustrated, and rightfully so.

I am proud to be part of a bipartisan effort to reform the law by repealing the mandate that employers provide coverage they can't afford and the mandate that individuals buy insurance on their own.

Earlier this year, the administration delayed the employer mandate because businesses across the country just weren't ready, but not the individual mandate. At the very least, our constituents deserve the same relief that the businesses got.

This isn't about pointing fingers. This is about providing some relief to the folks we represent who are facing serious uncertainty because they are being forced to buy something that is just not ready.

I urge my colleagues and the administration to delay the individual mandate. It is not only the right thing to do, it is the only practical thing to do.

HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS SPENT ON HEALTHCARE.GOV

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a great concern over the lack of accountability and transparency we continue to see from the President and his administration as they scramble to fix the problems in the health care exchange and their Web site platform.

Mr. Speaker, we have walked through the tragedy of Benghazi, the abuse of the IRS, the lack of real commitment from the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, this isn't right. We need a government that is transparent, that is willing to tell the truth to the American people.

Three weeks after the rollout of these exchanges, the administration finally has come to Capitol Hill, but they are coming, Mr. Speaker, only to speak to House Democrats. Now figure that out. Where is the transparency there?

The American people deserve to know the truth of what happened with the $400 million that was spent on a Web site to try to enlist people to join this health care exchange. The American people are being left on the hook for a Web site that cost hundreds of millions of dollars, and they deserve better.

ROLLING ALONG

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to have a number of good news stories for my colleagues and the American people, and I am delighted to have a good news story, which is that the Affordable Care Act is rolling along. I recognize that the most important aspect of this law is that Americans, like Kendall Brown in Oklahoma City, are having their lives changed in front of their eyes.

She writes to the President that she has Crohn's disease and she has already benefited from the Affordable Care Act by being able to stay on her parents' insurance, but now she is able to enroll. And she wrote in this letter that as individuals are debating to delay the individual mandate—she said:

> Mr. President, if they do it, then this is the last letter that you will receive from me because I will be dead by the time I am 27 years old.

So the good news is, my friends, enroll. You can use 1–800–318–2596—30,000 calls and only 20 seconds in wait time. You can use the navigators. You can use the outreach efforts. You can even get on the Web and be educated. 1–800–318–2596.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize the fact that October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

In my home State of Michigan, breast cancer is currently the second leading cause of cancer deaths for women, and it is the most frequently diagnosed cancer for women in Michigan.

I served as a doctor for 30 years in northern Michigan. I am all too familiar with how devastating breast cancer is for patients and their friends and their loved ones. Thankfully, early detection rates have increased and mortality rates have decreased nationwide.

This is partially due to the hard work of the doctors, nurses, and medical professionals who are involved in diagnosing and treating this illness and in coming up with innovative new treatment options. This improvement is also due to the fundraising, outreach, and public awareness efforts of the groups like the Michigan Breast Cancer Coalition and the National Breast Cancer Foundation.

However, there is still much work left to be done. I urge all of my colleagues and all of my constituents to raise awareness of breast cancer and to take the steps necessary in order to detect this terrible disease. I encourage all women to be sure they are up to date on their mammograms.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act without delay to provide certainty to employers, keep families together, and ensure that all children raised here in America have access to affordable higher education.

Less than a decade ago, it might have been impossible to imagine that so many businesses, farmworkers, labor leaders, educators, and even politicians would come together to support comprehensive reform of our broken immigration system, a system that no longer reflects our values or national interests.

The American public has reached consensus, as has the United States Senate. It is time for Members of the House to put aside their differences and pass a bill that grows the economy, creates a modernized immigration system, enhances our security, and creates an achievable path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

I encourage the leadership to bring comprehensive, commonsense, and compassionate immigration reform legislation to the House floor this fall. Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today's much-anticipated and greatly needed water resources bill will allow our Nation to develop and maintain our economically vital ports and waterways and will support flood protection and environmental restoration efforts.

As a water-centered State, Florida is uniquely impacted by the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. We have 16 seaports which contributed $96.6 billion to the economy last year, and our maritime cargo industry supports more than 680,000 jobs.

Florida has invested millions in our ports in preparation for the expansion of the Panama Canal, and this bill before us today is a complement to Florida's investment in world-class maritime infrastructure. Without this bill, Florida and, indeed, our Nation, as a whole, are at risk of losing jobs to nearby foreign ports and their ready or soon-to-be ready deep draft harbors.

Simply put, this bipartisan water resources bill will create good American jobs and will grow local economies. Let's pass it, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1215

JOBS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Congress finally took action to end a painful, unnecessary government shutdown that cost our economy $24 billion, forced hundreds of thousands of Federal workers to stay home, and brought us to the brink of defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States.

While the hardworking men and women I serve in Rhode Island's First District are relieved that Congress finally did its job, they want all of us to get back to work on addressing the urgent challenges facing our Nation—creating jobs, strengthening the economy, fixing our broken immigration system, repairing our crumbling infrastructure, and finding responsible ways to reduce the Federal debt.

Like all Americans, Rhode Islanders want their elected officials to get beyond the political battles of the moment and work together on implementing effective policies and innovative solutions that will put our country on the right track and get Americans back to work.

Over the past several years, the House has voted over and over again on bills that would repeal ObamaCare, restrict reproductive freedom for women, weaken critical environmental standards, and limit collective bargaining rights for workers, even though there is no chance these divisive proposals would ever be signed into law. It is time now to get things done.

Each of us should commit to abandoning the partisan rhetoric and working as colleagues to overcome the challenges facing our country and those we have the privilege to represent here in the Congress.

OBAMACARE AFFECTING GEORGIANS

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, now that ObamaCare has had 23 days of what has been a disastrous rollout and hundreds of thousands of Americans are getting health insurance cancellation notices, I want to give you a couple of examples of what is happening in Georgia.

In our State, the news is not good. One constituent tells me:

> Not only are premiums higher, but we have to pay more out of pocket. We will end up spending about $500 to $600 a year on durable medical supplies that have always been covered 100 percent. That does not help the middle class.

Another shared the news that he recently learned from his employer:

> My premiums are going up over $1,200 a year, my deductible is going up by over $1,000 a year, and my out-of-pocket maximum will move from $3,500 to $6,500.

That is more than a house payment for many Georgians, Mr. Speaker.

These are hardworking, middle class families in my district who were promised by the President that if they like their insurance, they could keep their current health plans. Now these plans are more expensive and my constituents have less coverage. This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Contrary to the President's promises, ObamaCare is driving up costs, threatening jobs, and kicking Georgians out of the plans they like and were promised they could keep.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this week, New York City lost a Brooklyn original and our Nation lost a tireless champion for the powerless.

Representative Major Owens' district included parts of my current district, and I can attest firsthand that he was beloved throughout Brooklyn.

A librarian before entering politics, service to community was simply part of who he was—and that is reflected by his accomplishments. His work led to the creation of the YouthBuild initiative at HUD, which, to this day, creates opportunity for thousands of disadvantaged youth through construction in low-income communities.

Major will also be remembered for his work on the Americans with Disabilities Act. Always a voice for the voiceless, he shepherded that historic bill to enactment, creating a more just society for millions of Americans.

He is, perhaps, the only Member of Congress known for composing rap lyrics. Performing at open mic sessions, he spoke to the issues of our time, addressing peace, war, poverty, and social justice through the power of hip-hop.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in New York and Brooklyn today mourn the loss of a neighbor, while our Nation honors the passing of its public servant.

I hope all my colleagues join me in paying tribute to and remembering our friend and former colleague, Major Owens.

OPEN ACCESS WEEK

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of greater accessibility to taxpayer-funded research.

This week is Open Access Week in America, and I am proud to be a lead cosponsor of the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act, better known as FASTR.

Access to scientific research maximizes research investments and improves the quality of science while assuring transparency and efficient use of tax dollars. Simply put, taxpayers should not have to pay for taxpayer-funded research over and over again.

Policies like FASTR have been a tremendous success already at the National Institutes of Health, and some of the best research institutions in America, like my alma mater, the University of Kansas, have helped lead the charge by instituting open access policies of their own.

Now it is time to make open access the law of the land for all publicly funded research. I urge my colleagues to make a real impact on the quality of science and lifesaving research conducted in America, and urge them to cosponsor and support the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act.

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, an opportunity to stand with the millions of victims who have suffered in silent fear in their own homes.

Approximately three women are killed each day as a result of domestic violence, according to the National Network to End Domestic Violence. While our country has made enormous strides in combating domestic violence, gaps in Federal law leave millions vulnerable. In this Nation, one in six women will find themselves a victim of stalking in their lifetime. Many of these encounters turn violent and, tragically, women are hurt or killed by their stalkers because of a glaring loophole in Federal law.

Under current law, convicted stalkers of ''intimate partners'' are prohibited from possessing firearms, but women who have had no romantic relationship with their stalker are left unprotected.

I have introduced the Protecting Victims of Stalking Act, legislation that would address this glaring loophole and prevent stalkers under restraining orders from purchasing firearms. I hope you will join me in this effort to reaffirm our commitment to protecting the victims of domestic violence.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE LANDSBERRY

(Mr. AMODEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, Mike Landsberry, a math teacher at Sparks Middle School, passed away just about 50 hours ago. He was 45 years old, an Alabama native, high school athlete, coach, husband, brother, dad, marine, Nevada Air Guard senior master sergeant, and a friend.

Mike Landsberry observed the horror of an active shooter at his school Monday morning, and simply moved without hesitation, instinctively, into harm's way to protect others. In so doing, Mike made the ultimate sacrifice in service to the end to his students, his school, and his community.

Coach, you humble us all with your warrior spirit and compassion. They will be your lasting legacy. Thank you for your service, and may you rest in peace.

HONORING STEPHEN ADUBATO, SR.

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stephen Adubato, Sr., the founder of the North Ward Center and an inspiring figure of the Newark, New Jersey, community. To recognize Mr. Adubato's achievements and contributions, a statue of him reading to two young children will be placed on the main campus of the North Ward Center.

Mr. Adubato began his career in education and as a teacher in Newark, and went on to develop the North Ward Center in 1970, a group of five institutions designed to provide educational, cultural, and meaningful social services to low- and moderate-income families in the area.

From its humble beginnings as a small preschool, the center now includes an adult medical daycare, business training center, as well as the Robert Treat Academy, a charter school that has received national recognition and the honor of being named a Blue Ribbon School.

Since the founding of the center, Stephen Adubato, Sr., has continually worked to improve the quality of life for everyone in the community, from young to senior citizens. Mr. Adubato has been honored by numerous organizations and institutions, such as Kean University and the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, for his contributions and dedication to education.

Today, I recognize the accomplishments of Stephen Adubato, Sr., and thank him for his continued dedication to the residents of Newark, particularly the North Ward.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation to be considered on the floor this afternoon, H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment, ruled in order and to be considered en bloc, addresses an issue very important to my district in northeast Indiana, as well as other similarly situated districts around the country.

I am proud to represent Fort Wayne, Indiana's second-largest city, which has more than 10 miles of levees that protect residents and businesses. In response to recent Army Corps of Engineers guidelines requiring levee devegetation, local governments across the country affected by this policy have made their voices heard. Unfortunately, this unnecessary policy will cost taxpayers in my district millions of dollars.

My amendment saves the city of Fort Wayne $25 million and makes levee safety the highest priority while allowing the Army Corps of Engineers to fully examine the guidelines study authorized in the underlying bill.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his assistance and look forward to further pursuing solutions to this issue.

POWER OF THE PURSE

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, later today, the WRRDA bill will come before this body. I intend to vote against it. The reason is that there are 23 earmarks in it. I support all of those projects, but I don't have an earmark in it—and I want one.

I am not one of those people who is going to pretend to the public, as many of us have, that earmarks cost the budget any more money than they do. They do not. We go around and talk about the ''bridge to nowhere.'' There is a bridge. It is called the Gravina Island Bridge.

The worse thing about this is that, constitutionally, we have the power of the purse. We have given it to the administration. So they put 23 projects out here and said, Well, they used to be earmarks. That is like cutting off the tail of an alligator and putting some little ears on him and saying, It used to be a dog.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is wrong. The public needs to understand that this earmark business is damaging the Constitution because it is our job to spend the purse.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support today's jobs bill, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, because it is not an earmark. It authorizes—not appropriates—money for 23 projects identified by the Corps of Engineers as important. They are important for a number of reasons, not the least of which is their primary purpose is the movement of goods and services into the global marketplace, which creates wealth and jobs for Americans.

Further, it authorizes projects that are important to flood protection in flood-prone areas like the Red River Valley of the North, in my area. In addition to that, the real reforms that are impressive are things like it de-authorizes old projects to the tune of $12 billion worth. Furthermore, it gives more leverage and flexibility for the use of non-Federal funds, which is, I think, the very thing that the taxpayers of this State are looking for—the type of flexibility that allows local governments and local communities to do the right thing for themselves.

OXI DAY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 73 years ago, as countries across Europe were falling to Hitler's forces, an emissary from Mussolini arrived in Athens to demand the Greeks surrender and allow the Axis forces to occupy that country. In response, the Greeks courageously replied, ''oxi,'' or ''no.''

The Axis forces quickly descended on Greece, but they failed to anticipate the courage of the Hellenic people, who led a passionate resistance in defense of their freedom and their beloved country. On the island of Crete, for example, with only broomsticks and plowshares as weapons, women and children held the Germans at bay for 10 days, breaking the back of the assault.

The story of this bravery has largely been overlooked in the history books, but the Greek refusal to surrender proved to be one of the most decisive moments in the war. As Winston Churchill said:

> If there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know what the outcome of World War II would have been.

On August 28, Greeks around the world celebrate Oxi Day to honor the great legacy of the Greek people and share with the world the story of their bravery. I commend them and say, ''Happy Oxi Day.''

□ 1230

THE OBAMACARE WEB SITE—BROKEN AND CAN'T BE FIXED

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if you go into a restaurant and you order two eggs over medium with sausage and toast and if the server brings you two eggs scrambled with bacon and a muffin, you have got two choices. You either eat what you have got or you send it back, and you start over—double the cost, double the time.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what has happened with Healthcare.gov, the ObamaCare Web site. It doesn't work. These are not glitches. It is broken and it can't be fixed.

The President needs to own up to this. He needs to reimburse the American people for the over-$400 million that has been spent; he needs to hold those in his administration accountable who misled him and the American people; and he needs to give the American people a break on this individual mandate until the Web site does work.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we recognize the final days of Domestic Violence Awareness Month, I ask Congress to pass legislation that helps put an end to domestic violence.

This issue impacts Americans of all backgrounds regardless of age, race, religion, or economic status. One victim of domestic violence is too many; but the heartbreaking reality is that, in this country, three women are killed daily by intimate partners. Young women are at a greater risk to be victims of domestic violence. Four out of every 10 teen girls know people their ages who have been abused by a boyfriend.

Last week, I introduced H.R. 3297, the Teen Dating Violence Education Act, which is to protect teenage victims of domestic violence. My bill helps provide schools offering domestic violence inclusion programs with the resources to inform students of their legal rights as they relate to dating violence.

Our teens deserve to be empowered with the knowledge to create a safe and secure environment free of domestic violence. Ending teen domestic violence now is a good first step towards preventing future domestic violence among adults. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3297.

THE TRAIN WRECK OF OBAMACARE CONTINUES

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the train wreck of ObamaCare continues.

In 2007, before he was elected President, the President said that family policy prices would go down $2,500 per family. That was the promise. In 2009, the President promised that, if you liked your policy, you would get to keep it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the President is going to say to Charles from northern Baltimore Country, who wrote me yesterday and said:

> I just received my cancellation letter from Blue Cross regarding my family's insurance policy. My $697-a-month Health Savings Account qualifiable policy is no longer compliant. To have a similar product in an ObamaCare-compliant plan, my premium will increase nearly 40 percent and will have a $7,000 deductible. Yikes. So much for, ''if you like your policy, you will get to keep it.''

Charles and his family are not getting a $2,500 cut in their premium. They are getting a $3,300 increase in their premium. Their deductible is going up to $7,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, they like their plan, but they don't get to keep it.

The train wreck continues.

FOOD DAY, OCTOBER 24

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 24, is Food Day, a nationwide movement to promote healthy, affordable and sustainably produced food; and next week, Congress will begin the process of reconciling the House and Senate farm bills.

I know this is a big job, but I want to urge my colleagues to work to come up with a farm bill that promotes healthy, affordable and sustainably produced food.

Without exception, everywhere I go and every group I talk to—from bankers to teachers unions and from veterans to college students—people nod their heads when I talk about locally grown, sustainable food. People want to know where their food comes from, and they want to see the farmers in their communities succeed. There is nothing more fundamental than food, and it is time we got serious about creating a food system that works for everyone—for families, for farmers, and for our local communities.

If we are going to change our food system, Congress must take this historic opportunity to reform agriculture policy by producing a farm bill that reinvests in our local economies.

DOMESTIC GAS PRODUCTION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, according to a Federal report issued yesterday by the Energy Information Administration, natural gas being produced in the Marcellus shale region is growing faster than expected. Production has now reached 12 billion cubic feet a day. That is six times the production rate of 2009. The vast majority of production is coming from Pennsylvania, including the areas of the State that I represent, along with West Virginia.

To put this in perspective, the Marcellus alone produces more natural gas than Saudi Arabia. If the Marcellus were its own country, production would rank third in the world after Russia and the rest of the United States. This has led to record low gas prices. It is the reason companies are moving manufacturing back to the United States. It is why consumers have more money in their pockets after paying their bills. Also, Mr. Speaker, data released Monday by the EIA indicates that carbon-related emissions dropped by 3.8 percent from 2011 to 2012—to their lowest levels since 1994.

Mr. Speaker, domestic gas production is helping create a stronger American economy. It is helping us improve the environment. It is helping America remain competitive.

A BALANCED AND REASONABLE FISCAL PLAN

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the President was right last week when he said that nobody won after last week's political spectacle—instead, it was America that lost—but I am glad that we finally came together and reopened the government.

If we had followed the Republican plan, we would only have funded 17 percent of the entire Federal Government. Such haphazard funding is really a recipe for a long-term, manmade disaster—a colossal failure to invest adequately in our Nation's future.

So, in the next few weeks, we will have an opportunity to come together and, once and for all, put these funding battles behind us. We all understand that agreeing on a budget will not be easy, but that doesn't mean we should wait until the last minute to start talking to one another. Let's get back to work now and start the process of figuring out how we can agree on a balanced and reasonable fiscal plan that puts middle class American families first and the American Dream back in reach.

THE LIFE OF RUBY SESSION

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of a truly remarkable woman, Ruby Session, who passed away earlier this month.

In 1985, Ms. Session's son, Timothy Cole—a veteran, a student at Texas Tech University and a Black man—was wrongfully convicted of the rape of a woman in Lubbock County and was sentenced to 25 years in prison. He died there of an asthma attack while incarcerated. In 2009, DNA evidence proved

that Tim Cole was wrongfully convicted; and in 2010 he received the first posthumous pardon in Texas history.

Ms. Session fought for justice for her son, but throughout all of that, she still fought for justice for everyone in the State who had been wrongfully convicted. Thanks to her efforts, Texas now has additional safeguards to prevent wrongful convictions and to provide restitution to former prisoners who have been exonerated of their crimes.

I am honored to have known Ms. Session and to have supported her pursuit of justice while I served in the Texas Legislature. Her spirit lives on in her reforms and in the many individuals whose lives she has touched.

A GREAT LEADER HAS PASSED

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I became aware of the death of a great United States Congressman, BILL YOUNG, from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG was the senior Republican Member, who served in this House since 1970. He was a gentle soul, congenial, friendly—always nice to me. I asked him to join with me in the Tourette Syndrome Caucus, and he did. He was one of the founding members. He was a leader in seeking funds for biomedical research, which doubled during the time in which he was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He understood earmarks were the responsibility of this Congress, and he fought for them and supported them.

He was close friends with John Murtha, and I was proud to serve and to know both of them. Both men were in the military reserve, and both men towards the end of their careers recognized that war was wrong in places where they had previously been for it—John Murtha in Iraq, and, in 2012, Mr. YOUNG said that it is time to get out of Afghanistan.

A great leader has passed. His funeral will be tomorrow in the State of Florida. I was proud to know him. This country was fortunate to have him serve in this body.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 62

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 62.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 385 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 385

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–24. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend and colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

House Resolution 385 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, the first WRRDA bill since 2007. The rule makes 24 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order, half of which are sponsored by my colleagues across the aisle, and it provides for robust debate in the House of Representatives.

The underlying bill was marked up by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which reported the bill favorably with unanimous bipartisan support. The bill before us today garnered that support because of four reasons: this bill reforms the Federal bureaucracy; this bill is fiscally responsible; this bill strengthens accountability; and this bill creates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, talk to anyone around the country that relies on the Army Corps of Engineers; talk with anyone that depends on our water infrastructure, water resources and so forth; talk to anyone who wants to develop a new water resource infrastructure; talk to anyone who ships in or out of our harbors or ports. Maybe you have the opportunity to talk with our shipping companies, or maybe with the women and men who work on our tugboats and barges, or maybe with the farmer who needs to get his corn to the right markets, or maybe the manufacturer who needs to ship her product or his product to a foreign customer, or maybe the port director who is trying to get America prepared for the economic opportunities that will come with the larger ships coming through the Panama Canal. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues spoke with these men and

women, they would hear the same refrain: our bureaucracy delays American investment; our bureaucracy costs American jobs; and our bureaucracy helps America's foreign competitors.

The approval process of our critical water infrastructure takes years too long, and sometimes well over a decade. One project that my friend from Florida is familiar with is a project in Port Everglades, which has been studied for nearly two decades. Some bureaucrats have spent their entire career studying this one project. The study of the project of Port Everglades is a prime example of Washington bureaucracy crushing America's jobs and America's future.

This bill before us today does away with these delays: it sets hard deadlines on the time and cost of the studies; it consolidates or eliminates duplicative studies; it requires concurrent project review by multiple agencies; and it puts our projects on a path to construction.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reforms Federal bureaucracy, but it also is fiscally responsible. We all know that our Nation spends too much, our Nation oftentimes spends money haphazardly without a plan and without restraint. This bill does not.

Chairman SHUSTER is committed to restraining spending and is committed to managing American taxpayer dollars wisely. This bill is proof of that. This bill restrains spending. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for actually making the tough choices necessary to get our budget in order.

Mr. Speaker, when was the last time an infrastructure bill was brought to the House floor and it cut more than it spent? The bill before us today does just that: it deauthorizes $12 billion of old, inactive projects; it pays for the new projects by canceling old projects; and it sunsets the construction of new projects in order to prevent future backlogs. Mr. Speaker, this bill reforms Federal bureaucracy, is fiscally responsible, and it strengthens accountability.

Many of our constituents, when they hear us talk about infrastructure, remember the days of pork barrel spending. Many of our colleagues might remember the 1939 movie about a newly appointed Senator who goes to Washington running head-on into a political machine built on earmarks and pork barrel spending. ''Mr. Smith Goes to Washington'' is a dramatic rendering of how most infrastructure bills were put together in the past. In fact, the bill that was debated in the movie was a water resource bill, and the filibuster was over an earmark in that bill. This bill ends that earmark process.

The bill before us today strengthens accountability for the American people. Gone are the days of inserting earmarks at the last minute. Gone are the days of creating new pet projects. Gone are the days of wasting taxpayer money on pork barrel spending. Mr. Speaker, this bill contains no earmarks.

It also establishes a new, transparent process for future bills that will ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent on necessary projects. It will prioritize our spending and provide strong Congressional oversight. This bill reforms Federal bureaucracy, is fiscally responsible, strengthens accountability, and creates jobs.

The key to creating American jobs is expanding our economy. American producers must be able to get their products to the world market. This push to sell to the world is a high-stakes competition that America must win. Our farmers are being pressured by our neighbors in South America. Our manufacturers are being pressured by both European and Asian countries. Our energy producers are being pressured by many foreign countries in all corners of the globe. Investing in our infrastructure will boost trade, increase American competitiveness, and position our country for economic growth. These advancements will put America to work.

While construction workers will immediately be put to work on these projects, every single American job that depends on our transportation infrastructure will benefit from this bill. Our economy will grow, our producers will compete with the world, and American jobs will be created.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see why this bill garnered unanimous bipartisan support from the members of the committee and why it deserves to be passed here. This bill reforms Federal bureaucracy; this bill is fiscally responsible; this bill strengthens accountability; and this bill creates jobs.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill. Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have provided us with a unanimously supported bipartisan bill that will move our Nation forward.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and agree with everything that my good friend and colleague from Florida said—everything that he said—with the exception of the fact that I am opposed to the rule. While I may support the underlying legislation, the rule blocks over 70 amendments, many of which were germane to the bill. This kind of rule is not conducive to an open process.

The bill, though far from perfect, is long overdue. There is a lot of go-nowhere, do-nothing talk about creating jobs here on the Hill, but this bill, like the highway bill and the farm bill, will actually create jobs.

The bill also reinforces a point that I have been making for some time, and that is: repairing our Nation's aging infrastructure, including our water infrastructure, is the best jobs program out there. The resulting economic benefits will ripple from our ports to Main Street America as badly needed jobs across a wide range of industries. For example, every dollar spent on Everglades restoration, like the ones authorized here, is returned fourfold by stimulating related industries like tourism, construction, and retail.

Despite these undeniable benefits, it has been 7 years since the last WRRDA bill. That is 7 years of productivity lost. But if you think 7 years is a long time, try waiting 17 years, as my colleague Mr. WEBSTER pointed out. That is how long Port Everglades has been waiting for a Chief's Report from the Army Corps to deepen its channels in anticipation of the new Panama Canal standards. At long last, the report is due shortly, yet this bill fails to authorize the pending project. While much of the blame for the delay falls outside of this Chamber, Congress can and should do right by the port.

Mr. Speaker, the port has already waited its turn. With the new Panama Canal expansion becoming operational in 2015, any further delay for such a vital piece of our Nation's infrastructure will be too late.

I do understand that tough choices have to be made. The way I see it, the Army Corps' lengthy review process is in part to blame for the backlog of projects. Though this bill contains some partisan measures addressing this issue, the Corps has already begun testing its own way of increasing the speed of review.

One of these successful tests was the pilot program for the Central Everglades Planning Project, yet that project is not included in this bill either, despite the Chief's report for CEPP being anticipated within a few months. This new approach, when coupled with a more frequent WRRDA bill, could help eliminate the massive backlog of projects that has forced Congress to make these tough decisions.

When we look what CEPP actually does, the urgency for authorization is even more obvious. CEPP will help end the discharges of polluted water from Lake Okeechobee that have been devastating Florida communities for years. The water is choked green with algae and killing wildlife, tourism, fishing, and oyster industries, particularly in the Indian River area of our State.

The people of Florida can't wait for another WRRDA bill to roll around. The streamlined successful pilot program is infinitely more preferable than the streamlining of environmental review contained in this bill.

My friends across the aisle seem oddly opposed sometimes to having fresh water and clean air, attacking NEPA and environmental regulations at every opportunity, including otherwise inappropriate vehicles like this

bill. But I understand that no one is happy all the time.

I do have grave reservations about some of the policies in the bill and hope that we can work them out through the legislative process. There is no need for Congress to make the waters rougher than they already are. Let's continue to do our work constituents sent us here to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nearly one-third of our economy depends on international trade, and 99 percent of that trade passes through our Nation's ports. Since transportation accounts for as much as 10 percent of the cost of the products we buy, it is so very critically important that our ports and waterways run efficiently and are properly maintained.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which is a part of the critical role laid out to Congress by our Founding Fathers in regulating interstate commerce. With this bill we can reform the Army Corps of Engineers' management of important infrastructure projects and reduce their project backlog in order to create the conditions for a much stronger American economy. Mr. Speaker, this bill does that, and that is why I am proud to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all begin by opposing the rule. This House is becoming much too closed. I would remind my Republican colleagues of the promises they made when they took over this place. They promised a more open and more transparent House of Representatives. What we have seen is closed and restricted rules time and time and time again. There is no reason why this can't be an open rule. So I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against the rule.

Secondly, with regard to the underlying bill, it is my intention to support the underlying bill, but I do have serious reservations. The proponents of this bill talk about the streamlining provisions that are in this bill that somehow streamline the environmental review process and that somehow the environmental review process causes delays.

I would remind my colleagues that the facts are clear that delays are caused by funding that doesn't correspond to the demand. The last WRRDA bill authorized over $23 billion in new projects, and since that time appropriations have been at $1.5 billion per year. The Ryan budget, which my Republican colleagues seem to love so much, will cut that by another third. Add to that sequestration and all the other budget cuts that my colleagues are proposing here, it is lack of money, not environmental reviews, that is causing the delays.

Further, environmental reviews are really the only way voters have any say about the Federal projects in their community.

□ 1300

We need a WRRDA bill, but we don't need to sacrifice the environmental review process or a process that allows our constituents to have a say on how projects proceed. I hope when this bill moves to conference committee with the Senate, we can fix some of these, I think, egregious problems with the bill with regard to the environmental review process.

We do need a WRRDA bill, and we also need a transportation bill. I would hope my colleagues on the other side could convince the Tea Party members to allow that to come to the floor because we have an aging infrastructure, not only in terms of water projects but in terms of highways, roads, and bridges. I could go on and on and on.

If we get this right, we can create some jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and support the underlying bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3080.

This bill provides commonsense reforms to the construction of water infrastructure projects, which will help facilitate commerce and get this country back to work, and it does so without earmarks. It also addresses our regulatory framework amidst commonsense solutions that we can use.

Article I of the Constitution clearly spells out that the Federal Government has a role in regulating commerce, and when we talk about building ports and dams, these are the types of projects that the Federal Government can and should undertake, which will allow the private sector to thrive, as well as encouraging private sector participation.

I want to thank the chairman and the committee for their work on this bill, which also advances the cause of the Savannah Harbor expansion project, which is one of the many projects that can move forward under this bill. The Savannah Harbor deepening will allow the State of Georgia to begin construction on this much-needed project. When it is completed, consumers and businesses all across the country will benefit from the imports and exports that flow through Savannah.

The bill also provides residents across the country with a framework that advances long-term economic growth opportunities by expanding and improving our sources of water supply.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the House of Representatives.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say thanks to my good friend from Florida for yielding me this time.

I urge that the rule be rejected. There is no reason why we can't have an opportunity to amend this legislation to address some of its failures. As the author of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, I was proud to usher in a new era of environmental and wildlife conservation. Moreover, NEPA passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support, by a vote of 372–15. A similar vote took place in the Senate. During the debate on NEPA, I noted:

> Mankind is playing an extremely dangerous game with his environment. We have not yet learned that we must consider the natural environment as a whole and to assess its quality continuously if we really wish to make strides in improving, preserving, and protecting it.

NEPA has a very simple promise: look before leaping. The law ensures that Federal agencies weigh the environmental consequences of development projects before they are undertaken. This bill puts its finger in the eye of that particular approach. I worry that the provisions included in the bill before us today will lead us down a path going back to those days of impunity and disregard for the well-being and concerns of the public, where actions were taken without any full appreciation or understanding of the environmental impact of that.

That was the reason NEPA was passed, so that we would know what we were doing, and so that we would have a fair opportunity for people to participate in the judgments by having these decisions made in an open and a transparent fashion. Now perhaps changes are needed, and perhaps an update, if you will. We cannot say that this legislation does that. However, before we make changes, we need to have some comprehensive hearings in the committee of jurisdiction. I note that the committee that brings this legislation to the floor is not necessarily the committee of jurisdiction.

This is a proposal which is disregarding one of the things which was said by President Nixon when he signed it. He said that this was going to stop the decay of the environment. We are renewing that decay.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for the inclusion of the provisions in the bill to help expedite environmental reviews and for the language that was requested by myself and Congressman FARENTHOLD which would help increase private investment in our Nation's ports and expedite the completion of large critical projects.

One important project that is authorized in this bill is the deepening of the Sabine-Neches Waterway. I have been working on the authorization of this project since I was elected in 2004. My predecessors, Nick Lampson and Jack Brooks, worked on this project. Mr. WEBER, who now represents this area, has been working on this project. In fact, the original Chief's Report for the Sabine-Neches Waterway was authorized to begin in 1997, 16 years ago. That was three Presidents ago. It was in the last century.

Since that time, all four of my kids have finished high school, graduated from college, gotten married, and have given me 10 grandkids. The United States has fought two major wars. Sixteen years to do an authorization on a Federal project—something is wrong with this picture, Mr. Speaker.

This project was supposed to cost $300 million. Today, if it is authorized, it will be $1.1 billion. That is a 287 percent increase, and we still haven't moved any dirt. There is something wrong with this picture, Mr. Speaker.

That is why this WRRDA bill is so important. It makes critical structural improvements to the way the Corps of Engineers does business so we can end these absurd delays. It shouldn't take 20 years to complete a project, and I'm talking about authorization just to approve a project, like the Sabine-Neches Waterway.

The Sabine-Neches Waterway is critical to America's energy and national security. It was first authorized at 40 feet. This WRRDA bill will make the depth 48 feet, permitting deeper draft vessels to come through. Right now, tankers that come up the Sabine-Neches Waterway can't be full because they drag bottom. They have to offload part of their fuel before they come up the waterway. That is why this is important to the United States.

It is also vital to the United States military. The Sabine-Neches Waterway, actually is the home of the largest commercial military out-load port in America, and it is the second-largest military port in the world. The channel is home to two designated military strategic seaports: Beaumont and Port Arthur, Texas.

Additionally, 20 to 30 percent of the Nation's commercial jet fuel and a significant majority and classified amount of our military's jet fuel is produced on the Sabine-Neches Waterway.

This is the energy corridor of the United States. Refineries line this entire waterway. Delays by the Corps of Engineers have cost millions of dollars, all because they cannot make up their mind to approve the project.

Mr. Speaker, pick a horse and ride it. Either approve the project or deny the project, but make up your mind. These delays are absurd.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, while not a perfect bill, I will be voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, better known as WRRDA.

As a member of the California Delegation, I am particularly supportive of reauthorizing WRRDA, which is such a critical bill for our state.

Although this bill was intended to be reauthorized every two years, it has been six years since the last Water Resources Development Act (WRRDA) was signed into law.

After examining the provisions included in this legislation, I am encouraged by provisions like Section 124 which helps our state by requiring a comprehensive review of the Corps of Engineers' policy guidelines on vegetation management for levees.

I am hopeful that this provision will help eliminate some of the challenges that local governments and flood control agencies face because of current vegetation removal policy.

Additionally, provisions like the one outlined in Section 130 mandate that a report be issued on the practices, priorities, and authorized purposes at Corps of Engineers reservoirs in arid regions and their effect on water supply during times of drought.

This is a good start to begin addressing the need and ability for local water agencies to be able to store more water in their dams for water replenishment.

Although we do not have the ideal reauthorization bill of WRRDA in front of us, I believe this to be a good start to once again focus on the importance of water supply and management.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my good friend and a former member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan WRRDA bill. I want to commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL, along with Chairman Gibbs and Ranking Member BISHOP. I would also like to thank Senator BOXER for leading the Senate in passing its WRRDA bill earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, my district of Sacramento is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at the confluence of two great rivers: the American and the Sacramento. We have a lot at risk. We waited too long for this bill, and we need Congress to act.

Since the last WRRDA in 2007, a number of key flood protection investments have been carefully studied by the Army Corps of Engineers. One such project that has been thoroughly studied by the Corps of Engineers and holds a Chief's Report is the Natomas Levee Improvement Project. Levee deficiencies were found in the area in 2008, and it was remapped by FEMA in 2008. The Corps of Engineers put the level of protection at 1 in 33 years, a third of the national standard. Since then, costly flood insurance has become mandatory.

The area to be protected by the project is home to over 100,000 people, two interstate highways, and an international airport. It is heavily urbanized, and home to dozens of schools and hundreds of small businesses. If a levee broke, the damage would be similar to that experienced in New Orleans.

To fully underscore the importance of this project, my constituents have voluntarily voted twice to pay their local share. Despite the significant local investment, work remains uncompleted. The project needs congressional authorization.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this bill. We must establish a conference committee with the Senate, and we must work to ensure WRRDA becomes law this year. It is too important for our Nation, and I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to ensure that.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, as well as a bipartisan amendment that we will have on the floor later today. This bill works to address our Nation's competitiveness and increasing economic growth by maintaining our infrastructure in a sensible manner.

Our amendment that we will offer today will work to address the challenges that invasive species present to our country today. As the cochair of the Invasive Species Caucus and the only Member who has the privilege to represent three of the five Great Lakes, I am honored to speak on the floor today about the threat that these species bring to our natural environment. They also represent a huge economic cost to each of our districts. It costs over $100 million a year in the Great Lakes alone to have these invasive species fought and controlled.

Mr. Speaker, our amendment is simple. It does not authorize any new funds or create new programs. Simply put, it helps address the invasive species issue by requiring the GAO to complete a comprehensive report on Federal spending for the operations and cost of invasive species. Why is this important? A report that takes into account all species nationwide will allow Congress to identify both gaps and duplicative efforts in the future. By beginning with a comprehensive report, we can effectively target areas for improvement in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your support and all Members' support for this bill and our amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell us the time remaining for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) who is the cochair of the PORTS Caucus, of which I am a proud member.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying bill, and as my colleague said, as a founder and cochair, along with my friend, TED POE, of the Congressional PORTS Caucus, I am happy that today the House has this opportunity to pass a water resources bill that will provide long-needed investment to our Nation's ports and create jobs. Our ports and waterways have been waiting for over 6 years for a new water bill. It is time to end their wait.

One of the things I came to Congress to do was to fight for the full use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and to ensure that we address the expanded use needs of ports like the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach that see so much commerce but so little of this harbor maintenance funding.

Do I wish that we would have been able to be more aggressive in this bill? Of course—but the bill we have before us is a huge step in the right direction. Congress, I think, is finally recognizing that our ports aren't just gateways; they are engines of growth, of prosperity, and of jobs. Passing this legislation would be a big victory for our ports, a strong signal that this House recognizes the critical importance of our ports to our economic health.

I am going to be voting for this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1315

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the Rules Committee for yielding.

This is a big bill for Georgia. It is a big bill for all of America. Mr. Speaker, it is so often that we hear about conflict in this body. We all know that jobs are important to absolutely everyone's constituency; and when we all know that 99 percent of our imports and exports travel through our ports, it is easy to come together and get excited about doing things that matter.

We have got the Panama Canal opening for newer and wider and bigger ships, but my own home port in Savannah is not ready, through no fault of our own. We began that process back in the 1990s to begin to expand the Port of Savannah, and it has taken 15 years to get through that permitting process. This bill says: Who benefits from that? Whose constituency is it that benefits from jobs being slowed or delayed for 15 years? No one's does. So we are able to come together and say let's do it; let's do it right, but let's do it in an efficient manner.

Three years is what we have given, 36 months, to study each and every aspect in the permitting process, and to do those things concurrently. Today, Mr. Speaker, as you know, you have to do one study first and then a second one and then a third one and then a fourth one, and you can't start the next one until the first one is finished. Today we say, if we know we have six studies to do, let's do them simultaneously. Let's go ahead and get all the work done. We all benefit from that, Mr. Speaker.

The reforms in this bill go into those projects that are authorized, Mr. Speaker, that represent spending on our books that we know we are not going to do. We say that if we have any new projects we are interested in doing, let's take those old projects off that are no longer a priority for America. Let's set our priorities. We know we have to spend money in this government, but we ought to spend it on the best projects, not the least of these; and this bill recognizes, in a budget-neutral way, a way to authorize those projects that are most important to us while we are moving those that are the least.

Mr. Speaker, I live in a county that relies on a Corps of Engineers' lake. Working with the Corps of Engineers in partnership is critical to my community for our drinking water, for our recreation, for our economy. The Corps has been a good partner, but the Corps is often hamstrung by the laws that this Congress has put in place and by the implementation of those laws by administrations, both Republican and Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reclaims to this House, for both sides of the aisle, the authority to direct the projects of the Corps of Engineers. We direct these not through earmarks, Mr. Speaker, but by recognizing that constitutional responsibility that we have to our constituents back home to decide where those dollars are spent, how those projects are prioritized. Rather than punting on that issue, this bill reserves those powers rightfully to this House and to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not everything that I would like for it to be. Candidly, in 3 years of serving in this Congress, I have yet to see a bill that is everything that I would like for it to be. What I know is that this bill is a step in the right direction, a step that we can take and a step that we must take.

I thank my friend from Florida for his leadership on the issue, for his leadership on the Rules Committee, and for yielding me the time today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), my friend.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, we are a country of interdependent States that share prosperity, challenges, and resources, united with a goal of a healthy economy supported by quality infrastructure.

At times, though, inequities in the collection and distribution of Federal resources create such an imbalance that one region is put at a distinct disadvantage. This is the case for California, which collects nearly one-third of the Nation's harbor maintenance taxes but receives less than 7 percent of the expenditures for port projects.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO's amendment, had it been allowed to come to this floor, would have brought a measure of equity to this stark imbalance. I believe this was a missed opportunity for our Nation's ports.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Mr. SOUTHERLAND, my fellow Floridian and good friend.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me today.

Today I rise in support of this rule for the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, and I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN). She understands how important this bill is, as do I.

Make no mistake, this is a jobs bill. We are going to be able to take advantage of economic opportunities because of this piece of legislation. I am proud to serve as a member of the Transportation Committee. That this bill passed unanimously out of committee is something that I think needs to be noted.

This legislation enhances the Army Corps of Engineers' ability to develop and support America's port and waterway infrastructure, and it does so with full spending offsets and zero earmarks. That is the kind of commonsense reform I believe the American people expect and deserve.

This bill places hard caps on the time and cost of studies, eliminates duplications and delays, places a 3-year cap on those studies and caps in dollar amounts of $3 million. It expands the role of public-private partnerships in water infrastructure and makes significant changes to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund so that monies that are collected for harbor maintenance are more fully utilized for their design purpose. I know it is a novel idea that those monies collected for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund would be there, and this bill addresses that.

Perhaps most importantly to the people of my district, this bill begins a critically important conversation that began at the committee level on the impact of the decreased water flows down the ACF River system and into the Apalachicola Bay. The Apalachicola Bay is a natural treasure, producing 90 percent of Florida's oyster harvest and 10 percent of the Nation's oyster harvest. The oystermen, small businesses, and hardworking families who depend on this bay have seen their livelihoods put at risk.

I am pleased that Chairman SHUSTER and the ranking member have worked in good faith to begin this dialogue with me. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as the underlying bill, which provides critical support to Florida's 15 deepwater ports and allows us to be fully prepared for the economic opportunities as a result of the Panama Canal expansion.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), my good friend and fellow Helsinki Commission member.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for this time.

As the cochairman of the Congressional Waterways Caucus, I do support many of the provisions of this bill, but I am concerned that it has no language to reauthorize expiring coastal protection projects.

Our beaches are the economic engines and environmental treasures that protect our coasts from storms and create jobs for our community. In fact, when you talk about return on tax dollars, the beaches can't be beat. For every $1 spent by the Federal Government on beach renourishment, $320 is returned in revenue. I know of no other Federal program that gives that kind of return.

When we think about the inclusion of coastal renourishment projects, there are over 50 that will be expiring if this is not addressed. We have found at Carolina and Kure Beach in North Carolina, and as many of our colleagues all over the Nation have found, a few thousand dollars on the frontside saves millions of dollars on the backside after a vicious storm like Sandy, Katrina, Fran, or Hugo. The list goes on.

It is imperative that the WRRDA language contain the reauthorization of these projects that are already in progress; otherwise, we lose these investments, and that is not a good use of taxpayer money. These are investments that ultimately create jobs and save money.

EXPIRING COASTAL NOURISHMENT PROJECTS

Member	State	Project	End Year
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Carolina Beach and Vicinity	2014
Rep. Bill Young	FL	Pinellas County—Treasure Island Segment	2019
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Broward County—Segment II	2020
Rep. Patrick Murphy	FL	Fort Pierce Beach St. Lucie	2020
Rep. John Carney	DE	Delaware Coast Protection, Indian River Inlet	2021
Rep. Jack Kingston	GA	Tybee Island	2023
Rep. Alcee Hastings	FL	Broward County-Segment III	2025
Rep. Debbie Wasserman-Schultz	FL	Dade County-Bal Harbour	2025
Rep. Timothy Bishop	NY	Westhampton	2027
Rep. Corrine Brown	FL	Duval County	2028
Rep. C.W. Bill Young	FL	Pinellas County—Long Key Segment	2030
Rep. Debbie Wasserman-Schultz	FL	Dade County—Sunny Isles	2038
Rep. Trey Radel	FL	Lee County—Captiva Island Segment	2038
Rep. Theodore Deutch	FL	Palm Beach County—North Boca Raton Segment	2038
Vacant	MA	Revere Beach	2041
Rep. Frank LoBiondo	NJ	Cape May City (Cape May Inlet to Lower Tower	2041
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Wrightsville Beach	2041
Rep. Marcy Kaptur	OH	Presque Island	2042
Rep. Marshall "Mark" Sanford	SC	Folly Beach	2043
Rep. Vern Buchanan	FL	Manatee County	2043
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Palm Beach County—Delray Beach Segment	2043
Rep. Richard Nugent	FL	Pinellas County—Sand Key Segment	2043
Rep. Rosa DeLauro	CT	Prospect Beach	2043
Rep. Frank LoBiondo	NJ	Ocean City—Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck	2043
Rep. Luke Messer	IN	Indiana Shoreline	2044
Rep. Patrick Murphy	FL	Martin County	2045
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Palm Beach—Jupiter/Carlin	2045
Rep. Hakeem Jeffries	NY	Coney Island	2045
Rep. Gregory Meeks	NY	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet Sectic	2045
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Monmouth Beach (F	2045
Rep. Tom Rice	SC	Myrtle Beach	2046
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Sea Bright (Reach 1)	2046
Rep. Lois Frankel	FL	Palm Beach—Ocean Ridge Segment	2047
Rep. Vern Buchanan	FL	Sarasota County—Venice Segment	2047
Rep. Christopher "Chris" Smith	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Belmar to Manasqui	2047
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Kure Beach	2047
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Long Branch (Reach	2048
Rep. Scott Rigell	VA	Sandbridge	2048
Rep. Steve Southerland	FL	Panama City Beaches	2050
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr.	NJ	Sea Bright—Manasquan: Asbury to Avon	2050
Rep. Mike McIntyre	NC	Ocean Isle, Brunswick County Beaches	2050

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. WEBSTER from Florida.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. WRRDA is commonsense legislation that permits the Army Corps of Engineers to eliminate costly and duplicative projects, caps the time and costs of studies, consolidates and accelerates environmental analyses, and stimulates the U.S. economy through increased competitiveness in the global market and through job reaction.

In my home State of Florida, our 15 ports have contributed over $96 billion to the State's economy and, perhaps most importantly, employs hundreds of thousands of individuals. Within my district, we have two inland ports in particular, Ocala and Lake City, which are uniquely positioned to import and export products quickly to Florida, the southeast, and to America's heartland. Encouraging infrastructure projects such as these spur job creation. In today's economy, we cannot afford to neglect these opportunities.

We have, today, the opportunity to demonstrate that Congress can work towards the best interest of our country. So I urge my colleagues in the House to take swift action in voting to approve WRRDA and get our country back on the path to save infrastructure, global competitiveness, economic stability, and job creation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act because it is essential for our economy and it addresses flood control and water management issues important to my district.

Waterways and ports support more than 27,000 jobs in Connecticut, but Congress hasn't passed a WRRDA bill since 2007. We can't wait another 6 years to ensure that our inland waterways and seaports remain the greatest in the world.

I do have concerns about provisions meant to streamline environmental reviews, but this bill is the result of bipartisan cooperation, something all too rare in Washington these days; and as a cosponsor, I am proud to say that this bill reflects the bipartisan action that my constituents expect from Congress. That is why I am so grateful to my friend from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, as well as Ranking Member RAHALL and Representative BISHOP for

their responsible bipartisan leadership on this effort.

If you are concerned about the economy, public safety, or the lack of funding for our water infrastructure, pass WRRDA today.

I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, because it is essential for our economy, and it addresses flood control and water management issues that are important to my district.

This past May, I led officials from the Army Corps of Engineers' New England Office on a tour of my district.

We met with constituents in Torrington, CT, where the city is bound by old restrictions on levee vegetation that are both costly AND harmful to the environment. This bill is a good first step to provide them relief.

We met with city leaders in Meriden, CT, about a downtown flood control project that is vital for economic development.

They need a partner in Washington, as do communities across America, and that means they need Congress to pass water resources legislation on a regular basis.

Waterways and ports support more than 27,000 jobs in Connecticut, but Congress hasn't passed a WRDA bill since 2007.

We can't wait another 6 years to ensure our inland waterways and seaports remain the greatest commercial water transportation system in the world.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I'm also proud to say this bill reflects the kind of bipartisan cooperation my constituents expect from Congress.

This is not a perfect bill.

I am particularly concerned about provisions meant to streamline environmental reviews.

But this bill is the result of bipartisan negotiations, something that is all too rare in Washington these days. Despite our disagreements, we have worked together to advance our national interest.

That is why I am so thankful for my friend from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, as well as Ranking Member RAHALL and Representative BISHOP, for their responsible bipartisan leadership.

If you are concerned about the economy, public safety, or environmentally friendly reforms for Corps policy: pass this bill today, so that we can turn our focus to the critical lack of funding for our water infrastructure.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify one thing, and that is the chairman and the ranking member did everything they could to stay within the guidelines and the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and they did that. They did not vary in any way over into the Clean Water Act or anything else. So nothing in this bill is changing any of the standards; all it is doing is allowing parallel tracks. That is it. So the project mentioned by Mr. WOODALL, which is 15 years, and the project in Mr. HASTINGS' area, which is 17 years, would only be done sooner, not by circumventing any environmental requirement, but through the parallel tracks.

I now yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1733, when General Oglethorpe sailed up the Savannah River, I have been told the river was 12 feet deep. We have been playing in the mud down there ever since. Today, it is 42 feet deep, but 42 feet isn't enough for the large Panamax ships that will soon start coming through the expanded Panama Canal. If we are to stay competitive, we have to deepen the river.

There are 352,000 jobs in Georgia related to import/export and the Port of Savannah. In fact, the cost-benefit analysis of this investment is a dollar spent gives us a $5.50 return. In these tough economic times, that is why this legislation is so important.

□ 1330

Furthermore, it is basically a reauthorization necessitated by bureaucratic delays. The original authority to deepen the Savannah River was in 1999. It took 13 years and $41 million worth of study to finally get four Federal agencies to approve it. During that period of time, China built a port, from start to finish, which is bigger than the Port of Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to be competitive as a Nation, we have to do better than this. Today's legislation accelerates the approval process by alleviating unnecessary government delays.

This legislation is common sense; it is pro-jobs and pro-America; and I urge its passage.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am privileged to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, and I rise in support for a very good reason. This bill helps create jobs, good jobs, family-wage jobs. And it is not just jobs in construction from the infrastructure projects. It is jobs throughout the shipping and transportation sectors.

I happen to represent a district that contains a number of ports, including the Port of Olympia and parts of the Port of Tacoma. And activities at the Port of Tacoma alone are related to 113,000 jobs in Washington State; but there are more jobs to be found there, and around the country, if we act now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a healthy economy requires a healthy environment, and I hope that the final bill that is reported out of the conference committee does not get caught in the false premise of having to choose just one.

However, I think this bill is a good, bipartisan start, and I urge its passage.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no more presenters and I am prepared to close. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, this reauthorization is long overdue. There is no better way to put people back to work and stimulate our economy than to invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

In my home, the 10th District of Illinois, there are $235 million in projects that are waiting to get under way. The multiplier effect that these projects will have in our communities cannot be overstated.

This bill makes a number of reforms that will benefit the communities in Illinois that I represent. It will, for the first time, recognize the Great Lakes Navigation System as the single system that it is. It will ensure that a portion of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is dedicated to small harbors like the one I represent in Waukegan.

This bill is not perfect. I certainly have objections to some of the environmental streamlining provisions. That said, this bill is a great example of the progress that can be made when both sides come to the table and find common ground.

I believe there is still more to be done to safeguard our environment in the underlying bill, and I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member as this bill moves through the conference to ensure that adequate environmental protections are maintained in the final measure.

I thank the gentleman and look forward to passing this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today generally in support of the reauthorization of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, but I do want to express a couple of concerns that I have.

One is this discussion about reforms that I think really put in jeopardy what it is that we are trying to do, both in terms of developing our water resources and also protecting our environment.

I am concerned about the streamlining under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA. It doesn't slow down projects. In fact, it ensures that the general public, State and local government officials, and industry have a seat at the table when Federal agencies make decisions that impact our communities.

Indeed, I am offering an amendment, along with my colleagues, Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEFAZIO, that would restore our confidence in the system to make sure that we are really protecting our environment.

My other concern, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment that is going to be offered, the Young and Petri amendment, that would, in fact, go back to the private sector for services instead of leaving that to the decision of the Army Corps of Engineers.

I look forward to further working on these issues.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged that we have today before us a bipartisan bill that will help improve our Nation's waterways and infrastructure and create jobs.

However, I do agree that this bill is imperfect, and I am dismayed that this bill includes provisions that will undermine our environmental protections and reduce the ability for public input. In that regard, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. DINGELL.

What is left out is an environmental review process that avoids pitfalls and saves taxpayers money by allowing the Army Corps of Engineers to understand where problems may exist with their proposals.

The bill also misses an opportunity to encourage the Corps to use natural infrastructure in its flood control projects. In order to better address future extreme weather, safeguard our neighborhoods, and improve wildlife habitat, nonstructural alternatives to Corps projects should be considered as viable options.

Project delays are overwhelmingly due to funding issues or changes to the project, not environmental review. I urge my colleagues to fix these shortcomings in the conference committee process.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time.

Environmental review isn't a problem; it is a good thing. Including citizens in projects and how they affect our communities and their voices is important. Protecting water quality in natural areas that drive local economies is important. Saving tax dollars is important.

And yet, unfortunately, in the minds of some, environmental review is a problem that needs to be streamlined. I don't call these environmental review streamlines something good. I say that they are just weakening a good process that allows people to be involved and participate.

I think weakening the National Environmental Protection Act is shortsighted, misguided; and I oppose those particular provisions.

While there are merits in this bill, there also are problems, and weakening environmental review is chief among them. I am very disappointed those provisions are included in this bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out, again, no environmental law has been changed, none. Nothing has been weakened. Nothing has been shortchanged. Nothing has been slowed down.

The only thing that has happened is those studies, instead of being done in a linear path, one after another, are done simultaneously. It doesn't weaken anything. It doesn't undo anything. What it does do is speed up the process, which is very, very needed.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida.

Despite some merits in the WRRDA bills that the Republicans have proposed, they fail to address the number one reason why Corps of Engineers projects are delayed, a serious lack of Federal funding. The bill before us perpetuates a myth that the problem is environmental review of engineering projects and not inadequate funding.

In my congressional District, the Green Brook project has been funded at $11 million per year. If this funding level continues, it will take more than 30 years to complete the project, which will eventually protect several flood-prone communities frequently at risk from extreme weather, and save lives. Until then, the Green Brook residents remain under threat.

Now, every water resource project has effects on the environment and should have good environmental review. Streamlining environmental review will not save money or expedite construction. Limiting the national environmental review limits public participation, prevents identification of potentially costly problems, project-stopping problems.

Environmental review is not something to be tolerated. It is something to be welcomed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, distinguished Member from Florida, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation. It is a good example of bipartisanship and cooperation and common sense, as opposed to some of the politics that have dominated this Chamber.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, I was pleased to have had a part in several bipartisan provisions beneficial to the economy, to the environment, and to conservation.

We are creating jobs and stimulating the business economy with this legislation. We are putting a stop to raids on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. We are expanding the definition of invasive species, now limited to plant life, to include animal life species like zebra mussels and Asian carp, and we are closing the lock and dam at St. Anthony Falls to prevent the spread of Asian carp through the precious lakes and rivers of northern Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill, the Congress demonstrates that we are still capable of achieving reasonable, bipartisan solutions that solve problems and get things done here in this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) to discuss our proposal if we defeat the previous question.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding time to me.

My amendment is very simple. It authorizes the Corps projects to receive a final Chief's Report up to 1 year following the enactment of the bill.

Let's be clear: under the present arbitrary deadline, critical Corps of Engineer projects throughout the United States will have to wait for years. This is the second Corps project that we have done in 14 years.

Now, my colleague from Florida keeps saying that there is no change. There is a change in this project, in that, in this particular bill, this is the first time that members did not have up to 2 years to get their Chief's Report in.

The Chief's Report is long, it takes time, it is economically and environmentally justified, and it has to indicate it is a benefit to the entire country.

Now, let me say one thing about this amendment. It does not change anything in the current bill. It pays the same way other projects are paid for. It is what we have always done.

Authorizing these additional projects would generate billions of dollars in economic activity, create hundreds and thousands of well-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman for the yielding.

I rise once again, Mr. Speaker, to discuss an environmental catastrophe taking place in my district. While I strongly support the underlying bill, without the amendment, it would force my constituents and residents from Florida to wait at least another 2 years for projects critical for our environment and our economy.

The Central Everglades Planning Project, critical to the deteriorating health of the waterways in my district, is nearly ready to go.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the distinguished gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. The project will safely move more water south of Lake Okeechobee, instead of forcing polluted fresh water into brackish rivers to the east and west, causing immeasurable damage to our environment and our local economy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and support the commonsense, bipartisan Brown-Frankel-

Crenshaw-Posey amendment that would allow the Army Corps to complete its work on authorizing several important projects that are in the final stages of approval.

□ 1345

I spoke on the floor earlier today about the importance of acting now on initiatives that will help address the environmental crisis occurring in our area. Today we have that chance. My constituents and our waterways cannot wait.

Defeat the previous question and support the Brown amendment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, we can bring up this amendment right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the manager, for yielding the time. He knows how important this whole bill is to the Texas gulf region.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are many things we would like to fix in this bill, but I know that there are many Texans who are waiting for this bill to pass; and I was delighted to work with the Texas delegation to strengthen the bill by encouraging non-Federal entities to invest in their harbor maintenance and step in when the Army Corps of Engineers cannot. I am also delighted that we have addressed the question of dredging, and we should do it even better.

I thank the Rules Committee for consenting to my amendment that deals with consultation, with stakeholders and water districts, local city, county government. I know my local governments are waiting to have the Army Corps of Engineers actually listen to them as well as Historically Black Colleges and minority institutions.

I am also looking forward to making sure that the $20 billion in projects in the DeFazio amendment is included and not rejected.

And finally, I hope that we can work together, Mr. Speaker, on ensuring minority- and women-owned businesses and the billions of dollars that are used by the Army Corps of Engineers are actually getting the opportunity to work. I ask my colleagues to recognize the importance of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for bringing this important legislation to the House floor. Smart investments in water infrastructure are critical to the Nation's economic well-being. Water infrastructure is vital to my home State of Texas.

For example, waterways and ports support 207,970 Texas jobs. Additionally, it generates $34 billion dollars in economic activity to the Texas economy. As the Representative of the 18th Congressional District, which is adjacent to the Port of Houston, I understand how critically important it is to make smart investments to create jobs and keep our economy growing.

Texas's commercial deepwater ports connect 152,000 miles of rail, 460,000 miles of pipelines, and 45,000 miles of interstate highways. In addition, the State of Texas has 11 deepwater ports, but hurricane damage and age threaten their ability to handle the next generation of post-Panama vessels.

Mr. Speaker, over half of Texas port facilities require maintenance to fully accommodate the next generation of maritime shipping vessels. Without these investments, Texas and the Nation will be at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy. That is why I support H.R. 3080.

I also want to thank the Rules Committee for making in order my amendment. This amendment provides that in making recommendations pursuant to Section 118 of the Act, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, it is an essential tool in our desire to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

I am sure we will never forget the critical impact from Hurricane Sandy that crippled the Northeast area from Massachusetts to North Carolina. And not long before Hurricane Sandy, as we were working to learn how to prevent another Hurricane Katrina that crippled the great City of New Orleans. Our nation was still healing from Hurricane Ike and Hurricane Rita which crippled Houston, Texas.

As my colleagues are aware, a healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth. This highlights the importance of not only giving greater attention to our underserved communities but also how we can help our citizens by educating them on the areas in which they live. That is why my amendment requires the Secretary of the Army to consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities.

I regret that the Rules Committee did not make in order my amendment that directs the Secretary of the Army to encourage the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects and requires the GAO to submit a report to Congress within 2 years on the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects.

I recognize the value of a diverse supplier base and its impact on the community and population at large. Therefore, I will continue to work directly with the Secretary of the Army to establish an opportunity for Minority and Women Owned Businesses to participate on specific projects and to ensure that the United States Army Corp of Engineers continues to creatively seek new supplier sources, particularly among minority and women owned businesses, to fulfill the business opportunities at a number of Ports throughout our great nation.

Lastly, I appreciate the Committee making in order an amendment cosponsored with Congressman DEFAZIO of Oregon that conditions the application of Section 103 of the bill on a reduction in the backlog of Corps of Engineers projects to less than $20 billion in construction costs. This amendment highlights the fact that it is a lack of funding not the environmental review process that has led to a backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. We have spent enough energy arguing over the budget and the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) streamlining, but not enough time in making the hard decisions and investments that are going to create economic growth and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3080 is not a perfect bill. But no compromise legislation ever is. But this bill is a good start and merits my support.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill used to be known as the Water Resources Development Act. Now it is called the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. While it is with many of these new reforms that I take issue, I look forward to working with my friends on the other side of the aisle to make sure that we are here in 2 years to again update our water resources and infrastructure, hopefully a bill with less ill-advised reforms.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I am going to offer an amendment to allow for the inclusion of the bipartisan Brown amendment, which would authorize projects that receive a final Chief of Engineers' Report up to 1 year following the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for ample and open debate and makes in order amendments from both sides of the aisle. Further, it advances a bill that was reported out of the committee with unanimous bipartisan support.

This bill is good for American workers, is good for American producers, and is good for American shippers. As my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) knows, this bill is also good for the State of Florida.

Florida has 18 public seaports. These seaports are critical components to our economy. They are responsible for supporting more than half a million Florida jobs and for generating $66 billion in total economic value. The activity of these seaports contributed $1.7 billion to Florida's State and local budgets. Furthermore, this bill advances key ecosystem restoration projects in the Florida Everglades and supports the economic development that the Everglades provides in our State.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER for working with me and other Florida Members to ensure that the State is well

positioned to move forward. Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have given us a bipartisan product that reforms the Federal bureaucracy, is fiscally responsible, strengthens accountability, and creates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I say to my colleagues in the House, if you support reforming the Federal bureaucracy, if you are looking to manage our spending, if you are looking to increase transparency while investing in our infrastructure, and if you are looking to create American jobs, support this bill. Vote for the rule. Vote for the bill. Move the country forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 385 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 6 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative BROWN of Florida or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 6. The amendment referred to in section 5 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES COMMITTEE PRINT FOR H.R. 3080 OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Page 162, before line 1, insert the following:

SEC. 402. CONDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any project for water resources development, conservation, or other purposes for which a favorable final report of the Chief of Engineers is completed during the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plan, and subject to the conditions, described in the final report of the Chief.

(b) OFFSET.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall revise the report submitted under section 301 to identify further projects and separable elements that in the aggregate have an estimated Federal cost to complete (as of the date of the report) that is equal to the total cost of all projects authorized under subsection (a).

Page 139, line 4, insert ''or any revision of the report,'' after ''this subsection,''.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—225

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Campbell
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Palazzo
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1415

Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BARBER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 271, noes 147, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—271

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—147

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Campbell
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, George
Nugent
Palazzo
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1423

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 554: On ordering the previous question—providing for consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall No. 555: On agreeing to the resolution—providing for consideration of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3080.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 385 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3080.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1426

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, with Mr. FORTENBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will submit for the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Budget, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud today that we are considering one of my highest priorities as the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee—H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, or WRRDA.

WRRDA is the most policy- and reform-focused legislation of its kind in the last two decades. The new name reflects the landmark reforms. We have added an ''R,'' for Water Resources Reform and Development Act, because of the number of reforms that we have in here. It is the most fiscally responsible WRRDA in history, and there are no earmarks. It does not cede our constitutional congressional authority to the executive branch. We made sure that we maintained that. We have worked together in a bipartisan way on this bill since day one, developing this bill with input from Members and stakeholders through listening sessions, roundtables and hearings.

I want to thank my partners and original cosponsors, Ranking Member RAHALL, Water Subcommittee Chairman BOB GIBBS, and also Water Subcommittee Ranking Member TIM BISHOP, for their work on this piece of legislation.

I want to thank all of the members of the committee and all of the staff members for their hard work and desire to work together on this important infrastructure and reform legislation.

I am also proud that WRRDA has received more than 70 letters of support from stakeholders, a list of which I will submit for the RECORD.

This bill was passed out of committee on September 19 on a voice vote. It is about strengthening our infrastructure so that we can remain competitive.

□ 1430

It is about economic growth. It is about trade. It is about jobs, not just the jobs that will be created when we are dredging ports and rebuilding locks and dams, but the jobs that will help our manufacturers when they manufacture their products and send them into the world markets, making sure they get there in a competitive way. Also, making sure that those products coming into our ports and harbors are getting onto the shelves of our local stores, allowing the consumers to buy these products at a lower cost, allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned dollars.

Congress has not enacted a WRRDA since 2007 and we can't afford to delay. Without improvement, our water transportation system becomes obsolete every day and we become less competitive. If we cannot compete, we lose jobs to those who can.

Our bill cuts red tape, reforms the bureaucracy, accelerates project delivery. It sets hard deadlines on the time and cost of studies. It also consolidates or eliminates unnecessary studies and requires concurrent reviews. And our bill streamlines environmental reviews. I want to repeat, it streamlines them; doesn't eliminate them, but streamlines them.

Our bill is also fiscally responsible. This WRRDA bill deauthorizes $12 billion of old, inactive projects that were authorized prior to this current law and fully offsets new authorizations. In addition, it sunsets new authorizations to prevent future backlogs at the Corps of Engineers.

This WRRDA has no earmarks. Our bill establishes a new, transparent process for future bills to review and prioritize water resources development activities, with strong constitutional oversight and without handing over our constitutional authority to the executive branch. I want to repeat that. I think it is very important that this body, that Congress, holds on to its constitutional authority and not give it over to the executive branch, as we have done for decades.

We have been recognized by leading outside watchdog groups for having a bill with no earmarks and for keeping congressional oversight without ceding that authority to the Corps. I am extremely proud of the accomplishments, and we should all be.

WRRDA breaks down barriers that hold back the development of our water resources infrastructure. It maximizes the ability of non-Federal interests to contribute their own funds to move studies and projects forward. It also expands the ability of non-Federal interests to contribute funds to expedite the evaluation and processing of permits, and it establishes a public-private partnership program in water infrastructure. With the leadership of RODNEY DAVIS, that is in this WRRDA legislation.

This bill improves our ability to compete by authorizing needed investments in America's ports. As I mentioned, this is a jobs bill, not just construction jobs to improve our ports, but to help our manufacturers and to help Americans be able to keep more of their hard-earned dollars.

Our bill supports our underserved and emerging ports to also help them become more competitive. It reforms and preserves the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund to better ensure those fees collected from users for these systems are utilized for their intended purposes.

These are all important and necessary reforms, but at its heart WRRDA ensures that we don't lose sight of the importance of strong infrastructure and keeping us competitive in the world. Our bill supports our water transportation network to make sure that it provides the foundation for job growth and fosters a more robust economy.

I ask all Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, I am writing concerning H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was marked-up by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013.

In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 3080, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3080, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was ordered to be reported. by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting floor consideration of this legislation.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, the Committee on the Budget will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 3080 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources

Reform and Development Act of 2013. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, while the Committee on Natural Resources received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 3080 from further consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the bill report filed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013. 1 appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. In addition, I recognize that the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 3080 in the bill report filed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, I am writing concerning H.R. 3080, the ''Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013,'' which may be scheduled for floor consideration as early as next week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code 1986. Section 201 of this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code by modifying the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund expenditure authority. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3080, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee On Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA), which was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 19, 2013. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 3080 in the bill report filed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR WRRDA H.R. 3080

American Association of Port Authorities; American Association of Port Authorities; American Coal Ash Association; American Concrete Pavement Association; American Concrete Pipe Association; American Concrete Pumping Association; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; American Council of Engineering Companies; American Council of Engineering Companies; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Iron and Steel Institute; American Road and Transportation Builders Association.

American Society of Civil Engineers; American Society of Civil Engineers; American Society of Concrete Contractors; American Soybean Association; American Waterways Operators; America's Infrastructure Alliance; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated Equipment Distributors; Association of Equipment Manufacturers; Associated General Contractors of America.

Build Up Greater Cleveland; California State Assembly; CH2M Hill; City of Sacramento; City of West Sacramento; Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute; County of Santa Barbara; The Everglades Foundation; The Everglades Trust; The Fertilizer Institute; Friends of the North Natomas Library; Georgia Ports Authority; Geosynthetic Materials Association; Greater Cleveland Partnership; Great Lakes Commission; Great Lakes Maritime Task Force; Great Lakes Metro Chambers Coalition.

Interlocking Concrete Pavement Institute; International Union of Operating Engineers; International Union of Operating Engineers; International Union of Painters and Allied Trades; Laborers International Union of North America; Lake Carriers' Association; Mason Contractors Association of America; NACE International—The Corrosion Society; National Asphalt Pavement Association; National Association of Counties; National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Manufacturers; National Association of Manufacturers—Key Vote; National Association of Waterfront Employers.

National Conference of State Legislatures; National Concrete Masonry Association; National Construction Alliance II; National Precast Concrete Association; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; National Ready Mixed Concrete Association; National Slag Association; National Society of Professional Engineers; National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association; National Utility Contractors Association; National Waterways Conference, Inc.; North America's Building Trades Unions; Pennsylvania Farm Bureau; Portland Cement Association; Portland Cement Association.

Port of Corpus Christi; Port of Pittsburgh Commission; Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute; RAMP—Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Fairness Coalition; Reclamation District No. 17; Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency; Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange; Slag Cement Association; Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency; Texas Transportation Commission; Transportation Construction Coalition; Transportation Trades Department; AFL–CIO Trenton Corporation; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Key Vote; U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Multi-Industry Letter; Water Resources Coalition; Water Resources Coalition; Waterways Association of Pittsburgh; Waterways Council, Inc.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 1380, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. I commend Chairman SHUSTER, the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GIBBS, and our ranking member, Mr. BISHOP, for the superb bipartisan way in which this legislation and the whole process has been handled.

This legislation does provide important direction to the Army Corps of Engineers to meet its mission objectives and reform their planning and construction processes while also investing in our water transportation infrastructure and creating jobs.

It has been 6 long years since we have passed Corps of Engineers water resources legislation. While Congress has had its back turned on our water infrastructure, Mother Nature has not been complacent. Since passage of the last WRRDA in 2007, the Nation has been challenged with floods, hurricanes, and droughts. Our aging locks, dams, and ports have too often been neglected. This bill before us today stops the ''finger in the dike'' solutions to our water infrastructure challenges and instead invests in these corridors of commerce.

It should be pointed out that H.R. 3080 is not your traditional type of WRRDA. It does not contain Member-directed projects, the traditional earmarks, but at least the bill does take a step forward in reclaiming our constitutional authority.

It is clear that in today's challenging fiscal times we have to find innovative

ways to get water projects funded and completed. The pending measure identifies the role of non-Federal sponsors in supporting and moving projects ahead. It provides a process to address the $60 billion construction backlog—that is with a ''B,'' billion—and addresses initial reform to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund program.

At its core, though, as the chairman has stated, this is a jobs bill. The investments contained in H.R. 3080 mean jobs in our maritime economy, as larger containerships will be able to call at our deepened ports to offload their cargo while filling their decks with American exports. It creates jobs moving commodities from farms, coal mines, and steel mills more efficiently down the inland waterways that crisscross our Nation. These investments also help protect our flood-prone complainants so that homes and businesses remain safe when the rivers unexpectedly rise.

I would like to thank, again, all members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on both sides of the aisle: Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS, and especially our ranking member on our side of the aisle, Representative TIM BISHOP, who has worked very hard on this legislation and knows its intricacies very well. Their hard work and dedication has developed a collaborative and bipartisan bill of which we all can be proud. I hope it is a model for future pieces of legislation. It certainly should be a model for this entire Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the pending measure.

Without maintaining our waterways and harbors the Nation's ability to meet the global challenges for trade and commerce will be severely restricted. The only way to protect our citizens and avoid falling behind global trade competition is to invest in our water resources and infrastructure by passing H.R. 3080 today.

As I mentioned, this is not the bill that I would have written. But I would add that this is not the exact bill that Chairman SHUSTER would have written either had he acted alone. He chose instead to bring before the House a bill that received unanimous support in our Committee. As a result, many of the provisions in H.R. 3080 are likely to eventually feel the weight of law instead of serving as just another exercise in rhetoric on the House floor.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, someone who has great responsibility in crafting this legislation.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, now is the time for the Congress to reengage in the development of the Nation's water resources and play a bigger role in prioritizing projects and activities carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress cannot abdicate its constitutional responsibility in determining what projects should go forward and should reassert its constitutional authority.

H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, is one of the most policy- and reform-focused pieces of legislation related to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

H.R. 3080 is a bipartisan bill that was developed by working across the aisle to achieve a common goal of investing in America's future.

H.R. 3080 contains no earmarks, cuts Federal red tape, streamlines the project delivery process, and strengthens our water transportation networks to promote competitiveness, prosperity, and economic growth.

H.R. 3080 is a jobs bill. $1.4 trillion worth of goods associated with 30 million jobs in international trade are impacted. Thousands of jobs are created and supported by the construction and maintenance of our waterways and locks and dams.

This bill is fiscally responsible by more than fully offsetting new project authorizations with deauthorizations of old, inactive projects.

This bill establishes a path forward for enacting a WRRDA bill every 2 years without conceding any congressional authority to the executive branch.

This committee held numerous listening sessions, public roundtables, and official hearings in developing the legislation. We have heard from the public, industry, stakeholders, and from our colleagues in Congress while developing this legislation and have incorporated their ideas into H.R. 3080.

Just because a study is costly, complex, and long does not necessarily mean it is a better project. In fact, a large, costly project with so many add-ons that never gets funded is a benefit to no one.

In what used to take the Army Corps 3 to 5 years to do a study has now become the norm for the Corps to take 10, 12, or even 15 years to produce a study. It is no wonder it is taking so much time, since the Corps has to review, in detail, many different alternatives.

In one case, a Chief's Report was sent to the Congress last year. The study for the project was authorized in 1999. The original purpose of the project was for navigation improvements. But when the Chief's Report was delivered to the Congress last year, the total project cost was $650 million, but only $250 million was for the actual construction of the navigation improvements. The rest of the project costs, almost $400 million, are attributed to environmental enhancements, not just environmental mitigation.

In another case, the Corps of Engineers delivered to Congress a Chief's Report for which there is no non-Federal cost-share partner. That study took 7 years to develop, but since there is no non-Federal sponsor, why should Congress authorize the project? The funding spent on that study could have been spent more wisely on projects where there are non-Federal sponsors and local support.

Too often, we allow Federal agencies, including the Army Corps of Engineers, to literally study these projects to death. H.R. 3080 accelerates the Corps of Engineers study delivery process by limiting studies to 3 years and $3 million. In addition, we accelerate the study delivery process by requiring concurrent reviews at the district-, division-, and headquarters-level personnel.

Ultimately, the Federal taxpayer is on the hook for these studies and for the length of time it takes to carry them out. The Corps reviews far too many alternatives and then sends to Congress a project request that far exceeds, in scope and costs, what was initially intended.

Too often, non-Federal interests and their contributions are forced to sit on the sidelines while our international competitors race past us. H.R. 3080 empowers non-Federal interests and ensures projects will be completed faster and cheaper with local support.

Too often, resources from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are diverted to other activities unrelated to keeping the U.S. ports competitive in a global marketplace. H.R. 3080 creates the incentive to spend the funds for their intended purpose in a manner that all ports agree upon.

One of the most important elements of this legislation is that it ensures the legislative branch engages in the Water Resources Development Act process at least once every Congress.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBS. I appreciate Messrs. SHUSTER, RAHALL, and BISHOP's bipartisan support. By working together, we can accomplish solid goals to get this done.

I urge the reforms pass.

I want to thank my subcommittee staff—Geoff Bowman, John Anderson, Jon Pallow—and my personal staff—Corry Marshall and Joe Price—for their efforts.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud and happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), our superb, super-superb ranking member.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. This critical, bipartisan legislation allows Congress to renew its commitment to our Nation's water infrastructure for the first time since 2007.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS for the open and inclusive process with which the committee drafted WRRDA. I would also like to express my gratitude to the chairman and to Ranking Member RAHALL for their leadership in returning the

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to its long-standing traditions of bipartisanship and collaboration.

H.R. 3080 is not a perfect bill. It is not the bill that either side of the aisle would have drafted on its own. However, it represents a bipartisan effort based on valuable input from Members and stakeholders, constructive negotiation, and mutual respect. This ought to serve as a model for how this Congress conducts the American people's business.

This bill is about many things, but most importantly, it is about job creation, not just good construction jobs that will come with the authorization of Chief's Reports contained in the bill, but also the jobs that rely on a robust network of large and small ports and inland waterways to move goods throughout the United States.

H.R. 3080 also provides some relief from the challenges facing the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund by setting targets so that a greater amount of fund proceeds are used for their intended purposes—harbor maintenance. The bill also provides for the maintenance of our Nation's small ports.

However, we Members must be vigilant that the changes proposed in this bill do not further erode the ability of the Corps to carry out construction projects, such as those necessary to meet the post-Panamax vessels that will come once the Panama Canal expansion is complete.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at the progress we have made together on improving water infrastructure in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3080.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), vice chairman of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and also the chair of the 21st Century Freight Transportation.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I rise in strong support of this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure legislation, and I would like to commend Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for working together to bring this very important bill to the floor today.

This is one of the most fiscally responsible infrastructure bills that this Congress has ever seen. I think it is fair to say that in my 25 years of service in this body that I have one of the most fiscally conservative voting records possible, so I am proud to support this type of legislation.

□ 1445

Every day tons of goods are transported across our waterways. Without basic infrastructure in place, much of these goods would be transported on our already overly congested highways. According to the National Waterways Foundation, a 15-barge tow can transport the same amount of goods as 1,050 tractor-trailer trucks. Moving goods on the water is also the most fuel efficient and environmentally sound method of transportation.

In addition, this legislation streamlines project delivery, potentially saving the Federal Government and our taxpayers billions of dollars.

While I would never support a project that is harmful to the environment, I do not think we should drag these projects out for years and years and spend megamillions of dollars on studies and drive up these costs to ridiculous levels. This legislation sets hard timelines and caps costs for studies that have to be completed for infrastructure projects.

Because H.R. 3080 removes so much red tape and bureaucracy, it helps us complete these projects in a timely and cost-effective manner. This bill, as I said, is a fiscally responsible one. Not only does it not contain any earmarks, as has been mentioned, it deauthorizes $12 billion worth of inactive projects that are no longer needed or feasible, which offsets all of the new authorizations made in this legislation.

This bill also authorizes the important flood control projects that we need to prevent natural disasters. We saw what can happen when Katrina hit New Orleans a few years ago. That disaster caused an estimated $150 billion in damage, according to USA Today. We need to make smart investments today so we are not foolishly spending billions of dollars after a disaster strikes.

I urge my colleagues to support this very conservative and reasonable legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member on our freight panel.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is far from perfect, but it is a good step forward. I have concerns about the environmental streamlining sections. There are commonsense things we could do to advance projects more efficiently, but limiting public input is not one of them. The best way to expedite projects is to ensure there is agreement among stakeholders and to identify potential problems early, which is one of the main benefits of the NEPA process. The real obstacle is lack of adequate funding.

I am pleased the bill increases the amount that can be spent out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and expands the eligibility for use of these funds.

The bill also requires the Corps to make specific project recommendations as part of the study funded in the Sandy supplemental appropriations bill on reducing the risk of flood and storm damage along the North Atlantic coast. This is an important provision, but we should do much more.

We are still not doing enough to prepare for climate change, rising sea levels, and extreme weather events. Whether or not you believe these events are linked to global warming, the fact is that extreme weather events are happening more often, and we would be fools not to respond to that fact. It has been 7 years since Congress last passed a WRDA bill. We are long overdue in reauthorizing these critical infrastructure projects.

This bill is a bipartisan compromise, and I will support it with the hope that we can improve it as it moves through the process.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3080. This legislation is the only fiscally responsible and reform-focused water resources and development bill to ever be considered by this House. This bill, as the chairman has pointed out, contains no earmarks, places us on a path of a more limited role for the Federal Government in water infrastructure development, and lays the groundwork for private sector and State level oversight.

H.R. 3080 promotes public-private partnerships and expands the ability of the private sector to contribute necessary funds to expedite and move projects forward. It also places a strict time limit on the amount of time and money that the Federal Government is allowed to spend on feasibility studies. It took the Federal Government 10 years to complete a study on how to fix Jacksonville's Mile Point navigation problem and allow for greater cargo movement. That project is slated to create 3,500 jobs.

The Port Everglades channel dredging study took 17 years and cost upwards of $10 million to complete. Project study delays like these are unacceptable, and have far-reaching negative economic consequences.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3080 and want to express my appreciation to the committee leadership, both the chairmen and ranking members of both the full committee and the subcommittee. As the senior Texan on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I applaud the chairmen and ranking members for their leadership in advancing this legislation to this point.

While I ultimately support the passage of this bill, I am concerned about the streamlining provisions of this bill. If properly funded, necessary projects

can be completed with appropriate environmental considerations and public participation. I am discouraged that the environmental protections are being weakened under this guise.

Within this bill, I supported language to increase commercial navigation capabilities for the Texas ports and waterways. With the expansion of the Panama Canal, these improvements would allow for an increased role in global trade and interstate commerce.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2013. As the Senior Texan on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and cosponsor of this legislation, I am glad to once again be addressing water resources legislation on the House Floor. Such legislation has not been passed by this esteemed Body since 2007, when I served as Chairwoman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee that helped craft and usher the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 into law over a presidential veto. With this background, I understand the challenge of composing and advancing such legislation to this point. I applaud the leadership demonstrated by the Chairman and Ranking Members of both the Full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee for bringing this bill to the Floor today.

While I ultimately support the passage of this legislation, I am concerned about the weakening of environmental protections and the ability of the public to participate in that process as a result of the streamlining provisions of this bill. The Army Corps of Engineers project construction backlog and astronomical figure it carries demonstrates that project efficiency must be improved. I understand the desire to expedite Army Corps of Engineers study and project completions, yet do not believe that the environmental safeguards such as the National Environmental Policy Act are the cause of those delays. If properly funded, necessary projects can be completed with appropriate environmental considerations. I am discouraged that environmental protections are being weakened under this guise.

As Co-Chair of the Texas Maritime Caucus, I have supported language in this bill to increase commercial navigation capabilities for Texas' ports and waterways. I am excited about Texas' ports and the role that they play in cultivating the Texas economy, the National economy, and the global economy. With expansive coastlines, established intermodal infrastructure, and strategically beneficial location, maritime commerce has a bright future in Texas. Moreover, the American economy has a brighter future because of Texas' transportation investments and capabilities.

I am glad to have worked in a bipartisan fashion to include language in this legislation for an assessment of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. This assessment will be a valuable tool for the State of Texas to determine its current and future operation and maintenance needs for navigation improvements to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, allowing it to be utilized more efficiently and productively in maritime commerce.

Further, I supported the inclusion of projects at the Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas and at Freeport Harbor, Texas—both of which are authorized in this legislation. The Sabine-Neches Waterway project will contribute to the economic effectiveness of commercial navigation in a system of navigation channels in the Sabine-Neches estuary of Texas and Louisiana. The Freeport Harbor project provides for a deep-draft waterway from the Gulf of Mexico to the City of Freeport through the original mouth of the Brazos River. It will contribute to the economic efficiency of commercial navigation in the region and will significantly improve Freeport Harbor's ability to compete in international maritime commerce.

These projects will help bring nearly a billion dollars of Federal funds to Texas' ports and waterways. In turn, these improvements will be a boon for Texas' economy and the National economy. Further, with the expansion of the Panama Canal, these improvements will allow Texas' ports to play an increased role in the global economy. The increased economic benefit and movement of goods will be felt throughout Texas, including in my home district in Dallas, home to two Class One rail lines, an intermodal facility, numerous interstate highways, and a strong consumer marketplace.

It is my hope that the passage of this legislation will revive the biannual WRDA authorization schedule. Monitoring the streamlining provisions of this bill, as well as assessing the expenditures of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund will be ripe for reconsideration during the next Congress—as will many other issues. It is my belief that the overall objectives and purposes of water resources legislation are vital to America and should be considered on a biannual basis. The importance of this bill should not be lost in politics.

In closing, I want to once again thank the Chairman and Ranking Members of both the Full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee for their leadership in advancing this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our committee chair, Mr. SHUSTER, and the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, from my state of West Virginia. I rise in very strong support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, or WRRDA.

West Virginia is in the Ohio River Basin, where coal makes up 59 percent of the shipped tonnage. Waterways and ports support 9,900 local jobs and directly contribute $1.6 billion to the West Virginia economy. Domestic power plants rely on our rivers to maintain a steady supply of coal, and our country's coal exports have nearly doubled in the last 4 years. Efficient and effective water transportation has never been more important to West Virginia's economy. Projects like the Marmet Lock and Dam in my district demonstrate the importance of these projects.

I am especially pleased that this WRRDA bill takes steps to preserve the Inland Waterways Trust Fund so we can reduce the $8 billion backlog of construction projects on our rivers. This will create jobs and spur growth.

WRRDA's passage today will be a significant victory for West Virginia jobs, for American jobs, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3080, and I thank the chairmen and the ranking members on both the committee and subcommittee. I especially thank the chairmen and ranking members for supporting provisions requested that will help the State of California.

Section 131 requires the Army Corps of Engineers to review and report on improving water supply options at Corps dams in arid regions such as California.

Section 135 allows the Corps to use Federal funds to prevent and manage aquatic invasive species on Corps projects, including quagga mussels, shore crab, and foreign algae, not only a major California problem but a problem for many rivers and dams. They are very costly. This section will allow the Corps to assist our local agencies in combating invasive species.

Section 125 requires the Corps to reissue regulations regarding levee vegetation and incorporate regional characteristics and levee performance.

Some of the water agencies are complaining that the Corps may be a little heavyhanded, not looking at good science when requiring removal of trees and bushes from our levees, and it would require the Corps to work with local agencies to solve the problem in a regionally appropriate and scientifically proven way.

Section 106 and 109 provide more flexibility for local agencies to sponsor Corps projects. That means accept funding.

Section 201 allows for expanded use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

We are asking for an ''aye'' vote on this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina, Governor SANFORD.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the chairman. I thank him and the other members of the committee for their work on this important bill, because it is certainly about cost. I mean, you can't do anything efficiently if you have got a 15-year permitting process.

It is certainly about competition. We are in a competition for jobs, capital, and way of life, and our ability to get product in and out depends on a vital and healthy infrastructure system. Ports like Charleston ultimately are not State ports, not regional ports, but ultimately national ports given how important, for instance, port depth will be.

But I think ultimately there is a much bigger consideration, which is a constitutional question on the balance of power. To me, what this bill fundamentally is about is reclaiming some

authority that has been ceded to the executive branch that is fundamental to the overall balance of power that is so important to conservatives across this Congress, or across this Nation. Ultimately, that consideration, I think, employs even far greater weight than the cost of infrastructure and components that are important as well.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), a valued member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding.

I rise today in strong support and as a cosponsor of WRRDA. This bill shows that the T&I Committee is working together, finding areas of agreement, building consensus, and, yes, compromising in order to get things done for the American people. I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for demonstrating how Congress should operate in constructing a bill that rebuilds America and creates jobs.

Earlier this year, Congressman WHITFIELD and I issued H.R. 1149 to fix our inland waterways, and WRRDA incorporates a number of WAVE 4 provisions, including project delivery process reforms, project prioritization, development of a 20-year capital investment plan, and Olmsted project reform.

In addition, this bill contains important provisions to stop the movement of Asian carp to the Great Lakes, and I urge support of Representative MCCOLLUM's amendment that I am cosponsoring which would strengthen these provisions.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I'd like to begin by commending Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for their efforts on H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA). As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and as a co-sponsor, I rise in support of this bi-partisan legislation.

It's important to recognize that in the current political climate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is working together to find areas of agreement, build consensus, and yes, compromise in order to get things done on behalf of the American people.

This is exactly what they sent us here to do; it's what they expect this Congress to do.

Today's Big Four agreement exemplifies this commitment to working together. And it is indicative of Chairman SHUSTER'S and Ranking Member RAHALL'S leadership style on the Committee. I'm hopeful that we will continue to work in a bi-partisan manner as we turn to the rail and highways & transit reauthorizations in the future.

I'd like to thank the Big Four for working with me to include several important provisions in this legislation, including language to deauthorize Dime Pier in Chicago, IL and deauthorize Lucas-Berg Pit in Worth, IL.

Dime Pier, which is located just south of Navy Pier in Chicago, is almost 100 years old and is no longer used for the purposes of navigation. WRRDA would formally deauthorize the pier, effectively allowing the City to redevelop that area of the lakefront.

Lucas-Berg Pit is a former gravel pit, located in my district, acquired by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago and designated by the Army Corps in the 1970s as a site for the placement of dredged materials from the Cal-Sag Channel. For a variety of reasons, including its proximity to the community, the site simply isn't suitable for the placement of these materials. WRRDA recognizes this reality and deauthorizes the use of the site.

I'm also pleased that WRRDA contains a number of provisions included in H.R. 1149, the Waterways Are Vital for the Economy, Energy, Efficiency, and Environment Act of 2013 (WAVE4), which Mr. WHITFIELD and I introduced earlier this year.

In particular, Title II of WRRDA includes project delivery process reforms, project prioritization, the development of a 20-year Corps capital investment plan with the Inland Waterways Users Board, and a modification to the cost sharing requirement on the Olmsted Lock and Dam project—items all addressed by WAVE4.

The Olmsted Lock and Dam cost sharing modification provision, Section 216 of the bill, is especially important. Unfortunately, Olmsted is significantly over budget and behind schedule, currently consuming most of the revenue out of the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. This has prevented virtually any other major project in the system from moving forward. Section 216 of the bill increases the federal share of the project, thus allowing more revenue in the Trust Fund to flow to other projects while Olmsted moves to completion.

I would also like to thank Ms. MCCOLLUM for offering an amendment—which I am cosponsoring—to prevent the spread of Asian carp. The Great Lakes provide an estimated 7 billion dollars of fishing activity to the region each year, activity that would be damaged by the spread of Asian carp. We must take immediate action to preserve the Great Lakes environment and all of the economic activity—from fishing and recreation to shipping and transportation—that helps make the Midwest economy strong. Under this amendment, federal agencies would partner with state and local governments to provide expertise and advice on best practices for eliminating Asian carp through activities like contract fishing and pesticide application.

While this bill is critically important, like all legislation it is not perfect. For example, one important provision currently not included in the legislation is the increased revenue necessary for the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Given the legitimate needs and the condition of the network, industry is supportive of a user-fee increase. My legislation, WAVE 4, proposes a 6 cents-per-gallon increase, and I am hopeful Congress can address this issue in the coming months.

I would like to close by again thanking Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for their hard work on WRRDA this year. This bill is based on compromise and collaboration, and accordingly I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS and Mr. RAHALL and Mr. BISHOP for bringing this important legislation to the floor, and I also want to thank their staff.

This innovative legislation is vitally important to the economic well-being of our country because we have to have a strong inland waterway system in order to be competitive in the global marketplace.

Setting a priority for inland waterway projects, reforming the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' project delivery methods, and freeing up money in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund for these projects is vitally important, and that is what this legislation does.

I also want to thank the committee for including some of the WAVE 4 language used to improve the inland waterway system. That bill was introduced in the House and in the Senate. Some of the provisions are in here.

I also want to thank the committee for including language supporting our Nation's small ports and harbors; also for their commitment to repair the aging levees that shield many of our local communities from devastating floods, hurricanes, and other disasters. I also want to thank the committee for making sure that our freedom to fish is protected.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, this bill is extremely important, and I urge support of the bill.

There is much in it to like; there are a few things that I think we ought to tweak as we move along. The levee vegetation issue is addressed. It should be modified slightly. There will be an effort to do that later.

The crediting issue is still out and about. It should be modified. It is extremely important to allow projects to move forward with local money, so I urge some modification in that.

Ports are absolutely critically important. There is great progress made in this and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund being used for its intended purpose. I commend all involved in that.

The Chief's Report issue has been significantly improved. I want to thank the chairman and others for bringing back to this Congress the power that the Constitution gives it. The Chief's Report issue is there. I would recommend that we modify it slightly to give a little bit more leeway on when and where a Chief's Report is.

All in all, it is a great bill. Congratulations, and thanks to all who were involved in writing it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

□ 1500

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this water resources bill, and I commend the chairman of the full committee, the ranking

member, and the entire Transportation Committee for this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a bill that is a step in the right direction. I represent Chattanooga, Tennessee. We have all heard of the Chattanooga Choo Choo, but there is another place called the Chickamauga Lock in Chattanooga. This bill basically does something that I have been working on so hard since I have been in Congress. It is a step in the right direction to finally work towards funding the Chickamauga Lock.

What it does, basically, is it reforms the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. This is a trust fund right now that is fundamentally broken. Why? Because what it does is it sends all of the money to one particular lock project and starves out all of the other lock projects in the system, including Chickamauga. This bill is a great step in the right direction because it basically works to fund it. In addition to that, it is a good bill because it restores, unlike the Senate bill, the power to the Congress, in determining the funding of these locks.

Let me end by saying this. Our waterways transportation fund is critically important to this Nation, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans. I know in my home city of Chattanooga, this lock, which is stopped in construction, needs to have construction started again. These are American jobs. These are American exports. These are American goods. This is a bill that is a step in the right direction for a great America.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), who has worked very hard on this legislation and does a superb job of representing her ports in southern Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of this bill, and I want to thank the chairman and ranking members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for extraordinary leadership in bringing this bipartisan and very important bill to the floor.

Transportation moves our economy, and our waterways play a vital role. This bill is about jobs for America, and as a Floridian, I am pleased to support this legislation that promotes our ports and protects our most precious wetlands, the Everglades.

Today's proposal will allow Florida's east coast ports in Miami, Fort Lauderdale, and Jacksonville to advance in preparation for the widening of the Panama Canal. Accommodation of larger and heavier loaded post-Panamax freight ships is expected to create tens of thousands of jobs with a multibillion-dollar impact to Florida's economy.

Today's bill also authorizes important projects that help restore Florida's most important watershed, the Everglades, with a four-to-one return on every dollar spent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. This restoration means improving water quality for millions of people, protecting our natural habitat, increasing property values, expanding recreational opportunities, and boosting tourism for Florida. As this bill progresses, I hope we can work together to extend the period of authorization, as in years past.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bipartisan bill. It is good for Florida, and it is good for our country. I urge its support.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

Among many other vital water projects in Texas, this bill authorizes funding for the deepening of the Sabine-Neches, where 100 million tons of cargo transit annually. The Sabine-Neches Waterway is a major economic contributor to both Texas and America, providing $106 billion in revenue for our Nation's economy.

America's aging infrastructure is a threat to a healthy national economy. Thirteen million jobs rely on water infrastructure, and it is up to Congress to ensure that America's ports, waterways, and water systems remain the very best in the world.

I applaud Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their diligence, and also my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their tremendous work.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and thank her for her tremendous input and help on this legislation as we developed the bill.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the 2013 Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

Our Nation's infrastructure is critical to a thriving economy. In Florida alone, civil works projects improve navigation at our many ports, assist with flood control, restore the Everglades ecosystem, and help protect our pristine beaches, which are central to our $65-billion-a-year tourism industry. Yet Congress has, unfortunately, passed only one WRRDA bill in the last 13 years, so this legislation is certainly long overdue and much needed. I am grateful for the committee's leadership in championing this effort.

WRDA 2000 launched the visionary Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, or CERP. This 30-year Federal-State partnership is the largest environmental restoration project in our Nation's history. After much delay, projects are now underway. This bill authorizes four additional much-needed components.

One of those is the Broward Water Preserve, located in my congressional district. This project will help capture, store, and distribute surface water runoff from the Everglades and assist with flood protection and groundwater recharge.

I am also pleased the manager's amendment will allow non-Federal sponsors to prefund projects prior to authorization, and I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL's flexibility that this amendment affords my community. This will assist Port Everglades, a major economic engine in south Florida.

Port Everglades generates nearly $26 billion a year in economic activity, but needs to be deepened from 42 feet to 48 feet to allow it to be competitive in attracting deeper draft cargo ships in the post-Panama Canal expansion market.

The Army Corps, after considerable urging from the Florida delegation, is close to completing a long-delayed dredge study to make this happen. Despite years of intense efforts, the final study is not yet ready for authorization by this bill.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their commitment to returning to a more regular WRRDA process. We simply cannot wait another 6 or 7 years to authorize the next step of public infrastructure projects. We need to start the next WRRDA bill in a timely fashion.

In Florida alone, there are four critical projects almost ready for authorization, including Port Everglades, two other Florida ports projects, and the Central Everglades Planning Project. All four of these initiatives are critical to our State and should not have to wait many years to receive authorization simply because of either Congress' or the Army Corps' delay.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill that will focus on our ability to create jobs and make sure we can move our economy forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill. Kentucky's Fourth District is home to 276 miles of the Ohio River and three locks and dams. As such, we are willing hosts to millions of tons of interstate commerce.

Pursuant to our Constitution, there is a Federal role in transportation and infrastructure. Transportation is one of the few things that Congress actually should spend money on. In fact,

the constitutionality of this issue was settled two centuries ago during our Nation's infancy, in 1824, with the landmark Supreme Court decision ruling in Gibbons v. Ogden. A congressional precedent for maintaining national infrastructure was established with the Rivers and Harbors Act of that same year. As long as our country has been in existence, transportation has been a priority, especially waterborne transportation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAKA FATTAH, a very powerful member of the House Appropriations Committee.

(Mr. FATTAH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I want to first thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and TIM BISHOP for their hard work. The committee has developed a product that is worthy of House support, and I rise in support of it.

We are almost at the 80th anniversary of the Mississippi River Control Council. We have seen a lot of progress in my part of the country in terms of waterways. I like the work that the committee has done on the Harbor Maintenance Fund.

I serve on the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee, as the ranking member has indicated. The Army Corps has taken some hits on this matter. Really, it is the responsibility of Congress to put us in a position to move forward. Some of the delays that have been occasioned by the environmental assessment have been much too long, and I think that the committee's efforts to shorten that is good. I have some concerns about limitations on dollars, but I know that, as this bill goes forward, it will be perfected even more.

So I rise in support, and I hope that many Members of the House will find it within their purview to support this important legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 30 seconds to the majority leader of the House, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor as I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

Mr. Chair, our economy remains weak, and many working families are struggling. Many are having a hard time paying their bills, and others are struggling to find work. The American people deserve an efficient, effective, and accountable government that is focused on finding bipartisan solutions that will reignite our economy so those who are looking for a job are able to find one. The legislation before us today will provide a big step in that direction.

This is a fiscally responsible bill that will create jobs and ensure that America remains competitive in the global economy. It will encourage investing in our national water transportation networks, while cutting red tape and streamlining the infrastructure project delivery process.

Our waterways and ports support over $1.4 trillion worth of goods each year, and over the next few decades our trade volume is expected to grow exponentially. Every State in this country and millions of hardworking American families depend on the many parts of our waterway infrastructure to be strong economic arteries.

Other countries around the world have been investing in their commercial infrastructure to improve their standing in the global marketplace and so that they can gain a competitive edge. As a result, improving and strengthening our ports and inland waterways is not just an economic desire, it is an economic necessity.

This bill authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to develop, maintain, and build important development projects, streamlines redundant environmental reviews, and establishes a transparent process for future activities with strong congressional oversight—and it does so without any earmarks. This is a commonsense bill that should garner bipartisan support because it will help revitalize our waterways, our ports, and our economy. The American people are counting on their elected leaders to restore trust in our government and faith in our economy, and this bill is an important part of achieving that goal.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, and the rest of the members on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is how Congress ought to work with one another, all 435 of us. I don't mean that 435 are going to vote for the bill, but we have worked together on this bill.

And I want to congratulate the chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, whose father would be proud of him and would have acted in the same way, working together to make things happen for America in a bipartisan way. So I congratulate Mr. SHUSTER, Congressman SHUSTER, brother SHUSTER.

I also want to congratulate NICK JOE RAHALL from West Virginia, who has been such an expert on the areas of building America and growing our economy.

□ 1515

I want to thank also Dr. TIM BISHOP, TIM BISHOP from Long Island, who has worked so hard on this particular piece of legislation.

As I have said many times, Mr. Chairman, from this floor, Congress has a responsibility to take bipartisan action to boost our economic competitiveness in a way that will create jobs. This bill has the potential and, in my opinion, will do exactly that.

While the bill is not perfect—none of them are—by investing in our Nation's infrastructure, including ports and waterways, as this bill does, we can lay the groundwork for a more efficient delivery system for American-made products to reach markets in our country and overseas.

Promoting and increasing U.S. exports is a core component of the House Democrats and, I might say, a bipartisan Make It in America plan for jobs and competitiveness.

I hope Democrats and Republicans can work together in a bipartisan way, as Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL have done with this bill, to move additional pieces of Make It in America legislation to the floor so we can further promote exports, pursue a national manufacturing strategy, encourage the return of innovation and jobs from overseas, and secure a skilled workforce for the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill today for what it does to create jobs and improve our waterborne transportation; but I hope that, as the House and Senate develop a final bill, the conferees will look closely at the environmental review provisions to make certain that we can strike an appropriate balance between expediting projects, while understanding their impact on the environment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us to make sure that our efforts to provide certainty account for the size and complexity of some WRRDA projects.

If we can continue to act in a bipartisan way, as I know Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. RAHALL will do, we can send a message that Congress is ready to move forward and help more of our people make it in America.

I hope we can tap into the spirit of cooperation by scheduling consideration of a comprehensive immigration reform legislation which, like this bill, has support from both sides of the aisle, from business, from labor, from religions groups, and from leading nonprofits. That is a challenge I think that we can meet this year.

Again, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), who has worked hard in a focused and bipartisan way to bring this day to fruition, and I congratulate him.

I thank Mr. RAHALL, my good friend, who has worked so diligently over so many years to make sure that people can make it in America, and that America invests in itself.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the whip for his kind words.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

I am privileged to represent Rome, New York, where nearly 2 centuries ago, our Nation embarked on its first major transportation project, the Erie Canal.

This bill before us creates jobs by updating and reauthorizing water infrastructure projects. It reforms the outdated process that allows projects to be approved by the Army Corps of Engineers.

This legislation cuts $12 billion from a backlog of outdated projects. It is fiscally responsible and doesn't include a single earmark, a much-needed departure from past water resources development bills.

By passing WRRDA, we facilitate trade, keep products moving across America, and create jobs in our communities. Congress has an opportunity before it today to help America do what it does best: compete. We should seize it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the committee.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this WRRDA bill. The bill provides the much-needed oversight of the Army Corps of Engineers, streamlines the environmental review process, and consolidates duplicative analyses of projects that have delayed important infrastructure improvements, sometimes for as long as 15 years. These types of delays have cost our economy billions of dollars and have put the United States at a competitive disadvantage.

I am also pleased that this bill will provide additional funding for smaller ports, like in Mount Vernon, Indiana. The Mount Vernon Port has several businesses headquartered on its property and is vitally important to the economy of southwest Indiana. A functioning water transportation system is critical for their success now and in the future.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, Subcommittee Chairman Gibbs, and Subcommittee Ranking Member BISHOP for working together on this important piece of legislation that makes government work better for our taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much, Chairman SHUSTER.

I rise today as well in support of this bill because it is a jobs bill, and it is not just a jobs bill because the government spends money to create jobs. It is a jobs bill because it builds infrastructure that we need in this country to remain competitive and get our goods to market throughout the world.

Having grown up in Corpus Christi, Texas, served by the Port of Corpus Christi, a deepwater port on the Intracoastal Waterway, I know the needs and how important it is to have ports and waterways that are here to serve our Nation.

That is one of the reasons I am working with my colleague from across the aisle, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and a variety of other Texas Members to support the Texas Port Conference to raise awareness of how critical ports and waterways are to the jobs throughout this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to get behind this jobs bill to get America back to work.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and also to Subcommittee Chairman BOB GIBBS. They have done a wonderful job with this bill. It is a bipartisan bill.

I rise today as a cosponsor and a proud supporter of WRRDA. I like to actually call it WRRDA, since we have got the extra R. Reform matters; and in this bill it shows that we can move things forward and we can make a difference.

But I have got to tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is good to be back here governing this week and focusing on commonsense policies like this one here today.

Why is WRRDA critical?

Because our waterways provide a cost-effective, fuel-efficient way to move our goods, and we must maintain and support U.S. infrastructure.

I come from a district that borders the Mississippi and is blessed with productive farmland; 81 percent of our U.S. ag exports are waterborne, and with trade expected to double by 2021, we must rebuild our capacity.

With a $60 billion water project backlog, I believe this program provides a solution to move projects forward; and, again, I am proud to support and cosponsor this bill. I look forward to helping this committee advance this important legislation through this process and have this bill signed into law by the President.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, may I have the time remaining on both sides, please.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his leadership in bringing the WRRDA bill to the floor.

I wanted to talk specifically about the Morganza to the Gulf project. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been down to Terrebonne and Lafourche Parish and seen this project that is so vital, not only for hurricane protection, but also for protecting the infrastructure that produces 30 percent of our Nation's oil and gas, a lot of the energy infrastructure for our country.

I know the process that has been set up in this bill allows for Chief's Reports, once they move forward, to then go to the committee for hearing. The Chief's Report for this project wasn't completed until after the last hearing that your committee had.

I just wanted to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania to see if there was going to be another committee hearing in the near future to take up new projects that have gotten Chief's Reports since that time, and to see if Morganza to the Gulf would be one of the projects that we could have on that list.

Mr. SHUSTER. I would like to engage in a colloquy, but first, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to stress that the Morganza to the Gulf project is of immense importance to Louisiana's coastal restoration and protection efforts. It protects both fragile wetlands from hurricane surge and also is environmentally sound.

The Corps estimates it will prevent an estimated $1 billion in flood-related damages annually and protect over 53,000 structures. The Corps supports this project. Their own analysis indicates it will provide over $300 million in annual economic benefit.

It has been under study for the last two decades, was previously authorized in 2000 and 2007; and as Mr. SCALISE notes, recently a completed Chief's Report was filed which stated the project is economically justified, environmentally sound and acceptable, and of sound engineering.

That said, there is this problem with the late filing of the Chief's Report. We do need this project authorized, and I ask that the legislation be passed and that it go to conference, where Mr. SCALISE, Mr. VITTER, and I can all work with the chairman on this.

I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to please hold these hearings and to review all projects that have received a Chief's Report.

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve my answer until I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) for a colloquy.

The CHAIR. The gentlemen from Louisiana's time has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. CAPUANO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is the exact situation for Boston. We have our Chief's Report. It was 2 weeks past the deadline, and I know that we have already spoken. I know that you are more than willing to help us do what we need to do, and I appreciate that. I am just here to say thank you.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, like everybody else here today, let me thank you for you leadership, not only on this bill, but on the overall Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. It is truly bipartisan.

Secondly, I want to talk about the flood-control project impacting residents of my district that I have been working on for more than a decade.

The Chief's Report is in: Orestimba Creek and San Joaquin River Basin near the city of Newman, located in my district. The Army Corps has officially endorsed the authorization of a plan for flood-risk management by constructing a levee along the city of Newman's northwestern perimeter known as the Chevron Levee.

This project is a local partnership with the city of Newman and the County of Stanislaus and was initiated over a decade ago.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Without construction of this levee, the people of Newman and the surrounding area will be at continual risk of flooding resulting from the overflow of Orestimba Creek. In association with the construction of the levee, the city of Newman will develop and implement an advance warning system.

Mr. Chairman, included in this legislation we are considering today are several Chief's Reports that were received in time for the committee to review. I ask that your commitment to working with me to ensure the Chief's Report on Orestimba can be reviewed in this process.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman, and all of my colleagues. At this point I would like to respond to them, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the key principles in developing WRRDA was increasing transparency, accountability and congressional oversight without ceding constitutional congressional responsibility to the executive branch.

WRRDA authorizes 23 vital water resources projects that have completed the technical review by the Corps of Engineers and have been recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee held a full committee hearing to review all the pending Chief's Reports on June 5, 2013. My position has been clear. In order to maintain our constitutional congressional authority, Congress must review the Chief's Reports and specifically authorize them. We cannot hand over our authority to the administration and the Corps of Engineers to self-authorize.

Chief's Reports have been finalized on the three reports that the gentleman has questioned and will be reviewed and considered by the committee as we continue to work through WRRDA.

To provide strong congressional oversight, I commit to holding a hearing at the appropriate time in the process so that the very important issues are fully considered and have the opportunity to be addressed.

With that, I thank the gentlemen for engaging in colloquy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a very valuable member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who has had tremendous input on this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member, and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, as well as the subcommittee chair and ranking member.

This is a recognition of the extraordinary importance of Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States of America to engage in both domestic and international commerce. Sometimes that seems to be lacking around here. We seem to lump everything the Federal Government does into one big pot, and if you have got something you don't like, it kind of all gets associated together.

This is a program that will be paid for out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Yes, there is a trust fund—sort of, kind of. It has got $7 billion of theoretical balance in it. Unfortunately, our friends on the Appropriations Committee have seen fit to spend that $7 billion on other things because it is not a real trust fund.

This legislation will begin to move us back toward utilizing those dedicated tax dollars in a dedicated way to maintaining the port and maritime infrastructure of the United States of America. I mean, here we are today, the Corps of Engineers has stopped dredging all small ports. I will tell you what; that is kind of a disaster in my State, and it is a disaster all around the country.

I have one port where they have to take the boats out of the water onto a dock, and they are having trouble even now getting into that port at high tide to get the boats up onto the dock. I have other channel entrances that are shoaling and becoming dangerous. We are going to lose lives because the Corps doesn't have the money to do the work. We have jetties that are failing. If we fix them now, $10 million, $15 million; if they go totally a failure, $50 million. Now, what sense does that make? But we are the United States of America. We can't afford to do the $10 to $15 million now. We have dams and locks that are failing. Are we going to wait until they fail or are we going to do the repairs now?

This bill begins to move us in the direction of doing the repairs that are needed to better move commerce, people, and goods in this country. It is long, long overdue. And this bill has a 10 percent set-aside which will be dedicated to the small ports.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This year, I had to get my State to partner with the Federal Government so the Federal Government would bring the four dredges with the Corps crews down to dredge my small ports, paid for by the State of Oregon. My State doesn't have a lot of money, but we partnered and we did that. There are innovative solutions that will work, too. But long term, we need the full investment. We need the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund dollars to be spent on needed harbor maintenance.

As I mentioned earlier, I have a jetty at Coos Bay that is failing. We could fix it now for less or a lot more later. We have a jetty on the Columbia River that is failing. We can fix it now for less or a lot more later. That is repeated all around the country.

And I am glad to see today the bipartisan work here and the agreement on the critical infrastructure role that only the Federal Government can play using funds raised federally on imports into the United States of America, a tariff that is placed on those that is dedicated to these functions. It is a paid-for program. We need it now.

I congratulate Members for their good work.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the distinguished Policy Committee chairman.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, i would like to bring up my support for this bill but also to be able to talk about the limited funds that the Corps of Engineers have. They have very limited funds because the United States of America obviously has limited funds, what we actually receive from the taxpayers.

There is a study within this bill itself that is being proposed that looks at the low-priority projects and the things that are not within the core mission of

the Corps of Engineers. That study doesn't need to be a study to nowhere. It does need to be a study to look at the low-priority inventory and then just go in a drawer and say, Gosh, we have low-priority inventory that we can't afford to maintain that sits closed and a local municipality can't open it. So we need to be able to establish the next step on that.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on it. I agree with him. We need to move forward to get these properties off the Corps' books, so we will continue to work with the gentleman to make sure we expedite this and make sure the Corps is eliminating things that are not important to their mission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). This particular gentleman is a member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee and has been a leader on that committee in discussions about financing this Nation's infrastructure, whether it be water port infrastructure or highway infrastructure, and I commend him for that leadership.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, I feel like I am just a member of the T&I Alumni Association. I deeply cherish the time that I spent on the committee, on the Water Resources Subcommittee, and I appreciate the hard work that the committee has moving forward, trying to find some areas of agreement in a sometimes fractured House and focus on the big picture: What is going to put America in the best position going forward?

I am going to have an amendment coming forward talking a little bit about some of the backlog and some of the NEPA efforts, but one of the fundamental problems we have now is that we are not providing the resources to move the projects forward. There is a backlog of $60 billion, and there are opportunities here to add to it. The point we want to focus on is being able to deal meaningfully with it so we don't have projects that go stale, that are outmoded, that are past their shelf life.

Another thing that I hope to be able to work with the committee on in the future deals with the principles and guidelines for the Corps that were established in 1983. This was a project of mine for years on the committee. We finally updated them, but they have been stalled by some hold, I think, through the appropriations process that have stymied them, so they are not going forward.

These principles and guidelines, if they were adopted in 1983, were clearly in the process in the mid-seventies. We have learned a lot over the course of almost 40 years; and I am hopeful that we can focus on the big picture, get the resources that are necessary to do the job right and then be able to have the flexibility to make sure that the Corps has up-to-date tools to do its jobs better.

I look forward to further debate. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and the hard work that the committee has done.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I am here to support H.R. 3080 and to compliment the ranking member and the chairman for the work they have done on this valuable bill. I support it because it creates jobs and deauthorizes $12 billion in backlogged projects that are outdated and do not have construction funds obligated.

I do want to point out that there are some issues with the text of the bill that my constituents have brought to my attention. For example, one dam in the Second District of New Mexico is awaiting approval from the D.C. Corps of Engineers office but likely will not get approval until January, with a projected contract awarded in March 2014. I have been assured by the chairman and committee staff that the deauthorization language will not target projects like this one, projects that are in a study, design, or reevaluation phase.

I thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee for his efforts to pass this vital infrastructure bill and for ensuring that the cuts are targeted toward wasteful and unnecessary projects, not those that impact public safety and our economic well-being.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico and am committed to work with him.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a very valued member of our committee.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of this important committee for their work on this bill, and I would also like to thank my colleague from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership as part of this bill in addressing the enormous challenges that invasive species present to our country's waters.

In southern Nevada—you think of that as a desert, but there is a lot of water there—the spread of the quagga mussels is a growing threat to Lake Mead, which contributes nearly $1 billion to the local economy and supplies 90 percent of southern Nevada's water supply. The spread of quagga mussels in this critical reservoir has led to expensive countermeasures by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is spending nearly $1 million a year to prevent quaggas from infiltrating the Boulder Dam intakes. The Southern Nevada Water Authority was also forced to redesign the water intake 3 project, which is currently underway, to prevent quagga mussels from growing there as well. If unchecked, the mussels can clog the intakes to prevent water from reaching the residents and the visitors to southern Nevada. Likewise, Lake Tahoe, which borders Nevada and California, is on the edge of waterways where quagga mussels have been found and are taking hold. Should quagga mussels establish colonies in Lake Tahoe, the annual impact would be over $22 million a year.

The amendment that is part of this bill would direct the GAO to examine the current efforts to address the spread of invasives and to help develop a long-term strategy. So I would urge my colleagues to not only support the bill, but also the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I want to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS, and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP for their hard work on this legislation. I also want to thank them for accepting the Nolan Amendment during Committee Markup that expands the use of the Noxious Weed program to cover aquatic invasives providing an additional tool to address the growing threat of invasive species to our environment and our economy. I want to thank my colleague from California, Mr. THOMPSON, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support our Amendment.

The amendment itself is simple, but the underlying issue it addresses is complicated and critical because aquatic invasives impact communities across the country, including Las Vegas. In Southern Nevada we are facing enormous challenges with the spread of Quagga Mussels into our local waters, in particular, Lake Mead. Lake Mead is a crown jewel of the National Park Service system welcoming 8 million visitors every year, and contributing up to $1 billion dollars to the local and regional economy.

In addition to the recreational opportunities from boating and fishing, Lake Mead is also essential to the vitality of Las Vegas and Southern Nevada, providing 90% of our water. The spread of Quagga mussels in this critical reservoir has led to expensive countermeasures by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is spending nearly $1 million a year to prevent Quaggas from infiltrating the Boulder Dam intakes. In addition to countermeasures to prevent mussel infestation in Las Vegas' water intakes number 1 and 2 in Lake Mead, the Southern Nevada Water Authority has had to change the design of the water intake 3 project, currently underway, to prevent Quagga colonies from growing there as well. If unchecked, the mussels can clog the intakes, preventing water from reaching residents and visitors in Southern Nevada.

In addition to impacts in Southern Nevada, I am concerned about the mussels spreading to other parts of our country. Lake Tahoe, which borders Nevada and California, is on the edge of the waterways where Quagga mussels have taken hold. According to a 2009 Army Corps analysis, should Quaggas establish colonies in Lake Tahoe, the annual economic impact would be $22 million dollars.

These are issues we cannot afford to ignore.

Our amendment directs the GAO to examine the current state of efforts to address the

spread of invasives, and to develop a long-term strategy to address this growing concern.

Again I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield Chairman SHUSTER an additional 2 minutes of my time for him to control.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, as we conclude this debate, I want to once again commend Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman Gibbs, and our ranking member, Mr. BISHOP of New York, for the tremendous effort that has been made to bring this legislation where it is today.

It started out with Chairman SHUSTER's leadership early on in this Congress at the Member level. It spread to the staff level, and it has continued every day. It has been a transparent process and a process in which we have been in communication with one another. And as I said in the very beginning, I hope this will be a signal of how this committee will bring future pieces of legislation to the floor, and I just hope that it will be a signal to the entire Congress how we should be working closer together in a bipartisan fashion.

This legislation has a wide array of supporters. I have a list here of some five pages of labor, industry, and business supporters that have written members of our committee in strong support of the pending legislation. They include: the American Coal Ash Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Home Builders, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Friends from labor, including carpenters, transportation trades, AFL–CIO, Laborers' International, and many other labor organizations have come together in support of this legislation.

And as I summarize and conclude my comments, I want to quote the president of the Transportation Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, Mr. Ed Wytkind. He wrote members of our committee:

> Real investment in harbor maintenance is vital to the health of an industry that supports 500,000 jobs, plays a critical role in expanding U.S. exports, and is the gateway to international trade and humanitarian aid. H.R. 3080 will help improve our maritime infrastructure and keep pace with our international competitors, and will also create thousands of good-paying construction and maritime jobs during what remains a slow economic recovery. I urge you to vote in favor of this important legislation.

I will conclude by again thanking Chairman SHUSTER for his superb leadership and join with all my colleagues in urging passage of this vital piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself the remaining time.

I also thank members from the other side of the aisle, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and their staff for all their hard work and for working together to produce a bipartisan bill, a bill that is full of policy, full of reform, a bill that is fiscally responsible and, I must say, is the most fiscally responsible WRRDA in the history of WRRDA. There are no earmarks, but we made sure that we did not cede any of our constitutional congressional authority to the executive branch, which I believe is very important for this body and for the Congress.

As I have said, we have worked together in a bipartisan fashion in talking to the stakeholders at roundtables and in hearings and coming up with a piece of legislation, and I am very proud we have it on the floor today.

Again, our thanks to Ranking Member RAHALL, Ranking Member BISHOP, and the entire staff on the minority for working with us so closely.

Also, I would like to thank our staff for the long hours that they have put in, and my counterpart, Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS, for his efforts and his staff member Joe Price who worked so hard and also John Anderson, Geoff Bowman, Jonathan Pawlow, and Tracy Zea from the Water Resources Subcommittee.

And in the front office, starting with the leadership of Chris Bertram, the staff director, and a special thanks to the deputy staff director and my longtime staff member Steve Martinko for ramrodding this through the committee—I appreciate his support—Beth Spivey, Matt Sturges, Jim Tymon, Jennifer Hall, Clare Doherty, Jim Billimoria, Justin Harclerode, Michael Marinaccio, Caryn Moore, Denny Wirtz, and Keith Hall. All of these folks put in so many hours to make sure that we have on the floor here today a very good product, one that I am proud to stand behind, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.R. 3080.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, and to commend committee Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member RAHALL, as well as subcommittee chairman GIBBS and ranking member TIM BISHOP, for their efforts in crafting and bringing to the floor this very important water infrastructure bill.

Mr. Chair, according to the American Association of Port Authorities, U.S. seaports move 99.4% of the country's overseas cargo by volume. Every one of the 50 states relies on seaports for imports and exports, totaling some $3.8 billion worth of goods moving through U.S. seaports each day. And our ports support the employment of more than 13 million Americans.

As the Representative from the 8th Congressional District of Massachusetts, I represent the Port of Boston. In fact, my District Office is actually located on a pier within the industrial port.

Observing the day to day operations of the Port, and also being a Member of the Congressional Ports Caucus, I know firsthand that ports and waterways are vital to our economic prosperity.

For instance, the Port of Boston generates $2.4 billion in economic benefits annually and 34,000 jobs are connected to port activities. With the expected 2015 completion of the Panama Canal expansion project, those numbers should only increase as larger container ships utilize our ports on both coasts.

Mr. Chair, the Boston Harbor Navigation Improvement Project, recently recommended and approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will allow the Port of Boston to keep pace with what lies ahead and with our global competitors.

I look forward to working with the authors of this bill to move this important project forward.

Mr. Chair, we all have a stake in the success of our ports and waterways and need to more frequently address our critical water infrastructure and flood control projects. That is why I also applaud the authors for including in the bill a Sense of Congress that we consider a water resources bill no less than every two years.

Getting this bill to the floor required making difficult choices. I Want to again thank its authors for their efforts.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, a bipartisan bill that is an important step toward creating good jobs here at home and growing our economy while improving our waterways infrastructure and addressing significant risks to public safety.

The House WRRDA bill makes crucial investments in ports and waterways and is an important vehicle to improve our nation's flood protection systems. Maintaining and investing in these resources is essential to economic prosperity and public safety both because there are a substantial number of jobs linked to waterways and ports and because flood damage poses a serious risk to the livelihoods and economies of communities across the country.

Although I am voting in favor of this bill and believe that passage of it is critical, I am deeply concerned by misguided environmental streamlining provisions in the bill that ultimately will weaken the National Environmental Protection Act. Although the major reason for the Army Corps of Engineers' project delay is a backlog in projects and a lack of funding for those projects, the troublesome provisions in this bill instead purport to address that issue by unwisely undermining the effectiveness of NEPA reviews through unreasonable time restrictions and limitations on the quality of information available to both reviewing agencies and the public. In addition, the bill undermines the integrity of several other foundational environmental laws, including the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Ultimately, these provisions will weaken environmental protections and undermine other elements in the bill that are designed to improve efficiency. It is critical that concerns over these provisions be addressed in the conference committee on this bill so that we can ensure final

passage of a bill that create jobs, improves our waterways infrastructures, and protects the environment.

Once again, I urge support for WRRDA and look forward to working with my colleagues to improve the bill further to secure final passage of a bill that helps create jobs across the country in an environmentally responsible way.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I strongly support the Water Resources, Reform, and Development Act. WRDA is an important bill for my area. We have critical flood control projects and our Port of Houston, which is the largest port for foreign tonnage in the country, is an economic engine for the entire region.

I prefer the Senate language in some ways, especially the funding for dredging at our ports. But, the bill in front of us represents the hard work of both sides of the T&I committee and I appreciate the leadership that they have shown on this issue and I look forward to supporting it.

I am pleased that Chairman Shuster and Ranking Member Rahall included language in the managers amendment that my colleagues and I from the Houston area requested regarding assumption of maintenance. This language is important because we want to incentivize entities like Ports to take on some of the responsibilities for deepening and widening channels and other projects, but we have to make sure that the federal government lives up to their responsibility to assume the maintenance. I want to make sure that the language that was included is the best way to accomplish this and I look forward to working with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Port of Houston, and our committee leadership to make any necessary changes and I am pleased that they are working with us toward achieving our policy intent.

I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3080, the ''Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013,'' better known as ''WRRDA.'' This legislation is long overdue, and although it is a good down-payment, this body needs to take far more drastic steps to repair and replace our nation's aging and increasingly uncompetitive water infrastructure—which will require more than $1 trillion in investment over the next couple of decades.

Americans across the country will benefit commercially and economically from the improvements to infrastructure and the jobs provided by those projects. The competitive benefits and the economic jolt provided by WRRDA is an important investment in our future. It means that manufacturers can ship more cheaply and more quickly, and can more easily return jobs to our shores than if they had to struggle to bring their goods to the market. It also means that well-trained and hard-working men and women will go back to work, which will provide needed inertia to an economy that has been heavily battered by the last few weeks of brinksmanship.

I will be supporting this bill because I believe that our current infrastructure backlog is desperately in need of legislative action. However, I have a number of misgivings about this bill, which I hope my colleagues will address during a conference between the chambers. Though my concerns are many, I can sum them up simply: H.R. 3080 does not do enough to eliminate the infrastructure deficit or to ensure that we do so in the most responsible way.

One problem I have is that H.R. 3080 makes across the board cuts to previously authorized projects—$12 billion out of a roughly $60 billion backlog. This ''Sequester'' style cut is a bad legislative approach. The solution to a problem often requires a more deft touch than simply lopping off whatever portion seems right. Americans are already fed up with this sort of austerity from the across the board cuts that went into effect at the beginning of 2013, which has wreaked havoc upon important programs and on the American economy. I urge my colleagues to make their decisions based on a more thorough review of the merits of individual projects, instead of just demanding $12 billion in cuts and turning the scissors over to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Another problem I have lies with the ''streamlining approach'' found in this legislation which does little to actually eliminate the delays that keep important projects in limbo. I am especially concerned about the portions of H.R. 3080 which dramatically alter the environmental safeguards built into existing law. One of those changes, which would cut the time that communities have to review final agency approval of water infrastructure projects from six years to 150 days—a cut of nearly 95 percent—could undermine the rights of citizens to hold their government accountable for the impact that projects may have on their community. However, even after the environmental review process is completed, these projects still face potentially endless delays because of how the appropriations process leads to grossly inadequate funding levels. That is why I support and I urge my colleagues to support the DeFazio Amendment, which will require the tremendous backlog of projects to be reduced before the environmental safeguards are touched.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3080, because although its flaws are many, it will put the shovel in the ground to dig us out of the ditch we are in. Americans are passing trillions in debt—in the form of outdated roads and water resources—on to the next generation. This may not be everything we need, but it is a good start.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, a water resources bill in 2013 is critical to the success of America, and crucial to our economic growth and job creation. The last water resources bill was signed into law six years ago, making this one long overdue. I would like to thank Mr. SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for their leadership in moving this legislation forward.

American international trade accounts for more than one quarter of our Gross Domestic Product. More than 99 percent of our overseas trade moves through America's seaports. Cargo moving through our seaports is responsible for more than 13 million American jobs and generates in excess of $200 billion annually in federal, state, and local tax revenues. We need to keep America's economic recovery moving forward by ensuring that when American workers make products, we can efficiently move them through our ports to overseas markets.

To that end, I hope my colleagues across the aisle will support the WRRDA bill so that our navigation channels and ports are operating at their optimal levels. Of all U.S. overseas exports, 99.4 percent are waterborne and go through ports.

For America to remain on top the global economy, we need to be competitive internationally so that global consumers increasingly purchase American-made goods.

This bill takes an important first step in addressing an issue of key concern to not only the Port of Houston and Galveston in Texas, but to all of our nations' ports, the collection and use of the federal Harbor Maintenance Tax. The WRRDA bill also includes numerous reforms to help meet the maritime transportation needs of our nation today and in the future.

America's public ports and their private sector partners plan to invest more than $46 billion in seaport infrastructure in the next five years. It is important that we pass this historic legislation by investing in America's transportation infrastructure. Maintaining America's link to the global marketplace by creating and maintaining modern and efficient seaport and waterway infrastructure will provide significant benefits to our nation's economic vitality, job growth, and international competitiveness, as well as create sizable tax revenues from cargo and trade activities.

Ports serve as America's gateway to the global economy. The nation's economic prosperity rests on the ability of containerized and bulk cargo arriving unimpeded at U.S. ports to support the ''just in time'' delivery system that underpins the manufacturing and retail sectors.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), ports, waterways, and vessels are part of an economic engine handling more than $700 billion in merchandise annually, according to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and an attack on this system could have a widespread impact on global shipping, international trade, and the global economy. The Port of Houston houses approximately 100 steamship lines offering services that link Houston with 1,053 ports in 203 countries. It is also home to a $15 billion petrochemical complex, the largest in the nation and second largest worldwide.

As a result, it is an ideal port for examining security practices in the maritime environment. At the Port of Houston, and other ports across the country, balancing security concerns with the need to facilitate the free flow of people and commerce remains an ongoing challenge for both the public and private sectors.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, Chairman GIBBS and Ranking Member BISHOP in working with the Texas Delegation on behalf of our constituents to strengthen the bill by encouraging non-federal entities to invest in their harbor maintenance and step in when the Army Corps of Engineers cannot.

This legislative provision particularly benefits ports like the Port of Houston which have invested substantial amounts of their own funds to complete critical infrastructure in order to provide for safe navigation of larger vessels, and to assure its terminals remain competitive in the world market. This success complements my efforts to secure necessary funding for harbor dredging in the FY' 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the Committee leadership for supporting the Jackson Lee Amendment #9 on the roster and including the amendment En Bloc. This amendment

provides that in making recommendations pursuant to Section 118 of the Act, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions.

Mr. Chair, as you are aware, it is an essential tool in our desire to improve the lives of low income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

I am sure we will never forget the critical impact from Hurricane Sandy that crippled the Northeast area from Massachusetts to North Carolina. And not long before Hurricane Sandy, as we were working to learn how to prevent another Hurricane Katrina that crippled the great City of New Orleans. Our nation was still healing from Hurricane Ike and Hurricane Rita which crippled Houston, Texas.

Thereby highlighting the importance of not only giving greater attention to our underserved communities but also how we can help our citizens by educating them on the areas in which they live. As my colleagues are aware, a healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Consulting with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The coordination with the aforementioned groups is vital to ensuring that economically disadvantaged and minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environment and the continued preservation of their communities as we look to environmental and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration. Further, any issues of concern regarding the potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project, including any issues that may substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project study.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of our rivers and harbors of the United States, and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

I want to also acknowledge and recognize Congressman DEFAZIO of Oregon for offering an amendment, in which I cosponsored that conditions the application of Section 103 of the bill on a reduction in the backlog of Corps of Engineers projects to less than $20 billion in construction costs. This amendment highlights the fact that it is a lack of funding not the environmental review process that has led to a backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. We have spent enough energy arguing over the budget and the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) streamlining, but not enough time in making the hard decisions and investments that are going to create economic growth and create jobs. I urge Congress to support Rep. DeFazio's amendment #2.

Mr. Chair, I believe the WRRDA bill would have been stronger with the inclusion of an amendment I offered to the Rules Committee that directs the Secretary of the Army to encourage the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects and requires the GAO to submit a report to Congress within 2 years on the participation of minority- and women-owned businesses in such projects.

I recognize the value of a diverse supplier base and its impact on the community and population at large. Therefore, I will work directly with the Secretary of the Army to establish an opportunity for Minority and Women Owned Businesses to work directly with the United States Army and the United States Corp of Engineers on specific projects that will ensure that the United States Army and the United States Corp of Engineers continues to creatively seek new supplier sources to fulfill the business opportunities at a number of Ports throughout our great nation and that minority and women owned businesses are given the opportunity to compete for these specific project business opportunities.

In closing, it is important to note that since the establishment of our Nation, our inland waterways and seaports have linked America directly to the global economy. This remains true today. Goods from all over the world reach our store shelves after arriving here through our ports, and products grown and made in the U.S.A. get to market overseas using our water transportation network.

The importance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers mission to maintain our port and waterways infrastructure will only increase with time. Expansion of the Panama Canal is expected to be completed in 2014, allowing more and larger ships to call on America's ports. Our trade volume is expected to double within a decade, and to double again by 2030. We have to be ready for this expected growth in order to remain globally competitive.

The economic benefits of the Corps' mission are not limited to navigation and commerce. Levees, dams, reservoirs, and other measures within the Corps' mission scope provide flood protection for homes and businesses, protecting property and life.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3080.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of passage of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act today, although I have serious concerns with the changes to public and environmental review made in the bill.

This long-overdue authorization of Army Corps projects is critical to continue infrastructure maintenance and construction and environmental restoration in our nation's waterways. In my home state of Maryland, the Corps' work is essential for the operations of the Port of Baltimore, which supports thousands of jobs. Additionally, its environmental protection and oyster recovery work bolsters our efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay.

However, I am deeply concerned that the bill goes too far in its attempts to expedite project review. While we all support prompt analysis of federal projects, the NEPA process is critical to ensuring that proposed projects are cost-effective, environmentally sound, and in the best interest of the surrounding communities. Corps projects in particular are often large and complex, with impacts across waterways and ecosystems. We must provide adequate time for public and agency review and comment to avoid lasting environmental damage and costly litigation.

While I will vote today to move this bill forward, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the conference process to preserve a robust review and oversight process for all proposed projects.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, maintaining and investing in our national water infrastructure is an important responsibility of Congress. Critical to our coastal and inland communities alike, these resources keep our national transportation networks running and our economy growing. The Water Resources Development Act protects our neighborhoods from floods, provides for environmental restoration and protection, and helps keep commerce moving, all while ensuring community engagement, access, and transparency in project decision making. Regrettably, the bill before us erodes many of the safeguards designed to protect the very lives and communities impacted by these projects. Despite the enormous benefits of passing a water resources bill into law, we should not do so at the cost of decades-old protections for our states, cities and towns. If we weaken the laws that require us to evaluate the full range of options for projects and alternatives, we may undermine the success of future projects, endangering their fiscal soundness and environmental stewardship.

In Rhode Island, the Army Corps of Engineers has worked diligently to protect our coastlines, stem shoreline erosion, institute flood protections and improve inland navigation. Over the past 50 years, most of the navigation work on Rhode Island's waterways has been constructed by the Army Corps. Since the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), these projects rightfully went through rigorous review and solicited comments from affected communities, businesses and governments.

For more than four decades laws like NEPA have contributed to cleaner water, cleaner air, and a safer and healthier environment. Their authors recognized that healthy communities beget healthy economies, passing these bills into law with strong bipartisan support. In fact, Congress has been a greater hindrance to the advancement of Army Corps projects than environmental review. While the last WRDA bill passed by Congress in 2007 authorized the construction of projects costing more than $22 billion, Congress appropriated just $1.5 billion for the Corps' construction budget last year.

The NEPA process informs federal decisions and provides a critical check to communities on federal planning. In many cases, NEPA offers the only opportunity for the public to have a say in federal actions that may have profound impacts on their health, safety, livelihood, and wellbeing. It has saved money, time, vital resources, historical sites, endangered species, and public lands, while ensuring public disclosure and engagement.

I hope my colleagues will join me in working to prevent any degradation of the NEPA process going forward. Without such action, we are set on a path to undermine public input

into the federal decision-making process, increase taxpayer costs, and harm the environment.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my frustration. For many of us, the 2007 WRDA bill included the authorization for critical projects in our districts. Since the passage of that bill, the Army Corps of Engineers have begun interpreting the language and technical errors came to light.

Last night, through the Rules process, I attempted to right 2 exact wrongs by making technical corrections to the specific language in the 2007 WRDA bill with 2 precise amendments at no additional cost to the American taxpayer.

One of my amendments would have made a necessary technical change to the language of the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Feasibility Study to include the entire city of Delcambre, LA. As the study perimeters are currently written, they include only areas within 3 particular Parishes. However, there is one community, the city of Delcambre, LA that is divided by the Vermilion Parish line with half of the city and its structures in Vermilion, thus covered by the study, and the other half in Iberia Parish, not covered in the study. As the Corps began to move forward with study implementation, they made the decision to essentially cut the community, and structures, in half. This is not a sensible approach to ensuring a community's protection from hurricane destruction.

The second amendment would make a technical change to the Acadiana Gulf of Mexico Access Channel (AGMAC) an existing project, in order to reduce costs and improve the beneficial use of dredge material.

AGMAC was designed to allow for more efficient marine access from the Port of Iberia and other Acadiana Ports to the Gulf of Mexico by enlarging the existing channel to a project depth of twenty feet. Congress authorized the AGMAC project in the 2007 WRDA bill.

My amendment would propose removing the entire phrase related to Incidental Storm Surge Protection from the 2007 WRDA description of the project. The original authorization amount of the project in 2007 was $131 million, the current cost of the project is $310 million. The main reason for the radical difference in cost estimates, is the Incidental Storm Surge Protection language that was inserted at the request of one specific group. My amendment would remove this specific provision, with the understanding from the Corps of Engineers in New Orleans, that this change would allow the Corps to maintain the authorized spending level for this project, and most importantly, permit this suspended project to move forward.

Unfortunately due to an improper overreach back in 2007, a critical project has been on hold. This amendment would stimulate job creation, and the Acadiana economy by more than $50 million a year, has been delayed and now is the time to get it back on track.

Millions of federal and state dollars have already been invested in performing feasibility studies to ensure that the AGMAC project was worthy of authorization. With the change proposed in my amendment, we can ensure that these dollars are not wasted, but instead that this critical project is completed.

It is important to note that CBO found both of these amendments to be budget neutral. The amendment maintains the authorized spending level for both projects found in the WRDA 2007. There is NO additional cost to the American taxpayers. Instead these changes would a.) ensure that an entire town, not just half, is better prepared when the next hurricane hits the Gulf Coast, and b.) restore consistency when determining the use of dredge material from a navigation project.

Mr. Chair, I understand why we have a rules process. I understand why we no longer have earmarks. However it is inefficient and irresponsible to stop an amendment that makes a NECESSARY, technical, budget neutral language change. I look forward to working with the Chairman to devise a simple and time efficient strategy forward to fix these problems.

The Corps will continue to interpret legislative language the way it sees fit. If it is to the detriment of our constituents, is it expected that I will shrug that off and not fight that mistake? That's not what the people of South Louisiana elected me to do here in Washington.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 3080—the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. I would like to commend Chairman SHUSTER for his continued willingness to work with all Members to ensure that this bill is a truly bipartisan product.

For the first time since 2007, this House will have the opportunity to debate legislation that authorizes our critical water infrastructure. I believe that this bill represents the proper reform that will implement deadlines, increase transparency at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and take offline $12 billion in projects that have been inactive for a number of years.

Mr. Chair, while these overall reforms are beneficial, there are two specific aspects of this bil that are important to the State of Georgia—as well as the entire Southeast region. First and foremost, this legislation authorizes the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project (SHEP) to deepen the port from 42 feet to 47 feet. For a number of years, this important regional project has been delayed by a statutory oversight in a previous WRDA bill. However, H.R. 3080 will finally provide the State of Georgia the ability to commit the $201 million of the state share that has already been set aside.

SHEP benefits both the State of Georgia and the country as a whole. It has been estimated that for every dollar invested in deepening the port, $5.50 would be generated for the country while providing savings of $174 million on shipping annually. Furthermore, the Army Corps' own General Re-evaluation stated that SHEP will create 11,554 jobs, over $551 million in labor income, and a gross regional value of over $794 million. With the upcoming expansion of the Panama Canal, SHEP will only help maintain a competitive edge for deep water ports in the Southeast.

Mr. Chair, there is another aspect of WRRDA for which I commend the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee for its work. Unfortunately, in the version of WRDA passed by the Senate in May of this year, there were attempts made by our colleagues in the other body to undermine the longstanding issue among Georgia, Alabama, and Florida regarding water usage in both the Apalachicola-ChattahoocheeFlint (ACF) Basin and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa (ACT) Basin. This WRRDA bill is no place to interfere with ongoing negotiations, and I believe that this legislation's silence on this issue is the correct approach.

For these important reasons, I support H.R. 3080.

□ 1545

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–24. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3080

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary.

TITLE I—PROGRAM REFORMS AND STREAMLINING

Sec. 101. Vertical integration and acceleration of studies.
Sec. 102. Expediting the evaluation and processing of permits.
Sec. 103. Environmental streamlining.
Sec. 104. Consolidation of studies.
Sec. 105. Removal of duplicative analyses.
Sec. 106. Expediting approval of modifications and alterations of projects by non-Federal interests.
Sec. 107. Construction of projects by non-Federal interests.
Sec. 108. Contributions by non-Federal interests.
Sec. 109. Contributions by non-Federal interests for management of Corps of Engineers inland navigation facilities.
Sec. 110. Additional contributions by non-Federal interests.
Sec. 111. Clarification of impacts to other Federal facilities.
Sec. 112. Clarification of previously authorized work.
Sec. 113. Tribal partnership program.
Sec. 114. Technical corrections.
Sec. 115. Water infrastructure public-private partnership pilot program.
Sec. 116. Annual report to Congress.
Sec. 117. Actions to be taken in conjunction with the President's annual budget submission to Congress.
Sec. 118. Hurricane and storm damage reduction study.
Sec. 119. Non-Federal plans to provide additional flood risk reduction.
Sec. 120. Review of emergency response authorities.
Sec. 121. Emergency communication of risk.
Sec. 122. Improvements to the National Dam Safety Program Act.
Sec. 123. Restricted areas at Corps of Engineers dams.
Sec. 124. Levee safety.
Sec. 125. Vegetation on levees.
Sec. 126. Reduction of Federal costs.

Sec. 127. Advanced modeling technologies.
Sec. 128. Enhanced use of electronic commerce in Federal procurement.
Sec. 129. Corrosion prevention.
Sec. 130. Resilient construction and use of innovative materials.
Sec. 131. Assessment of water supply in arid regions.
Sec. 132. River basin commissions.
Sec. 133. Sense of Congress regarding water resources development bills.
Sec. 134. Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam.
Sec. 135. Aquatic invasive species.
Sec. 136. Recreational access.
Sec. 137. Territories of the United States.
Sec. 138. Sense of Congress regarding interstate water agreements and compacts.

TITLE II—NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Subtitle A—Ports

Sec. 201. Expanded use of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.
Sec. 202. Assessment and prioritization of operation and maintenance.
Sec. 203. Preserving United States harbors.
Sec. 204. Consolidation of deep draft navigation expertise.
Sec. 205. Disposal sites.

Subtitle B—Inland Waterways

Sec. 211. Definitions.
Sec. 212. Project delivery process reforms.
Sec. 213. Efficiency of revenue collection.
Sec. 214. Inland waterways revenue studies.
Sec. 215. Inland waterways stakeholder roundtable.
Sec. 216. Preserving the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.
Sec. 217. Public comment on lock operations.
Sec. 218. Assessment of operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.
Sec. 219. Upper Mississippi River protection.
Sec. 220. Corps of Engineers lock and dam energy development.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND BACKLOG PREVENTION

Sec. 301. Deauthorization of inactive projects.
Sec. 302. Review of Corps of Engineers assets.
Sec. 303. Backlog prevention.
Sec. 304. Deauthorizations.
Sec. 305. Land conveyances.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

Sec. 401. Authorization of final feasibility studies.
Sec. 402. Project modifications.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—PROGRAM REFORMS AND STREAMLINING

SEC. 101. VERTICAL INTEGRATION AND ACCELERATION OF STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent practicable, a feasibility study initiated by the Secretary, after the date of enactment of this Act, under section 905(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)) shall—

(1) result in the completion of a final feasibility report not later than 3 years after the date of initiation;

(2) have a maximum Federal cost of $3,000,000; and

(3) ensure that personnel from the district, division, and headquarters levels of the Corps of Engineers concurrently conduct the review required under that section.

(b) EXCEPTION.—If the Secretary determines that a feasibility study described in subsection (a) will not be conducted in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary, not later than 30 days after the date of making the determination, shall—

(1) prepare an updated feasibility study schedule and cost estimate;

(2) notify the non-Federal feasibility cost sharing partner that the feasibility study has been delayed; and

(3) provide written notice to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate as to the reasons the requirements of subsection (a) are not attainable.

(c) TERMINATION OF AUTHORIZATION.—A feasibility study for which the Secretary has issued a determination under subsection (b) is not authorized after the last day of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the determination if the Secretary has not completed the study on or before such last day.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the status of the implementation of this section, including a description of each feasibility study subject to the requirements of this section;

(2) the amount of time taken to complete each such feasibility study; and

(3) any recommendations for additional authority necessary to support efforts to expedite the feasibility study process, including an analysis of whether the limitation established by subsection (a)(2) needs to be adjusted to address the impacts of inflation.

(e) REVIEWS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the initiation of a study described in subsection (a) for a project, the Secretary shall—

(1) take all steps necessary to initiate the federally mandated reviews that the Secretary is required to complete as part of the study, including environmental reviews;

(2) convene a meeting of all Federal, tribal, and State agencies identified under section 2045(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348(d)), as amended by this Act, and that may be required by law to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion on or to make a determination concerning a permit or license for the study;

(3) provide the agencies referred to in paragraph (2) with all relevant information related to the scope and potential impacts of the project, including environmental impacts; and

(4) take all steps necessary to provide information that will enable required reviews and analyses related to the project to be conducted by other agencies in a thorough and timely manner.

SEC. 102. EXPEDITING THE EVALUATION AND PROCESSING OF PERMITS.

Section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''or public-utility company (as defined in section 1262 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16451))'' after ''non-Federal public entity'';

(B) by inserting ''or company'' after ''that entity''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that expediting the evaluation of a permit through the use of funds accepted and expended under this section does not adversely affect the timeline for evaluation (in the Corps district in which the project or activity is located) of permits under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army of other entities that have not contributed funds under this section.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 103. ENVIRONMENTAL STREAMLINING.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress declares that—

(A) the benefits of water resources projects are important to the Nation's economy and environment;

(B) it is in the national interest to expedite the delivery of water resources projects;

(C) it is in the national interest for Federal and State agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and other entities involved in water resources projects—

(i) to accelerate study completion and project delivery and to reduce costs; and

(ii) to ensure that the planning, design, engineering, construction, and funding of water resources projects is done in an efficient and effective manner, promoting accountability for public investments and encouraging greater local and private sector involvement in project financing and delivery while addressing public safety and protecting the environment; and

(D) delay in the delivery of water resources studies and projects—

(i) increases project costs, flood risks, and local and Federal expenditures for emergency management and recovery;

(ii) harms the economy of the United States; and

(iii) impedes the shipment of goods for the conduct of commerce.

(2) POLICY.—Given the declarations set forth in paragraph (1), it is the policy of the United States that—

(A) recommendations to Congress regarding such projects should be accelerated by coordinated and efficient environmental reviews and cooperative efforts to quickly resolve disputes during the development of water resources projects;

(B) the Secretary shall have the lead role among Federal agencies in facilitating the environmental review process for water resources projects;

(C) each Federal agency shall cooperate with the Secretary to expedite the environmental review process for water resources projects;

(D) programmatic approaches shall be used if applicable to reduce the need for project-by-project reviews and decisions by Federal agencies;

(E) the Secretary shall identify opportunities for non-Federal sponsors to assume responsibilities of the Secretary if such responsibilities can be assumed in a manner that protects public health and safety, the environment, and public participation; and

(F) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall identify and promote the deployment of innovations aimed at reducing the time and money required to deliver water resources projects while protecting the environment.

(b) STREAMLINED PROJECT DELIVERY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2045 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 2045. STREAMLINED PROJECT DELIVERY.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

''(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term 'environmental impact statement' means the detailed statement of environmental impacts required to be prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(2) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'environmental review process' means the process of preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for a project study.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'environmental review process' includes the process for and completion of any environmental permit, approval, review, or study required for a project study under any Federal law other than the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(3) FEDERAL JURISDICTIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'Federal jurisdictional agency' means a Federal agency with jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision required for a project study under applicable Federal laws, including regulations.

''(4) PROJECT.—The term 'project' means a Corps of Engineers water resources project.

''(5) PROJECT SPONSOR.—The term 'project sponsor' means the non-Federal interest as defined in section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

''(6) PROJECT STUDY.—The term 'project study' means a feasibility study for a project carried out pursuant to section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282).

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—The procedures in this section are applicable to all project studies initiated after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 and for which an environmental impact statement is prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and may be applied, to the extent determined appropriate by the Secretary, to other project studies initiated after such date of enactment and for which an environmental review process document is prepared under such Act.

''(c) LEAD AGENCIES.—

''(1) FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY.—The Corps of Engineers shall be the Federal lead agency in the environmental review process for a project study.

''(2) NON-FEDERAL PROJECT SPONSOR AS JOINT LEAD AGENCY.—At the discretion of the Secretary and subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), a non-Federal project sponsor that is an agency defined in subsection (a)—

''(A) may serve as a joint lead agency with the Corps of Engineers for purposes of preparing any environmental review process document under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

''(B) may assist in the preparation of any such environmental review process document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 if the Secretary provides guidance in the preparation process, participates in preparing the document, independently evaluates that document, and approves and adopts the document before the Secretary takes any subsequent action or makes any approval based on that document.

''(3) ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.—Any environmental review process document prepared in accordance with this subsection shall be adopted and used by any Federal agency in making any approval of a project subject to this section as the document required to be completed under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to the same extent that the Federal agency may adopt or use a document prepared by another Federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(4) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY.—With respect to the environmental review process for any project, the Federal lead agency shall have authority and responsibility—

''(A) to take such actions as are necessary and proper, within the authority of the Federal lead agency, to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review process for the project study; and

''(B) to prepare or ensure that any required environmental impact statement or other document for a project study required to be completed under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is completed in accordance with this section and applicable Federal law.

''(d) PARTICIPATING AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.—

''(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Federal lead agency shall identify, as early as practicable in the environmental review process for a project study, any Federal or State agency, local government, or Indian tribe that may—

''(A) have jurisdiction over the project;

''(B) be required by law to conduct or issue a review, analysis, opinion, or statement for the project study; or

''(C) be required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or other approval or decision for the project study.

''(2) INVITATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal lead agency shall invite any such agency identified under paragraph (1) to become a participating or cooperating agency in the environmental review process for the project study.

''(B) DEADLINE.—An invitation to participate issued under subparagraph (A) shall establish a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted, which may be extended by the Federal lead agency for good cause.

''(3) FEDERAL COOPERATING AGENCY.—Any Federal agency that is invited by the Federal lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a project study shall be designated as a cooperating agency by the Federal lead agency unless the invited agency informs the Federal lead agency, in writing, by the deadline specified in the invitation that the invited agency—

''(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project;

''(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the project study; and

''(C) does not intend to submit comments on the project study.

''(4) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—A participating or cooperating agency shall comply with the requirements of this section and any schedule established under this section.

''(B) IMPLICATION.—Designation under this subsection shall not imply that the participating or cooperating agency—

''(i) supports a proposed project; or

''(ii) has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise with respect to evaluation of, the project.

''(5) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each participating or cooperating agency shall—

''(A) carry out the obligations of that agency under other applicable law concurrently and in conjunction with the required environmental review process unless doing so would prevent such agency from conducting needed analysis or otherwise carrying out their obligations under those other laws; and

''(B) formulate and implement administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.

''(e) PROGRAMMATIC COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue guidance regarding the use of programmatic approaches to carry out the environmental review process that—

''(A) eliminates repetitive discussions of the same issues;

''(B) focuses on the actual issues ripe for analyses at each level of review;

''(C) establishes a formal process for coordinating with participating and cooperating agencies, including the creation of a list of all data that is needed to carry out the environmental review process; and

''(D) complies with—

''(i) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

''(ii) all other applicable laws.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) as the first step in drafting guidance under that paragraph, consult with relevant Federal and State agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and the public on the use and scope of the programmatic approaches;

''(B) emphasize the importance of collaboration among relevant Federal agencies, State agencies, local governments, and Indian tribes in undertaking programmatic reviews, especially with respect to reviews with a broad geographical scope;

''(C) ensure that the programmatic reviews—

''(i) promote transparency, including of the analyses and data used in the environmental review process, the treatment of any deferred issues raised by a Federal or State agency, local government, Indian tribe, or the public, and the temporal and special scales to be used to analyze those issues;

''(ii) use accurate and timely information in the environmental review process, including—

''(I) criteria for determining the general duration of the usefulness of the review; and

''(II) the timeline for updating any out-of-date review;

''(iii) describe—

''(I) the relationship between programmatic analysis and future tiered analysis; and

''(II) the role of the public in the creation of future tiered analysis; and

''(iv) are available to other relevant Federal and State agencies, local governments, Indian tribes, and the public;

''(D) allow not less than 60 days of public notice and comment on any proposed guidance; and

''(E) address any comments received under subparagraph (D).

''(f) COORDINATED REVIEWS.—

''(1) COORDINATION PLAN.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Federal lead agency, after consultation with each participating and cooperating agency and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable, shall establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in and comment on the environmental review process for a project study.

''(B) INCORPORATION.—In developing the plan established under subparagraph (A), the Federal lead agency shall take under consideration the scheduling requirements under section 101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

''(2) SCHEDULE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal lead agency, after consultation with each participating and cooperating agency and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable, shall establish, as part of the coordination plan established in paragraph (1)(A), a schedule for completion of the environmental review process for the project study. In developing the schedule, the Federal lead agency shall take under consideration the scheduling requirements under section 101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013.

''(B) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the schedule, the Federal lead agency shall consider factors such as—

''(i) the responsibilities of participating and cooperating agencies under applicable laws;

''(ii) the resources available to the participating and cooperating agencies and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable;

''(iii) the overall size and complexity of the project;

''(iv) the overall schedule for and cost of the project; and

''(v) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that may be affected by the project.

''(C) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER TIME PERIODS.—A schedule under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with any other relevant time periods established under Federal law.

''(D) MODIFICATION.—The Federal lead agency may—

''(i) lengthen a schedule established under subparagraph (A) for good cause; or

''(ii) shorten a schedule only with the concurrence of the affected participating and cooperating agencies and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable.

''(E) DISSEMINATION.—A copy of a schedule established under subparagraph (A) shall be—

''(i) provided to each participating and cooperating agency and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable; and

''(ii) made available to the public.

''(3) COMMENT DEADLINES.—The Federal lead agency shall establish the following deadlines for comment during the environmental review process for a project study:

''(A) DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—For comments by agencies and the public on a draft environmental impact statement, a period of not more than 60 days after such document is made publicly available, unless—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the Federal lead agency, all participating and cooperating agencies, and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the Federal lead agency for good cause.

''(B) OTHER COMMENT PERIODS.—For all other comment periods established by the Federal lead agency for agency or public comments in the environmental review process, a period of not more than 30 days after the date on which the materials for which comment is requested are made available, unless—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the Federal lead agency, all participating and cooperating agencies, and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the Federal lead agency for good cause.

''(4) DEADLINES FOR DECISIONS UNDER OTHER LAWS.—

''(A) PRIOR APPROVAL DEADLINE.—If a participating or cooperating agency is required to make a determination regarding or otherwise approve or disapprove the project study prior to the record of decision or finding of no significant impact, such participating or cooperating agency shall make such determination or approval not later than 30 days after the Federal lead agency publishes notice of the availability of a final environmental impact statement or other final environmental document, or not later than such other date that is otherwise required by law, whichever occurs first.

''(B) OTHER DEADLINES.—With regard to any determination or approval of a participating or cooperating agency that is not subject to subparagraph (A), each participating or cooperating agency shall make any required determination or otherwise approve or disapprove the project study not later than 90 days after the date that the Federal lead agency approves the record of decision or finding of no significant impact for the project study, or not later than such other date that is otherwise required by law, whichever occurs first.

''(C) RECORD CLOSED.—In the event that any participating or cooperating agency fails to make a determination or approve or disapprove the project study within the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A), the Federal lead agency may close the record and find the record sufficient for the project study as it relates to such agency determination or approval.

''(g) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

''(1) COOPERATION.—The Federal lead agency and participating and cooperating agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that may delay completion of the environmental review process or result in the denial of any approval required for the project study under applicable laws.

''(2) FEDERAL LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal lead agency shall make information available to the participating and cooperating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review process regarding the environmental and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration.

''(B) DATA SOURCES.—Such information under subparagraph (A) may be based on existing data sources, including geographic information systems mapping.

''(3) PARTICIPATING AND COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Based on information received from the Federal lead agency, participating and cooperating agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts of the project, including any issues that may substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project study.

''(4) ACCELERATED ISSUE RESOLUTION AND ELEVATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of a participating or cooperating agency or non-Federal project sponsor, the Secretary shall convene an issue resolution meeting with the relevant participating and cooperating agencies and the non-Federal project sponsor or joint lead agency, as applicable, to resolve issues that may—

''(i) delay completion of the environmental review process; or

''(ii) result in denial of any approval required for the project study under applicable laws.

''(B) MEETING DATE.—A meeting requested under this paragraph shall be held not later than 21 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the request for the meeting, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause to extend that deadline.

''(C) NOTIFICATION.—Upon receipt of a request for a meeting under this paragraph, the Secretary shall notify all relevant participating and cooperating agencies of the request, including the issue to be resolved and the date for the meeting.

''(D) ELEVATION OF ISSUE RESOLUTION.—If a resolution cannot be achieved within 30 days after a meeting under this paragraph and a determination is made by the Secretary that all information necessary to resolve the issue has been obtained, the Secretary shall forward the dispute to the heads of the relevant agencies for resolution.

''(E) CONVENTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may convene an issue resolution meeting under this subsection at any time, at the discretion of the Secretary, regardless of whether a meeting is requested under subparagraph (A).

''(h) STREAMLINED DOCUMENTATION AND DECISIONMAKING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal lead agency in the environmental review process for a project study, in order to reduce paperwork and expedite decisionmaking, shall prepare a condensed final environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(2) CONDENSED FORMAT.—A condensed final environmental impact statement for a project study in the environmental review process shall consist only of—

''(A) an incorporation by reference of the draft environmental impact statement;

''(B) any updates to specific pages or sections of the draft environmental impact statement as appropriate; and

''(C) responses to comments on the draft environmental impact statement and copies of the comments.

''(3) TIMING OF DECISION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in conducting the environmental review process for a project study, the Federal lead agency shall combine a final environmental impact statement and a record of decision for the project study into a single document if—

''(A) the alternative approved in the record of decision is either a preferred alternative identified in the draft environmental impact statement or is a modification of such preferred alternative developed in response to comments on the draft environmental impact statement; and

''(B) the Federal lead agency has a written commitment from parties responsible for implementation of the measures applicable to the approved alternative that are identified in the final environmental impact statement that they will implement those measures.

''(i) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall preempt or interfere with—

''(1) any practice of seeking, considering, or responding to public comment; or

''(2) any power, jurisdiction, responsibility, or authority that a Federal or State agency, local government, Indian tribe, or non-Federal project sponsor has with respect to carrying out a project study or any other provision of law applicable to a project.

''(j) TIMING OF CLAIMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or other approval issued by a Federal agency for a project study shall be barred unless it is filed not later than 150 days after publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or other approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law which allows judicial review. Nothing in this subsection shall create a right to judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or other approval.

''(2) NEW INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall consider new information received after the close of a comment period if the information satisfies the requirements for a supplemental environmental impact statement under title 40, Code of Federal Regulations. The preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement or other environmental document when required by this section shall be considered a separate final agency action and the deadline for filing a claim for judicial review of such action shall be 150 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing such action.

''(k) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(A) survey the use by the Corps of Engineers of categorical exclusions in projects;

''(B) publish a review of the survey that includes a description of—

''(i) the types of actions that were categorically excluded or may be the basis for developing a new categorical exclusion; and

''(ii) any requests previously received by the Secretary for new categorical exclusions; and

''(C) solicit requests from other Federal agencies and non-Federal project sponsors for new categorical exclusions.

''(2) NEW CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, if the Secretary identifies, based on the review under paragraph (1), a category of activities that merit establishing a categorical exclusion not in existence on the day before the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to propose that new categorical exclusion, to the extent that the categorical exclusion meets the criteria for a categorical exclusion under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulation).

''(l) IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall prepare guidance documents that describe the processes that the Secretary will use to implement this section.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2045 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 2045. Streamlined project delivery.''.

(c) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION IN EMERGENCIES.—For the repair, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of a water resources project that is in operation or under construction when damaged by an event or incident that results in a declaration by the President of a major disaster

or emergency pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Secretary shall treat such repair, reconstruction, or rehabilitation activity as a class of action categorically excluded from the requirements relating to environmental assessments or environmental impact statements under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, if such repair or reconstruction activity is in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as the original water resources project as before the declaration described in this section.

SEC. 104. CONSOLIDATION OF STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 905(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(b)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 905(a)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''perform a reconnaissance study and''.

(b) CONTENTS OF FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—Section 905(a)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''A feasibility report shall include a preliminary analysis of the Federal interest and the costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of the project.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary shall continue to carry out a study for which a reconnaissance level investigation has been initiated before the date of enactment of this Act as if this section, including the amendments made by this section, had not been enacted.

SEC. 105. REMOVAL OF DUPLICATIVE ANALYSES.

Section 911 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2288) is repealed.

SEC. 106. EXPEDITING APPROVAL OF MODIFICATIONS AND ALTERATIONS OF PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, after providing notice and an opportunity for comment, shall establish a process for the review of section 14 applications in a timely and consistent manner.

(b) SECTION 14 APPLICATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''section 14 application'' means an application submitted by an applicant to the Secretary requesting permission for the temporary occupation or use of a public work, or the alteration or permanent occupation or use of a public work, under section 14 of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1899 (commonly known as the ''Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899'') (33 U.S.C. 408).

(c) BENCHMARK GOALS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF BENCHMARK GOALS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(A) establish benchmark goals for determining the amount of time it should take the Secretary to determine whether a section 14 application is complete;

(B) establish benchmark goals for determining the amount of time it should take the Secretary to approve or disapprove a section 14 application; and

(C) to the extent practicable, use such benchmark goals to make a decision on section 14 applications in a timely and consistent manner.

(2) BENCHMARK GOALS.—

(A) BENCHMARK GOALS FOR DETERMINING WHETHER SECTION 14 APPLICATIONS ARE COMPLETE.—To the extent practicable, the benchmark goals established under paragraph (1) shall provide that—

(i) the Secretary reach a decision on whether a section 14 application is complete not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of the application; and

(ii) if the Secretary determines that a section 14 application is not complete, the Secretary promptly notify the applicant of the specific information that is missing or the analysis that is needed to complete the application.

(B) BENCHMARK GOALS FOR REVIEWING COMPLETED APPLICATIONS.—To the extent practicable, the benchmark goals established under paragraph (1) shall provide that—

(i) the Secretary generally approve or disapprove a completed section 14 application not later than 45 days after the date of receipt of the completed application; and

(ii) in a case in which the Secretary determines that additional time is needed to review a completed section 14 application due to the type, size, cost, complexity, or impacts of the actions proposed in the application, the Secretary approve or disapprove the application not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of the completed application.

(3) NOTICE.—In any case in which the Secretary determines that it will take the Secretary more than 45 days to review a completed section 14 application, the Secretary shall—

(A) provide written notification to the applicant; and

(B) include in the written notice a best estimate of the Secretary as to the amount of time required for completion of the review.

(d) FAILURE TO ACHIEVE BENCHMARK GOALS.—In any case in which the Secretary fails make a decision on a section 14 application in accordance with the process established under this section, the Secretary shall provide written notice to the applicant, including a detailed description of—

(1) why the Secretary failed to make a decision in accordance with such process;

(2) the additional actions required before the Secretary will issue a decision; and

(3) the amount of time the Secretary will require to issue a decision.

(e) NOTIFICATION.—

(1) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall provide a copy of any written notice provided under subsection (d) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall maintain a publicly available database, including on the Internet, on—

(A) all section 14 applications received by the Secretary; and

(B) the current status of such applications.

SEC. 107. CONSTRUCTION OF PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) CONSTRUCTION OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking ''**FLOOD CONTROL**'' *and inserting* ''**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**''*; and*

(2) by striking ''flood control'' each place it appears and inserting ''water resources development''.

(b) COMPLETION OF STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES.—Section 211(c) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(c)) is amended by striking ''date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''date of enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013''.

(c) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 211(d)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A)(i) and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A non-Federal interest may carry out construction for which studies and design documents are prepared under subsection (b) only if—

''(I) the Secretary approves the project for construction; and

''(II) the project is specifically authorized by Congress.''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES UNDER SUBSECTION (c).—Any non-Federal interest that has received from the Secretary under subsection (c) a favorable recommendation to carry out a water resources development project, or separable element thereof, based on the results of completed studies and design documents for the project or element may carry out the project or element if—

''(i) a final environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) has been filed for the project or element; and

''(ii) the project is specifically authorized by Congress.''.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—Section 211(e) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) if the project is specifically authorized by Congress.''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''At the request'' and inserting ''In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), at the request''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', or toward the non-Federal share of any other authorized water resources development study or project of such non-Federal interest''.

(e) OTHER MATTERS.—Section 211 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b–13) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS.—Whenever a non-Federal interest constructs improvements to a harbor or inland harbor, the Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance in accordance with section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)) if—

''(1) the Secretary determines, before construction, that the improvements, or separable elements thereof, are economically justified and environmentally acceptable;

''(2) the Secretary certifies that the project is constructed in accordance with applicable permits and the appropriate engineering and design standards;

''(3) the Secretary does not find that the project, or separable element thereof, is no longer economically justified or environmentally acceptable; and

''(4) the project is specifically authorized by Congress.

''(i) IMPLEMENTATION.—All laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out a project shall apply to the non-Federal interest carrying out a project under this section.

''(j) NOTIFICATION OF COMMITTEES.—The Secretary shall notify in writing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate prior to initiation of negotiations with a non-Federal interest regarding the utilization of the authorities under this section.''.

(f) REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232).

(2) Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 426i–1) and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of that Act.

(3) Section 404 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2232 note; 104 Stat. 4646) and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of that Act.

SEC. 108. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes'', approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), is amended—

(1) by striking ''from States and political subdivisions thereof,'' and inserting ''from a non-Federal interest (as defined in section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b))'';

(2) by striking '', which includes planning and design'';

(3) by inserting '', including a project for navigation on the inland waterways,'' after ''study or project'';

(4) by striking ''by States and political subdivisions thereof,'' and inserting ''by a non-Federal interest'';

(5) by striking '': Provided further, That the term 'States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States, and Federally recognized Indian tribes''; and

(6) by inserting '': And provided further, That the term 'work' means the planning, design, or construction of an authorized water resources development study or project, or the repair, restoration, or replacement of an authorized water resources development project that has been damaged by an event or incident that results in a declaration by the President of a major disaster or emergency pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)'' after ''contributing interests''.

(b) NOTIFICATION FOR CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.—Prior to the initiation of negotiations for accepting contributed funds under section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes'', approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), the Secretary shall provide written notice to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Section 111(b) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (125 Stat. 858).

(2) Section 4 of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved March 4, 1915 (33 U.S.C. 560).

SEC. 109. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS FOR MANAGEMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS INLAND NAVIGATION FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 225 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2328) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

"SEC. 225. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS FOR MANAGEMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS FACILITIES.";

(2) in subsection (a) by striking ''managing recreation facilities'' and inserting ''operating, maintaining, and managing inland navigational facilities, recreational facilities,''; and

(3) in subsection (b) by striking ''and management of recreation facilities'' and inserting '', maintenance, and management of inland navigation facilities, recreational facilities,''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 is amended by striking the item relating to section 225 and inserting the following:

''225. Contributions by non-Federal interests for management of Corps of Engineers facilities.''.

SEC. 110. ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) is amended—

(1) by striking ''In order to insure'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to insure''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), in accordance with section 5 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes', approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), the Secretary may accept funds from a non-Federal interest for any authorized water resources development project that has exceeded its maximum cost under subsection (a), and use such funds to carry out such project, if the use of such funds does not increase the Federal share of the cost of such project.''.

SEC. 111. CLARIFICATION OF IMPACTS TO OTHER FEDERAL FACILITIES.

In any case where the modification or construction of a water resources development project carried out by the Secretary adversely impacts other Federal facilities, the Secretary may accept from other Federal agencies such funds as may be necessary to address the adverse impact, including by removing, relocating, or reconstructing such facilities.

SEC. 112. CLARIFICATION OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED WORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out measures to improve fish species habitat within the boundaries and downstream of a water resources project constructed by the Secretary that includes a fish hatchery if the Secretary—

(1) has been explicitly authorized to compensate for fish losses associated with the project; and

(2) determines that the measures are—

(A) feasible;

(B) consistent with authorized project purposes and the fish hatchery; and

(C) in the public interest.

(b) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the non-Federal interest shall contribute 35 percent of the total cost of carrying out activities under this section, including the costs relating to the provision or acquisition of required land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations.

(2) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal interest shall contribute 100 percent of the costs of operation, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation of the measures carried out under this section.

SEC. 113. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B)—

(A) by striking ''The ability'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The ability''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, the Secretary shall issue guidance on the procedures described in clause (i).''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out activities under this section in fiscal years 2014 through 2023.''.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with an Indian tribe (or a designated representative of an Indian tribe) to carry out authorized activities of the Corps of Engineers to protect fish, wildlife, water quality, and cultural resources.

SEC. 114. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) LIMITATION; STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Section 221(a)(4)(E) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(E)) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) LIMITATION.—In any case in which a specific provision of law provides for a non-Federal interest to receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study for, or construction or operation and maintenance of, a water resources project, the Secretary shall apply—

''(I) the specific provision of law instead of this paragraph; or

''(II) at the request of the non-Federal interest, the specific provision of law and such provisions of this paragraph as the non-Federal interest may request.

''(iii) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed to affect the applicability of subparagraph (C).''.

(b) WATER RESOURCES PROJECT DEFINED.—Section 221(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)) is amended—

(1) by moving paragraphs (1) and (2) and the matter following paragraph (2) 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(3) by striking ''(b) DEFINITION'' and all that follows through ''The term'' and inserting the following:

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—The term''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) WATER RESOURCES PROJECT.—The term 'water resources project' includes projects studied, reviewed, designed, constructed, operated and maintained, or otherwise subject to Federal participation under the authority of the civil works program of the Secretary of the Army for the purposes of navigation, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, hurricane and storm damage reduction, water supply, recreation, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife conservation, water quality, environmental infrastructure, resource protection and development, and related purposes.''.

(c) CORRECTION.—Section 221(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(c)) is amended by striking ''enforcible'' and inserting ''enforceable''.

(d) FEDERAL ALLOCATION.—Section 2008(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2340(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This subsection shall apply without regard to whether the original partnership agreement was entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

(e) IN-KIND CREDIT.—Section 221(a)(4)(C) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(C)) is amended by striking ''In any case'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

''(i) CONSTRUCTION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A) for the cost of construction carried out by the non-Federal interest before execution of a partnership agreement and that construction has not been carried out as of the date of enactment of this clause, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such work and shall do so prior to the non-Federal interest initiating construction or issuing a written notice to proceed for the construction.

''(II) ELIGIBILITY.—Construction that is carried out after the execution of an agreement under subclause (I) and any design activities that are required for that construction, even if the design activity is carried out prior to the execution of the agreement, shall be eligible for credit.

''(ii) PLANNING.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the non-Federal interest is to receive credit under subparagraph (A) for the cost of planning carried out by the non-Federal interest before execution of a feasibility cost sharing agreement, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement under which the non-Federal interest shall carry out such planning and shall do so prior to the non-Federal interest initiating that planning.

''(II) ELIGIBILITY.—Planning that is carried out by the non-Federal interest after the execution of an agreement under subclause (I) shall be eligible for credit.''.

SEC. 115. WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to evaluate the cost effectiveness and project delivery efficiency of allowing non-Federal interests to carry out authorized water resources development projects for coastal harbor improvement, channel improvement, inland navigation, flood damage reduction, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and hurricane and storm damage reduction.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the pilot program established under subsection (a) are—

(1) to identify cost-saving project delivery alternatives that reduce the backlog of authorized Corps of Engineers projects; and

(2) to evaluate the technical, financial, and organizational benefits of allowing a non-Federal interest to carry out and manage the design or construction (or both) of 1 or more of such projects.

(c) SUBSEQUENT APPROPRIATIONS.—Any activity undertaken under this section is authorized only to the extent specifically provided for in subsequent appropriations Acts.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out the pilot program established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) identify for inclusion in the program at least 15 projects that are authorized for construction for coastal harbor improvement, channel improvement, inland navigation, flood damage reduction, or hurricane and storm damage reduction;

(2) notify in writing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of each project identified under paragraph (1);

(3) in consultation with the non-Federal interest associated with each project identified under paragraph (1), develop a detailed project management plan for the project that outlines the scope, financing, budget, design, and construction resource requirements necessary for the non-Federal interest to execute the project, or a separable element of the project;

(4) at the request of the non-Federal interest associated with each project identified under paragraph (1), enter into a project partnership agreement with the non-Federal interest under which the non-Federal interest is provided full project management control for the financing, design, or construction (or any combination thereof) of the project, or a separable element of the project, in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary;

(5) following execution of a project partnership agreement under paragraph (4) and completion of all work under the agreement, issue payment, in accordance with subsection (g), to the relevant non-Federal interest for that work; and

(6) regularly monitor and audit each project carried out under the program to ensure that all activities related to the project are carried out in compliance with plans approved by the Secretary and that construction costs are reasonable.

(e) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In identifying projects under subsection (d)(1), the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the project—

(1) is significant to the economy of the United States;

(2) leverages Federal investment by encouraging non-Federal contributions to the project;

(3) employs innovative project delivery and cost-saving methods;

(4) received Federal funds in the past and experienced delays or missed scheduled deadlines;

(5) has unobligated Corps of Engineers funding balances; and

(6) has not received Federal funding for recapitalization and modernization since the project was authorized.

(f) DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.—Not later than 180 days after entering into a project partnership agreement under subsection (d)(4), a non-Federal interest, to the maximum extent practicable, shall submit to the Secretary a detailed project schedule for the relevant project, based on estimated funding levels, that specifies deadlines for each milestone with respect to the project.

(g) PAYMENT.—Payment to the non-Federal interest for work completed pursuant to a project partnership agreement under subsection (d)(4) may be made from—

(1) if applicable, the balance of the unobligated amounts appropriated for the project;

(2) other amounts appropriated to the Corps of Engineers, except that the total amount transferred to the non-Federal interest may not exceed the estimate of the Federal share of the cost of construction, including any required design; and

(3) revenue generated by the project.

(h) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—At the request of a non-Federal interest participating in the pilot program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may provide to the non-Federal interest, if the non-Federal interest contracts with and compensates the Secretary, technical assistance with respect to—

(1) a study, engineering activity, or design activity related to a project carried out by the non-Federal interest under the program; and

(2) obtaining permits necessary for such a project.

(i) IDENTIFICATION OF IMPEDIMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) except as provided in paragraph (2), identify any procedural requirements under the authority of the Secretary that impede greater use of public-private partnerships and private investment in water resources development projects;

(B) develop and implement, on a project-by-project basis, procedures and approaches that—

(i) address such impediments; and

(ii) protect the public interest and any public investment in water resources development projects that involve public-private partnerships or private investment in water resources development projects; and

(C) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, issue rules to carry out the procedures and approaches developed under subparagraph (B).

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to allow the Secretary to waive any requirement under—

(A) sections 3141 through 3148 and sections 3701 through 3708 of title 40, United States Code;

(B) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(C) any other provision of Federal law.

(j) PUBLIC BENEFIT STUDIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before entering into a project partnership agreement under subsection (d)(4), the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of whether, and provide justification in writing to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate that, the proposed agreement provides better public and financial benefits than a similar transaction using public funding or financing.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An assessment under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be completed in a period of not more than 90 days;

(B) take into consideration any supporting materials and data submitted by the relevant non-Federal interest and other stakeholders; and

(C) determine whether the proposed project partnership agreement is in the public interest by determining whether the agreement will provide public and financial benefits, including expedited project delivery and savings for taxpayers.

(k) NON-FEDERAL FUNDING.—A project carried out under the pilot program established under subsection (a) may consist of the non-Federal interest financing the non-Federal share of the project.

(l) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL LAW.—Any provision of Federal law that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out a project shall apply to a non-Federal interest carrying out a project under this section.

(m) COST SHARE.—Nothing in this section affects a cost-sharing requirement under Federal law that is applicable to a project carried out under the pilot program established under subsection (a).

(n) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the results of the pilot program established under subsection (a), including any recommendations of the Secretary concerning whether the program or any component of the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(o) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''non-Federal interest'' includes non-Federal government entities and private entities.

SEC. 116. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary shall develop and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an annual report, to be entitled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', that identifies the following:

(1) FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—Each feasibility report that meets the criteria established in subsection (c)(1)(A).

(2) PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—Any proposed feasibility study submitted to the Secretary by a non-Federal interest pursuant to subsection (b) that meets the criteria established in subsection (c)(1)(A).

(3) PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.—Any proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study that meets the criteria established in subsection (c)(1)(A) that—

(A) is submitted to the Secretary by a non-Federal interest pursuant to subsection (b); or

(B) is identified by the Secretary for authorization.

(b) REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—

(1) PUBLICATION.—Not later than May 1 of each year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice requesting proposals from non-Federal interests for proposed feasibility studies and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies to be included in the annual report.

(2) DEADLINE FOR REQUESTS.—The Secretary shall include in each notice required by this subsection a requirement that non-Federal interests submit to the Secretary any proposals described in paragraph (1) by not later than 120 days after the date of publication of the notice in the Federal Register in order for such proposals to be considered for inclusion in the annual report.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—On the date of publication of each notice required by this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) make the notice publicly available, including on the Internet; and

(B) provide written notification of such publication to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(c) CONTENTS.—

(1) FEASIBILITY REPORTS, PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES, AND PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.—

(A) CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN REPORT.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report only those feasibility reports, proposed feasibility studies, and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies that—

(i) are related to the missions and authorities of the Corps of Engineers;

(ii) require specific authorization by Congress in law or otherwise;

(iii) are not authorized by Congress;

(iv) have not been included in any previous annual report; and

(v) if authorized, could be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF BENEFITS.—For each proposed feasibility study and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included in the annual report, the Secretary shall describe the potential benefit of the proposed feasibility study or modification, including, to the extent applicable, whether the water resources development project that is the subject of the proposed feasibility study, or the proposed modification, will—

(i) reduce risks to human life or public safety or property;

(ii) benefit the national economy;

(iii) stimulate the creation of jobs;

(iv) reduce the need for future disaster relief;

(v) promote the development and delivery of domestic energy resources;

(vi) improve the competitiveness of United States exports;

(vii) improve water-related transportation for interstate or international commerce;

(viii) restore or protect, or mitigate the impacts of a water resources development project on, the environment; or

(ix) promote the use of cost-effective and sustainable solutions to water resources challenges.

(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report, for each feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included under paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) the name of the associated non-Federal interest, including the name of any non-Federal interest that has contributed, or is expected to contribute, a non-Federal share of the cost of—

(i) the feasibility report;

(ii) the proposed feasibility study;

(iii) the authorized feasibility study for which the modification is proposed; or

(iv) construction of—

(I) the water resources development project that is the subject of—

(aa) the feasibility report;

(bb) the proposed feasibility study; or

(cc) the authorized feasibility study for which a modification is proposed; or

(II) the proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project;

(B) a letter or statement of support for the feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, or proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study from each associated non-Federal interest;

(C) the purpose of the feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, or proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study;

(D) an estimate of the Federal, non-Federal, and total costs of—

(i) the proposed feasibility study, or proposed modification to an authorized feasibility study; and

(ii) construction of—

(I) the water resources development project that is the subject of—

(aa) the feasibility report; or

(bb) the authorized feasibility study for which a modification is proposed, with respect to the change in costs resulting from such modification; or

(II) the proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project; and

(E) an estimate, to the extent practicable, of the monetary and nonmonetary benefits of—

(i) the water resources development project that is the subject of—

(I) the feasibility report;

(II) the proposed feasibility study; or

(III) the authorized feasibility study for which a modification is proposed, with respect to the benefits of such modification; or

(ii) the proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report a certification stating that each feasibility report, proposed feasibility study, and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included in the annual report meets the criteria in paragraph (1)(A).

(4) APPENDIX.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report an appendix listing the proposals submitted under subsection (b) that were not included in the annual report under paragraph (1)(A) and a description of why the Secretary determined that those proposals did not meet the criteria for inclusion under such paragraph.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR INITIAL ANNUAL REPORT.—Notwithstanding any other deadlines required by this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a notice required by subsection (b)(1);

(2) include in such notice a requirement that non-Federal interests submit to the Secretary any proposals described in subsection (b)(1) by not later than 90 days after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register in order for such proposals to be considered for inclusion in the first annual report developed by the Secretary under this section; and

(3) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit an annual report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(e) PUBLICATION.—Upon submission of the annual report to Congress, the Secretary shall make the annual report publicly available, including through publication on the Internet.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—The term ''annual report'' means the report required by subsection (a).

(2) FEASIBILITY REPORT.—The term ''feasibility report'' means a final feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), and includes—

(A) a report described in section 105(d)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)(2)); and

(B) where applicable, any associated report of the Chief of Engineers.

(3) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The term ''feasibility study'' has the meaning given that term in section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215).

(4) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—The term ''non-Federal interest'' has the meaning given that term in section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

SEC. 117. ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.

(a) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, as part of the President's annual budget submission to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall—

(A) identify and recommend Corps of Engineers construction projects for which Congress should provide funding at the full level authorized for the project; and

(B) provide an explanation of the process used by the President in making the recommendations.

(2) COVERED PERIOD.—The President shall make recommendations under paragraph (1) for the fiscal year for which the budget submission is prepared and each of the succeeding 4 fiscal years.

(3) BASIS FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS.—The President shall base recommendations under paragraph (1) on the assumption that $2,000,000,000 will be appropriated for Corps of Engineers construction projects for each fiscal year.

(b) MISSOURI RIVER BASIN.—To assist in the prioritization of Federal activities carried out related to the project for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143), and in conjunction with the President's submission to Congress of a budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that provides—

(1) an inventory of all Federal actions taken and a prioritization of all Federal actions planned in furtherance of the project, including an inventory of lands owned, acquired, or directly controlled by the Federal Government, and lands enrolled in federally assisted conservation programs;

(2) a description of the specific Federal actions proposed for the upcoming fiscal year in furtherance of the project;

(3) an assessment of the progress made in furtherance of the project, including a description of how each of the actions identified under paragraph (1) have impacted such progress; and

(4) an assessment of additional actions necessary to achieve the results of the project.

SEC. 118. HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY.

As part of the study for flood and storm damage reduction related to natural disasters to be carried out by the Secretary under title II of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013, under the heading ''Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers—Civil—Investigations'' (127 Stat. 5), the Secretary shall make specific project recommendations. The Secretary may include those recommendations in the report entitled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', developed in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 119. NON-FEDERAL PLANS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FLOOD RISK REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If requested by a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall carry out a locally preferred plan that provides a higher level of protection than a flood risk management project authorized under this Act if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the plan is technically feasible and environmentally acceptable; and

(2) the benefits of the plan exceed the costs of the plan.

(b) NON-FEDERAL COSTS.—If the Secretary carries out a locally preferred plan under subsection (a), the cost attributable to the higher level of protection provided under the plan shall be paid by the non-Federal interest.

SEC. 120. REVIEW OF EMERGENCY RESPONSE AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall undertake a review of implementation of section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and

harbors for flood control, and for other purposes'', approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), to evaluate the alternatives available to the Secretary to ensure—

(1) the safety of affected communities to future flooding and storm events;

(2) the resiliency of water resources development projects to future flooding and storm events;

(3) the long-term cost effectiveness of water resources development projects that provide flood control and hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits; and

(4) the policy goals and objectives that have been outlined by the President as a response to recent extreme weather events, including Hurricane Sandy, that relate to preparing for future floods are met.

(b) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In carrying out the review, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the historical precedents and implementation of section 5 of such Act, including those actions undertaken by the Secretary, over time, under that section—

(A) to repair or restore a project; and

(B) to increase the level of protection for a damaged project to address future conditions;

(2) evaluate the difference between adopting, as an appropriate standard under section 5 of such Act, the repair or restoration of a project to pre-flood or pre-storm levels and the repair or restoration of a project to a design level of protection, including an assessment for each standard of—

(A) the implications on populations at risk of flooding or damage;

(B) the implications on probability of loss of life;

(C) the implications on property values at risk of flooding or damage;

(D) the implications on probability of increased property damage and associated costs;

(E) the implications on local and regional economies; and

(F) the estimated total cost and estimated cost savings;

(3) incorporate the science on expected rates of sea-level rise and extreme weather events; and

(4) incorporate the work completed by the Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force, established by Executive Order 13632 (December 7, 2012).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the review.

SEC. 121. EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION OF RISK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any river basin where the Secretary carries out flood risk management activities subject to an annual operating plan, the Secretary shall establish procedures for providing the public and affected governments, including Indian tribes, in the river basin with—

(1) timely information regarding expected water levels;

(2) advice regarding appropriate preparedness actions;

(3) technical assistance; and

(4) any other information or assistance determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall utilize the procedures only when precipitation or runoff exceeds those calculations considered as the lowest risk to life and property contemplated by the annual operating plan.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) AFFECTED GOVERNMENT.—The term ''affected government'' means a State, local, or tribal government with jurisdiction over an area that will be affected by a flood.

(2) ANNUAL OPERATING PLAN.—The term ''annual operating plan'' means a plan prepared by the Secretary that describes potential water condition scenarios for a river basin for a year.

SEC. 122. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM ACT.

(a) ADMINISTRATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) is amended by striking ''Director'' each place it appears and inserting ''Administrator''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2(3) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467(3)) is amended in the paragraph heading by striking ''DIRECTOR'' and inserting ''ADMINISTRATOR''.

(b) INSPECTION OF DAMS.—Section 3(b)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467a(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''or maintenance'' and inserting ''maintenance, condition, or provision for emergency operations''.

(c) NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—

(1) OBJECTIVES.—Section 8(c)(4) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467f(c)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) develop and implement a comprehensive dam safety hazard education and public awareness initiative to assist the public in mitigating against, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from dam incidents;''.

(2) BOARD.—Section 8(f)(4) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 467f(f)(4)) is amended by inserting '', representatives from nongovernmental organizations,'' after ''State agencies''.

SEC. 123. RESTRICTED AREAS AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

Section 2 of the Freedom to Fish Act (Public Law 113–13; 127 Stat. 449) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1) by striking ''until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act'';

(2) in the heading of subsection (c) by inserting ''OR MODIFIED'' after ''NEW''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''new or modified'' after ''establishes any''; and

(B) in paragraph (3) by striking ''until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''until the Secretary has complied with the provisions of this subsection''.

SEC. 124. LEVEE SAFETY.

Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) LEVEE SAFETY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a State or political subdivision thereof, and in consultation with that State and appropriate non-Federal interests, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to a State to—

''(A) encourage effective State or local programs intended to ensure levee safety to protect human life and property;

''(B) assist the State or political subdivision in establishing and carrying out a levee safety program; or

''(C) improve an existing State or local levee safety program.

''(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of technical assistance provided under this subsection shall be—

''(A) to ensure that human lives and property that are protected by new and existing levees are safe;

''(B) to encourage the use of appropriate engineering policies and procedures for levee site investigation, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and emergency preparedness;

''(C) to encourage effective levee safety programs in a State;

''(D) to develop and support public education and awareness projects to increase public acceptance and support of levee safety programs;

''(E) to build public awareness of the residual risks associated with living in levee protected areas; and

''(F) to develop technical assistance materials, seminars, and guidelines to improve the security of levees in the United States.

''(3) FEDERAL GUIDELINES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary, in consultation with States and non-Federal interests, shall establish Federal guidelines relating to levee safety.

''(B) INCORPORATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.—The guidelines established under subparagraph (A) shall encompass, to the maximum extent practicable, activities and practices carried out by appropriate Federal agencies.

''(C) INCORPORATION OF STATE AND LOCAL ACTIVITIES.—The guidelines established under subparagraph (A) shall encompass, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(i) the activities and practices carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector to safely build, regulate, operate, and maintain levees; and

''(ii) Federal activities that facilitate State efforts to develop and implement effective State programs for the safety of levees, including levee inspection, levee rehabilitation, locally developed flood plain management, and public education and training programs.

''(D) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall allow States and non-Federal interests, including appropriate stakeholders, to review and comment on the guidelines established under subparagraph (A) before the guidelines are made final.

''(4) ASSISTANCE FOR STATE LEVEE SAFETY PROGRAMS.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for technical assistance under this subsection, a State shall—

''(i) be in the process of establishing or have in effect a State levee safety program under which a State levee safety agency, in accordance with State law, carries out the guidelines established under paragraph (3); and

''(ii) allocate sufficient funds in the budget of that State to carry out such State levee safety program.

''(B) WORK PLANS.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each State receiving technical assistance under this subsection to develop a work plan necessary for the State levee safety program of that State to reach a level of program performance that meets the guidelines established under paragraph (3).

''(C) INSPECTION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall work with States receiving technical assistance under this subsection to develop State technical guidelines for levee inspection programs that—

''(i) address hazard classifications and technically based frameworks for levee assessment; and

''(ii) are incorporated into State levee safety programs.

''(D) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Technical assistance may not be provided to a State under this subsection during a fiscal year unless the State enters into an agreement with the Secretary to ensure that the State will maintain during that fiscal year aggregate expenditures for programs to ensure levee safety that are at or above the average annual level of such expenditures for the State for the 2 fiscal years preceding that fiscal year.''.

SEC. 125. VEGETATION ON LEVEES.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of the Army, in accordance with subsection (c), shall undertake a comprehensive review of the Corps of Engineers policy guidelines on vegetation management for levees (in this section referred to as the ''guidelines''). The Secretary shall commence the review upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) FACTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In conducting the review, the Secretary shall examine the guidelines in view of—

(A) the varied interests and responsibilities in managing flood risks, including the need to provide the greatest levee safety benefit with limited resources;

(B) preserving, protecting, and enhancing natural resources, including the potential benefit that vegetation on levees can have in providing habitat for species of concern;

(C) protecting the rights of Indian tribes pursuant to treaties and statutes;

(D) determining how vegetation impacts the performance of a levee or levee system during a storm or flood event; and

(E) such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) REGIONAL AND WATERSHED CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the review, the Secretary shall specifically consider factors that promote and allow for consideration of potential variances from national guidelines on a regional or watershed basis. Such factors may include regional or watershed soil conditions, hydrologic factors, vegetation patterns and characteristics, environmental resources, levee performance history, institutional considerations, and other relevant factors. The scope of a variance approved by the Secretary may include an exemption to national guidelines where appropriate.

(c) COOPERATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The review shall be undertaken in cooperation with interested Federal agencies and in consultation with interested representatives of State and local governments, Indian tribes, appropriate nongovernmental organizations, and the public.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Corps of Engineers Regional Integration Teams, representing districts, divisions, and headquarters, in consultation with State and Federal resources agencies, and with participation by local agencies, shall recommend to the Secretary vegetation management policies for levees that conform with State and Federal laws and other applicable requirements.

(d) REVISION OF GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) provide the public 30 days to review and comment on the guidelines;

(B) revise the guidelines based on consideration of the results of the public review; and

(C) submit to Congress a report that contains a summary of the activities of the Secretary and a description of the findings of the Secretary under this section.

(2) CONTENT; INCORPORATION INTO MANUAL.—The revised guidelines shall—

(A) provide a practical process for approving regional or watershed variances from the national guidelines, reflecting due consideration of measures to maximize public safety benefits with limited resources, levee performance, regional climatic and hydrologic variations, environmental quality, implementation challenges, and allocation of responsibilities; and

(B) be incorporated into the manual proposed under section 5(c) of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes'', approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(c)).

(e) CONTINUATION OF WORK.—Concurrent with completion of the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall proceed without interruption or delay with those ongoing or programmed projects and studies, or elements of projects or studies, that are not directly related to vegetation variance policy.

SEC. 126. REDUCTION OF FEDERAL COSTS.

Section 204(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) REDUCING COSTS.—To reduce or avoid Federal costs, the Secretary shall consider the beneficial use of dredged material in a manner that contributes to the maintenance of sediment resources in the nearby coastal system.''.

SEC. 127. ADVANCED MODELING TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall encourage and incorporate advanced modeling technologies, including 3-dimensional digital modeling, for activities related to water resources development projects and studies.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary, to the greatest extent practicable, shall—

(1) compile information related to advanced modeling technologies, including industry best practices with respect to the use of the technologies;

(2) disseminate to non-Federal interests the information described in paragraph (1); and

(3) promote the use of advanced modeling technologies.

(c) ADVANCED MODELING TECHNOLOGY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''advanced modeling technology'' means an available or developing technology, including 3-dimensional digital modeling, that can expedite project delivery for or improve the evaluation of water resources development projects that receive Federal funding by—

(1) accelerating and improving the environmental review process;

(2) increasing effective public participation;

(3) enhancing the detail and accuracy of project designs;

(4) increasing safety;

(5) accelerating construction and reducing construction costs; or

(6) otherwise achieving such purposes.

SEC. 128. ENHANCED USE OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE IN FEDERAL PROCUREMENT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the Secretary's actions to carry out section 2301 of title 41, United States Code, regarding the use of electronic commerce in Federal procurement.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the 2 fiscal years most recently ended before the fiscal year in which the report is submitted—

(1) an identification of the number, type, and dollar value of procurement solicitations with respect to which the public was permitted to respond to the solicitation electronically, which shall differentiate between solicitations that allowed full or partial electronic submission;

(2) an analysis of the information provided under paragraph (1) and actions that could be taken by the Secretary to refine and improve the use of electronic submission for procurement solicitation responses;

(3) an analysis of the potential benefits of and obstacles to implementing fuller use of electronic submission for procurement solicitation responses, including with respect to cost savings, error reduction, paperwork reduction, increased bidder participation, and competition, and expanded use of electronic bid data collection for cost-effective contract management and timely reporting; and

(4) an analysis of the options and technologies available to facilitate expanded implementation of electronic submission for procurement solicitation responses and the suitability of each option and technology for contracts of various types and sizes.

SEC. 129. CORROSION PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall encourage and incorporate corrosion prevention activities at water resources development projects.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary, to the greatest extent practicable, shall ensure that contractors performing work for water resources development projects—

(1) use best practices to carry out corrosion prevention activities in the field;

(2) use industry recognized standards and corrosion mitigation and prevention methods when—

(A) determining protective coatings;

(B) selecting materials; and

(C) determining methods of cathodic protection, design, and engineering for corrosion prevention;

(3) use certified coating application specialists and cathodic protection technicians and engineers;

(4) use best practices in environmental protection to prevent environmental degradation, and to ensure careful handling of all hazardous materials;

(5) demonstrate a history of employing industry-certified inspectors to ensure adherence to best practices and standards; and

(6) demonstrate a history of compliance with applicable requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

(c) CORROSION PREVENTION ACTIVITIES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''corrosion prevention activities'' means—

(1) the application and inspection of protective coatings for complex work involving steel and cementitious structures, including structures that will be exposed in immersion;

(2) the installation, testing, and inspection of cathodic protection systems; and

(3) any other activities related to corrosion prevention the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 130. RESILIENT CONSTRUCTION AND USE OF INNOVATIVE MATERIALS.

The Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall encourage the use of durable, resilient, and sustainable materials and practices, including the use of geosynthetic materials, advanced composites, and innovative technologies, in carrying out the activities of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 131. ASSESSMENT OF WATER SUPPLY IN ARID REGIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the management practices, priorities, and authorized purposes at Corps of Engineers reservoirs in arid regions to determine the effects of such practices, priorities, and purposes on water supply during periods of drought.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the assessment.

SEC. 132. RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS.

Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1201) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REPORT.—After each fiscal year, if the Secretary did not allocate funds in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary, in conjunction with the President's next submission to Congress of a budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

''(1) the reasons why the Secretary did not allocate funds in accordance with subsection (b) during that fiscal year; and

''(2) the impact, on the jurisdiction of each Commission specified in subsection (b), of not allocating the funds, including with respect to—

''(A) water supply allocation;

''(B) water quality protection;

''(C) regulatory review and permitting;

''(D) water conservation;

''(E) watershed planning;

''(F) drought management;

''(G) flood loss reduction;

''(H) recreation; and

''(I) energy development.''.

SEC. 133. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BILLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Between 1986 and 2000, a water resources development bill was typically enacted every 2 years.

(2) Since 2000, only 1 water resources development bill has been enacted.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, because the missions of the Corps of Engineers are unique and benefit all individuals in the United States and because water resources development projects are critical to

maintaining economic prosperity, national security, and environmental protection, Congress should consider a water resources development bill not less than once every Congress.

SEC. 134. DONALD G. WALDON LOCK AND DAM.

It is the sense of Congress that, at an appropriate time and in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, to recognize the contributions of Donald G. Waldon, whose selfless determination and tireless work, while serving as administrator of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway for 21 years, contributed greatly to the realization and success of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Compact, that the lock and dam located at mile 357.5 on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway should be known and designated as the ''Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam''.

SEC. 135. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES.

Section 104(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(a)) is amended by inserting ''and aquatic invasive species'' after ''noxious aquatic plant growths''.

SEC. 136. RECREATIONAL ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not prohibit the use of a floating cabin on waters under the jurisdiction of the Secretary if—

(1) the floating cabin is in compliance regulations for recreational vessels issued under chapter 43 of title 46, United States Code, and section 312 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1322); and

(2) the Secretary has authorized the use of recreational vessels on such waters.

(b) FLOATING CABIN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''floating cabin'' means a vessel, as defined in section 3 of title 1, United States Code, with overnight accommodations.

SEC. 137. TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary shall waive'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall waive''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall adjust the dollar amount specified in subsection (a) for inflation for the period beginning on November 17, 1986, and ending on the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

SEC. 138. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING INTERSTATE WATER AGREEMENTS AND COMPACTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) States and local interests have primary responsibility for developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes.

(2) The Federal Government cooperates with States and local interests in developing water supplies through the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal water resources development projects.

(3) Interstate water disputes are most properly addressed through interstate water agreements or compacts that take into consideration the concerns of all affected States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the Secretary should urge States to reach agreement on interstate water agreements and compacts;

(2) at the request of the Governor of a State, the Secretary should facilitate and assist in the development of an interstate water agreement or compact;

(3) Congress should provide prompt consideration of interstate water agreements and compacts; and

(4) the Secretary should adopt policies and implement procedures for the operation of reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers that are consistent with interstate water agreements and compacts.

TITLE II—NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Subtitle A—Ports

SEC. 201. EXPANDED USE OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year in which target appropriations described in subsection (b) are met, the Secretary may use up to 5 percent of the total amount made available to the Secretary from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for the eligible operations and maintenance costs described in section 210(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)) for that fiscal year for expanded uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(b) TARGET APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of this section, target appropriations are met for a fiscal year if the total amount made available to the Secretary from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for that fiscal year equals or exceeds, as determined by the Secretary, the following:

(1) For fiscal year 2014, 65 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2013.

(2) For fiscal year 2015, 67 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2014.

(3) For fiscal year 2016, 69 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2015.

(4) For fiscal year 2017, 71 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2016.

(5) For fiscal year 2018, 73 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2017.

(6) For fiscal year 2019, 75 percent of the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in fiscal year 2018.

(7) For fiscal year 2020, and each fiscal year thereafter, 80 percent of total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received in the previous fiscal year.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ELIGIBLE HARBORS AND INLAND HARBORS DEFINED.—The term ''eligible harbor or inland harbor'' means a harbor or inland harbor that, historically, as determined by the Secretary—

(A) generates an amount of harbor maintenance taxes; that exceeds

(B) the value of work carried out for the harbor or inland harbor using amounts from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(2) EXPANDED USES.—The term ''expanded uses'' means the following activities performed for an eligible harbor or inland harbor:

(A) The maintenance dredging of a berth in a harbor that is accessible to a Federal navigation project and that benefits commercial navigation at the harbor.

(B) The maintenance dredging and disposal of legacy-contaminated sediment, and sediment unsuitable for open water disposal, if—

(i) such dredging and disposal benefits commercial navigation at the harbor; and

(ii) such sediment—

(I) is located in and affects the maintenance of a Federal navigation project; or

(II) is located in a berth that is accessible to a Federal navigation project.

(3) TOTAL AMOUNT OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TAXES RECEIVED.—The term ''total amount of harbor maintenance taxes received'' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the aggregate of amounts appropriated, transferred, or credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund under section 9505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for that fiscal year as set forth in the current year estimate provided in the President's budget request for the subsequent fiscal year, submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9505(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''(as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996)''.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any increase in harbor maintenance programs described in this section shall result from an overall increase in appropriations for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers and not from similar reductions in the appropriations for other programs, projects, and activities carried out by the Corps of Engineers for other authorized purposes.

SEC. 202. ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITIZATION OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) ASSESSMENT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2).

''(2) TYPES OF HARBORS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the harbors used for—

''(A) commercial navigation;

''(B) commercial fishing;

''(C) subsistence, including utilization by Indian tribes (as such term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)) for subsistence and ceremonial purposes;

''(D) use as a harbor of refuge;

''(E) transportation of persons;

''(F) purposes relating to domestic energy production, including the fabrication, servicing, or supply of domestic offshore energy production facilities;

''(G) activities of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating;

''(H) public health and safety related equipment for responding to coastal and inland emergencies;

''(I) recreation purposes; and

''(J) any other authorized purpose.

''(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—For fiscal year 2015, and biennially thereafter, in conjunction with the President's annual budget submission to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that, with respect to harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2)—

''(A) identifies the operation and maintenance costs associated with the harbors, including those costs required to achieve and maintain the authorized length, width, and depth for the harbors, on a project-by-project basis;

''(B) identifies the amount of funding requested in the President's budget for the operation and maintenance costs associated with the harbors, on a project-by-project basis;

''(C) identifies the unmet operation and maintenance needs associated with the harbors, on a project-by-project basis; and

''(D) identifies the harbors for which the President will allocate funding over the next 5 fiscal years for operation and maintenance activities, on a project-by-project basis, including the amounts to be allocated for such purposes.''.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EMERGING HARBOR PROJECTS.—Section 210 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2238) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EMERGING HARBOR PROJECTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall make expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of the harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2), including expenditures of funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, based on an equitable allocation of funds among all such harbors, regardless of the size or tonnage throughput of the harbor.

''(2) CRITERIA.—In determining the equitable allocation of funds under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) utilize the information obtained in the assessment conducted under subsection (c);

''(B) consider the national and regional significance of harbor operation and maintenance; and

''(C) not make such allocation based solely on the tonnage transiting through a harbor.

''(3) EMERGING HARBORS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in making expenditures described in paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the Secretary shall allocate not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of emerging harbors.

''(B) EMERGING HARBOR DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'emerging harbor' means a harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) that transits less than 1,000,000 tons of commerce annually.

''(4) EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the Secretary from making an expenditure to pay for the operation and maintenance costs of a specific harbor, including the transfer of funding from the operation and maintenance of a separate project, if—

''(A) the Secretary determines that the action is necessary to address the navigation needs of a harbor where safe navigation has been severely restricted due to an unforeseen event; and

''(B) the Secretary provides advance notice and information on the need for the action to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

''(5) MANAGEMENT OF GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM.—To sustain effective and efficient operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes Navigation System, including any navigation feature in the Great Lakes that is a Federal responsibility with respect to operation and maintenance, the Secretary shall manage and allocate funding for all of the individually authorized projects in the Great Lakes Navigation System as components of a single, comprehensive system, recognizing the interdependence of the projects.''.

SEC. 203. PRESERVING UNITED STATES HARBORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with a non-Federal interest, at the request of the non-Federal interest, under which the Secretary agrees to maintain a navigation project for a harbor or inland harbor (in this section referred to as a ''federally authorized harbor'') in accordance with section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)).

(b) REPORT BY NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to enter into an agreement under subsection (a) with respect to a federally authorized harbor, a non-Federal interest shall submit to the Secretary a report justifying economic investment in maintenance of the harbor.

(2) JUSTIFICATION OF INVESTMENT.—A report submitted under paragraph (1) may justify economic investment in the maintenance of a federally authorized harbor based on—

(A) projected economic benefits, including transportation savings and job creation; and

(B) other factors, including navigation safety, national security, and sustainability of subsistence harbors.

(3) TERMINATION OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—An agreement entered into under subsection (a) with respect to a federally authorized harbor shall contain terms to allow the Secretary to terminate the agreement if the Secretary determines that Federal economic investment in maintaining the harbor is no longer justified.

(c) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preclude the operation and maintenance of a federally authorized harbor under section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)).

SEC. 204. CONSOLIDATION OF DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION EXPERTISE.

Section 2033(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2282a(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION PLANNING CENTER OF EXPERTISE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consolidate deep draft navigation expertise within the Corps of Engineers into a deep draft navigation planning center of expertise.

''(B) LIST.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the consolidation required under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a list of personnel, including the grade levels and expertise of the personnel, assigned to the center described in subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 205. DISPOSAL SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with subsections (b) and (c) and with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, is authorized to reopen the Cape Arundel Disposal Site (in this section referred to as the ''Site'') as an alternative dredged material disposal site under section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)).

(b) DEADLINE.—The Site may remain open under subsection (a) until the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Site does not have any remaining disposal capacity;

(2) the date on which an environmental impact statement designating an alternative dredged material disposal site for southern Maine has been completed; or

(3) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site under subsection (a) shall be subject to the conditions that—

(1) conditions at the Site remain suitable for the continued use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site; and

(2) the Site not be used for the disposal of more than 80,000 cubic yards from any single dredging project.

Subtitle B—Inland Waterways

SEC. 211. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND.—The term ''Inland Waterways Trust Fund'' means the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) QUALIFYING PROJECT.—The term ''qualifying project'' means any construction or major rehabilitation project for navigation infrastructure of the inland and intracoastal waterways that is—

(A) authorized before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) not completed on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) funded at least in part from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

SEC. 212. PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS REFORMS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFYING PROJECTS.—With respect to each qualifying project, the Secretary shall require—

(1) for each project manager, that—

(A) the project manager have formal project management training and certification; and

(B) the project manager be assigned from among personnel certified by the Chief of Engineers; and

(2) for an applicable cost estimation, that—

(A) the Secretary utilize a risk-based cost estimate with a confidence level of at least 80 percent; and

(B) the cost estimate be implemented—

(i) for a qualifying project that requires an increase in the authorized amount in accordance with section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), during the preparation of a post-authorization change report or other similar decision document;

(ii) for a qualifying project for which the first construction contract has not been awarded, prior to the award of the first construction contract;

(iii) for a qualifying project without a completed feasibility report in accordance with section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), prior to the completion of such a report; and

(iv) for a qualifying project with a completed feasibility report in accordance with section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) that has not yet been authorized, during design for the qualifying project.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROJECT DELIVERY PROCESS REFORMS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) establish a system to identify and apply on a continuing basis best management practices from prior or ongoing qualifying projects to improve the likelihood of on-time and on-budget completion of qualifying projects;

(2) evaluate early contractor involvement acquisition procedures to improve on-time and on-budget project delivery performance; and

(3) implement any additional measures that the Secretary determines will achieve the purposes of this subtitle, including—

(A) the implementation of applicable practices and procedures developed pursuant to management by the Secretary of an applicable military construction program;

(B) the development and use of a portfolio of standard designs for inland navigation locks;

(C) the use of full-funding contracts or formulation of a revised continuing contracts clause; and

(D) the establishment of procedures for recommending new project construction starts using a capital projects business model.

(c) PILOT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may carry out pilot projects to evaluate processes and procedures for the study, design, and construction of qualifying projects.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—At a minimum, the Secretary shall carry out pilot projects under this subsection to evaluate—

(A) early contractor involvement in the development of features and components;

(B) an appropriate use of continuing contracts for the construction of features and components; and

(C) applicable principles, procedures, and processes used for military construction projects.

(d) INLAND WATERWAYS USER BOARD.—Section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) DUTIES OF USERS BOARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Users Board shall meet not less frequently than semiannually to develop and make recommendations to the Secretary and Congress regarding the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

''(2) ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—For commercial navigation features and components of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States, the Users Board shall provide—

''(A) prior to the development of the budget proposal of the President for a given fiscal year, advice and recommendations to the Secretary regarding construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels;

''(B) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding any completed feasibility report in accordance with section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) relating to those features and components;

''(C) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding an increase in the authorized cost of those features and components;

''(D) not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of the budget proposal of the President to Congress, advice and recommendations to Congress regarding construction and rehabilitation priorities and spending levels; and

''(E) advice and recommendations on the development of a long-term capital investment program in accordance with subsection (d).

''(3) PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAMS.—The chairperson of the Users Board shall appoint a representative of the Users Board to serve as an informal advisor to the project development team for a qualifying project or the study or design of a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

''(4) INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.—Any advice or recommendation made by the Users Board to the Secretary shall reflect the independent judgment of the Users Board.'';

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) DUTIES OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) communicate not less than once each quarter to the Users Board the status of the study, design, or construction of all commercial navigation features or components of the inland waterways or inland harbors of the United States; and

''(2) submit to the Users Board a courtesy copy of all completed feasibility reports relating to a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways or inland harbors of the United States.

''(d) CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, in coordination with the Users Board, shall develop and submit to Congress a report describing a 20-year program for making capital investments on the inland and intracoastal waterways based on the application of objective, national project selection prioritization criteria.

''(2) CONSIDERATION.—In developing the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the 20-year capital investment strategy contained in the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report published on April 13, 2010, as approved by the Users Board.

''(3) CRITERIA.—In developing the plan and prioritization criteria under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that investments made under the 20-year program described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) are made in all geographical areas of the inland waterways system; and

''(B) ensure efficient funding of inland waterways projects.

''(4) STRATEGIC REVIEW AND UPDATE.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Users Board, shall—

''(A) submit to Congress a strategic review of the 20-year program in effect under this subsection, which shall identify and explain any changes to the project-specific recommendations contained in the previous 20-year program (including any changes to the prioritization criteria used to develop the updated recommendations); and

''(B) make revisions to the program, as appropriate.

''(e) PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The chairperson of the Users Board and the project development team member appointed by the chairperson under subsection (b)(3) may sign the project management plan for the qualifying project or the study or design of a commercial navigation feature or component of the inland waterways and inland harbors of the United States.

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—The Users Board shall be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, other than section 14, and, with the consent of the appropriate agency head, the Users Board may use the facilities and services of any Federal agency. For the purposes of complying with such Act, the members of the Users Board shall not be considered special Government employees (as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code). Non-Federal members of the Users Board while engaged in the performance of their duties away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.''.

SEC. 213. EFFICIENCY OF REVENUE COLLECTION.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a report on the efficiency of collecting the fuel tax for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which shall include—

(1) an evaluation of whether current methods of collection of the fuel tax result in full compliance with requirements of the law;

(2) whether alternative methods of collection would result in increased revenues into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund; and

(3) an evaluation of alternative collection options.

SEC. 214. INLAND WATERWAYS REVENUE STUDIES.

(a) INLAND WATERWAYS CONSTRUCTION BONDS STUDY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall conduct a study on the feasibility of authorizing the issuance of federally tax-exempt bonds secured against the available proceeds, including projected annual receipts, in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) CONTENTS.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall examine the implications of issuing such bonds, including the potential revenues that could be generated and the projected net cost to the Treasury, including loss of potential revenue.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury, at a minimum, shall consult with—

(A) representatives of the Inland Waterway Users Board established by section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251);

(B) representatives of the commodities and bulk cargos that are currently shipped for commercial purposes on the segments of the inland and intracoastal waterways listed in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804);

(C) representatives of other users of locks and dams on the inland and intracoastal waterways, including persons owning, operating, using, or otherwise benefitting from—

(i) hydropower generation facilities;

(ii) electric utilities that rely on the waterways for cooling of existing electricity generation facilities;

(iii) municipal and industrial water supply;

(iv) recreation;

(v) irrigation water supply; or

(vi) flood damage reduction;

(D) other stakeholders associated with the inland and intracoastal waterways, as identified by the Secretary or the Secretary of the Treasury; and

(E) the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a joint report on the results of the study to—

(A) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(b) POTENTIAL FEES FOR BENEFICIARIES AND USERS OF INLAND AND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on potential user fees and revenues from other sources that could be collected to generate additional revenues for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) SCOPE OF STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall evaluate an array of potential user fees and other revenues options that, when combined with funds generated by section 4042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, are sufficient to support one-half of annual construction expenditure levels of $380,000,000 for the authorized purposes of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(B) POTENTIAL REVENUE OPTIONS FOR STUDY.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary, at a minimum, shall evaluate potential user fees and other revenue options identified in—

(i) the report of the Congressional Budget Office entitled ''Paying for Highways, Airways, and Waterways: How Can Users Be Charged?'', dated May 1, 1992;

(ii) the draft bill submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to Congress entitled the ''Lock User Fee Act of 2008'', dated April 4, 2008;

(iii) the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report, published on April 12, 2010, as approved by the Inland Waterways Users Board established by section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251); and

(iv) the draft bill submitted by the President to Congress entitled the ''Inland Waterways Capital Investment Act of 2011'', dated September 2011.

(3) CONDUCT OF STUDY.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(A) take into consideration whether the potential user fees and revenues from other sources—

(i) are equitably associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of inland and intracoastal waterway infrastructure, including locks, dams, and navigation channels; and

(ii) can be efficiently collected;

(B) consult with, at a minimum—

(i) representatives of the Inland Waterways Users Board; and

(ii) representatives of other nonnavigation beneficiaries of inland and intracoastal waterway infrastructure, including persons benefitting from—

(I) municipal water supply;

(II) hydropower;

(III) recreation;

(IV) industrial water supply;

(V) flood damage reduction;

(VI) agricultural water supply;

(VII) environmental restoration;

(VIII) local and regional economic development; or

(IX) local real estate interests; and

(iii) representatives of other interests, as identified by the Secretary; and

(C) provide the opportunity for public hearings in each of the geographic regions that contain segments of the inland and intracoastal

waterways listed in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of the study to—

(A) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 215. INLAND WATERWAYS STAKEHOLDER ROUNDTABLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an inland waterways stakeholder roundtable to provide for a review and evaluation of alternative approaches—

(1) to address the financial needs of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund; and

(2) to support the water infrastructure needs of the Inland Waterways System.

(b) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required by section 214(b), the Secretary shall select individuals to be invited to participate in the stakeholder roundtable.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The individuals selected under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) representatives of affected shippers and suppliers;

(B) representatives of State and Federal water managers; and

(C) other interested persons with direct knowledge of the Inland Waterways System.

(c) FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA.—The Secretary shall work with a group of the individuals selected under subsection (b) to develop the framework and agenda for the stakeholder roundtable.

(d) CONDUCT OF STAKEHOLDER ROUNDTABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required by section 214(b), the Secretary shall conduct the stakeholder roundtable.

(2) ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED.—The stakeholder roundtable shall provide for the review and evaluation described in subsection (a) and shall include the following:

(A) An evaluation of alternatives that have been developed to address funding options for the Inland Waterways System.

(B) An evaluation of the funding status of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(C) Prioritization of the ongoing and projected water infrastructure needs of the Inland Waterways System.

(D) Identification of a process forward for meeting such needs, with timeline for addressing the funding challenges for the inland waterways trust system.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required by section 214(b), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(1) a summary the stakeholder roundtable, including areas of concurrence on funding approaches and areas or disagreement in meeting funding needs; and

(2) recommendations developed by the Secretary for logical next steps to address the issues discussed at the stakeholder roundtable.

SEC. 216. PRESERVING THE INLAND WATERWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) OLMSTED PROJECT REFORM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212(a)), for each fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, 25 percent of the cost of construction for the Olmsted Project shall be paid from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection the term ''Olmsted Project'' means the project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013).

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the appropriation for the Olmsted project should be not less than $150,000,000 for each fiscal year until construction of the project is completed.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate regarding the lessons learned from the experience of planning and constructing the Olmsted Project and how such lessons might apply to future inland waterway studies and projects.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRESS AND COSTS.—For any inland waterways project that the Secretary carries out that has an estimated total cost of $500,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional committees referred to in subsection (a)(4) an annual financial plan for the project. The plan shall be based on detailed annual estimates of the cost to complete the remaining elements of the project and on reasonable assumptions, as determined by the Secretary, of any future increases of the cost to complete the project.

SEC. 217. PUBLIC COMMENT ON LOCK OPERATIONS.

At least 90 days before carrying out a proposed modification to the operation of a lock at a project for navigation on the inland waterways, the Secretary shall—

(1) provide notice of the proposed modification in the Federal Register; and

(2) accept public comments on the proposed modification.

SEC. 218. ASSESSMENT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS OF THE ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY AND THE GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

(b) TYPES OF ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall assess the operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway as used for the following purposes:

(1) Commercial navigation.

(2) Commercial fishing.

(3) Subsistence, including utilization by Indian tribes (as such term is defined by section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)) for subsistence and ceremonial purposes.

(4) Use as ingress and egress to harbors of refuge.

(5) Transportation of persons.

(6) Purposes relating to domestic energy production, including fabrication, servicing, and supply of domestic offshore energy production facilities.

(7) Activities of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

(8) Public health and safety related equipment for responding to coastal and inland emergencies.

(9) Recreation purposes.

(10) Any other authorized purpose.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—For fiscal year 2015, and biennially thereafter, in conjunction with the President's annual budget submission to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that, with respect to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway—

(1) identifies the operation and maintenance costs required to achieve the authorized length, width, and depth;

(2) identifies the amount of funding requested in the President's budget for operation and maintenance costs; and

(3) identifies the unmet operation and maintenance needs of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

SEC. 219. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

(a) ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the impact of closing the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam on the economy and the environment, including an assessment of the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam during the preceding 5 years.

(b) MANDATORY CLOSURE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if the Secretary determines pursuant to the study conducted under subsection (a), or based on other appropriate information made available to the Secretary, that the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam during the preceding 5 years was not more than 1,500,000 tons.

(c) EMERGENCY OPERATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent the Secretary from carrying out emergency lock operations necessary to mitigate flood damage.

(d) UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam'' means the lock and dam located on Mississippi River Mile 853.9 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

SEC. 220. CORPS OF ENGINEERS LOCK AND DAM ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

Section 1117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4236) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1117. W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma may—

''(1) design and construct one or more hydroelectric generating facilities at the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam on the Arkansas River, Oklahoma; and

''(2) market the electricity generated from any such facility.

''(b) PRECONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) PERMITS.—Before the date on which construction of a hydroelectric generating facility begins under subsection (a), the Cherokee Nation shall obtain any permit required under Federal or State law, except that the Cherokee Nation shall be exempt from licensing requirements that may otherwise apply to construction, operation, or maintenance of the facility under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.).

''(2) REVIEW OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.—The Cherokee Nation may initiate the design or construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a) only after the Secretary reviews and approves the plans and specifications for the design and construction.

''(c) PAYMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept funds offered by the Cherokee Nation and use such funds to carry out the design and construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

''(2) ALLOCATION OF COSTS.—The Cherokee Nation shall—

''(A) bear all costs associated with the design and construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a); and

''(B) provide any funds necessary for the design and construction to the Secretary prior to the Secretary initiating any activities related to the design and construction.

''(d) ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY.—The Cherokee Nation shall—

''(1) hold all title to a hydroelectric generating facility constructed under subsection (a) and may, subject to the approval of the Secretary, assign such title to a third party;

''(2) be solely responsible for—

''(A) the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of the facility; and

''(B) the marketing of the electricity generated by the facility; and

''(3) release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities that may arise out of any activity undertaken to carry out this section.

''(e) ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—The Secretary may provide technical and construction management assistance requested by the Cherokee Nation relating to the design and construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

''(f) THIRD PARTY AGREEMENTS.—The Cherokee Nation may enter into agreements with the Secretary or a third party that the Cherokee Nation or the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out this section.''.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND BACKLOG PREVENTION

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to identify $12,000,000,000 in water resources development projects authorized by Congress that are no longer viable for construction due to—

(A) a lack of local support;

(B) a lack of available Federal or non-Federal resources; or

(C) an authorizing purpose that is no longer relevant or feasible;

(2) to create an expedited and definitive process to deauthorize water resources development projects that are no longer viable for construction; and

(3) to allow the continued authorization of water resources development projects that are viable for construction.

(b) DEAUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BEFORE WRDA 2007.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and shall publish in the Federal Register, a report that lists each authorized water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction before November 8, 2007—

(A) for which—

(i) construction was not initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) construction was initiated before the date of enactment of this Act, but for which no funds, Federal or non-Federal, were obligated for construction of the project or separable element during the 5-year period ending on July 1, 2013; and

(B) that is identified in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR ONGOING CONSTRUCTION.—A project or separable element shall not be listed pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(ii) if the project or separable element is being constructed as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall identify in the report submitted under paragraph (1) projects and separable elements that—

(i) meet the requirements described in subparagraph (A) of that paragraph; and

(ii) in the aggregate have an estimated Federal cost to complete (as of the date of the report) that is at least $12,000,000,000.

(B) SEQUENCING OF PROJECTS.—In identifying projects and separable elements under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall identify projects and separable elements according to the order in which the projects and separable elements were authorized, beginning with the earliest authorized projects and separable elements and ending upon the aggregate estimated Federal cost to complete for the projects and separable elements identified satisfying the requirement under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(4) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD; DEAUTHORIZATION.—After the expiration of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the report under this subsection, any project or separable element identified in that report is hereby deauthorized, unless during such period the non-Federal interest for the project or separable element provides, under Federal law, all funds necessary to complete the project or separable element.

(c) TREATMENT OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—For purposes of this section, if an authorized water resources development project or separable element has been modified in an Act of Congress, the date of the authorization of the project or separable element shall be deemed to be the date of the most recent such modification.

SEC. 302. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

(a) ASSESSMENT AND INVENTORY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of all properties under the control of the Corps of Engineers and develop an inventory of the properties that are not needed for the missions of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) CRITERIA.—In conducting the assessment and developing the inventory under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use the following criteria:

(1) The extent to which the property aligns with the current missions of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) The economic impact of the property on existing communities in the vicinity of the property.

(3) The extent to which the utilization rate for the property is being maximized and is consistent with nongovernmental industry standards for the given function or operation.

(4) The extent to which the reduction or elimination of the property could reduce operation and maintenance costs of the Corps of Engineers.

(5) The extent to which the reduction or elimination of the property could reduce energy consumption by the Corps of Engineers.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—As soon as practicable following completion of the inventory of properties under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide the inventory to the Administrator of General Services.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the notification under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the findings of the Secretary with respect to the assessment and inventory required under subsection (a).

SEC. 303. BACKLOG PREVENTION.

(a) PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A water resources development project, or separable element of such a project, authorized for construction by this Act shall not be authorized after the last day of the 7-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act unless during that period funds have been obligated for construction of such project.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.—Not later than 60 days after the expiration of the 7-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that identifies the projects deauthorized under paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the expiration of the 12-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) a list of any water resources development projects authorized by this Act for which construction has not been completed during that period;

(2) a description of the reasons the projects were not completed; and

(3) a schedule for the completion of the projects based on expected levels of appropriations.

SEC. 304. DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) WALNUT CREEK (PACHECO CREEK), CALIFORNIA.—The portions of the project for flood protection on Walnut Creek, California, constructed under section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 488), consisting of the Walnut Creek project from Sta 0+00 to Sta 142+00 and the upstream extent of the Walnut Creek project along Pacheco Creek from Sta 0+00 to Sta 73+50.

(2) WALNUT CREEK (SAN RAMON CREEK), CALIFORNIA.—The portion of the project for flood protection on Walnut Creek, California, constructed under section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 488), consisting of the culvert constructed by the Department of the Army on San Ramon Creek from Sta 4+27 to Sta 14+27.

(3) HILLSBOROUGH (HILLSBORO) BAY AND RIVER, FLORIDA.—Those portions of the project for navigation, Hillsborough (Hillsboro) Bay and River, Florida, authorized by the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1126; chapter 425), that extend on either side of the Hillsborough River from the Kennedy Boulevard bridge to the mouth of the river that cause the existing channel to exceed 100 feet in width.

(4) KAHULUI WASTEWATER RECLAMATION FACILITY, MAUI, HAWAII.—The project carried out pursuant to the authority provided by section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) to provide shoreline protection for the Kahului Wastewater Reclamation Facility, located on the Island of Maui in the State of Hawaii.

(5) CHICAGO HARBOR, ILLINOIS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Chicago Harbor, Illinois, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1129; chapter 425), and the first section of the Act of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1283; chapter 95), and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at the southwest corner of Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago sluice gate that abuts the north wall of the Chicago River Lock.

(B) Thence running north for approximately 290 feet.

(C) Thence running east approximately 1,000 feet.

(D) Thence running south approximately 290 feet.

(E) Thence running west approximately 1,000 feet to the point of origin.

(6) LUCAS-BERG PIT, ILLINOIS WATERWAY AND GRANT CALUMET RIVER, ILLINOIS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Illinois Waterway and Grand Calumet River, Illinois, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes'', approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 636; chapter 596), that consists of the Lucas-Berg Pit confined disposal facility, Illinois.

(7) ROCKLAND HARBOR, MAINE.—The portion of the project for navigation, Rockland Harbor,

Maine, authorized by the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 202), and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at the point in the 14-foot turning basin limit with coordinates N162,927.61, E826,210.16.

(B) Thence running north 45 degrees 45 minutes 15.6 seconds east 287.45 feet to a point N163,128.18, E826,416.08.

(C) Thence running south 13 degrees 17 minutes 53.3 seconds east 129.11 feet to a point N163,002.53, E826,445.77.

(D) Thence running south 45 degrees 45 minutes 18.4 seconds west 221.05 feet to a point N162,848.30, E826,287.42.

(E) Thence running north 44 degrees 14 minutes 59.5 seconds west 110.73 feet to the point of origin.

(8) CORSICA RIVER, QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—The portion of the project for improving the Corsica River, Maryland, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved July 25, 1912 (37 Stat. 205), and described as follows: Approximately 2,000 feet of the eastern section of the project channel extending from—

(A) centerline station 0+000 (coordinates N506350.60, E1575013.60); to

(B) station 2+000 (coordinates N508012.39, E1574720.18).

(9) GLOUCESTER HARBOR AND ANNISQUAM RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portions of the project for navigation, Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Massachusetts, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 12; chapter 19), consisting of an 8-foot anchorage area in Lobster Cove, and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at a bend along the easterly limit of the existing project, N3063230.31, E878283.77, thence running northwesterly about 339 feet to a point, N3063478.86, E878053.83, thence running northwesterly about 281 feet to a bend on the easterly limit of the existing project, N3063731.88, E877932.54, thence running southeasterly about 612 feet along the easterly limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(B) Beginning at a bend along the easterly limit of the existing project, N3064065.80, E878031.45, thence running northwesterly about 621 feet to a point, N3064687.05, E878031.13, thence running southwesterly about 122 feet to a point, N3064686.98, E877908.85, thence running southeasterly about 624 feet to a point, N3064063.31, E877909.17, thence running southwesterly about 512 feet to a point, N3063684.73, E877564.56, thence running about 741 feet to a point along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3063273.98, E876947.77, thence running northeasterly about 533 feet to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3063585.62, E877380.63, thence running about 147 feet northeasterly to a bend along the westerly limit of the project, N3063671.29, E877499.63, thence running northeasterly about 233 feet to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3063840.60, E877660.29, thence running about 339 feet northeasterly to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3064120.34, E877852.55, thence running about 573 feet to a bend along the westerly limit of the existing project, N3064692.98, E877865.04, thence running about 113 feet to a bend along the northerly limit of the existing project, N3064739.51, E877968.31, thence running 145 feet southeasterly to a bend along the northerly limit of the existing project, N3064711.19, E878110.69, thence running about 650 feet along the easterly limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(10) IPSWICH RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Ipswich River, Massachusetts, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 5, 1886 (24 Stat. 317, chapter 929) consisting of a 4-foot channel located at the entrance to the inner harbor at Ipswich Harbor, and described as follows:

(A) Lying northwesterly of a line commencing at N3,074,938.09, E837,154.87.

(B) Thence running easterly approximately 60 feet to a point with coordinates N3,074,972.62, E837,203.93.

(11) EAST FORK OF TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS.—The portion of the project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), that consists of the 2 levees identified as Kaufman County Levees K5E and K5W.

(12) BURNHAM CANAL, WISCONSIN.—The portion of the project for navigation, Milwaukee Harbor Project, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, known as the Burnham Canal, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act for the protection of commerce on Lake Michigan'', approved March 3, 1843 (5 Stat. 619; chapter 85), and described as follows:

(A) Beginning at channel point #415a N381768.648, E2524554.836, a distance of about 170.58 feet.

(B) Thence running south 53 degrees 43 minutes 41 seconds west to channel point #417 N381667.728, E2524417.311, a distance of about 35.01 feet.

(C) Thence running south 34 degrees 10 minutes 40 seconds west to channel point #501 N381638.761, E2524397.639, a distance of about 139.25 feet.

(D) Thence running south 34 degrees 10 minutes 48 seconds west to channel point #503 N381523.557, E2524319.406, a distance of about 235.98 feet.

(E) Thence running south 32 degrees 59 minutes 13 seconds west to channel point #505 N381325.615, E2524190.925, a distance of about 431.29 feet.

(F) Thence running south 32 degrees 36 minutes 05 seconds west to channel point #509 N380962.276, E2523958.547, a distance of about 614.52 feet.

(G) Thence running south 89 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds west to channel point #511 N380952.445, E2523344.107, a distance of about 74.68 feet.

(H) Thence running north 89 degrees 04 minutes 59 seconds west to channel point #512 N381027.13, E2523342.91, a distance of about 533.84 feet.

(I) Thence running north 89 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds east to channel point #510 N381035.67, E2523876.69, a distance of about 47.86 feet.

(J) Thence running north 61 degrees 02 minutes 07 seconds east to channel point #508 N381058.84, E2523918.56, a distance of about 308.55 feet.

(K) Thence running north 36 degrees 15 minutes 29 seconds east to channel point #506 N381307.65, E2524101.05, a distance of about 199.98 feet.

(L) Thence running north 32 degrees 59 minutes 12 seconds east to channel point #504 N381475.40, E2524209.93, a distance of about 195.14 feet.

(M) Thence running north 26 degrees 17 minutes 22 seconds east to channel point #502 N381650.36, E2524296.36, a distance of about 81.82 feet.

(N) Thence running north 88 degrees 51 minutes 05 seconds west to channel point #419 N381732.17, E2524294.72, a distance of about 262.65 feet.

(O) Thence running north 82 degrees 01 minutes 02 seconds east to channel point #415a, the point of origin.

(13) MANITOWOC HARBOR, WISCONSIN.—The portion of the project for navigation, Manitowoc River, Manitowoc, Wisconsin, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1852 (10 Stat. 58; chapter 104), and described as follows: The triangular area bound by—

(A) 44.09893383N and 087.66854912W;

(B) 44.09900535N and 087.66864372W; and

(C) 44.09857884N and 087.66913123W.

(b) SEWARD WATERFRONT, SEWARD, ALASKA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the portion of the project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska, identified as Tract H, Seward Original Townsite, Waterfront Park Replat, Plat No 2012–4, Seward Recording District, shall not be subject to navigation servitude beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) ENTRY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The Federal Government may enter upon the property referred to in paragraph (1) to carry out any required operation and maintenance of the general navigation features of the project referred to in paragraph (1).

(c) PORT OF HOOD RIVER, OREGON.—

(1) EXTINGUISHMENT OF PORTIONS OF EXISTING FLOWAGE EASEMENT.—With respect to the properties described in paragraph (2), beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the flowage easement identified as Tract 1200E–6 on the Easement Deed recorded as Instrument No. 740320 is extinguished above elevation 79.39 feet (NGVD 29), the ordinary high water line.

(2) AFFECTED PROPERTIES.—The properties described in this paragraph, as recorded in Hood River County, Oregon, are as follows:

(A) Instrument Number 2010–1235.

(B) Instrument Number 2010–02366.

(C) Instrument Number 2010–02367.

(D) Parcel 2 of Partition Plat 2011–12P.

(E) Parcel 1 of Partition Plat 2005–26P.

(3) EXTINGUISHMENT OF FLOWAGE EASEMENT.—With respect to the properties described in paragraph (2), the flowage easement is extinguished if the elevation of the property is above the standard project flood elevation.

(4) FEDERAL LIABILITIES.—The United States shall not be liable for any injury caused by the extinguishment of the easement under this subsection.

(5) NO EFFECT ON OTHER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subsection affects the remaining rights and interests of the Corps of Engineers for authorized project purposes.

SEC. 305. LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA, ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) LAND EXCHANGE.—On conveyance by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

(A) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 87 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, contained within United States Tracts 413 and 427 and acquired for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas Navigation System.

(B) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means the approximately 34 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, and owned by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa that lie immediately south and east of the Federal land.

(3) SPECIFIC CONDITIONS.—

(A) DEEDS.—

(i) DEED TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary may only accept conveyance of the non-Federal land by warranty deed, as determined acceptable by the Secretary.

(ii) DEED TO FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa by quitclaim deed and subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions the Secretary determines necessary to—

(I) allow the United States to operate and maintain the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System; and

(II) protect the interests of the United States.

(iii) CASH PAYMENT.—If the appraised fair market value of the Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the appraised fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, the Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall make a cash payment to the United States reflecting the difference in the appraised fair market values.

(b) CITY OF ASOTIN, WASHINGTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the city of Asotin, Asotin County, Washington, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3).

(2) REVERSION.—If the land transferred under this subsection ceases at any time to be used for a public purpose, the land shall revert to the United States.

(3) DESCRIPTION.—The land to be conveyed to the city of Asotin, Washington, under this subsection are—

(A) the public ball fields designated as Tracts 1503, 1605, 1607, 1609, 1611, 1613, 1615, 1620, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1626, and 1631; and

(B) other leased areas designated as Tracts 1506, 1522, 1523, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1529, 1530, 1531, and 1563.

(c) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(5) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF FINAL FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

The following final feasibility studies for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plan, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:

(1) NAVIGATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. TX, LA	Sabine Neches Waterway, Southeast Texas and Southwest Louisiana.	July 22, 2011	$779,399,000	$359,227,000
2. FL	Jacksonville Harbor-Milepoint	April 30, 2012	$27,804,000	$9,122,000
3. GA	Savannah Harbor Expansion Project	Aug. 17, 2012	$461,000,000	$201,000,000
4. TX	Freeport Harbor	Jan. 7, 2013	$121,132,000	$116,342,000
5. FL	Canaveral Harbor (Sect 203 Sponsor Report)	Feb. 25, 2013	$28,652,000	$11,588,000

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. KS	Topeka	Aug. 24, 2009	$15,494,000	$8,343,000
2. CA	American River Watershed, Common Features Project, Natomas Basin.	Dec. 30, 2010	$943,300,000	$479,500,000
3. IA	Cedar River, Cedar Rapids	Jan. 27, 2011	$67,216,000	$36,194,000
4. MN, ND	Fargo-Moorhead Metro	Dec. 19, 2011	$801,542,000	$979,806,000
5. KY	Ohio River Shoreline, Paducah	May 16, 2012	$12,893,000	$6,943,000

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Initial Federal Cost and Estimated Total Federal Cost for Life of Project	E. Estimated Initial Non-Federal Cost and Estimated Total Non-Federal Cost for Life of Project
1. NC	West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach).	Sept. 28, 2009	Initial Cost: $30,557,000 Total Cost: $132,372,000	Initial Cost: $17,315,000 Total Cost: $132,372,000
2. NC	Surf City and North Topsail Beach	Dec. 30, 2010	Initial Cost: $81,484,000 Total Cost: $106,182,000	Initial Cost: $43,900,000 Total Cost: $106,182,000
3. CA	San Clemente Shoreline	April 5, 2012	Initial Cost: $7,500,000 Total Cost: $43,400,000	Initial Cost: $4,000,000 Total Cost: $43,400,000

(4) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. MS	Mississippi Coastal Improvement Program (MSCIP) Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties.	Sept. 15, 2009	$815,090,000	$438,890,000

(5) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Federal Cost	E. Estimated Non-Federal Cost
1. MD	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island	Aug. 24, 2009	$1,221,721,000	$657,849,000
2. FL	Central and Southern Florida Project, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Caloosahatchee River (C–43) West Basin Storage Project, Hendry County.	March 11, 2010	$297,189,000	$297,189,000
3. LA	Louisiana Coastal Area	Dec. 30, 2010	$954,452,000	$513,936,000
4. MN	Marsh Lake	Dec. 30, 2011	$6,403,000	$3,564,000
5. FL	Central and Southern Florida Project, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, C–111 Spreader Canal Western Project.	Jan. 30, 2012	$88,992,000	$88,992,000
6. FL	CERP Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetland, Florida	May 2, 2012	$96,209,000	$96,209,000
7. FL	Central and Southern Florida Project, Broward County Water Preserve Area.	May 21, 2012	$433,353,500	$433,353,500
8. LA	Louisiana Coastal Area-Barataria Basin Barrier	June 22, 2012	$283,567,000	$152,690,000
9. NC	Neuse River Basin	April 23, 2013	$23,253,100	$12,520,900

SEC. 402. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) MIAMI HARBOR, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida, authorized by section 1001(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1052), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $152,510,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $92,007,000 and a non-Federal cost of $60,503,000.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on November 8, 2007.

(b) LOWER OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS AND KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $2,300,000,000, with a first Federal cost of $2,300,000,000.

(c) LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), INDIANA.—The project for flood control, Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4115), and modified by section 127 of Public Law 109–103 (119 Stat. 2259), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $269,988,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $202,800,000 and a non-Federal cost of $67,188,000.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–251. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 14, after ''company'' insert ''or natural gas company''.

Page 33, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF REPORTS.

The Secretary shall—

(1) expedite the completion of any on-going feasibility study for a project initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) if the Secretary determines that the project is justified in a completed report, proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project in accordance with section 910 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4189).

Page 42, after line 23, add the following:

(g) SAVING PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any agreement entered into under section 204(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)) before the date of enactment of this Act.

Page 46, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS PRIOR TO AUTHORIZATION OF FINAL FEASIBILITY REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), a non-Federal interest may carry out a project for which—

(1) a final feasibility report has been completed; and

(2) authority for the Secretary to carry out such project has not specifically been authorized by Congress.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The non-Federal interest—

(1) shall, before carrying out the project, obtain any permit, approval, or authorization required pursuant to Federal or State law; and

(2) shall carry out the project in accordance with the plan, and subject to the conditions, described in the final feasibility report.

(c) CREDIT, REIMBURSEMENT, AND FUTURE MAINTENANCE.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY FOR CREDIT OR REIMBURSEMENT.—Subject to paragraph (4), and in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), a non-Federal interest may be eligible for credit or reimbursement for the Federal share of any work carried out by the non-Federal interest under this section.

(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS.—Subject to paragraph (4), and in accordance with section 211(h) of the Water Resources Development of Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(h), whenever a non-Federal interest constructs improvements to a harbor or inland harbor under this section, the Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance of such harbor.

(3) LIMITATION.—Any activities carried out under this section are authorized only to the extent specifically provided for in subsequent appropriations Acts.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall not apply unless—

(A) all laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out the project were applied by the non-Federal interest during construction of the project; and

(B) the project is subsequently specifically authorized by Congress.

(5) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—Absent a specific subsequent authorization by Congress, the non-Federal interest shall not be reimbursed or receive credit for in-kind contributions.

Page 75, after line 12, insert the following:

(3) review and evaluate the historic and potential uses, and economic feasibility for the life of the project, of nonstructural alternatives, including natural features such as dunes, coastal wetlands, floodplains, marshes, and mangroves, to reduce the damage caused by floods, storm surges, winds, and other aspects of extreme weather events, and to increase the resiliency and long-term cost-effectiveness of water resources development projects;

Page 128, beginning on line 13, strike ''section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212(a))'' and insert ''section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013)''.

Page 163, strike lines 1 through 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan manager's amendment.

In this amendment, we provide clarity related to expediting projects while authorizing the Corps of Engineers to move to pre-construction, planning, engineering, and design activities immediately following a completed feasibility study. This will ensure work will continue without stops and starts in the study process.

We authorize non-Federal interests with the ability to carry out work at their own expense pursuant to an unauthorized yet completed feasibility study if the non-Federal interest agrees to carry out the work subject to any State or Federal permitting departments, and that the non-Federal interests carry out the project in accordance with the feasibility study.

We request that the Corps of Engineers review the uses and economic feasibility of nonstructural alternatives in their review of existing authorities for clearing-out work after a storm event. We have made technical and conforming changes to the bill.

We developed this amendment working closely with Members to address several key issues and to improve upon the underlying bill.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, although I am not opposed to the amendment, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, Shuster amendment No. 1 provides for the expediting and completion of ongoing feasibility studies and authorizes the Corps of Engineers to move to pre-construction planning, engineering, and design. It directs the Corps of Engineers to consider nonstructural alternatives in the rebuilding of areas impacted by floods and storms.

I am in support of the amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Mr. RAHALL for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am in support of this amendment. I particularly want to thank the chairman for the inclusion of language in this amendment that addresses two issues of concern. One is the inclusion of consideration of nonstructural alternatives in preventing future storm damage. I think that is very important, particularly in the wake of Hurricane Sandy, for those of us that live in the Northeast; also, the language that allows the non-Federal cost-share partner to begin work on issues that are of importance to their locality.

I think these are very important issues to Members on our side, and I thank the chairman for including them.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the underlying bill.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and all of the committee for the tremendous work that was done to substantially improve the outlook on the use of the harbor maintenance tax because these moneys were not being used for dredging, as they were intended to be. And this has severely hurt American competitiveness.

If we are going to grow this economy, we have to expand international trade, and we have to have the maritime and port infrastructure to do so. It is essential that these funds are used for the intended purpose.

I also want to point out a couple of concerns I have. There are two issues in the 2007 WRDA bill, authorizations that require technical amendments that pertain to Louisiana authorizations, and I am hopeful that as we go forward on this, the chairman and the subcommittee chairman will work with me to achieve some resolution of this, because it is holding up Army Corps of Engineers projects, and it is something that would be very easy to fix, it is no cost, and adds nothing to the budget. They are purely technical adjustments that need to be made.

So I am hopeful we can work through this as we go forward.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment and the underlying bill. I wanted to speak to one concern that I had.

Mr. Chair, Congress has consistently limited the authority of the Corps of Engineers and recognized the long-established State water rights to protect federalism. This bill is certainly no exception.

In my State of South Dakota, and in the Upper Missouri Basin, the Corps is planning to charge for water from the Missouri River. This is after the Dakotas gave up hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland during the creation of the dams along the Missouri River, for which we have never been fully compensated.

The issue of the Corps charging for surplus water is a concern for many communities, tribes, and cities up and down the Missouri River. Chairman SHUSTER has assured me that he would work with us into the future to move forward on conferees to resolve this issue and to stop this attempt to take our water. For that, I certainly appreciate the efforts.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I want to thank the chairman and the committee for their hard work on WRRDA, which I am pleased to support.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment that addresses an issue with the population growth projections of the 1958 Water Supply Act, which are outdated, and many local water districts are now forced to pay substantial principal and interest to the Federal Government on excess water supply.

My amendment allows the Corps and local water districts to collaborate on finding new markets for their excess water storage. Not only does this partnership allow for the best use of shared resources, it also saves the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Again, I want to thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the chairman, and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill and for supporting my amendment.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. First, I do want to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and also Representative MCCOLLUM.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment is on the Asian carp. It is a very invasive species that really has a devastating effect on the Upper Mississippi River and the Ohio River Basin. This is a fish that can grow to 70 to 100 pounds. It is a voracious fish that is highly invasive. It can potentially destroy a $7 billion commercial fishing business industry in the Great Lakes. It also would have a devastating effect on commercial boaters, recreational boaters, and sportsmen.

Again, I want you to understand that the nature of this fish is incredible. Anytime the surface of the water is disturbed, it leaps out of the water. As I said, it can be 70 to 100 pounds. I know that many of us do boating in the summertime and have little children that boat with us. This is a fish that is so aggressive and so voracious that it

can eat sometimes up to four times its own weight.

What does this fish do? It eats everything that other fish eat. If we allow this to come forward, it can be devastating.

This is a great example. I watched the last 3 weeks as both sides tried to get to some type of agreement, and couldn't get there. This is a bipartisan effort, a collective effort, collaborative effort, that allows both the States and the Federal agencies to work together on a solution to a problem that has been in existence and will continue to be in existence until we stop it.

So I want to again thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and especially Ms. MCCOLLUM as we work together on this piece of legislation. I think it will have a great effect on our ability to keep the Great Lakes, the Upper Mississippi River, and the Ohio River Basin safe.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 11, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 12, line 3, and insert the following:

''(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall be effective on the date on which the Secretary certifies to Congress that the cost to construct all water resources development projects that are authorized for construction by the Chief of Engineers by any Act of Congress, but are not completed, is less than $20,000,000,000 (adjusted for inflation as of the date on which the certification is made).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would delay the environmental shortcuts in section 103 until the Secretary certifies that the Corps has significantly reduced the backlog of projects that have already been approved, using the current environmental review process—already been approved.

The reason we are doing this is to make the point that this shortcut process would undermine environmental protections and critical public participation under NEPA and other conservation laws. Combined with strict timelines and limited funding for feasibility studies, it guarantees the Corps will not have the information it needs to plan major projects with broad environmental impact.

There is no evidence that the public participation environmental review process has caused delay. In the hearings on H.R. 3080, no witness identified a single project where that had been the case. When asked directly about why Corps projects take years to implement, the common answer was: lack of available appropriations at critical times during project development and construction.

The problem is not NEPA. The problem is that this Congress has failed to appropriate enough money to keep up with the projects we authorized. WRDA 2007 authorized $23 billion in new projects. Few have even been started. The estimated cost of completion of Corps projects currently under construction is another $20 billion.

In stark contrast, the most recent appropriation of the Corps' construction budget was $12.2 billion. If the Ryan budget is adopted—well, it was adopted in the House, but not implemented—that number would be even lower, pathetically lower.

Clearly, complying with NEPA and other environmental and public participation requirements is not the reason we have a backlog of projects worth billions of dollars.

Congress should appropriate—and this bill is a start—the funding needed to allow these projects which have already been approved, using all existing environmental review requirements, to be completed before we implement any new shortcuts.

A more thoughtful approach, as we work through this backlog over the next 5, 6, 10, 15 years at the current rate of spending—or 25 or 50 years at Ryan spending—would be to bifurcate the process. If we identified that there was a delay, particularly for repair, rehabilitation, replacement, or minor projects, we could streamline those under the House or Senate provisions, but major projects should still go through a full review so that we don't end up later in endless litigation over those very same projects.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3080 was drafted in a bipartisan fashion. Our environmental streamlining provision in section 103 is a result of compromise.

We have heard from many Members who are supportive of our provisions to implement what is commonly called the ''three by three by three process.'' However, in order for the Corps to have the flexibility to fit within the timeframes laid in section 101 of H.R. 3080, accelerating the environmental review process in section 103 of the bill is critical.

The amendment seeks to undermine all environmental streamlining provisions in WRRDA. Regardless of the existence of backlog, streamlining environmental reviews is an essential reform, and I believe will help to reduce backlogs.

Additionally, reforms in WRRDA provide opportunities for non-Federal interests and other private sectors to move projects forward with their own funds, providing incentive for accelerating these project delivery processes regardless of the availability of Federal funding.

So I urge all Members to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman, and what he said is correct in terms of a situation here.

Mr. Chairman, streamlining provisions in this bill provide nothing but an empty promise that projects will be built faster. The empty promise comes with real costs: it will lead to more damaging and costly projects, and it will prevent States, local governments and other stakeholders from making realistic plans for the future.

The Corps currently has an estimated backlog of over 1,000 authorized activities that will take about $60 billion. The bill before us adds to the backlog. Both the Corps, itself, and the administration have pointed out that these proposed streamlining guidelines may actually slow project development and do not adequately protect communities, taxpayers, and the environment.

The real cause of delay is limited funding, competition for funding amongst the extensive study and project construction backlog, poor project planning that does not focus on national priorities or on identifying the least possible damaging solution to water resource problems. Project studies take the longest when the Corps and Congress insist on pushing outdated, damaging, and extremely costly projects that inconvenience or even harm communities instead of adopting low-impact, modern solutions that could more easily gain broad-based support.

I am all for getting projects done faster, but our infrastructure deficit slows the economy and puts people in physical danger at worst. We need to address that problem. Undercutting the environmental protections does not address it. It merely complicates it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Is the gentleman from Oregon prepared to close?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have one more speaker.

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Oregon. I thank the sponsors of this legislation, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and I am delighted, along with Mr. DEFAZIO, to be a cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, I really just want to emphasize the core values of Mr. DEFAZIO's as to what this amendment represents. The fact is there is a lack of funding. For those of us who are around ports, who are experiencing extreme flooding, there is a lack of funding that the environmental review process has nothing to do with, and it has not led to the backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. I support the timely delivery of water resources projects, but I have concerns as to whether the changes made in this bill in the name of streamlining will actually achieve that goal.

So I ask and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, which will make the construction of already authorized projects a priority, which clearly had no problems with the environmental review process, and I would argue the fact that we should be encouraged to make this truly a jobs bill and support the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. Chair, as a cosponsor to Rep. DEFAZIO's amendment, that would delay the application of the environmental "streamlining" provisions in Section 103 until the Secretary certifies that there is sufficient funding to reduce the backlog of authorized Corps projects to less than $20 billion in construction costs, I ask my colleagues across the aisle to support amendment #2.

This amendment highlights the fact that it is a lack of funding not the environmental review process that has led to a backlog of authorized projects that are not being constructed. We have spent enough energy arguing over the budget and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) streamlining, but not enough time in making the hard decisions and investments that are going to create economic growth and create jobs.

In short, while I strongly support timely delivery of water resources projects, I have concerns as to whether the changes made in this bill in the name of streamlining will actually achieve that goal.

Particularly given the real world funding issues that we face, and I remain very concerned about the impacts these changes will have on the public participation process and the assessment of impacts to the environment. I urge Members to support Rep. DEFAZIO's amendment which will make the construction of already authorized projects that clearly had no problems with the environmental review process a priority.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to control.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER)?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank you and all of the cosponsors of this amendment for putting this forward.

Mr. Chairman, this would actually delay the so-called ''environmental streamlining'' provisions in this bill, which would fast-track the critical review process and significantly limit public input. This amendment would also preserve the current review process that helps the Army Corps of Engineers foresee harmful environmental impacts before undertaking any project.

This safe, sustainable infrastructure is not really produced by cutting corners. WRRDA projects have wide-ranging consequences. I have several projects in my district, and I know how complex they can be. It is important to fully understand the effects that these projects will have on public health, on public safety, and on the environment.

History, quite frankly, has shown us that robust environmental reviews are good for the environment, the economy, public safety, and taxpayers. This bipartisan amendment would protect the environment and would really save taxpayer dollars. So I urge a ''yea'' vote, and I thank the gentleman for his tremendous leadership on this.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the chairman for his generosity, and I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is substantial agreement here in that we need to put more investment into critical water infrastructure projects. This bill begins to do that. We want to do it in the most thoughtful way possible. Some of these projects will alter local or regional environmental resources forever, sometimes to mitigate, sometimes, perhaps, not so much if they are not well thought out. Many of these projects are designed to last for 100 years or more. It certainly would behoove us to spend a little bit of time fully vetting these projects before we authorize them and move forward.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the DeFazio amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the July 19, 2010, Executive Order 13547 that established the ''National Policy for the Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes'' (in this section referred to as the ''National Ocean Policy'') among other things requires Federal implementation of ''ecosystem-based management'' to achieve a ''fundamental shift'' in how the United States manages ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources, and the establishment of 9 new governmental ''Regional Planning Bodies'' and ''Coastal and Marine Spatial Plans'' in every region of the United States;

(2) Executive Order 13547 created a 54-member National Ocean Council led by the White House Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Science and Technology Policy that includes principal and deputy-level representatives from Federal entities, including the Department of Defense;

(3) Executive Order 13547 requires National Ocean Council members, including the Department of Defense, to take action to implement the National Ocean Policy and participate in Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning to the fullest extent;

(4) the Final Recommendations that were adopted by Executive Order 13547 state that ''effective'' implementation of the National Ocean Policy will ''require clear and easily understood requirements and regulations, where appropriate, that include enforcement as a critical component'';

(5) despite repeated congressional requests, the National Ocean Council, which is charged with overseeing National Ocean Policy implementation, has still not provided a complete accounting of Federal activities taken and resources expended and allocated in furtherance of National Ocean Policy implementation;

(6) the Corps of Engineers is participating on at least one ''Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Regional Team''; and

(6) the Nation's continued economic and budgetary challenges underscore the necessity for sound, transparent, and practical Federal policies.

(b) PROHIBITION.—None of the programs or actions authorized under this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing all activities engaged in and resources expended in furtherance of Executive Order 13547 since it was issued on July 19, 2010, as well as any fiscal year 2014 budget requests in support of National Ocean Policy implementation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that addresses a burdensome executive order that will have vast impacts on both our ocean and inland economies.

Executive Order 13547 was signed in 2010, and it requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This means that a drop of rain that falls on your house could be subject to this overreaching policy because that precipitation will ultimately wind up in the ocean. The new policy guidelines under this executive order that were finalized in April of this year have the potential to change permitting criteria and regulatory requirements for a large number of economic sectors, including maritime shipping and inland river transportation.

The Army Corps of Engineers is participating in at least one Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning regional team, requiring resources and staff time outside of their current statutory obligations and outside their current budgetary authority. Since the Corps has not specifically asked for funds for the purpose of implementing Executive Order 13547, then they are raiding existing accounts to fund these activities, thus adding to the current projects backlogs and misusing scarce taxpayer resources.

Furthermore, the Senate WRDA bill includes a funding stream for regional planning bodies pursuant to the administration's National Ocean Policy, thereby creating a permanent slush fund to bankroll the implementation of their ocean-zoning initiative that has not even received congressional authorization.

My amendment would prohibit the programs or actions authorized under WRRDA from being used to further implement ocean zoning under the executive order, and it further requires that the Secretary of the Army conduct and submit a study to Congress that details all of the activities engaged in and resources expended relating to the executive order and to the National Ocean Policy, as well as relevant FY 2014 budget requests.

I want to thank the T&I Committee for its hard work on the WRRDA bill. I look forward to voting for the WRRDA bill, and I urge the approval of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very destructive to a very good policy that was created by this House by the Committee on Natural Resources when, back in the late nineties, all of the Federal agencies and private sector came to Congress and said, We have a lot of conflicts of the sea. We need to start doing some planning in the ocean, like we have on land, so that we can get jobs done.

We were losing all kinds of equipment to fisheries and mining operations. It was just a huge mess. No Federal agency knew what the other Federal agency was doing. It was all on public lands called the ''oceans,'' and the exploration of the oceans was very underserved.

The underlying bill that this amendment attacks was created by the committee in order to create a commission made up, in fact, of people from Texas for the oil industry. One of the things they said is, Stop that conflict. Let's have smart ocean planning. Let's help use and conserve our finite resources and grow our ocean economy.

This is the way to do it, but this amendment wipes it all back. It goes back to the Dark Ages. It goes back to the flat Earth opinion about ocean planning, which is: don't do it.

The aquaculture industry, which is a $1.2 billion industry, has said this would be very destructive, that the Flores amendment would be a major setback for our industry. The aquaculture is growing, and we rely on efficient permitting and long-term planning so our industry can grow and prosper.

If the Army Corps of Engineers can't engage in the National Ocean Policy planning that is geared toward helping our industry, then that is what sets us up for failure.

The North American Submarine Cable Association is opposed to this amendment. They stated that the first and foremost undersea cable operators engage in coastal marine spatial planning. Did you know that undersea cables, not satellites, carry more than 95 percent of the international voice, data and Internet traffic in the United States? They are critical for national security, and they carry civilian and military and U.S. Government traffic.

The Corps is working to improve coastal and sea floor maps and nautical charts, which are critical for navigation, citing offshore energy and recreational boating and fishing. The list goes on and on.

Even in the gentleman's home State of Texas, there are 170,000 people who are employed in the ocean economy. His amendment would destroy their ability to have good planning.

So I urge all of my friends to oppose this amendment, which is opposed by the private sector and public sectors, and it is just not smart thinking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Flores amendment is, quite frankly, an affront to states' rights. By preventing the Army Corps of Engineers from coordinating ocean and coastal planning with Federal and State partners, it will inhibit the ability of States like Rhode Island, my home State, from managing resources in a way that fits their needs and priorities.

We have long recognized that our ocean resources do not adhere to State boundaries. Accordingly, their management must be regionally based. In the Northeast, our Regional Ocean Council has allowed our States to pool resources and our businesses to have a voice in decision-making. The Flores amendment may inhibit regional efforts, including ongoing Hurricane Sandy recovery and restoration planning to protect against future storm damage.

Put simply, it is an attempt to impose restrictions and requirements on coastal States and districts that will prevent our counties, cities, along with State Governors, from working collaboratively with their Federal partners on projects critical to coastal economies.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In 2010, maritime economic activities supported 2.7 million jobs and $258 billion in GDP. These resources are too important to our economies not to be managed with the best science practices available.

I strongly urge my colleagues to protect the rights of States to manage their own resources and to vote ''no'' on this misguided amendment.

□ 1615

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. FARR. I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I think there is a little misunderstanding here. This is not about a new agency or giving agencies new regulatory authority or direction. I will use a simple example.

We have great prospects for wave energy off the Northwest coast. We had a really great wave period doing research at Oregon State. I have a couple of private companies interested, but there are at least three Federal agencies involved. Simply what this executive order does is require that those agencies coordinate and they don't stovepipe, they don't work in silos. So when

the wave developer goes to FERC, FERC will also have in the room NOAA, Marine Fisheries; the Pacific Fisheries Management Council will be involved; the other Federal agencies that have jurisdiction will be involved, and we won't end up going through one process with one agency, getting to the end of that, and then having another agency saying, ''Wait a minute. You didn't talk to us.''

This just happened with the bridge over the Columbia River to Washington State where the Coast Guard came in very late and said, ''Wait a minute. We have height concerns about passage under this bridge.'' Had it been coordinated terrestrially inland in the same way that the President is imposing for agencies to work in the ocean, we will have a better, more comprehensive process that serves all interests.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, in closing, you have heard a lot of hyperbole about my amendment. My amendment is a simple amendment, and that is to stop an unconstitutional executive order that has been considered four times by Congress, including the 110th Congress and 111th Congress which were controlled by the other side. During none of those Congresses was the law that is now part of this executive order ever approved by those Congresses. This is the bureaucracy in this chart that has been created unconstitutionally by this executive order. Congress clearly doesn't intend to do that because it has studied this for four Congresses and elected not to.

You also heard that there are shareholders that don't support what I propose to do in this amendment. Unfortunately, that is not true either. We have got everybody from farmers to energy to commercial fisheries to recreational fishing interests that support this amendment and are fully on the side of it.

They have said that stakeholders came to Congress and said there were problems and that they wanted this executive order. That is not true, because we had a hearing in the 112th Congress and the stakeholders, I specifically asked them: Did any of you want the provisions that are included by this executive order? To an entity, they said, no, they didn't care for it.

Also, I would like to say that this amendment has also passed four other times. In the 112th Congress, I added this amendment to the CJS appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013. It passed on a bipartisan basis, 246–174. I offered a similar amendment to the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act that passed by a bipartisan vote of 233–190. I also offered a related amendment to the FY 2014 Energy and Water appropriations bill that passed by a voice vote.

This is a commonsense amendment. We are just saying, A, if Congress hasn't authorized this activity, and, B, if Congress hasn't appropriated any money for this activity, then this activity shouldn't take place. That is what the Constitution calls for. That is what this amendment does.

With that, I would urge approval of the amendment and approval of the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to H. Res. 385, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 printed in House Report 113–251, offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN OF OKLAHOMA

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON SURFACE ELEVATIONS AT DROUGHT EFFECTED LAKES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) due to the ongoing drought in many parts of the United States, State agencies are finding it difficult to maintain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission-licensed lake levels; and

(2) local agencies should be able to modify licensees when drought conditions arise and persist.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the FERC shall initiate an assessment of the effects of drought conditions on FERC-licensed lakes, which shall include an assessment of—

(A) existing FERC-licensed lakes with stipulated lake levels and rule curves in areas of previous, current and prolonged drought; and

(B) the effect the long-term licenses have on state agencies being able to meet all their obligations, including hydroelectric obligations, water supply downstream, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

(2) REPORT.—FERC shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 72, line 18, insert ''In making recommendations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect communities served by historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions, the Secretary shall also consult with such colleges, universities, and institutions.'' before ''The Secretary''.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM OF NEW YORK

Page 72, line 18, strike ''may'' and insert ''shall''.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 76, after line 13, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall make the information required under subsection (a) available to the public through widely used and readily available means, including on the Internet.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. STUTZMAN OF INDIANA

Page 86, after line 24, insert the following:

(f) INTERIM RULE.—Until the date on which revisions to the guidelines are adopted under this section, the Secretary shall not require the removal of existing vegetation as a condition or requirement for any approval or funding of a project, or any other action, unless the specific vegetation has been demonstrated to present an unacceptable safety risk.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI OF PUERTO RICO

Page 95, line 21, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 95, after line 21, insert the following:

(2) in subsection (a), as so designated, by inserting ''Puerto Rico,'' before ''and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands''; and

Page 95, line 22, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON OF ARKANSAS

Page 97, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1___. FUTURE WATER SUPPLY.

Section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF 10-YEAR PLANS FOR THE UTILIZATION OF FUTURE STORAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary may accept from an interested State or local interest a submission of a plan for the utilization of future use water storage under this Act.

''(2) CONTENTS.—A plan submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a 10-year timetable for conversion of future use storage to present use; and

''(B) a schedule of actions that the State or local interest agrees to carry out over a 10-year period, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, to seek new and alternative users of future water storage that is contracted to the State or local interest on the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Page 97, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1___. CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT FOR NEW PROJECT PURPOSES.

Nothing in this Act authorizes the Secretary to carry out, at a Corps of Engineers dam or reservoir, any project for a purpose not otherwise authorized as of the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 139. MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUTARIES.

(a) MULTIAGENCY EFFORT TO SLOW THE SPREAD OF ASIAN CARP IN THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND OHIO RIVER BASINS AND TRIBUTARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, the Director of the National Park Service, and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall lead a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries by providing technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local governments in carrying out activities designed to slow, and eventually eliminate, the threat posed by Asian carp.

(2) BEST PRACTICES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the multiagency effort shall apply lessons learned and best practices such as those described in the document prepared by the Asian Carp Working Group entitled ''Management and Control Plan for Bighead, Black, Grass, and Silver Carps in the United States'' and dated November 2007, and the document prepared by the Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee entitled ''FY 2012 Asian Carp Control Strategy Framework'' and dated February 2012.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Chief of Engineers, shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the coordinated strategies established and progress made toward the goals of controlling and eliminating Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) any observed changes in the range of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries during the 2-year period preceding submission of the report;

(B) a summary of Federal agency efforts, including cooperative efforts with non-Federal partners, to control the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries;

(C) any research that the Director determines could improve the ability to control the spread of Asian carp;

(D) any quantitative measures that the Director intends to use to document progress in controlling the spread of Asian carp; and

(E) a cross-cut accounting of Federal and non-Federal expenditures to control the spread of Asian carp.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

Page 97, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1___. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION AND CONTROL.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an assessment of the Federal costs of, and spending on, aquatic invasive species.

(b) CONTENTS.—The assessment conducted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) identification of current Federal spending on, and projected future Federal costs of, operation and maintenance related to mitigating the impacts of aquatic invasive species on federally owned or operated facilities;

(2) identification of current Federal spending on aquatic invasive species prevention;

(3) analysis of whether spending identified in paragraph (2) is adequate for the maintenance and protection of services provided by federally owned or operated facilities, based on the current spending and projected future costs identified in paragraph (1); and

(4) review of any other aspect of aquatic invasive species prevention or mitigation determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(c) FINDINGS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 102, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

''(H) activities of the Secretary of the Navy;

Page 104, line 18, strike ''and''.

Page 104, after line 18, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraph accordingly):

''(C) where appropriate, consider national security and military readiness needs in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy; and

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 103, line 7, insert ''and the costs for expanded uses (as such term is defined in section 201(c)(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013)'' after ''the harbors''.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 109, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 2___. HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW-USE PORT.—The term ''low-use port'' means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(2) MODERATE-USE PORT.—The term ''moderate-use port'' means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study and submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports; and

(2) includes recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

Page 142, line 7, strike ''and''.

Page 142, line 9, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 142, after line 9, insert the following:

(4) a 5-year and 10-year projection of construction backlog and any recommendations to Congress regarding how to mitigate current problems and the backlog.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 4 in House Report 113–251 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON SURFACE ELEVATIONS AT DROUGHT EFFECTED LAKES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the FERC, shall initiate an assessment of the effects of drought conditions on lakes managed by the Secretary that are affected by FERC-licensed reservoirs, which shall include an assessment of—

(A) lake levels and rule curves in areas of previous, current, and prolonged drought; and

(B) the effect the long-term FERC licenses have on the Secretary's ability to manage lakes for hydropower generation, navigation, flood protection, water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary, in coordination with the FERC, shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendments en bloc, all of which have been approved by both the majority and the minority. These Members put forth thoughtful amendments, and I am pleased to be able to support moving them all en bloc.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects the good work of many Members from both sides of the aisle and, again, reflects a bipartisan process followed by Chairman SHUSTER in assembling this important legislation.

It includes thoughtful language related to control of aquatic invasive species at the bipartisan request of several Members from the Great Lakes area and the west coast, language relating to promoting government efficiency and communicating potential risk of flooding, as well as several important requests for additional information related to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and how Congress can continue to address the backlog of unconstructed Corps projects.

I support the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of our bipartisan amendment to require GAO to study the impacts of aquatic invasive species, and I thank the committee

leadership for including it in the en bloc agreement.

Aquatic invasives impose a challenge across our great country. Just to take one example, aquatic mussels such as quagga and zebra mussels have cost more than $5 billion since their introduction in the 1980s. Unfortunately, too often this important problem only receives attention after it is too late. This amendment would be proactive. It would require a timely report to find gaps in current efforts and minimize duplication of activities.

Invasive species are a national problem with significant and expensive local implications. More than ever, we need knowledge and guidance on this issue.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I support the en bloc amendment, which includes an amendment I filed.

Since 1986, the other U.S. territories have been given partial relief—up to $200,000—from the local cost-sharing requirements for Army Corps projects. The bill increases this amount to account for inflation. My amendment extends this waiver to the territory of Puerto Rico. There are about 20 authorized flood protection, harbor, and other Army Corps projects pending in Puerto Rico, some of which are stalled due to the constrained ability of the local government to provide its share of project costs.

The two reasons that justified enactment of this waiver for the other territories three decades ago also justify its extension to Puerto Rico today. Puerto Rico is particularly vulnerable to natural disasters like hurricanes and floods. In 2011 alone, there were several federally declared disasters in Puerto Rico, with FEMA assistance totaling $95 million. In addition, Puerto Rico faces severe economic and fiscal challenges which are in large part due to the fact that, as a territory, Puerto Rico is shortchanged under key Federal programs.

I thank the chairmen and the ranking members for recognizing that critical Army Corps projects in Puerto Rico should not be deferred or deauthorized because of the unique circumstances in the territory.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member and the chairman for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc amendments and indicate that this is a bill long overdue. Just to acknowledge, 209,000 jobs, 970 jobs in Texas, $16.7 billion in direct business, $14.1 billion in personal income.

My amendment adds to this legislation by providing for the Army Corps of Engineers under section 118 to consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments where applicable; State and local water districts; and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect underrepresented communities, the Secretary shall also consult with Historically Black Colleges and Universities, tribal colleges and universities, and other minority-serving institutions.

Mr. Chairman, we are all reminded of the tragedy of Hurricane Sandy, of the tragedy of Tropical Storm Allison, Hurricane Rita, Hurricane Ike, and Hurricane Katrina. Universities and communities were impacted. The Army Corps of Engineers will be much better for the idea of being able to engage in those who are directly impacted.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment and support the underlying bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, with that, I ask my colleagues to support the amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support my amendment to retain Congress's traditional role in authorizing project purposes at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers dams and reservoirs.

Corps dams and reservoirs throughout the Nation provide multiple benefits. Water supplies, hydropower, recreation and flood control are just some of the benefits that were approved by Congress and paid for by beneficiaries such as ratepayers. Some Corps dams also provide year-round cold-water flows for fisheries as part of their operations. In the Pacific Northwest, multi-purpose dams provide the economic backbone for our region. They power communities, small businesses and residential homes and provide water necessary for irrigation, recreation and navigation. These duties have been approved by Congress in some fashion after careful deliberation over the costs, needs and justification for these uses.

I'm proud to have worked with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the American Public Power Association, which collectively represent almost 90 million electric ratepayers in 49 states, on this amendment. These ratepayers receive emissions-free and renewable hydropower from federal reservoirs throughout our country. These organizations, whose ratepayers pay—with interest—for hydropower and other functions at the Corps of Engineers dams—have been concerned with proposals that would give undue discretion to the agency to change the projects without ratepayer or Congressional oversight and authorization.

I will quote an October 8, 2013 letter from the organizations to illustrate their predicament:

"The ability to change project operations at Corps projects that provide hydropower presents a risk that hydropower generation from these projects could be diminished at the agency's discretion. For many members of NRECA and APPA who rely on the power generated at Corps projects to keep electric rates as low as possible, the loss of hydropower generated at these projects would require our members to seek more expensive replacement power."

Policies and authorizations that govern the uses of Corps facilities, as authorized by Congress, should not be re-written by un-elected bureaucrats. There are some proposals to allow the Corps to administratively change project purposes and manuals that govern the Corps dams and reservoirs that could undermine congressional intent, erode government accountability, limit public input and create a litigious atmosphere. And, any such changes would have a cascading effect on dams owned by the Bureau of Reclamation and non-federal entities like public utility districts.

Instead of giving courts and bureaucrats more power, Congress needs to reinforce the congressionally-authorized policies that govern these projects. And, if changes need to be made at these facilities, they should be made by Congress in the open, not by the un-elected.

This amendment simply continues our historical role in determining how multiple-use Corps projects are operated. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for including my amendment No. 20, related to the Navy, in the en bloc agreement today.

My amendment is a simple, straight–forward improvement to H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

As you know, Section 202 of the underlying bill requires the Army Corps of Engineers to assess the operation and maintenance needs of harbors used for a variety of purposes, including for commercial navigation; for commercial fishing; for transportation of persons; domestic energy production; public health and safety; the activities of the Coast Guard; recreation; and other purposes.

My amendment would add ''activities of the Secretary of the Navy'' to the list of activities that the Army Corps must consider when assessing the operation and maintenance needs of harbors.

Section 202 of the underlying bill also requires the Army Corps of Engineers to determine an equitable allocation of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

The bill sets forth criteria, including an assessment of utilization; national and regional significance, and also states that the allocations shall not be based solely on tonnage.

My amendment would add a requirement for the Corps to consider—where appropriate—our national security needs in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy.

My amendment does not alter the delicate balance that the Committee

has sought to achieve between small and large harbors. It simply requires that the Corps of Engineers takes into account our naval fleet and our national security needs.

I believe better up–front coordination of our priorities is needed between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Navy because of a situation that has arisen in my Congressional District.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers began dredging Channel Islands Harbor in 1960 because erosion was threatening Navy installations near Port Hueneme and the dredging provided the sand to replenish what had washed away.

Due to inadequate federal funding for harbor maintenance in 2013, the beach area—that borders along Naval Base Ventura County—received only a fraction of the 1 million cubic yards of sand it typically gets when the Corps dredges the Channel Islands Harbor sand trap.

Now, severe erosion is threatening coastal streets in Port Hueneme, which serve as a critical transportation artery to and from the Naval Base.

The erosion is also threatening military readiness at Naval Base Ventura County.

According to the Navy: ''Continued beach erosion creates a potential for mission impacts at Naval Base Ventura County. These impacts include risks to critical Navy facilities and infrastructure; such as ordinance magazines and transportation routes, lab and training buildings, runway lighting, etc.''

Since coming to Congress, I have worked tirelessly with the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Navy to address these issues.

The Department of the Navy has communicated its clear national security interest to the Corps, and has informed me that the Navy stands ready to provide its legally required share of funds for the project. However, the project remains underfunded.

In the future, as the Army Corps of Engineers prioritizes the use of funds, I believe the Army Corps needs to consider the activities of the navy and our national security needs.

My amendment will require the Corps to take these issues into account when prioritizing the use of funds.

While I continue to work to find funds to address the immediate crisis, it is my hope that better up–front coordination between the Army Corps and the Navy will prevent this issue from occurring again in the future.

Again, I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Members support for this common–sense improvement to H.R. 3080.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for including my amendment No. 22, related to job creation, in the en bloc agreement today.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement to H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act.

This important amendment will require the Government Accountability Office to study and report to Congress on the effectiveness of the activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports.

The GAO will also be required to include recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

Under my amendment, the term ''low-use port'' means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

The term ''moderate-use port'' means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

I came to Congress to move our nation forward, to create jobs, and to ensure that Ventura County has the resources necessary to succeed.

Like many of my colleagues, I view all of the actions that Congress takes—and all federal programs—through the lens of its potential to create jobs.

That is why I think it is critically important that GAO undertake a comprehensive study of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and help us to maximize the job creation potential of the program and to increase our international competitiveness.

In my district, I am fortunate to represent several ports and harbors, including Channel Islands Harbor, Ventura Harbor, and the Port of Hueneme.

The ports and harbors in my district are critical to our local and regional economy—supporting both small, midsize, and large businesses, as well as thousands of jobs both directly at the port and indirectly in our community.

In 2012, the Port of Hueneme—which moved approximately 1.3 million tons of cargo—undertook a study of the local and regional economic impact.

The study concluded that 9,448 jobs in the Port Hueneme metropolitan region and the State of California were in some way related to the activity at the Port's marine terminals. This included 2,277 direct jobs, 2,727 induced jobs, 620 indirect jobs, and 3,824 regional jobs influenced by cargo exported and imported through the Port Hueneme marine terminals.

In fiscal year 2012, marine cargo activity at the Port of Hueneme generated a total of $723.8 million of total economic activity in the region.

A total of $50.8 million of state and local tax revenue was generated by maritime activity at the Port's marine terminals in fiscal year 2012.

In addition, $12.9 million of state and local taxes were created due to the economic activity of the users of the cargo moving via the marine terminals.

The Port of Hueneme is just one example of how strategic and smart use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is helping to create jobs and generate economic growth.

Across the nation our ports and harbors are vital economic engines of our economy.

I think it is critically important for Congress to have a thorough report from the GAO on the use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund across the nation so that we can maximize the use of these taxpayer dollars—supporting businesses and creating jobs.

Again, I appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Members support for this common-sense improvement to H.R. 3080.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. GEOSPATIAL SURVEYING AND MAPPING.

Section 918 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2292) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 918. GEOSPATIAL SURVEYING AND MAPPING.

''(a) PROCUREMENT OF SURVEYING AND MAPPING SERVICES.—Any surveying or mapping services to be performed in connection with a water resources project which is or has been authorized to be undertaken by the Secretary shall be procured in accordance with chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

''(b) GEOSPATIAL SURVEYING AND MAPPING ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out water resources projects, the Secretary shall, wherever practicable, utilize the private sector for commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping activities. The Secretary shall not start or carry on any activity to provide a commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping service that duplicates, competes with, or can be procured from a commercial source.

''(c) GUIDANCE.—

''(1) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary shall issue guidance to encourage entities in the Corps of Engineers to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, contracting with private sector sources for geospatial surveying and mapping services for water resources projects.

''(A) CONTENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(i) define appropriate inherently governmental roles in geospatial surveying and mapping activities, which roles shall include—

''(I) activities so defined in section 5 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2384);

''(II) preparation of standards and specifications;

''(III) research of geospatial surveying and mapping instrumentation and procedures that are not commercially available, with prompt technology transfer to the private sector;

''(IV) providing technical guidance, coordination, and administration of geospatial surveying and mapping activities; and

''(V) contracting with private sector sources for geospatial surveying and mapping activities.

''(ii) define commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping activities to include activities described in—

''(I) section 36.601–4(a)(4)(A) of the Engineer Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

''(II) section 467 of title 10, United States Code.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall develop a process for the oversight and monitoring, on an annual basis, of compliance with the guidance issued under subsection (c).

''(e) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of all entities in the Corps of Engineers, including divisions, districts, laboratories, and technical centers, to determine the extent to which each entity is utilizing governmental and private sector sources for commercially available geospatial surveying and mapping services. In conducting the assessment, the Secretary shall consult with organizations of commercial geospatial surveying and mapping firms.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I suggest respectfully this is a very simple amendment. It is about the intrusion by the Corps into the private sector of mapping. They have been very good in the past about contracting out.

I found out by reports that certain areas of the Corps have bought equipment, they have bought, frankly, a yacht, and they have gotten into the mapping business. In doing so, that is in direct competition to the private sector.

Today, with the scarce amount of money we have for infrastructure, we ought to keep that infrastructure available for, in fact, all the moneys for building and not for getting into the private sector business of mapping. They can still do it. If there isn't a contractor close by or it is not practical, they can still do their own work, but I see the expansion occurring as an invasion into an area that already has plenty of qualified people to do it.

I think this amendment is a very simple amendment. We ought to adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, throughout the development of H.R. 3080, the chairman has taken a measured approached to balancing the desire to encourage additional private sector involvement in the development and execution of Corps projects with maintaining the internal technical capability of the Corps to carry out its vital military and civil works missions.

For decades, this committee has held the belief that maintaining the technical capability of the Corps is critical not only to address the water resources needs of the Nation, but also to maintain the ability of the Corps to serve its other role as critical support our Nation's military.

To maintain this capability, we have strived to maintain critical technical expertise within the Corps, while at the same time recognizing those areas where outside commercial interests can provide a useful role.

In my view, this amendment seeks to push the lever too far towards outsourcing the internal capabilities of the Corps. My understanding is that currently the Corps contracts extensively with the private sector for surveying and mapping services. However, the decision as to when it is appropriate to use their own staff, a public agency, or a private contractor for this work should remain within the Corps' leadership, who understand the needs of specific projects.

For these reasons, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I include letters from the AFGE, the transportation trade, and the IFPTE in opposition to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2013.

Re Don't bail out bad contractors: oppose the Young-Petri amendment to give all surveying and mapping work to contractors, regardless of high costs or bad performance

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, which represents more than 650,000 federal employees, including in the Corps of Engineers (CoE), I urge you to oppose an amendment to be offered to the Water Resources Development Act (H.R. 3080) by Representatives Don Young (R–AK) and Tom Petri (R–WI) that would prevent the CoE from using lower-cost, higher-performing alternatives to contractors for the performance of surveying and mapping functions.

The Department of Defense (DOD), which spends 60% of all service contract dollars, including a large amount on behalf of CoE, has determined that contractors usually cost more than in-house performance, often by significant amounts. In 2010, then DoD Secretary Robert Gates told The Washington Post ''that federal workers cost the government 25 percent less than contractors''. Comptroller Robert Hale acknowledged to a Senate Subcommittee in June that contractors are two to three times more expensive than civilians. In a September House hearing, the Army Chief of Staff echoed Hale's remark.

The Young-Petri amendment would direct the CoE, in carrying out water resources projects, to use contractors for surveying and mapping functions whenever possible and forbid the CoE from starting or performing surveying and mapping functions if they happen to be performed by contractors. At a time when taxpayer dollars are precious, it makes no sense to force CoE to give work to contractors that can better be performed by federal employees.

There has been no determination by the agency, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, let alone any independent third party, that the agency is failing to adequately use contractors for these functions or that its federal sector surveyors and mappers are costly or inadequate. The Young-Petri amendment is simply an attempt by a group of contractors to use political pressure to force the CoE to give them more taxpayer dollars—the worst kind of earmark. The impartial experts at CoE should be responsible for determining how the agency meets its mission, not a self-interested band of contractors. Of course, surveying and mapping contractors want more money, but that doesn't mean they should take it from taxpayers. Enactment of the Young-Petri amendment would be a terrible public policy precedent.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact John Threlkeld (threlj@afge.org) of my staff if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

BETH MOTEN,
Legislative and Political Director.

TTD,
October 23, 2013.

Re Vote NO on the Young-Petri Amendment to WRRDA

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO (TTD), I ask that you oppose the Young-Petri amendment (#21) to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013 (WRRDA). While TTD supports the underlying legislation, Young-Petri would unnecessarily require the Army Corps of Engineers to contract with private firms for surveying and mapping services, and jeopardize the jobs of qualified, public service professionals.

This amendment would do nothing to improve the efficiency or flexibility for Corps surveying and mapping responsibilities. In fact, the Corps already contracts extensively with the private sector for these services. The decision as to when it is appropriate to use their own staff, a public agency or a private contractor for this work should remain with the Corps' leadership who understand the needs of specific projects. Should this amendment be adopted, Congress would be creating a special set-aside for the private firms in this industry and tying the hands of the experts and specialists who manage these projects. In addition, the amendment would set a bad precedent and is contrary to recent legal and regulatory efforts to ensure ''special consideration'' of using federal employees instead of contractors.

WRRDA is an important piece of legislation that will bring much needed investment and reform to our nation's water infrastructure. However, Young-Petri will have a negative effect on the Corps ability to use best judgment and practices when performing critical surveying and mapping duties and it will deal a devastating blow to those professionals who currently perform that work. I urge you to vote no on this amendment and preserve the integrity and bipartisan principles in the underlying bill.

Sincerely,

EDWARD WYTKIND,
President.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL–CIO & CLC,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As President of the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), I am writing regarding today's House consideration of HR 3080, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2013. As a union representing tens of thousands of workers, including Army Corps of Engineers employees, IFPTE believes that this much needed legislation will not only go a long way toward modernizing and preserving our homeland critical infrastructures, including our ports, inland, and

coastal waterways, but it will also create and preserve hundreds of thousands of high quality American jobs.

While IFPTE does support the legislation, we also have serious concerns with an amendment made in order by the Rules Committee. The amendment, sponsored by Representatives Don Young and Tom Petri, would force the Army Corps of Engineers to shift mapping and surveying functions from highly skilled federal workers to more costly contractor provided services.

The Young-Petri amendment is a simple one: It directs the Corps to use contractors for mapping and surveying wherever possible when performing water resources projects. It also prohibits Corps federal employees from undertaking mapping and surveying work, regardless of the quality and cost of the work, if it is already being performed by contractors.

IFPTE believes that all outsourcing should be done only after consideration of the cost versus benefit for the taxpayer. Just because a certain function may be deemed commercial in nature does not mean that it should be contracted out, as this amendment seeks to accomplish. The Army Corps of Engineers nor the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has found that surveying and mapping functions performed by federal workers are inadequate or more costly than contractors. In fact, just this past June Department of Defense (DOD) Comptroller, Robert Hale, testified before the Senate that contractors cost the taxpayer two to three times more than federal employees. Mr. Hale's statement was later reinforced by the Army Chief of Staff at a September House hearing. Forcing these activities to be contracted out absent any proof of cost savings is simply irresponsible.

WRDA is a jobs bill and will go a long way toward the creation and preservation of hundreds of thousands of American jobs. While our union supports the underlying bill, we are not supportive of the Young/Petri amendment. Support the bill, while rejecting the amendment.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions please contact IFPTE Legislative Director, Matt Biggs.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. JUNEMANN,
President.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding, and I rise to support the Young amendment. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

It is important that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers be encouraged to use the private sector for surveying and mapping services whenever practical. Congress should take steps to end the increasing duplication of and competition with the private sector by the Corps of Engineers. This amendment would allow the Corps to continue to manage mapping and surveying for its projects, but it should rely on the private sector to perform the mapping and surveying services and activities that are commercially available to the maximum extent practical.

At a time when Federal funds for infrastructure, including water resources projects, are limited, the Corps should be increasing its use of the private sector for surveying and mapping, where it makes sense, not wasting tax dollars by competing and duplicating the private sector.

So I encourage the House to adopt the Young amendment to increase the Corps' reliance on the capable and qualified private sector surveying and mapping services wherever practical.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I reluctantly rise in opposition to my good friend from Alaska's amendment.

The Corps of Engineers, like all Federal agencies, is required to follow acquisition and procurement laws. Much of the work of the Corps is in fact contracted out to private sector entities, including much of the hydrographic mapping, which is integral to construction and operation and maintenance.

While I understand and empathize with the sponsor of the amendment, it appears to me to be more of an acquisition and procurement issue. What we do not want is to have one acquisition and procurement law for the Federal Government, and a new or special or additional acquisition or procurement law for the Corps of Engineers.

So again, I reluctantly rise in opposition to my good friend from Alaska's amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I reluctantly respect the gentleman's opinion, but at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Alaska yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Small businesses struggle to stay in business every day, and they should not have to compete against their government, on top of all of the other challenges they face. In fact, sometimes I think we should pin a medal on anybody who is able to survive today in small businesses. Yet every day in almost every congressional district, big government agencies are competing with small businesses.

When the White House Conference on Small Business met in 1995, it listed unfair government competition with small businesses as one of the top issues. This is not a new problem. In fact, since the Eisenhower administration in 1955, it became official U.S. policy that:

> The Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

This is a service that can easily be provided by private small businesses, and we should support that. This amendment would simply require the Army Corps to take advantage of the private mapping and surveying services that are available instead of competing with them.

I believe this is a very reasonable and responsible amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I join Chairman SHUSTER in opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the Corps has been good, but they are expanding. They just spent money, instead of on solving a problem, on a UAV, and they spent $2.3 million on a yacht. There is no reason for that, Mr. Chairman; there is no reason.

This doesn't keep them from surveying, it doesn't keep them from contracting, but I don't want them to expand this program. We have another government agency, and we are trying to save money and we are going to allow them to expand it. I know how these agencies go. They will start buying more and more and they will expand and say, We don't have to contract anymore. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, you know that is true. I have watched these agencies. As chairman of this committee, I watched them and tried to stop them. This is not the time to spend money foolishly. We have the contractors out there. Let's use them where they are available. Let's not let them build a machine within the Corps of Engineers themselves. Keep that in mind. You ought to adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 139. ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET.

The Secretary shall include operation and maintenance costs associated with sand transfer plants in the annual operations and maintenance budget of the Corps of Engineers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would help to maintain beaches and the integrity of our shipping channels around the country.

Sand transfer plants are vital for beach renourishment, as well as to fight erosion and shoaling in navigation channels. These inlets are often the lifeblood of the communities they serve. When shoaling of the channels makes navigation dangerous, it is the people and businesses that suffer.

The Army Corps of Engineers is already spending money to dredge these

channels. By reducing the need to dredge so often, my amendment allows for more efficient allocation of Federal dollars. Furthermore, additional Corps resources are then freed up for other uses.

This amendment does not authorize or appropriate any funds. It merely allows the sand transfer plants to participate in the process and gives the Corps flexibility in prioritizing its funding. It applies to all sand transfer plants, those that are in existence and those not yet in existence. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, typically the Corps of Engineers carries out studies and projects that are cost-shared with non-Federal sponsors.

Sand transfer facilities that are associated with beach nourishment projects are traditionally a non-Federal responsibility. This amendment would require the Corps of Engineers to assume the operation and maintenance costs of these facilities. This would put more funding requirements on the Federal taxpayer for this type of work. It is clear that the Corps' budget will not be increased substantially to cover these additional requirements.

One of the key goals of H.R. 3080 is to empower non-Federal interests to take a larger role in carrying out water resources projects. This amendment is not financially responsible since it would place an additional burden on the Corps of Engineers without recognizing the fiscal restraints the Corps is already under, so I urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend Chairman SHUSTER for restoring the bipartisan nature to our committee, and I want to thank Congressmen RAHALL, BISHOP, and GIBBS for their work on this bill. I also want to thank the Corps of Engineers for their hard work. They have been underfunded and overworked, but they have always been there for the American people. The work they did during Hurricane Katrina and, most recently, Hurricane Sandy should be commended by Congress.

We are already failing to prepare our ports for post-Panamax ships and are falling behind in our international competition. Ports throughout Asia, Europe, South America, and the Caribbean all have ports with depths of 50 feet.

I agree that we need to fully reauthorize WRDA every 2 years, but I don't believe many people are confident that will happen. In fact, it took 7 years since reauthorization of the last WRDA bill.

I went to a preliminary review on the Chief's Report, and the Army Corps made clear that they don't pick winners and losers, but that is what we are doing here in Congress.

This is a fairness issue for the State of Florida. I hope that as we move toward conference, we must engage the House, the Senate, and the White House to ensure that the State of Florida is not left behind. As this bill continues to move through the process, we need to work together to make sure that we treat every State fairly and don't arbitrarily leave any critical infrastructure projects behind.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for this committee. I think they have done extraordinary work on behalf of all of us here in Congress, operating with fiscal restraint and able to produce a bipartisan product. Toward that end, most of all I respect Chairman SHUSTER, but I firmly disagree with his assessment of this particular measure.

There is one transfer plant that is located in an area that I serve, and that is in Lake Worth, Florida. It is the Lake Worth Inlet. There is one in California, one in New Jersey, and one in Bethany Beach on the Indian River Inlet. Additionally, this amendment would just apply whenever the Corps builds additional sand transfer plants.

There is no money that is involved. The money that the Corps of Engineers would save is immense, and I don't for the life of me understand why there would be opposition to that. I will have a lot more to say over the course of time regarding how the Corps conducts its operations, but I have lived for 21 years with many of their successes and a hell of a lot of their failures.

Toward that end, in this particular instance, I am trying to help them to save something and to be able to do the things that are necessary to allow for navigation of these waters that are critical to the areas that they serve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BENTIVOLIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 12, strike "$12,000,000,000" and insert "$35,000,000,000".

Page 137, beginning line 1, strike "AUTHORIZED BEFORE WRDA 2007".

Page 137, line 12, strike "November 8, 2007" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act".

Page 138, line 14, strike "$12,000,000,000" and insert "$35,000,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Chairman BILL SHUSTER, and other members of the committee and their staff for working so hard on this bill.

There are many good reforms in this legislation, and I applaud their efforts. However, while this bill initially deauthorizes $12 billion in old and inactive projects, most of those savings are simply moved to other projects.

□ 1645

Offsetting costs is always good, but we can do better. We should be looking for real savings and clearing out the backlog for the American people. While the bill sunsets some new authorizations to help curtail the backlog problem, much more needs to be done about the current backlog.

I am a former teacher. When educators teach the basics of our system of government, we say "the legislature creates the law and controls the purse." The fact of the matter is, Congress has not been in control of its purse for quite a while, and these outdated, backlogged projects, some almost 50 years old, prove just that. Simply put, there is just too much spending with little to no oversight or accountability. It needs to stop.

Many of these projects were earmarks in previous water resources bills. There was not sufficient follow-up to make sure they were completed on time and under budget. For example, the 2007 bill had approximately $8 billion in additional projects and earmarks thrown in during conference.

If these projects and this money are important and necessary, then what has Congress been doing all these years to ensure these much-needed projects and funds were being completed? By this body's own action—or inaction—it has shown over and over that either these projects aren't important as some claim or that Congress is spending money on improvements without much thought.

Every dollar we waste is a dollar that could be spent to help the American people and a dollar we wouldn't need to

borrow against our children's and grandchildren's future. If these projects aren't important enough for us to ensure their completion on time and within budget, then we probably shouldn't have authorized it in the first place.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, throughout the process of developing this water resources bill, Chairman SHUSTER has done a remarkable job of maintaining a balance between addressing future water resource needs of the Nation and coming to terms with those legacy projects and studies of the Corps of Engineers that may have languished over the decades. Unfortunately, the pending amendment would upset that balance, and it seeks to deauthorize a massive amount of projects that I would suggest continue to have strong local, congressional, and potentially administrative support.

While addressing the unconstructed backlog is an important issue, I urge opposition to this amendment that seeks to wipe away much of the good work of this body over the decades simply to make a point on fiscal conservatism. We all want to address the debt. It is a worthy goal. I agree with the gentleman's comments about passing that debt on to our children and grandchildren, but I suggest this is not the proper manner in which we are fair to our entire country and to the future infrastructure of this Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan permitting me to speak on this.

My friend from West Virginia made a very important point, that under this bill, if it is approved, we are going to extend the backlog to something like $72 million. There are many people who support these various projects, and that is part of the problem.

Simply authorizing is not somehow free. It costs money to be able to move them into the production stage. We have billions of dollars that are ready for construction that are languishing, and because we are not adequately funding year in and year out, we have an amazing number of projects with a shelf life that has expired.

I commend what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from West Virginia have done with the committee, trying to do a deeper dive, trying to fine-tune, trying to make some real progress here. The problem is we have a legacy where, for decades, that same care and consideration was not exercised, where there are a lot of projects that really are not cost effective, that really are no longer state of the art.

I think by moving forward to clear the decks of a little more of the backlog, not diverting—because the Corps and Congress have to contend with people that think just because it has been authorized they are entitled to have the project go forward. I can understand that if it stays on the books, but that is a distortion of where we are now. We are not adequately funding what this bill needs to do.

Unless and until we do a little more aggressive pruning, we are just going to continue to add to the backlog, and we are going to continue to have some projects that will get moved along sometimes for political reasons even though they are not the best projects. The more that we can help the committee move forward, prune it down, tailor it, focus it, we are all going to be better off.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to Chairman SHUSTER.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan wanting to be fiscally responsible. That is what we tried to do in this bill.

All of the new authorizations in WRRDA were more than fully offset by deauthorizations, and WRRDA seeks to deauthorize its old, inactive projects which have not begun construction or have not received any funds, Federal or non-Federal, in the last 5 years. This approach cuts waste and reduces the backlog of projects that are unlikely to move forward.

Such a significant increase in the deauthorization target could have unforeseen consequences, and I believe it would effectively deauthorize viable projects—projects that are almost ready to go, projects that have non-Federal money committed to them—and impact the ability to move these forward, these important water resources and infrastructure improvements that are ready to move that have non-Federal dollars in place.

We also put in this bill a sunset law, that if any new authorizations do not move in 7 years, they will automatically be deauthorized. It will continue to push down on that backlog. I certainly would be open in the next WRRDA bill for additional deauthorizations to make sure we continue to reduce that backlog.

I reluctantly urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis and Americans are sick of how much money Congress wastes. The fact that there is between $60 billion and $80 billion in old, inactive projects and backlog means something is wrong. It took less than a decade for the United States to go to the Moon. How could it possibly take decades to build a dam? Hoover Dam was built in 5 years.

If we aren't going to do these projects right and on time, we shouldn't be doing them at all. We need to prioritize and follow through on projects that are important. It is not radical to clear out old and back-dated projects.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me pick up on something that Chairman SHUSTER just said. He said that if we were to take the approach that is advocated by this amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, we would run the risk of deauthorizing projects that are very vital. Let me give you an example of one that would be in that category.

The Fire Island to Montauk Point Reformulation Study, a study that comprises the 83 easternmost miles of coastline of Long Island, 70 miles of which is in my district, which was first authorized in the 1960s, it has crept along primarily because it has not had adequate funding either for studies and certainly not for construction.

Hurricane Sandy proved just how valuable and just how important the work that has been contemplated by the Fire Island to Montauk Point Reformulation Study has been and would have been. If it were not for the Sandy supplemental funding, we still wouldn't be in a position to fund the vitally important construction projects associated with FIMP; but FIMP is the kind of project that would fall victim to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan were it to be approved.

So I join the ranking member and the chairman in urging opposition to the amendment

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, line 3, strike ''that has been damaged'' and all that follows before the closing quotation marks on line 7.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, Uncle Sam has largely stopped funding maintenance of federally authorized shallow

draft inlet projects. There are over a dozen of these projects in the district that I represent in North Carolina. These are critical to the local economy. To fill the gap, the State of North Carolina is stepping up to pay for dredging these waterways. My concern is that section 108 of the bill may be interpreted to allow States to only pay for maintenance of projects damaged by disasters.

Does the chairman share my belief that States should be allowed to contribute funds to any of the Federal projects, not just those damaged by disasters? And will he agree to work in conference to perfect the bill's language to meet our shared intent?

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I thank you for raising this issue.

We will be happy to try to work with you as we go through conference to look into what you are talking about and making sure we do what is right for the country in moving forward.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for that. I want to thank you and the ranking member for the outstanding job you and your staffs have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 113–251.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 95, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 137. NATIONAL WATER-BASED FREIGHT POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to improve the condition and performance of the national water-based freight network to ensure that such network provides the foundation for the United States to compete in the global economy and achieve each goal described in subsection (b).

(b) GOALS.—The goals of the national water-based freight policy are—

(1) to invest in infrastructure improvements and to implement operational improvements that—

(A) strengthen the contribution of the national water-based freight network to the economic competitiveness of the United States;

(B) reduce congestion; and

(C) increase productivity, particularly for domestic industries and businesses that create high-value jobs;

(2) to improve the safety, security, and resilience of water-based freight transportation;

(3) to improve the state of good repair of the national water-based freight network;

(4) to use advanced technology to improve the safety and efficiency of the national water-based freight network;

(5) to incorporate concepts of performance, innovation, competition, and accountability into the operation and maintenance of the national water-based freight network;

(6) to improve the economic efficiency of the national water-based freight network; and

(7) to reduce the environmental impacts of freight movement on the national water-based freight network.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL WATER-BASED FREIGHT NETWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a national water-based freight network in accordance with this section to assist States in strategically directing resources toward improved system performance to achieve efficient movement of freight on inland waterways, canals, ports, and harbors, and related freight intermodal connectors.

(2) NETWORK COMPONENTS.—The national water-based freight network shall consist of the primary water-based freight network, as designated by the Secretary under subsection (d) as most critical to the movement of water-based freight.

(d) DESIGNATION OF PRIMARY WATER-BASED FREIGHT NETWORK.—

(1) INITIAL DESIGNATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall designate a primary water-based freight network based on an inventory of national water-based freight volume and in consultation with stakeholders, including system users, transportation providers, and States.

(2) FACTORS FOR DESIGNATION.—In designating the primary water-based freight network, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) the origins and destinations of water-based freight movement in the United States;

(B) the total tonnage and value of water-based freight moved across United States bodies of water;

(C) the average annual water-based freight traffic on United States bodies of water;

(D) maritime ports of entry;

(E) access to energy exploration, development, installation, or production areas;

(F) population centers; and

(G) network connectivity.

(3) REDESIGNATION.—On the date that is 10 years after the initial designation of the primary water-based freight network, and every 10 years thereafter, using the factors described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall redesignate the primary water-based freight network.

(e) NATIONAL WATER-BASED FREIGHT STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) INITIAL DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with State departments of transportation and other appropriate public and private transportation stakeholders, shall develop and post on a public Web site a national water-based freight strategic plan that shall include—

(A) an assessment of the condition and performance of the national water-based freight network;

(B) an identification of bottlenecks on the national water-based freight network that create significant freight congestion problems, based on a quantitative methodology developed by the Secretary, and, to the maximum extent practicable, an estimate of the cost of addressing each bottleneck and any operational improvements that could be implemented;

(C) forecasts of water-based freight volumes for the 20-year period beginning with the year during which the plan is issued;

(D) an identification of major trade gateways and national water-based freight corridors that connect major population centers, trade gateways, and other major water-based freight generators for current and forecasted traffic and water-based freight volumes, the identification of which shall be revised, as appropriate, in subsequent plans;

(E) an assessment of statutory, regulatory, technological, institutional, financial, and other barriers to improved water-based freight transportation performance (including opportunities for overcoming the barriers);

(F) an identification of routes providing access to energy exploration, development, installation, or production areas;

(G) an identification of best practices for improving the performance of the national water-based freight network;

(H) an identification of best practices for mitigating the impacts of water-based freight movement on communities;

(I) an identification of a process for addressing multistate projects and encouraging jurisdictions to collaborate; and

(J) an identification of strategies to improve freight intermodal connectivity.

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 5 years after the date of completion of the first national water-based freight strategic plan under paragraph (1), and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall update and post on a public Web site a revised national water-based freight strategic plan.

(f) WATER-BASED FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS AND PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare a report that contains a description of the conditions and performance of the national water-based freight network in the United States.

(g) TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT DATA AND PLANNING TOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall—

(A) begin the development of new tools or improve existing tools to support an outcome-oriented, performance-based approach to evaluating proposed water-based freight-related projects, including—

(i) methodologies for systematic analysis of benefits and costs;

(ii) tools for ensuring that the evaluation of water-based freight-related projects and other transportation projects considers safety, economic competitiveness, environmental sustainability, and system condition in the project selection process; and

(iii) other elements to assist in effective transportation planning;

(B) identify water-based transportation-related model data elements to support a broad range of evaluation methods and techniques to assist in making water-based transportation investment decisions; and

(C) at a minimum, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, consider any improvements to existing water-based freight flow data collection efforts that could reduce identified water-based freight data gaps and deficiencies and help improve forecasts of water-based freight transportation demand.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with Federal, State, and other stakeholders to develop, improve, and implement tools and data collection under paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America's inland waterways move more than half a billion tons of cargo worth more than $150 billion annually, and more than 2.3 billion tons of cargo a year move through American seaports. Commercial activity on our inland waterways supports more than 13 million jobs in the United States and is crucial to our economic prosperity. America depends on the strength of its inland waterways to support businesses and consumers across the country.

My amendment will establish a national water-based freight policy. It requires the Secretary of the Army to designate a primary water-based freight network and develop a strategic plan to assess and improve performance. It also improves data collection methods so that the Army Corps of Engineers and policymakers have better information on how to improve the system going forward.

Although the recent surface transportation reauthorization established a national freight policy, that legislation did not incorporate ports, harbors, and inland waterways into the national freight network. As ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I have heard agriculture and rural groups speak time and time again about the importance of establishing a strategy for our inland waterways. This bill recognizes the critical importance of ports, harbors, canals, and inland waterways to our economic competitiveness and develops a comprehensive approach to identify and address their problems.

Unfortunately, our inland waterways are buckling under the pressure of our growing transportation needs. In many areas, the inland waterways system has not been updated since the 1950s; more than half of the locks are over 50 years old; 90 percent of the locks and dams on the U.S. inland waterways system experienced some type of unscheduled delay in 2009.

□ 1700

There is an average of 52 service interruptions a day throughout the system. These delays prevent goods from getting to markets, driving up costs and hurting the businesses that depend on our waterways.

Addressing these issues will take time and careful planning. Projects to repair and replace aging locks and dredge channels can take decades to approve and complete. By identifying key waterways, critical bottlenecks and major trade gateways, my amendment can guide the revitalization of our inland waterways in the most effective way possible.

Thinking strategically about our inland waterway system can lead to outsized returns in the future. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that modest investments will protect $700 billion in gross domestic product and 738,000 jobs in 2020; but in order for these investments to have their desired impacts, they must be properly targeted.

My amendment will help to funnel resources to the most beneficial projects available so that we can achieve a good return on investment on American taxpayers' money.

America's inland waterways, ports, and harbors are critical tools in ensuring that all markets, foreign and domestic, are open to American goods. Establishing a national network and policy for our waterways will help us grow our economy, spur job creation, and ensure that taxpayer money is put to good use.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great respect for the gentlelady from New York and agree with her that our ports, our inland waterway system are in bad shape. But we are in times that are fiscally restrained, and we have got to try to do our best to move these forward under these fiscal restraints, and that is what we think we are doing in this WRRDA bill, moving forward in a way that we can be positive but not break the bank.

The freight network is critical to the Nation's economic security and to our Nation's national security.

I have several concerns with this amendment. First, the amendment gives very broad authority to the administration when creating this freight network. In H.R. 3080, we intended to continue the role of Congress in authorizing Corps of Engineer activities.

Unfortunately, this amendment would undermine one of the key principles of this bill, giving away more of our authority to the administration.

Second, I believe the amendment would significantly increase bureaucracy.

Finally, this amendment requires the designation of a primary freight network that prioritizes projects near population centers and major trade gateways which, of course, are extremely important to the health of this Nation's economy. To someone from Los Angeles and New York City, that seems like a good idea.

Those of us from the interior of the country and rural parts of the country have concerns that this would leave a gaping hole in the freight transportation system. If you are from Coos Bay, Oregon, or Duluth, Minnesota, or Altoona, Pennsylvania, under this amendment you may not be considered part of that primary freight network.

But I assure you, those two ports, and hundreds of others, are integral to the regional economies and the Nation's economic well-being.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this, but certainly respect what the gentlelady from New York is trying to do.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee stated that this amendment gives broad authority to the administration, but it is the same authority that we gave to the administration in the provision created for highways in the surface transportation bill, MAP–21.

This amendment is modeled exactly on that provision, so what is good for the goose is good for the gander, right?

So I do not understand your logic. I do not understand your argument.

But let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that this is going to benefit metropolitan areas. We held hearing after hearing in the Small Business Committee regarding this issue, and this issue was brought up to my attention by small agricultural interests from rural areas that were concerned that waterways, particularly those in rural areas, were being ignored.

The truth of the matter is that this amendment will ensure that rural areas are given a greater voice.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentlelady for pointing that out; but I would also point out that it was the chairman of the Senate Committee who I believe put that provision in there. So in that case, once again, she was the goose and I was the gander. I may have not agreed, but we were in a conference committee on that.

But again, I am very, very concerned about giving away more and more authority to the executive branch; and again, that is one of the key principles of this bill that I think all 435 Members of this body and all 100 Members of the Senate ought to be in lockstep, making sure we don't continue to give away our constitutional authority to the executive branch. We have done far too much of that already.

But, again, I respect the gentlelady from New York and what she is attempting to do. But at this point I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. CALCULATION OF BENEFITS AND COSTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION AND HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A feasibility study conducted by the Secretary for a project for flood damage reduction or hurricane and

storm damage reduction shall include, as part of the calculation of benefits and costs—

(1) a calculation of the anticipated reduction in flood or hurricane damage to public and private property and infrastructure resulting from the completion of the proposed project;

(2) a calculation of the anticipated direct and indirect economic benefits resulting from the completion of the proposed project, including such benefits from any potential reductions in national and regional economic volatility, disruptions, and losses; and

(3) a calculation of the anticipated benefits to public safety, including protection of evacuation routes, resulting from the completion of the proposed project.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any feasibility study for a project for flood damage reduction or hurricane and storm damage reduction that has not been completed before the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me start with congratulating both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for including commonsense reforms in this WRRDA bill of this Congress; and with those commonsense reforms, I have just one to add.

Right now, when the Corps of Engineers does their cost-benefit analysis, they only look at the brick and mortar of the property that they are looking to protect. Well, that just doesn't make sense when we are talking about things that affect our economy.

For example, you can't just look at the bricks and mortars of the Port of New York. The Port of New York pays about $3.7 billion in taxes to the Federal Government every year. So if you only looked at the cost of the port, to rebuild the Port of New York, you would certainly miss the billions and billions of dollars' worth of impact.

There is an example in Louisiana where the port is thinking about building a levee. It includes not only the port, but it also includes our refineries, where we know that if those residents are forced to evacuate, like in Isaac, the cost of gas went up 7 cents around the country for 5 days. So you can't just look at the cost of those homes, when we know that that keeps the price of gas down and would affect the national economy.

So this is just one more of those commonsense reforms, Mr. Chairman; and I would hope that we look at this and make sure that everyone who has a port understands that the value of the port is not in the bricks and mortar, but in the goods and services that come through in the commodities.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what both gentlemen from Louisiana are trying to do with this. But the Corps of Engineers projects undergo rigorous economic and environmental reviews.

In carrying out the economic analysis for flood damage reduction projects, the Corps of Engineers review many factors to determine whether a project is economically justified. In other words, in order for the Corps of Engineers to carry a flood damage reduction project, the economic benefits have to outweigh the cost of constructing a project.

Unfortunately, this amendment would change that. The Corps currently is required to look at the national impact to the economy. So, for instance, the Port of New Orleans, it is extremely important to the Nation; the Port of Newark, New Jersey, extremely important to the Nation.

But in this amendment, what it will take is it will reduce it down to the regional impact to the economy and, again, that is what is important, that the Corps continues to look at a national perspective on how those projects impact nationally, not just regionally.

So I reluctantly, at this point, urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Orleans, Mr. RICHMOND, for bringing this amendment forward; and, of course, what we are trying to do is just put an additional reform in place to make sure that when a cost-benefit analysis is done, it truly reflects the value of those projects, especially as we are talking about flood protection and hurricane reduction projects, in many cases, where local governments are doing a lot of the work themselves to protect not only people and communities, but also vital energy infrastructure.

Of course, having the value of that infrastructure, as my colleague from New Orleans pointed out, even when we see a storm enter the Gulf of Mexico, and as rigs in the gulf are evacuated, we see immediate increases in the price of gasoline all across the country.

So we ought to be encouraging those local communities to be building up and strengthening their flood protection, whether it is coastal restoration, where our State of Louisiana has actually dedicated the lion's share of all of the offshore oil revenues our State will ultimately start getting in 2017, to make sure that that money is dedicated to restoring our coast, literally, where you have the State putting hundreds of millions of dollars of its own money where its mouth is to protect those resources.

But just as locals are doing that work, as the Corps is evaluating larger projects, Federal projects that would also protect that vital infrastructure, it is important that that calculation be made because, ultimately, if there is a storm or damage and that work is not done, then the economy will suffer. We have seen it suffer across the Nation.

I do want to mention, Mr. Chairman, that the American Petroleum Institute has come out in support of this amendment. It is a strong bipartisan amendment, and we appreciate the support of API; and, obviously, they understand the national importance of having this kind of reform in the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I really, really—I mean, I really reluctantly oppose this amendment. Some concerns have been raised about how the changes proposed in this amendment would affect the current process by which the Corps calculates future costs and benefits of potential projects.

The committee may need some additional time to better understand how these changes would be implemented and what the impact to project development would be. So, therefore, I really, really reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, also what we included in here, which I think is very important, and all of my colleagues should understand, is that when the Corps right now would evaluate a farm, they would just look at rebuilding the farmhouse, as opposed to the fact that you have millions and millions or hundreds of acres that produce goods every day for the Nation.

So we don't want the Corps to just look at brick and mortar when, for example, you may have an interstate smack dab in the area that they are thinking about protecting, and that interstate may be an evacuation route. It may be Interstate 10, which our goods and services come down.

All we are saying is that the Corps should use common sense when they do their cost-benefit analysis and not just look at bricks and mortar because, to do a true economic impact or a cost-benefit analysis, you have to get into the complexities of what the building, what the area has to offer.

So we would say that our refineries, our Port of South Louisiana, our Port of New Orleans are those types of things that you absolutely must protect, and you have to factor in the fact that they send billions and billions of dollars to the Federal Government every year in taxes.

So we would not just lose the bricks and mortar, but the Federal Government would lose billions and billions of dollars. And we are saying to the Corps of Engineers that they should take that into account when they are doing their cost-benefit analysis.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would just urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I share the ranking member's reluctance to oppose this because my two friends from Louisiana have been formidable opponents on many occasions that I have come up on the short end.

But in this case, I disagree respectfully with my colleagues that the Corps does look at the national implications, and there is no doubt that the gulf coast is the major producing region of energy in this country, so it should be; and it is in the Corps' calculation when they are looking at hurricane damage to the gulf coast, what the impact is to the Nation.

So, again, I reluctantly oppose this amendment at this time because I just don't believe this is something that to regionalize it is going to be beneficial to the Nation as whole.

So with that, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 113–251.

Mr. GARDNER. I rise to offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ___. OFFICE OF WATER STORAGE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall designate a team to serve as the Office of Water Storage (in this section referred to as the ''Office'') which shall serve as the principal point of contact for any person carrying out a project to construct a water storage facility that requires the acquisition of a Federal permit or the satisfaction of other Federal requirements.

(b) ADMINISTRATOR.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall designate an individual to serve as the head of the Office.

(c) PURPOSE.—The Office shall—

(1) serve as an initial point of contact for any person carrying out a project to construct a water storage facility that requires the acquisition of a Federal permit or the satisfaction of other Federal requirements;

(2) act as a liaison between such persons and appropriate Federal departments and agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Interior, with respect to such projects to facilitate the acquisition of necessary permits and the satisfaction of all other requirements;

(3) ensure that, with respect to such projects, necessary Federal permits are acquired and all other Federal requirements are satisfied before construction begins; and

(4) coordinate with appropriate Federal departments and agencies to streamline the Federal approval process with respect to such projects, including by limiting the duration of such process to not more than 365 days in each case in which each Governor of a State associated with the project has provided notice to the Office of that Governor's approval of the project.

(d) TIMING REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to a project to construct a water storage facility, any Federal permit or other Federal requirement necessary to be acquired or satisfied for purposes of such project shall be deemed to be acquired or satisfied if—

(1) each Governor of a State associated with the project has provided notice to the Office of that Governor's approval of the project; and

(2) a determination with respect to approval of the permit or satisfaction of the requirement was not made during the 365-day period beginning on the date on which an application for the permit or an inquiry regarding the satisfaction of the requirement was submitted to the relevant Federal department or agency.

(e) NOTICE OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Interior shall each provide notice to the Administrator of the Office upon the receipt of an application for a permit relating to a water storage facility.

(f) WATER STORAGE FACILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''water storage facility'' means any facility constructed by a person that is equipped to store at least 5,000 acre-feet of water for later use for any purpose, including dams, tanks, covered and uncovered reservoirs, water towers, and artificial water bodies.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, and I express my intention to withdraw this amendment at the end of my statement.

This amendment authorizes the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to designate a team to serve as the Office of Water Storage. The office is tasked with coordinating every agency involved in the approval of water storage permits, including the EPA, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior. Once initial applications are submitted to the Office of Water Storage, the office must, upon notification of the Governor, approve or deny a permit within 365 days.

The amendment does not circumvent environmental laws but merely sets a time frame for an initial up-or-down decision to move forward, and the Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment contains no direct spending. The amendment would seek to streamline the process for desperately needed water storage infrastructure, particularly in the western United States.

Economic development to agriculture job creation is directly correlated to each individual State's ability to deliver and store water. We can no longer rest on our current water storage infrastructure to meet the demands of both our agricultural and municipal water needs.

In Colorado alone, by the year 2050, we will need an additional 1 million acre-feet of water to meet the needs of agriculture, industry, and our growing cities. Without that water, we will see a buy-up and dry-up of agricultural land and the destruction of our economy.

To approve of these projects that have been tied up for decades in permitting battles, we need to rethink the Federal Government's role in water storage and redefine the various missions that agencies at the Federal level are charged with in these permitting decisions.

The Federal Government has created a litany of regulations and bureaucratic red tape that inhibit local communities and States from building new reservoirs and new water storage systems, and the result, as I said, will be a buy-up and dry-up of agricultural land if we fail to move forward with these permitting projects.

The amendment puts control back in the hands of local water users, back in the hands of local governments, back in the hands of the Governor of the State, and away from the bureaucracy of Washington, D.C.

I would like to continue to work on this issue with Chairman SHUSTER. I appreciate his leadership, and I certainly would love to continue working on this with the chairman.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Colorado for yielding.

I understand your great passion for solving the water problems. We saw what has happened after the massive fires in Colorado and the inability to stop the flooding from occurring because the ground cover was stripped away by those terrible fires, and I understand the need for Colorado, in the future, having that water storage for your economic development to ensure that agriculture remains an important part of the economy in Colorado.

So I thank the gentleman for raising the issue. I am committed to continuing to work with you, as we have in the past, to try to address these water issues as we move forward.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the chairman for his leadership on issues of national infrastructure.

And with that, I withdraw my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–251 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. RICHMOND of Louisiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—183

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—236

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
Langevin
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1752

Messrs. PITTENGER, SMITH of Missouri, BACHUS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. RIGELL, NUNNELEE, and GARY G. MILLER of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. MORAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote No. 556, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COOK was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF SACRIFICE OF SERVICEMEMBERS OF FIRST BATTALION, EIGHTH MARINES KILLED IN BEIRUT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in honor of 241 servicemembers who were killed 30 years ago in the attacks by Hezbollah against the U.S. Marine compound in Beirut.

I was not stationed in Beirut during the attack, but this was my former battalion, the First Battalion, Eighth Marines. Until 9/11, this was the deadliest terrorist attack against Americans in our Nation's history; and in many ways, it was the beginning of the war on terror that we are still fighting today.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask my colleagues to rise and observe a moment of silence in honor of the sacrifice of 241 Americans—220 marines, 18 sailors, and three soldiers—who were lost 30 years ago today.

The Acting CHAIR. Will all Members present please rise for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 193, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

AYES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—193

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Gibbs
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Nugent
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1800

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 287, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

AYES—133

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—287

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick

Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1806

Mr. LAMALFA changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HOLT changed his voted from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 183, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

AYES—237

Aderholt
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Delaney
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Edwards
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Long
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKinley
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Amash
Amodei
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Capuano
Chu
Cicilline
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Marino
Massie
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Messer
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Upton
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1812

Messrs. COTTON, CARSON of Indiana, COURTNEY, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1815

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATHAM, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 385, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—417

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Jones
Peterson
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Castor (FL)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Fincher
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Roybal-Allard
Rush

□ 1822

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business Friday. In addition, the House will consider two bipartisan bills from the Financial Services Committee: H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, authored by Representative RANDY HULTGREN; and H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ANN WAGNER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate that information.

I would simply observe, Mr. Speaker, and then I will have a couple of questions of the majority leader, but last week we did something that was, I think, critically important, and we did it in a bipartisan fashion: we made sure that the government was open, and we made sure that America pays its bills.

Today, in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion, we passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which will, as I heard the majority leader saying and I said as well, be helpful in growing our economy, growing jobs, and investing in America's growth.

I would simply observe that there are other things, Mr. Speaker, that I think we can act on in a bipartisan fashion as well and be successful in seeing enacted, which would make a real difference on behalf of our country.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask the majority leader whether or not there is any thought about bringing to the floor before the end of the year the immigration bill, and I will yield to my friend for the purpose of a response.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and would respond by saying that I think the gentleman knows that both the Speaker and I have said that we are not going to consider the Senate bill because we object to the Senate bill, although we

do want to make some progress in reforming our broken immigration system, and there are plenty of bipartisan efforts underway and in discussion between Members on both sides of the aisle to try and address what is broken about our immigration system. The committees are still working on this issue, and I expect us to move forward this year in trying to address reform and what is broken about our system.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information, Mr. Speaker, and I would say of course the Senate has passed a bill in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion, an immigration bill, and if in fact we bring an immigration bill to the floor, whether I vote for it or not, and we move that bill through the House, that will give us an opportunity to do what my Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, have been talking about—negotiating, sitting down, talking, going to conference. I think that will be a step forward.

We are on this side of the aisle very, very strongly in favor of moving immigration reform. We are obviously hopeful that the budget conference that has been convened will reach an agreement. We hope it will reach an agreement, frankly, before Thanksgiving so we will not again have to address on a crisis basis either the keeping of government open and funding of government for the balance of the fiscal year, but also ensuring that we do not have another time when we come very close to not approving the payment of our bills by what ought to be the most creditworthy nation on Earth, and I think it is the most creditworthy nation on Earth, so I am pleased to hear that information.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the majority leader whether or not he has any information which might lead us to having some confidence that we might have progress on the conference on the farm bill.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

□ 1830

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the conference committee has been appointed, it is meeting, and we anticipate a productive discussion on the farm bill and the reforms that the House voted on in all parts of the bill. We hopefully look forward to resolution on the differences between the Senate so that we can produce yet another bill that can be signed into law.

I would just underscore the fact, Mr. Speaker, that talks and negotiations are, yes, the way to go about trying to accomplish more for the American people. Along those lines, it is about trying to focus on the things and the beliefs that we have in common and not allowing those things that we disagree on to get in the way. If that spirit of negotiation is adopted by both sides, I believe there could be progress on the farm bill as well as other issues.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. CANTOR and I are in absolute agreement. If both sides take that attitude, then we can make some progress. Hopefully, that will be the case.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader has said, I said, HAL ROGERS of the Appropriations Committee has said, and others have said that the sequester will not work, that the sequester will, in fact, undermine the ability of America to invest in its growth and its opportunities and its ability to compete globally so that we can create jobs here in America. The majority leader has made an observation, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't think the sequester was the way to go. I share that view, and I share very strongly the view of Mr. ROGERS that, in fact, the sequester could not be implemented in a way that was consistent with the interests of our country.

I want to ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, focusing on what we can agree on and not what we disagree on, whether or not he shares my view that one of the conference's objectives should be replacing the sequester with a formula that gets us to a place where we are bringing down our expenditures and at the same time making sure that we protect the mandatory expenditures that Mr. RYAN talks about and others talk about to make sure that our most vulnerable in America are protected and that we do so, frankly, before Thanksgiving, Mr. Speaker.

I am urging the majority leader to hopefully take that course so that we do not once again confront a crisis prior to Christmas when we are scheduled to adjourn for the Christmas and Hanukkah holidays, but also to preclude coming into the first of January with a deadline confronting us and disrupting the confidence of our people and, frankly, the people around the world.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the gentleman that it is desirable. I look at it as a priority that we allow for the appropriations process to begin again, but that will require us to arrive at an agreement on what that top line number is, as the gentleman knows as a former appropriator.

We have said and maintained all along on the majority side of the aisle that the sequester is not the best way to go about achieving spending reductions, and I have said continuously that we would like to exchange for sequester mandatory savings and put that into law in exchange for the sequester. There are items in the President's budget that we agree on as well. That goes to my point, Mr. Speaker, of working and focusing on things that we have in common, things that we believe in in common, and leaving aside those things that we disagree on.

The main item that we disagree on in these discussions has been higher taxes. The Republicans and the majority in the House do not believe we ought to raise taxes, and we will not go about raising taxes in exchange for sequester relief. What we want to do instead is to allow for sequester relief and put into law mandatory savings that, in the long run, will exceed the kind of spending reductions that are in the sequester. They are smarter reductions. They make more sense and will allow us to provide, as the gentleman said, for the needs of those who are most wanting in our society. It will also allow for the defense of our country and will put us on to a path of fiscal stability.

Mr. Speaker, it takes us focusing and limiting our discussions to those things we have in common. I believe that is the best way forward.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, we have two bills: the Senate bill, which was passed some 6 months ago, and the House bill, which was passed about 6 months ago. We have been hoping to go to conference during those past 6 months. That hasn't happened. We are now going to conference. That is a positive step forward. My belief is that the conference will discuss both the Senate bill and its priorities and the House bill and its priorities, and we will come to a resolution, hopefully, on a compromise so that we can get from where we are to where we need to be.

I am not going to get into a debate at this point in time. At some point in time that will be appropriate with the gentleman. We seem to hoe this road a lot, but the fact of the matter is we ought to look at those who have made recommendations, worked on this to figure out how we can get from where we are to where we need to be.

Without going further into the specifics, as we talk about next week, let me ask the gentleman if he can give our Members some view of his thoughts on scheduling and subject matters for consideration for the balance of the year. I know we talked about a couple of items, and I know Members are interested in what their planning should be for the balance of the year, which is coming up pretty soon.

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we just discussed, we expect there to be a farm bill conference report that we will consider here in the House. We will also look to consider items dealing with our domestic energy supply and the ability for us to maximize the indigenous assets and resources we have here to increase our competitiveness as a country for investment, for job opportunity, and to increase the standard of living for all of working middle class Americans as well as all Americans.

I would also say to the gentleman that if the Senate acts in time, we look forward to a conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act as well as various provisions that expire at the end of the year. Obviously, we have SGR and other things that will

expire that we will have to take time to deal with.

Obviously, we maintain our focus on the rollout of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and our committees will be hard at work trying to understand exactly what is going on with the signup on these exchanges and to once again assert that it is only fair that all Americans are treated equally and fairly under this law, as is expected under every other law.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

He is going to find out, I am sure, over the next few weeks the overwhelming interest that Americans are displaying in getting health care opportunities and access to an affordable, quality health care.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, regarding morning-hour debate not apply tomorrow, and when the House adjourns on Thursday, October 24, 2013, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 28, 2013, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to address the important issue of climate change.

EPA reported some good news today: carbon pollution from power plants has dropped 10 percent from 2010 to 2012. Some of this drop was due to fuel switching from coal to natural gas, which is less polluting; some was due to increased energy efficiency; and some was due to growth in clean, renewable sources of electricity like wind and solar.

Our challenge is to continue these reductions. Market forces alone will not be enough. The Energy Department says that carbon pollution has crept up this year as coal prices fell and usage increased. That is why we need the new regulations proposed by EPA to limit carbon pollution from new power plants, and that is why we need limits on pollution from existing power plants.

The history of the Clean Air Act has shown us we can have both a strong economy and clean air. Our health, our environment, and our economic prosperity depend on developing the clean energy technologies of the future.

IN TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to our former colleague, Congressman Major Owens of Brooklyn, New York.

Major and I were elected in the class of 1998 and had the joy of serving together for several decades. He was a fighter for learning and perhaps the first librarian ever elected to the Congress of the United States. He came from Brooklyn, far from where I lived, but his predecessor, Shirley Chisholm, was the only Member of Congress that in our first campaign came to campaign for me. I shall never forget that.

Major was a social critic, and he was a voice from a Brooklyn that I only imagined as a child with the Brooklyn Dodgers. With the old Ebbets Field torn down, the Dodgers moved to Los Angeles, and baseball changed forever from a human institution where the players came from that region to an enterprise where they were traded like chattel.

Major understood the difference, and the work that he did here, whether it was fighting for learning, fighting for libraries, fighting for jobs in America, for the training of workers, he handled in a very measured way. He had a poetic sense about him when he came to the floor many times in the evening and delivered some of his handwritten lines. Through his work both in Brooklyn and for our country, he helped to build a better America, and he left us a better place for his service.

I wish to extend to his family and to his former constituents the deep sympathy of the people of Ohio. He was an honest man and an honorable man, and it was a great privilege to serve with him those many years which seem just like yesterday.

MANAGING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the preeminent privilege of talking to the Honorable Barney Frank just recently, the former chairperson of the Financial Services Committee. He called to my attention a speech made by the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, who is now the ranking member of the committee.

This speech was a keynote speech at the launch of the Global Financial Governance and Impact Report. This is a very insightful message accorded by the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. It is, in fact, a critique of the World Bank, the IMF. She goes into the global sovereign debt restructuring issue, and she talks also about the problem of growing inequality.

I would invite anyone who is interested in learning more about what I call the ''Waters Worldview,'' to peruse this document.

Chairman Frank was eminently correct when he suggested that this might become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I will place it in the RECORD tonight.

CONG. MAXINE WATERS KEYNOTE SPEECH AT THE LAUNCH OF THE ''GLOBAL FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE AND IMPACT REPORT'' BY THE NEW RULES FOR GLOBAL FINANCIAL COALITION

INTRODUCTION

I'm very honored to be invited here today by the New Rules for Global Finance coalition to talk about governance of the international economy and the role of the world's major economic institutions in helping to shape and manage the global financial system.

First, I'd like to say that I very much welcome this report by the New Rules coalition and the contribution it makes in calling attention to one of the most challenging issues we face today—how do we manage the global economy and how do we make our existing international institutions more effective in helping to preserve global stability and promote sustainable growth in a way that is broadly shared?

In a world of sovereign states, the underlying challenge to effective global economic governance originates from the absence of a single global entity responsible for overseeing the system and establishing the rules necessary for its operation.

The core infrastructure of the global economy will need to be based—in my view—on effective national rules coupled with increased international cooperation among nations, both through informal channels and through established multilateral institutions.

GLOBAL ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

Given the importance of our global economic institutions in these efforts—and the fact that these institutions have no system of direct democratic accountability—it is all the more important that there be confidence in their governance—and that they be transparent and accountable.

Particular attention should be paid to the effectiveness of their policies and the impact they have on developing countries.

Any examination of these institutions should first acknowledge how much progress they've made in many areas over the past 20 years—in large part due to pressure from civil society and individual governments. This is particularly the case with regard to the Bretton Woods institutions. Whatever deficiencies people might identify or perceive, one thing the international financial institutions cannot be accused of is being indifferent to pressure or impervious to change.

Having said that, I believe the first set of governance reforms we need at the Bretton Woods institutions is a more effective voice for developing countries. These countries now represent a much larger proportion of world economic activity than when the World Bank and the IMF were created in 1944.

Voice and representation reforms are imperative in order to re-establish the credibility of the Bank and the Fund as truly international institutions contributing to growth with equity and stability for all countries.

WORLD BANK

I believe it is very much in our interest that the World Bank—as the world's premier

development institution—remains strong, credible and effective.

One of the important contributions the Bank has made to the vitality of development efforts is its emphasis on good governance—its commitment to democratic values and inclusive, participatory decision-making.

Inspection Panel

In fact, twenty years ago the Bank became the standard-bearer for democratic accountability at the multilateral development institutions by establishing the Inspection Panel. This marked a very important advance in the governance of international institutions.

By creating an independent forum through which ordinary citizens who felt disadvantaged by Bank projects could submit their complaints and see them addressed—the Bank gave voice and standing to affected people. For the first time, an international organization provided a means through which individual citizens could hold the Bank accountable to its own standards.

Today, the Inspection Panel continues to contribute in important ways to project quality and improved development outcomes.

Racial Discrimination

But the World Bank can only be effective in conveying a message of good governance if it is seen as having good governance itself. There must be a belief that its own governance conforms to the standards that it demands of others—including standards relating to the choice of personnel and due process.

One of the Bank's most important assets is its human capital. It has created one of the most talented and qualified bureaucracies around the world. But the Bank has some serious work to do to ensure that its processes for hiring, retaining and promoting staff are free from discrimination. It must also ensure that staff have access to a justice system that they can trust will be fair and impartial. This is an issue that I will continue to follow very closely.

DOING BUSINESS REPORT

Another area where I'm optimistic we'll see permanent change is in the World Bank's annual ''Doing Business'' report, which ranks countries according to their attractiveness to business.

Several years ago, the Financial Services Committee learned that the ''Doing Business'' report included a labor index—the ''Employing Workers Indicator''—which downgraded countries in the rankings for any and all labor protections. This included factors such as having a minimum wage, maximum working hours, vacation days, or maternity leave. It was clear this had to change.

Another area of concern in the Report was its ''Paying Taxes'' indicator—which gave countries a higher rating based on how close to zero their corporate tax rates were. In effect, this meant that the World Bank's guidance to developing countries was to gut labor protections and shift the funding of all government functions to workers and households. Of course, this would make it more difficult to fund social safety net programs, build a middle class, or empower workers. This was odd advice for an organization supposedly devoted to ending poverty.

International labor groups such as the AFL-CIO, the International Trade Union Confederation, and the ILO all tried in vain to convince, shame, or bully the World Bank into eliminating the ''Employing Workers'' index.

After our Committee held a hearing on the subject several years ago, we made it clear to the World Bank that its funding could be very, very slow in moving forward through the committee until this problem was resolved. The outcome was that in 2009, the World Bank suspended the ''Employing Workers Indicator'' from the ''Doing Business'' rankings—and it created a working group to develop a new indicator to measure countries' adherence to core labor standards.

I'm confident that the anti-worker aspects of the Report will soon be permanently abolished altogether. Not doing so would greatly undermine the Bank's legitimacy and its relevance in the fight against global poverty.

International Monetary Fund

With regard to the IMF, I first want to thank Ms. LaGarde for her willingness to engage with me directly on issues that have been of particular importance to me. And I want to commend her leadership in focusing as much time and energy as she did on the country of Jamaica when the world was otherwise so focused on the turmoil in Europe.

I believe the IMF has a very legitimate and indispensable function in the global economy—in monitoring the world's economies and responding to countries facing balance-of-payment crises.

One mark of the vitality of an institution, in my view, is its ability to admit when it was wrong, to say that it had misjudged some things and made mistakes. The IMF has done that, and I think that adds to its legitimacy. For example, after the East Asian financial crisis in the late '90s, the IMF admitted that it was wrong in imposing too much austerity, which exacerbated debt crises.

Over the past decade, the IMF has tried to pay more attention to the social aspects of its programs, including by protecting social safety nets and vulnerable parts of society.

Last December, the IMF marked an end in the era of finance by reversing its long-held opposition to capital controls. The Fund announced a new official institutional view acknowledging that controls on volatile flows of capital around the globe can play an important role in helping to preserve the stability of the international financial system.

Moreover, when Congress authorized an IMF quota increase in 2009, which included a limited amount of gold sales, the IMF agreed to use a portion of the proceeds to help the poorest countries. This included the elimination of interest payments on its loans to the poorest countries for five years.

Labor Market Issues at the IMF

However, there are areas where I believe the IMF needs to do a better job. First, it's clear that the Fund doesn't always strike the right balance between austerity and growth, which has had some very negative consequences. Second, I believe the IMF should stick to what it knows best: macroeconomic issues that bear most directly on balance-of-payment questions. For example, it's difficult to understand why monetary economists at the IMF should intervene in a country's labor market policies, particularly when they encourage labor market flexibility measures. Labor market flexibility is nothing more than a euphemism for measures that make it easier for firms to fire workers and dilute the power of unions to negotiate on behalf of workers. I understand that the IMF has recently recommended a number of these policies in Europe and elsewhere. The IMF should not be re-writing the social compact in countries that recasts the balance of power between labor and capital.

Global Soverign Debt Restructuring Mechanism

On a positive note, I'd like to add my very strong support for recent work at the IMF, and elsewhere, to study and encourage a more efficient approach to sovereign debt restructuring.

The issue of sovereign debt is back at the center of economic policy debate. This is a result not only of the global crisis, but also because of recent court rulings that would give greater leverage to vulture funds, which could undermine future debt restructuring efforts.

I favor an approach that would establish a formal, institutionalized, and politically recognized procedure for restructuring the debt of bankrupt sovereigns. It would extend legal protections to both the sovereigns and creditors involved.

Under certain conditions, an international sovereign debt restructuring mechanism could allow for the orderly and swift resolution of debt crises in ways that would not only make crises less costly but would also encourage sovereign debtors and creditors to act more responsibly in normal times.

There are a couple of principles that I think should underlie such a mechanism. For example, odious debt should be written off. This would include, for example, the kind of debt the Congo had as a result of Mobutu borrowing, or Ethiopia, which was given loans that paid for arms that went to Mengistu. Also, when loans were made with advice from international lenders—advice that was wrong and led to projects that were poorly designed—the lenders should bear some of the risk for bad lending.

In any event, the recent court rulings allowing vulture funds to interfere with Argentina's ability to make payments to creditors that had accepted a debt restructuring have caused widespread concern. Both the World Bank and the IMF have noted that this will encourage holdouts and discourage creditor participation in future sovereign debt workouts, which could pose a very real threat to global financial stability.

THE PROBLEM OF GROWING INEQUALITY

This brings me to what I think is one of the central problems with the way we have approached international economic policy, through our trade agreements and through the policies of the international financial institutions.

I believe our international economic policy has been too one-sided—too focused on elevating the interests and mobility of capital over all other considerations. This was based on the misguided belief that unfettered markets would not only create wealth and stability, but would also solve almost all social problems through a trickle down of benefits to others in society.

But this isn't what has happened.

Over the past 30 years, we have seen a growing increase in inequality in the U.S. and in other advanced and some emerging market countries. This was the case even during periods of sustained growth. In fact, today the United States has the highest level of inequality of any advanced industrial country.

Although some degree of inequality is necessary for the function of a market economy, since it creates incentives to work hard and take risks, here in America and elsewhere, we have more much more inequality than is necessary for efficiency.

Left entirely to its own, the market system will produce more inequality than is economically necessary. And excessive inequality not only undermines social and political cohesion, it has also been shown to have negative effects on growth.

World Bank research has shown that growth alone is not sufficient in reducing poverty. You also have to pay attention to how the benefits of growth are distributed, so that its benefits are broadly shared. Recent research at the IMF has shown that inequality can also undermine growth, because

it weakens demand and depresses consumption.

Now, I believe in capitalism. I recognize the power of capitalism to create wealth, and I believe markets are the main engines of wealth creation in our country and elsewhere.

But in order to be truly supportive of the free market, I believe you must also be supportive of government. This is because we need to have an appropriate set of public policies in place to reign in the excesses of the market, to help maintain stability, and to ensure that the benefits of capitalism are broadly shared.

In fact, one of the most important lessons we have learned from the recent financial crisis is that markets must be deeply embedded in systems of governance. The idea that markets are self-correcting has received a mortal blow. Markets require other social and public institutions to support them. They rely on courts, legal frameworks, and regulators to set and enforce rules. They depend on the stabilizing functions that central banks and countercyclical fiscal policy provide. They also need the political buy-in that redistributive taxation, safety nets, and social insurance help generate.

And all of this is true of global markets as well.

What I'm saying is this: free markets and government are not opposites, they are complements. And if you don't want to believe me about the importance of government to the free market system—well, maybe you will believe the markets.

In Congress, one of the biggest supporters of the IMF and the World Bank has been the US Chamber of Commerce. They understand the need for effective public intervention when countries are facing an economic crisis. Business has also been the biggest supporter of the U.S. Export-Import Bank, another government function. Finally, last week, after the Republicans shut the government down, business deployed an army of lobbyist to Capitol Hill to stress the importance of getting the government back up and running again.

IN CLOSING

As I conclude my remarks, it occurs to me that perhaps this might not have been the most appropriate audience to hear my views on the importance of governance and the necessary and mutually reinforcing roles of government and markets.

I think perhaps the House Republicans in Congress would have benefited more from this message than anyone else.

Their insistence on shutting down the government—coupled with their apparent willingness to allow our government to default on its debt—reveal just how reckless and dangerously dysfunctional the Republican Party has become.

Their actions show not only a contempt for government, but also an indifference to markets and the importance of stability. Taken together, the Republicans have shown the country just how profoundly misguided their understanding is of the role and responsibilities of elected officials in a representative Democracy.

□ 1845

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Ms. SLAUGHTER, New York
Mr. MCINTYRE, North Carolina
Mr. COHEN, Tennessee

THE OBAMACARE DEBACLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as the ObamaCare debacle continues to unfold, there is more and more that is absolutely staggering that is now coming out. People in America need to understand who shut the government down September 30, October 1.

The House of Representatives had voted out, first, a bill to completely defund ObamaCare because we could tell—many of us have read it. I read it before I voted ''no.'' I could see it was a disaster waiting to happen, that real Americans would be really hurt. So we offered a compromise.

All right. This obviously, pursuant to notice by Democrats themselves, was a train wreck, nightmare. It was not ready for prime time. So we actually gave Democrats in the Senate and in the House that pushed it through without a single Republican vote, and the President himself, an easy out because that is, if you really want to get something done, unless it is ObamaCare that you want—that America knows is going to be harmful and totally against, or at least over half are against.

Unless you are going to do something like that that is really totalitarian and against the will of the American people, it is good, a Chinese proverb notes, to give adversaries a way out.

We gave a way out for Democrats in the House and the Senate that passed ObamaCare without Republicans. We gave a way out for President Obama. We said, okay, here is a compromise that ought to be an easy agreement. You know, we will give you money that you are demanding, with a gun to our heads, namely, the shutdown, and all we ask is that you do the right thing for America and suspend the implementation of ObamaCare for a year. Clearly, it is not ready now.

HARRY REID, maybe he consulted with the President, surely he did before refusing to let that go anywhere.

So we did what people are not supposed to do in a negotiation, continue to compromise against themselves. I didn't think it was a good idea. We should have waited for the Senate to vote on something, something. Do something, because being in a legislative body requires more than just saying no, no, no, no, which the majority leader in the Senate did.

Nonetheless, our Republican leadership decided we would compromise against ourselves—yet again. All right, if you don't want to suspend the whole thing for a year, at least do for individuals in America what you are doing for Big Business. Big Business, basically, as set forward in ObamaCare, was anybody with more than 50 employees.

And yet, again, HARRY REID and the President were a ''no'' on the compromise that would have just suspended, legally suspended, the mandate forced upon individuals that they are going to pay higher taxes, a fine of $95 or 1 percent of their income, going up to 2 percent.

But that was going to be implemented, they were going to be penalized, or as Chief Justice Roberts rewrote the ObamaCare bill and called it a tax after he called it nothing but a penalty. So Americans were going to get hammered. We could see that.

At least, we implored the Senate and the President, give individual Americans the same break you have now, basically, illegally given to Big Business by saying yeah, the law says that, but we are just not going to enforce it for a year.

Why not do that for individuals in America if you will do it for Big Business? Why not? It's the fair thing to do.

Once again, it gives a legislative opponent a way out. It gives you a back door to say, well, okay, we are caving in. We are going to allow the individual mandate to be suspended for a year, like we, like the President did, legislating from the executive office.

But, again, the answer was no. And in response to Majority Leader REID's no and the President's no, the President, of course, had called people to the White House later on, after the shutdown, and made clear to the leaders of the House and Senate, you know, I wanted to make clear to you I am not negotiating. Give me my money. Raise my debt ceiling, and then maybe we will negotiate.

Later on, in essence, it was give me my money. Raise the debt ceiling. You will be amazed at what I will be willing to negotiate once you give me everything I want.

So it was indicated yesterday, by the administration, you know, gee, there is a possibility we may have to delay the individual mandate. And in an article today from Jim Wizner, the title of the article, ''ObamaCare Mandate May Be Delayed. Official says deadline to have insurance could be postponed.''

The article says, the Obama administration may gave Americans extra time to sign up for health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, postponing when penalties for failing to buy coverage will go into effect, Market Watch has learned.

Further down, it says, the administration declined to say whether people who purchase health insurance late in the enrollment period, say, on March 31, would be exempt from a penalty, even if their policy doesn't kick in until April or May; nor would the Department give a specific date by which people would need to buy coverage to escape a fine.

The HHS, or Health and Human Services, official, however, indicated that the administration may extend the deadline beyond February 15: we are exploring options currently, and will issue guidance at a later date.

The article at marketwatch.com goes on to say the potential extension comes as the Federal health exchanges are under fire for ongoing technological problems that are making it difficult for some people to enroll. The Obama administration has so far resisted GOP pleas to delay the requirement that individuals purchase insurance next year, but has lately expressed frustration with the technical difficulties. Those problems, perhaps the elephant in the room during deadline discussions, may influence a decision to provide an enrollment grace period to avoid fines.

There is another problem that the penalty policy or, as rewritten by our Chief Justice, the tax policy, may be in flux. While Health and Human Services referred Market Watch's previous inquiries about the fine and the deadline to avoid it to the Treasury, a spokesperson there referred a request Wednesday back to Health and Human Services, suggesting that the health officials are now the ones writing new rules for the law.

For this administration, for Democrats in any part of this body or at the White House to even consider out loud suspending for 1 year the individual mandate is absolutely outrageous, and it exposes, clearly exposes that there were games being played in Congress, and it wasn't by Republicans.

It exposes that people knew there were problems with ObamaCare, with the Web sites. They knew that Americans were going to have a nightmare, and were having a nightmare in even trying to get online and review different policies, and they didn't care, just as, obviously, there were people in this administration who could have changed the policy.

They didn't care about the veterans. They can say now, oh, yeah, we had a policy that World War II vets were going to get in, or people that were utilizing their First Amendment rights.

Well, I was there the first day. There wasn't any mention of that. Those barricades were connected across in front of the World War II Memorial, across in front of the Lincoln Memorial, across in front of the Martin Luther King Memorial. There were barricades, for heavens sake, on the road that just made a loop around the Iwo Jima monument, the U.S. Marine Corps Memorial.

They were out to make things as difficult as possible. Apparently, at least as early as Thursday, before the shutdown the following Tuesday, plans were being made to gather barricades. There was an indication at one point some of them may have been rented.

We still haven't gotten to the bottom of where they all came from, where all the cones came from to interrupt people's lives around the country, as this administration sought to make it as difficult as possible on Americans. As one park ranger indicated, it was disgusting, the park ranger is reported to have said, but we have been ordered to make things as difficult for people as we can. Well, they were doing a good job.

So, for them, anyone in this administration, anyone down the hall, anyone in Congress to now think about, gee, maybe we should suspend the individual mandate, is an outrage. It tells you that there were people in Congress and there were a lot of people down Pennsylvania Avenue who had no consideration for the American people.

They were out to score political points. They didn't care. They wanted people to hurt and to suffer so maybe they could win the majority in the House next year, and the American people began to see through this.

When the next-to-last compromise of a compromise continuing against ourselves was to suspend the individual mandate for a year, there was no excuse for rejecting that.

□ 1900

The Senate should have at least voted that through. What an incredible turn of events for this administration now to say, Yes, we are thinking about suspending the individual mandate. You have got to be kidding me.

Nothing could make it more clear to the American people that games were played with the shutdown—and it wasn't by Republicans who kept compromising against ourselves, but it was with the people who kept saying, No, no, no.

Then the last thing we did the night before things really shut down was to say, Okay, under the law, the rules, here are our conferees. You appoint your conferees, and we will have this worked out hopefully by morning before people even realize there has been a shutdown. And once again, the answer was, No, no, no. Obviously people in the majority at the other end of the hall wanted the government shut down.

And I would expect that in the future, if someone were looking for a modern day Marie Antoinette, who reportedly, in response to the suffering of the people in France, had said, ''Let them eat cake.'' So out of touch with the suffering of the people, if that were actually said.

Here is an article by Susan Jones, CNSNews.com, and it is dated today:

> In an interview with CNN's Dr. Sanjay Gupta Tuesday night, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius said she won't be enrolling in the problem-plagued health insurance system that she was charged to implement.

And this is the quote that the Secretary of Health and Human Services told to CNN's Dr. Sanjay Gupta. This is the person who is charged with implementing ObamaCare. This is the person who is charged with overseeing ObamaCare. This is the person who has been given—by an overreaching, oppressive ObamaCare bill, she has been given the power over people's lives, over their health care. There is nothing more personal than that.

This person who will have so much control, if she is still in office at full implementation, says this:

> I have created an account on the site.

Talking about the ObamaCare site.

> I have not tried signing up because I have insurance.

Mr. Speaker, you had insurance. I had insurance. We had the same policy that every Federal worker in America had the chance to have. There were a number of different policies you could choose from in the Federal employee handbook, the ''Federal employee cafeteria plan,'' as they call it, a number of different insurance policies with private insurance. We had insurance just like Secretary Sebelius has now. The difference is that this bill, this oppressive, government-controlled ObamaCare business, took our health care insurance away.

There has been a lot of confusion in America about whether or not Members of Congress are under ObamaCare. We are. As of December 31, we will have lost our insurance.

I had a health savings account. I wasn't totally thrilled with it. It doesn't work like it should. There are some glitches that needed to be worked out, but I had a choice. I could choose to have a higher deductible, as I have, and a health savings account that I would manage, but Secretary Sebelius had authority to take that away, and she did.

So she says, Gee, I have insurance. Well, so did I. So did all of us in here. Mr. Speaker, so did you. But an oppressive, overreaching Congress took it away. And those Americans were promised over and over and over, if you like your insurance, you can keep it. That promise has now been broken millions of times to Americans. People were told, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. That promise has been broken probably millions of times to Americans.

The arrogance when millions and millions of Americans are having their insurance taken away from them, having to get different insurance, having to pay higher deductibles, having to pay higher amounts for their insurance, the arrogance to come back and say, I am not going to get insurance under ObamaCare. I already have insurance, that takes a lot of unmitigated gall. You might as well say, Let them eat cake. I have got my insurance. Let them eat cake.

Maybe people want a different Health and Human Services Secretary as a result of the horrendous job that was done in preparing this rollout, but I would think the head of Health and Human Services, to have this kind of arrogance, should not remain in the position with an attitude like that. It would be like the president of American Airlines refusing to fly on anything but United.

In the real world, people would care so much about their own product, that is what they would use. They would be embarrassed to refuse to use the product they were forcing on others. Airlines aren't forcing their products on us. This is being forced on us. And the one who is in charge of the forcing is too good to have ObamaCare insurance.

Now, the difference was, the Office of Personnel Management had put into the law something that wasn't in the law, and that was that Members of Congress would continue to have the Federal Government, which are the taxpayers, paying for over 70 percent of our monthly health care costs. We pay a little over a third—well, actually, not quite a third—and the government, the taxpayers, pay over two-thirds, so OPM had issued an order that that could continue even though the law didn't provide for it.

I have indicated that I am not going to accept that. Likely, I will be paying a fine unless the individual mandate is suspended for a year.

Just to indicate how bad this rollout is, this is from the Washington Free Beacon, headline, ''HHS Finds Two Enrollees for Pro-ObamaCare Ads. Ad claims website is 'very easy to use.''' This is by Elizabeth Harrington. It says:

New advertisements promoting ObamaCare by Health and Human Services claim HealthCare.gov is ''very easy to use'' despite a flood of reports about glitches and a dearth of users being able to actually access the site and purchase insurance.

President Barack Obama held a press conference on Monday in defense of his health care law, saying it is ''not just a Web site,'' which has been under scrutiny for its disastrous rollout since October 1.

Coverage of the site has been largely negative, with pundits and reporters alike at news outlets from The Washington Post to The New York Times to the Los Angeles Times noting the problems with the Web site.

However, Health and Human Services is out with new ads touting its success.

For heaven's sake, we ought to have a law against the government lying to the American people. We ought to start with a lie like that.

The new ads ''feature two individuals who have received media attention for beating the odds to sign up.''

''The site was very easy to use, and the customer service representatives were patient and helpful,'' she said.

The woman was identified online as Deborah Lielasus, 54, a self-employed grant writer, who has written grants for HHS.

Well, how about that. One of the two people in the ads that they were able to find to talk about how wonderful the ObamaCare Web site was happens to write grants for HHS. How about that.

See, back when I was a judge and chief justice, we would call that evidence that could be used to impeach her credibility. Because of that link with Health and Human Services, she has a direct interest in promoting how good things are at Health and Human Services so that she could potentially get favorable treatment. That is what you would call it in a court of law. And in a court of public opinion, reasonable people might be embarrassed that all you can find is somebody who has a pecuniary interest in promoting HHS.

But this article points out:

Her process for enrolling was not as smooth as the ad suggests. According to the Associated Press, Lielasus was only able to create an account from before the Web site crashed on October 2.

''As a grant writer who does a lot of research on Federal Web sites, Deborah Lielasus was impressed by how easy it was to use the new online insurance market that launched Tuesday—until it stopped working,'' the report said.

''They're telling me the system is down at the moment,'' Lielasus said.

Lielasus told the Washington Free Beacon that enrolling took several days.

''On the first day, I was only able to register for an account, but 2 or 3 days later, I was able to submit an application and enroll,'' she said in an email.

Lielasus said her experience with HealthCare.gov was ''primarily positive.''

'I expected some technology glitches in a rollout of this magnitude, particularly on the first day when the site was flooded with reporters as well as individuals trying to enroll,'' she said.

Lielasus appears to be one of the few who have successfully enrolled in New Hampshire. An ObamaCare navigator tried to sign up 45 people during the first week, ''but she wasn't able to enroll anyone online because of the glitches,'' according to the Concord Monitor . . . Lielasus said that she does not recall who contacted her to be in the video for HHS, only that, ''I believe I was approached for the video to share my personal story.''

A second HHS video features Daniel McNaughton, who was the only person able to sign up for health insurance during ObamaCare's first week, the Orlando Sentinel.

McNaughton said in his ad that with HealthCare.gov, it was ''pretty easy'' to shop for insurance.

''I already had health insurance, but I just wanted to see if I could do a little bit better on the health insurance marketplace, and I did,'' he said. ''Once I was on the site, it was pretty easy for me to compare plans. I was able to pick a much higher quality plan, and because of my income as a student, I only pay about 70 bucks a month for it.''

Well, the article goes on, and it says:

On Facebook, McNaughton posted a link to the plan he signed up for, which includes a $3,000 deductible, which doubles to $6,000 out-of-network. McNaughton, a 22-year-old male, will have maternity care covered, which is an ''essential benefit'' mandated by the health care law.

So another great thing, when the Federal Government decides to create a one-size-fits-all, single young men must pay for maternity care for themselves.

□ 1915

Because he only makes $15,000 a year, McNaughton is eligible for a subsidy and will pay about $70 per month, according to the Sentinel. He is known as one of the few Floridians who have successfully signed up for ObamaCare. The Miami Herald calls enrollees urban legends.

He is only one of two people found by the Herald, which solicited readers for stories of enrollees in the first weeks after the launch. That's weeks, plural:

Nearly 2 weeks after the Federal Government launched the online Health Insurance Marketplace at HealthCare.gov, individuals who successfully used the choked-up Web site to enroll for a subsidized health insurance plan have reached a status akin to urban legend: everyone has heard of them, but very few people have actually met one.

It is pretty sad, but that is what happens when the Federal Government takes charge of people's personal lives.

Here is an article from National Review Online by Andrew Johnson:

An Iowa City man may have the distinction as the Hawkeye State's first ObamaCare enrollee, but it didn't come easy. Edward Voss, a computer programer, told the Des Moines Register he had to try more than a hundred times before he was ultimately able to sign into HealthCare.gov.

Voss said he didn't know whether or not he had actually enrolled in a plan until CoOpportunity Health, one of Iowa's two carriers in the exchange, called him on Friday to congratulate him for being its first enrolled customer.

Even though he was eventually successful, Voss criticized the Web site for resembling one from the 1990s, saying it was one of the worst he's seen. He recommended that the administration consider shutting the site down for at least a week in order to address the problems. It's hard to fix things while you're up and running, he said.

That's rather amazing. Over a hundred times to sign up. I guess he probably got maternity care, too, that individual young man.

Here is an article from CNS News dated today—this afternoon—by Ali Meyer. The first line says:

House minority leader NANCY PELOSI, Democrat from California—

Also, the Speaker who helped push through ObamaCare without any Republican input or votes, and who famously said, We'll have to pass it to find out what's in it, this article says she:

—admitted Wednesday that the ObamaCare Web site is beyond glitches, adding that somebody should fix it.

Well, it seems to this person speaking that the somebody that should fix it should be led by the former Speaker, who shoved it through this House without America's support, without any Republican support, and without having any clue what was really in it. That is somebody that ought to work on fixing it.

Another article from National Review Online, by John Fund. Hopefully, he wouldn't mind me calling him a friend:

The no-excuse administration has a whopper of an excuse for ObamaCare. President Obama told the Nation there is no excuse for the disastrous rollout of the health care exchanges that are central on ObamaCare. But that didn't stop Kathleen Sebelius, his Secretary of Health and Health and Human Services and in overall charge of the project, from making excuses in a CNN interview with Dr. Sanjay Gupta yesterday.

She claimed to Gupta that President Obama hadn't been told of any potential problems prior to the launch of the exchanges on October 1—a dereliction of duty any way one defines it.

But there was also this startling explanation of what went wrong at HHS. We

talked about having testing going forward, and if we had an ideal situation and could have built a product and, you know, a 5-year period of time, we probably would have taken 5 years, but we didn't have 5 years. And certainly, Americans who rely on health coverage didn't have 5 years for us to wait. We wanted to make sure we made good on this final implementation of the law.

Well, okay, she only had 3½ years since ObamaCare became law in early 2010 to oversee the design of the exchanges and the Web site accompanying them. So now she tells us she needed 5 years:

Bruce Webster, a noted IT consultant to many companies, is stunned that Sebelius thinks that she needed 5 years, but only had 2, as somehow an excuse for this disaster. That's like Boeing saying, We know the plane crashed, but we needed 4 years to build it and a year to test it, but we only had 2 years. Color me boggled.

Bureaucratic baffle-gab like that was probably behind yesterday's White House announcement that it had, as Bloomberg reported, tapped former Acting Office of Management and Budget Director Jeff Zients to work with the team overseeing repairs to the ObamaCare Web site. Zients was named last month as the director of the National Economic Council, but his arrival there will now be delayed as he takes on his new Sisyphean task.

It is pretty clear that the White House has, as bureaucrats say, minimal confidence in Secretary Sebelius to deliver a functioning health care exchange system. I am told that, for now, her job is safe because firing her would prompt cries from liberals that she was the scapegoat for mistakes made by higher-ups such as her boss, who signed the legislation creating this mess and then failed to hire the proper people to ride herd on its implementation.

It also brings back to mind, through this disastrous rollout of ObamaCare, for which Republicans here in the House, with Speaker BOEHNER leading—he actually did a favor, with our consent, to say, Here's a way out: You want a CR, you want a continuing resolution, you just keep getting the same massive amount of money; you want the debt ceiling raised to who knows what; we'll do that. We'll give you an out on how bad ObamaCare is. Let's suspend it for a year.

When that didn't work—let's suspend the individual mandate. That gives you an out and allows us to postpone some of the harm that is going to come to America from ObamaCare, and they still said, ''No.'' Shut the government down for over 2 weeks, hurting Americans, refusing to provide death penalty benefits to families of fallen warriors in combat, even though they had the power under the bill we passed before the shutdown; making it as uncomfortable and difficult for people as possible, all the while when they were given an out by Republicans to just suspend it for a year. It is an out. It saves grief for America for a year. They wouldn't have it.

Now I know some have said, Well, the problem the administration is in is if they actually postponed ObamaCare for a year, after so many have already lost their insurance, there is no alternative. There is nothing we could do. Gee, what would anybody do? They have lost their insurance.

Well, this is just a suggestion, but I bet we in Congress could get a majority. I can't imagine there wouldn't be friends across the aisle among our Democratic friends who would agree to this, as they see how problematic ObamaCare is for Americans, and knowing that people think Federal employees have had this gold-plated health insurance policy is okay. I had better before I came here. I had better when I was in private practice.

But given where we are, there are private insurance companies that have provided insurance policies for what is called a cafeteria-style group of choices so every Federal employee in the country, before ObamaCare, could read through the thick handbook and say, Okay, I have studied the different insurance companies, the different plans, the different costs, and this is the one I choose or that's the one I choose.

How about if for the next year, 2 years, give America a break? Let's say any health insurance company that is part of a Federal exchange or a State cafeteria plan or a local government cafeteria plan, we make those available to anybody. If it is a local plan, anybody in that area. If it is in the State, anybody in that State. If it is in the Federal plan, any insurance in that plan or any insurance company that wants to offer the same type coverage for the same price.

Let's offer to every American across the country the same private insurance choices that Federal employees have until ObamaCare kicks in. But let's give them all of the choices that we had up through this year and just say we will suspend ObamaCare.

Yes, Mr. President; yes, HARRY REID; you shut down the government for over 2 weeks to make life difficult for Americans when you didn't have to. We are more interested in helping Americans. So how about a compromise plan that just says, Hey, why don't we let Americans across the country choose from any of the Federal choices we had before ObamaCare, any State choices, local choices, and you can allow employers, since the President is suspending the business mandate, whether there are more than 50 employees, less than 50 employees, let them choose from those. If their employees choose the policy and the employer wants to pay for part or all, let them do that.

Let's give them another year before we force them under the iron hand of the government. Let them choose from any of those, from private insurance companies. Let them make the choices Federal employees had until ObamaCare.

It would still take away the problem of the preexisting condition because the market would be so wide, the people signing up would be so numerous, it could afford to take care of that. If you want to leave people on that are 26, heck, I don't care, 28. Normally, people in their twenties are in good health. So let them stay on.

We offered to agree to a bill like that before ObamaCare ever passed, but the Democrats were so insistent on their way—not the highway, but their way, period—and now 3½ years later we see the consequences.

We ought to have unlimited amounts. If you have got a health savings account under a Federal plan, State plan, local plan, or if your insurance company that provided the employer insurance plan and the employer wants to continue that next year, even though it has already been canceled, if the health insurance company wanted to re-extend that, let that be part of the agreement during the suspension period of ObamaCare.

□ 1930

Let's allow people to put pre-tax dollars—as much as they want to—in Health Savings Accounts with the understanding that, once it is in there, it can't be used for anything but health care. I have a fear there will be people who might accumulate over the years $80,000, $100,000—well, I don't care. I will pay a 40, 45 percent penalty in interest. Man, just think. I could have two or three good bass boats for that, but we couldn't allow that because it is too important for people's health. Once that money is in a Health Savings Account, it can't be used for anything but health care. Let's do what Ben Carson suggested, and let's start encouraging young people to have Health Savings Accounts. Let's do that.

Those who are in Medicare and Medicaid can stay there. If they have the wherewithal to sign up under one of the plans—the Federal options—the Federal employees have had until ObamaCare passed, let them do that if they would rather, but still they will be in Medicare and Medicaid. Let's suspend the hurt that is being done to Medicare through ObamaCare. Let's suspend the hurt that is being done to young people. If one is a young man, single, then until such time as we have a pregnant young man in his twenties, let's don't make him pay for maternity care. There is no need for it.

Just when you think it couldn't get much worse—this is from the Washington Free Beacon dated today, this afternoon—then we also find out the NSA spied on 124 billion phone calls in one month, and those are the people who want to run our health care—the Federal Government.

An article from The Washington Times from this afternoon, today:

House Speaker John A. Boehner predicted Wednesday that, by the end of the month, more Americans will have lost their insurance by being kicked off existing health plans than the number that was able to sign up in the flawed online HealthCare.gov Web site, and the early numbers may back him up.

A massive number of people have now gotten their notices that they have lost their insurance or will effective January 1.

Here is an article that is on the Breitbart Web site, but it is talking about a CNN story:

CNN: ObamaCare site doomed. Riddled with security dangers.

This reports that today, on the CNN Money site, there is a terrific story about the problems surrounding the ObamaCare Web site. The story includes all kinds of new information from a host of experts. Most of the news is flat-out terrible:

A half billion dollar site needs to be rebuilt from scratch. The site has an unwieldy 500 million lines of computer code—it took just 500,000 lines of code to send a rover to Mars—and that code of ObamaCare is riddled with security holes that could result in one of the biggest breaches in American history.

That was quoting from CNN, that article by John Nolte. It is staggering.

State exchange enrollments are mostly Medicaid, not private insurance plans.

This is another story on Breitbart by Dr. Susan Berry:

Defenders of President Obama's signature health reform legislation claim the States that put effort into establishing their own exchanges, mostly Democrat-led, are signing people up successfully for ObamaCare. A new report, however, indicates most of the individuals signing up in these State-run exchanges are enrolling in Medicaid.

Pretty disingenuous.

Then just as you think you can't stand any more about the Federal Government—they are in your bedroom, your bathroom, your kitchen, all into your private lives; they will have your medical records, and they will be giving them to navigators who are not thoroughly vetted so as to keep it secure, and it will be put online where people are saying it is a dream for hackers to steal personal information—and just when you think you can't take anything more in the way of bad news, here is a story from the AP today. It is by Stephen Ohlemacher with the AP:

The headline reads: ''700 IRS Contract Workers Owe $5.4 Million in Back Taxes.''

It kind of reminds us of the old Secretary of the Treasury, Timothy Geithner. He signed four different documents, certifying—basically swearing—that if he would be given all of the money as an independent contractor instead of having money withheld, he would certify—he absolutely was swearing—that he would take care of paying his taxes, and he didn't do it until he got nominated to be the Secretary of the Treasury.

As one Treasury employee told me privately—she didn't want to make it public because she didn't want to lose her job—if employees of the IRS were to have done what Timothy Geithner had done in not paying the taxes he swore he would pay, they would be fired on the spot at the IRS. Of course, that was before Lois Lerner and her crew weaponized the IRS so they could go after conservative groups.

Anyway, it is bad news when it comes to ObamaCare; but, Mr. Speaker, like I say, we offered repeatedly to agree—in fact, we didn't just offer. We passed a bill that would allow ObamaCare to be suspended for a year to, if possible, get its act together and give an out to the President. The President and HARRY REID could have said, Well, those Republicans in the House—we didn't want to do it, but we needed a continuing resolution to keep the government going. We needed the debt ceiling raised, so we went ahead. We had to. They had us over a barrel. We agreed to suspend ObamaCare for a year. Gee, those pesky Republicans made us do it.

That is a political way out that they had, that we gave as Republicans in the House, that we extended as a gift. We passed it as a House bill. We extended it as a gift and gave them an out. That would have given them an extra year to try to get the act together; but, oh, no, they were more interested in scoring political points because they knew the mainstream media would give them cover, that they would blame Republicans 100 percent even though it was 100 percent not Republicans. It was the people who refused to even appoint conferees to try to work it out before the shutdown really took hold. It was the Democrats who refused to agree to just suspend the individual mandate, and the compromise before that was to suspend the bill for a year. They wouldn't even do that.

How sad for the mainstream media that the best question about ObamaCare and the horrendous roll-out of its Web site was not asked by somebody at the ABC, CBS, NBC evening news, but was asked by Jay Leno after finding out that the President said, We are putting our very best people on fixing this Web site. In essence, Jay Leno asked an entirely appropriate question:

Wait a minute. We are talking about our own health care. Why wouldn't you have put our best people on starting the Web site instead of waiting until it crashed so miserably?

The answer is unknown, but the American people deserve an answer.

Are you so intent on having the Federal Government take over people's private lives—their most personal medical secrets—that you would force this horrible health care system upon them?

I am certainly willing. I will bet you we could find a majority in the House, and if HARRY REID would let it come to a vote in the Senate, they would say, Okay. Let's suspend it for a year. Come on. Maybe make it 2 years. During that time, everybody in America—every employer—can either get their insurance back if the insurance companies will do it; and if they want, they can get the private insurance that we used to have as part of our cafeteria plan for every Federal employee in America. Let Americans choose from that. Don't force these ObamaCare exchanges on America. Let them choose like Federal employees have done. Let them choose.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a brief tribute to a patriotic man who was devoted to the military, devoted to seeing that the military had what it needed, devoted to America. C.W. Bill Young will have his funeral tomorrow in Florida. He was 82 years old. There have been plenty of tributes written about Bill Young. There will be many more written and many more spoken tomorrow, and I will look forward to hearing those at his funeral, but there is nothing that could be said that could surpass the witness he was to who he was.

I talked to him numerous times. Sometimes I had questions. Sometimes I had points to make. When I had questions, he always had time. He was always honest—completely honest, very sincerely honest. He was a kind, decent, honest man. We miss when we lose a kind, decent, honest man.

Bill Young, you will be missed.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today until 4 p.m. on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 22 and 23 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 24, 2013, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3352. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Animal Welfare; Retail Pet Stores and Licensing Exemptions [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0003] (RIN: 0579-AD57) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3353. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Environmental Policy Act: Categorical Exclusions for Soil and Water Restoration Activities (RIN: 0596-AD01) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3354. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations; Income Deductions and Resource Eligibility [FNS-2011-0036] (RIN: 0584-AE05) received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3355. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 11-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3356. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Air Force Case Number 11-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3357. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captain William R. Merz, United States Navy, to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3358. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting a report on the impact of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3359. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report entitled, ''Merger Decisions 2012'', in accordance with Section 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3360. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) Medical Malpractice Program Regulations: Clarification of FTCA Coverage for Services Provided to Non-Health Center Patients (RIN: 0906-AA77) received September 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3361. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0853; FRL-9832-9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3362. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0468; FRL-9900-74-Region 9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3363. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Operation in the 57-64 GHz Band [ET Docket No.: 07-113; FCC 13-112] [RM-11104] received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3364. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-51, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3365. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notice that the Deputy Secretary has issued the required determination to waive certain restrictions on the maintenance of a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3366. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on United States Participation in the United Nations in 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3367. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3368. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting notification that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo is to continue in effect 1 year beyond October 27, 2013; (H. Doc. No. 113—69); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3369. A letter from the Deputy Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3370. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a letter regarding a public interest determination to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for a committee of medical experts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3371. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates October 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013-21) received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3372. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Clarification of Notice 2013-29 [Notice 2013-60] received September 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3373. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Obtaining Final Medicare Secondary Payer Conditional Payment Amounts via Web Portal [CMS-6054-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AR90) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2850. A bill to require certain procedures in the conduct by the Environmental Protection Agency of its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources; with an amendment (Rept. 113–252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COBLE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 3309. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3310. A bill to provide for additional protections and disclosures to consumers when financial products or services are related to the consumers' military or Federal pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3311. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with States to allow continued operation of facilities and programs that have been determined to have a direct economic impact on tourism, mining, timber, or general transportation in the State and which would otherwise cease operating, in whole or in part, during a Federal Government shutdown that is the result of a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3312. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to allow for monthly installment payments for flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to cap the annual cost of flood insurance under that Act, to provide for a ten-year phase-in of premium increases resulting from the enactment of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 3313. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior shall take that land into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3314. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit recoupments of separation pay, special separation benefits, and voluntary separation incentive from members of the Armed Forces subsequently receiving retired or retainer pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the repair, expansion, and construction, without elevation, of agricultural structures located in special flood hazard zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide transparency and require certain standards in the award of Federal grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 3317. A bill to strengthen the Federal statutes designed to deter money laundering and terrorism financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 3318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 3319. A bill to modernize the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3320. A bill to ensure appropriate coverage of ventricular assist devices under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3321. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each voter registration agency in a State which requires an individual to present a government-issued photo identification as a condition of voting in an election for Federal office to provide such an identification without charge upon request to any such individual who does not otherwise possess one, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CHU, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3322. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prevent and treat diabetes, to promote and improve the care of individuals with diabetes, and to reduce health disparities, relating to diabetes, within racial and ethnic minority groups, including the African-American, Hispanic American, Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaskan Native communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BASS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3323. A bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3324. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to reduce burdensome paperwork, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3325. A bill to award grants to improve equality of access to technology-enabled education innovations and understanding of how partnerships of educational agencies and research institutions design and implement such innovations in ways that improve student outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3326. A bill to provide for an exchange of land between the United States and the Trinity Public Utilities District of Trinity County, California, involving a parcel of National Forest System land in Shasta-Trinity National Forest; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an extension of the work opportunity tax credit for veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an extension of the work opportunity tax credit for certain targeted groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 3329. A bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. YODER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 3330. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the limitation on the number of veterans authorized to be enrolled in programs of independent living services and assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3331. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to ensure that persons who form corporations or limited liability companies in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations or limited liability companies, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations and limited liability companies for criminal gain, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations and limited liability companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 3332. A bill to provide safe, fair, and responsible procedures and standards for resolving claims of state secret privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COOK, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3333. A bill to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to award mitigation financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfires; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 3334. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certified adult day services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3335. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3336. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 3337. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of expenses for a stopover of the remains of decedents covered by section 1481 of such title en route to the final destination; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. BARR):

H.J. Res. 98. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States and the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. KLINE):

H. Res. 389. A resolution congratulating the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team on winning the 2013 Women's National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 390. A resolution honoring the lives, work, and sacrifice of Joseph Curseen, Jr., and Thomas Morris, Jr., the two United States Postal Service employees and Washington, DC, natives who died as a result of their contact with anthrax while working at the United States Postal Facility located at 900 Brentwood Road, NE, Washington, DC, during the anthrax attack in the fall of 2001, United States Postal Service employees, who have continued to work diligently in service to the people of the United States notwithstanding the anthrax attacks, as well as the three other Americans who died and the 17 who became ill in the attacks; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 allows Congress ''[t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

Article IV, Section 3

''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

Article X

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause).

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 3323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states The Congress shall have Power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 3328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 9 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 3334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Article I Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment II of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 3336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 98.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution lays out the process for amending the Constitution. This joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution pursuant to Article V.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 60: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 104: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 139: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 182: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 233: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 272: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 278: Mr. POLIS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 333: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 411: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 440: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 460: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 519: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 523: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 540: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 543: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 574: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 685: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 700: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 778: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 792: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 847: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 855: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 863: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 956: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 983: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1149: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1150: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1164: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1186: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1250: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1281: Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1317: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1354: Mr. RADEL and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1429: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1462: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1507: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1509: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1563: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1620: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1701: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1726: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1740: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1750: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1775: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1812: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1830: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1837: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1844: Mr. FARR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1869: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1905: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1918: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1920: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1975: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2030: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2041: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2058: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2134: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2178: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2181: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2199: Ms. BASS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2203: Mr. LONG, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. COLE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2241: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2259: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2288: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2298: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2300: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 2302: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2305: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2309: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2328: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2358: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2368: Mr. HOLT and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2415: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2430: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 2479: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2502: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BASS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2509: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2536: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2543: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2575: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2590: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2619: Ms. BASS, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2655: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 2675: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2689: Mr. HIMES, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2697: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2716: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2737: Mr. NADLER and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2783: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2801: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2810: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2818: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2839: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2841: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2851: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2866: Mr. KIND, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2876: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2905: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2909: Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2914: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2939: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2955: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2959: Mr. FLORES and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2986: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 3040: Mr. KEATING and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 3077: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3090: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3108: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3112: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3121: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 3143: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3150: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3154: Mr. BARR, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3169: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3178: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 3179: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 3191: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3207: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3211: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 3212: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3218: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3224: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3279: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 3286: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3297: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. BARBER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.J. Res. 56: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. HALL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. MATHESON.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. ENYART.
H. Res. 47: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 72: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 97: Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 104: Mr. UPTON.
H. Res. 208: Mr. HIMES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 239: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 247: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 281: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. GARRETT.
H. Res. 284: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 286: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 302: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 338: Mr. SARBANES.
H. Res. 348: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 381: Mr. HIMES.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. HARRIS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING THE 165TH AIRLIFT WING OF THE GEORGIA AIR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 165th Airlift Wing of the Georgia Air National Guard, marking their tenth anniversary of mobilization for wartime missions.

Since 2003, the 165th Airlift Wing has served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn, with more than 80 percent of the wing's 900 airmen deploying during that time. Over the last ten years, the eight C–130H2 aircraft operated by the wing have seen 11,363 flying hours and 7,441 combat sorties.

When the 165th Airlift Wing was activated for the first time since the Korean War, its unit members responded admirably. Their first unit aircraft dispatched within 72 hours of notification. In 2004, the 165th Airlift Wing was the first C–130 unit to deploy and operate out of Iraq, flying under the famous ''Red Tail'' markings of the 332nd Air Expeditionary Wing.

In 2005, the 165th Airlift Wing had the solemn honor of supporting the rescue mission of the 16 Navy SEALs and Army Special Operation Aviation Regiment troops whose MH–47D was shot down while attempting to reinforce four SEALs under attack by the Taliban.

The 165th continued its tradition of excellence in 2011 as a part of the 774th Expeditionary Airlift Squadron, during which time the 774th was recognized as the only squadron in the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility tasked at 100 percent. All 15 squadron aircraft flew every day for over 60 days.

In tribute to its outstanding service during wartime mobilizations, I am honored today to recognize the 165th Airlift Wing and its contributions to the United States of America.

102ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, October 10th marked the 102nd Anniversary of the Wuchang uprising, which led to the establishment of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on January 1, 1912. National Day of the Republic of China marks a significant day for the Taiwanese people as they celebrate each year with parades, fireworks and military regalia. The United States and Taiwan have been fortunate to share such a dynamic friendship that I believe will only continue to grow.

As the U.S. seeks to rebalance our comprehensive foreign policy strategy, and we look to pivot to the Asian Pacific region, I feel that National Day deserves an appropriate commemoration from Congress. I believe it is vitally important for the U.S. to continue to bolster Taiwan's efforts as they are one of the most promising democracies in the region. Such stable regional partners should be valued and held in the highest regard.

This significant anniversary also provides an opportunity for this Congress to reflect on the current state of our bilateral relationship with Taiwan and to take proactive steps to enhance it.

As the 10th largest trading partner with the United States, Taiwan's economic importance is continuing to rapidly increase in a growing 21st century global economy. As longstanding friends and allies, I am pleased to add my voice to congratulate Taiwan on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th anniversary of one of my district's finest institutions: the Business and Industry Association of New Hampshire. For one hundred years, the BIA has represented and protected the interests of New Hampshire's business community as the statewide chamber of commerce. Over that time, it has helped to strengthen the Granite State's robust economy, and it has played an essential role in creating and upholding the state's unmatched pro-business climate.

First known as the New Hampshire Manufacturer's Association, the BIA was born in 1913 from the minds of several small business leaders concerned about government legislation and over-regulation of business. Since that time, the Association has grown to represent more than 400 businesses across New Hampshire's strongest industries. Together, those businesses employ more than 86,000 workers across the state's manufacturing, technology, health care, and financial services sectors, among many others, and they contribute more than $4.5 billion each year to the state economy.

Through the strength of its advocacy, the BIA has helped to shape public policies that encourage businesses to succeed and the community to prosper, now and into the future. On October 23rd, the Association will celebrate its 100th anniversary with a dinner and awards ceremony. As New Hampshire business leaders mark this special occasion, I urge all Granite Staters and all Americans to join them in honoring this essential community institution.

CONGRATULATING UNITED NORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN ALEXIS, IL

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate United North Elementary School in Alexis, IL, which has been recognized as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School and will be honored next month at a ceremony here in Washington.

As the mother of three sons who were educated by our public schools, I know firsthand the importance of a high-quality education and I am proud that students in our community are learning at one of the best schools in the nation. United North Elementary has implemented several programs that identify struggling students early and provide them with individual attention to make sure all students have an opportunity to succeed. They have seen great results in students' math and reading abilities and I am happy they have been recognized for their achievements.

United North also succeeds in involving the whole community in education. Along with regular parent-teacher conferences and an active PTO, the school hosts classroom visits during American Education Week and recently started a Very Special Person Day for students to bring adult visitors to the school.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate United North Elementary School and Principal Sue Wilson for this remarkable achievement and I thank them for their service to students in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF YVONNE WRIGHT

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Yvonne Wright, who celebrates her 100th birthday on October 23, 2013.

Yvonne Angelle Vigeant was born on October 23, 1913 in Brookline, Massachusetts. Growing up with twin sister Helene, she graduated from Brookline High School and was working at Boston State Hospital when she met Lewis Wright, who she married in 1935. A twin himself, Lewis and his brother were local entrepreneurs, purchasing English's Dairy and establishing Wright Brothers' Sports Center, the popular Holbrook bowling center and golf driving range. Together, Yvonne and Lewis raised four children, and went on to welcome nine grandchildren, fifteen great-grandchildren, and three great-great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Wright has expressed a lifelong passion for art, having become an accomplished

oil painter. She is also well-known in her community as being passionate about the environment, often advocating for greater environmental protections and voicing her opinion in local newspapers. Yvonne loves to spend time with her large family, and is often be found at her grandchildren's soccer games and school events.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Yvonne Wright on her 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

IN HONOR OF WORLD POLIO DAY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House that in many parts of the world, polio is on the run. What in the past was a worldwide epidemic is now a controlled, limited disease and the potential for total eradication is very real.

One of the groups that has dedicated much of its attention to this problem is our Rotary Clubs. Most of us think of Rotary as being that eclectic group of community volunteers who turn out at charity events or serve at pep rallies for the local high school football team. Their dedication to local goodwill is important, true, but they are actually much more.

In reality, more than 34,000 local Rotary Clubs throughout the world initiate and deliver service projects to address today's challenges, including illiteracy, disease, hunger, poverty, lack of clean water, peace and conflict resolution, and environmental concerns. Back in 1985 Rotary began a mission to eradicate Polio. At that time more than 350,000 children were stricken with Polio every year at a rate of nearly 1,000 people afflicted by the crippling disease every day. Today, the reality is much different. The number of countries which are polio-endemic has been reduced to just three—Afghanistan, Nigeria, and Pakistan. Polio cases have been reduced by 99% to fewer than 700 recorded cases in 2011.

This advancement in health is due to the effort of many governments and charities and even individuals around the world dedicated to public health. But key among them is Rotary which has taken on as one of its central missions a positive initiative to create awareness and to educate the citizens everywhere about the vital importance of eradicating polio worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, on October 24 Rotary Clubs will mark World Polio Day and I commend them on their contribution to the worthy goal of eliminating polio around the globe.

REMEMBERING WALLACE ''WALLY'' BELL

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the death of Wally Bell of Austintown, OH in my Congressional district. Wally Bell was a very well known umpire who had risen to the highest level of officiating in the MLB. Wally was another great sports product of the Mahoning Valley. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to all of his friends and family.

I submit the following article that appeared in the New York Daily News on October 15.

[From the Associated Press, Oct. 15, 2013]

MLB UMPIRE WALLY BELL DIES OF APPARENT HEART ATTACK AT AGE 48

NEW YORK.—Major League Baseball umpire Wally Bell, who worked the NL playoff series between the Pittsburgh Pirates and St. Louis Cardinals that ended last week, has died. He was 48.

The commissioner's office confirmed Bell's death Monday. He died of an apparent heart attack in his home state of Ohio. ''All of us at Major League Baseball are in mourning tonight regarding the sudden passing of Wally Bell,'' Commissioner Bud Selig said in a statement.

''I always enjoyed seeing Wally, who was a terrific umpire and such an impressive young man. On behalf of our 30 clubs, I extend my deepest condolences to Wally's family, fellow umpires and his many friends throughout the game.''

Bell became the first active MLB umpire to die since John McSherry passed away of a heart attack on the field in Cincinnati on opening day in 1996.

Bell worked the 2006 World Series and three All-Star games, including this year's event at Citi Field, where he was stationed at first base. A veteran of 21 big league seasons, he had also worked four league championship series and seven division series since joining the major league staff in 1993.

According to Bell's biography on MLB.com, his proudest moment as a big league umpire was returning to the field after having open heart surgery in 1999. ''I am deeply saddened and shocked at the loss of umpire Wally Bell,'' said Joe Torre, MLB executive vice president for baseball operations.

''Umpiring was his life, and he touched so many people within the game of baseball. Aside from being an accomplished, All-Star-caliber umpire, Wally was a loving dad to his two teenage children. I extend my deepest condolences to them, his girlfriend Renee, the rest of his family and his admirers across Major League Baseball.''

Bell was 34 and 2½ weeks from leaving for spring training in 1999 when his heart problem was detected. He had quintuple bypass surgery on Feb. 18, 1999, that left him with an 8-inch scar down the middle of his chest. Two of his arteries had been 100 percent blocked. Two more had been 80 percent blocked, another 70 percent. But he returned to work 11 weeks later in San Diego for a game between the Padres and Atlanta Braves. That night, plate umpire Mark Hirschbeck took the first ball out of play, and planned to have all the umps sign it before presenting the souvenir to Bell.

Seven years later, Bell was behind the plate for Game 3 of the World Series between Detroit and St. Louis at Busch Stadium. During the 2013 regular season, Bell was a member of Tim McClelland's crew.

''Wally was a great umpire, a great partner and a great friend. The umpiring community is deeply saddened by this tragic loss. He will be sorely missed by many,'' said major league ump Joe West, President of the World Umpires Association.

Bell is survived by his son, Jason, and daughter, Lindsey.

IN TRIBUTE TO HAROLD SHARP

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Harold Sharp for his 44 years and 3 months of dedicated government service. Arizona is in sincere gratitude for the assistance, guidance, and leadership you have provided for the Federal Aviation Administration for so many years.

HONORING KA JOOG

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the organization Ka Joog, and to recognize its contributions to the Somali community of Minnesota through art, education, and political action.

Ka Joog launched in 2007 as an organization with no funding, but with an abundance of energy and dedication. The organizers, led by Mohamed Farah, worked tirelessly to establish an environment where Somali youth could gather and solve problems in their community. Their challenges were abundant—from the language and cultural separation of growing up in a foreign country, to the negative media attention of gang shootings and drug trafficking. The members wanted to help Somali teens "stay away"—the translation of Ka Joog—from "drugs, violence, radicalization and other negative influences, and instead to stay on the right path by attaining higher education and serving and volunteering in their communities."

And in that, they have been phenomenally successful. Last year, Ka Joog was awarded the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award by the FBI's Minneapolis Division, as well as the Ninth Ward's Youth Leader of the Year award. In just six years, Ka Joog has established itself as a political and cultural force in the Twin Cities.

Its programming is diverse and effective. Mentoring groups provide support and guidance to the youngest of the community through workshops, field trips and tutoring. A program called "Invisible Art" fosters discussions through prose, poetry and song, nurturing creativity and effective communication. A summer camp last year provided a new connection to Minnesota's natural environment for disadvantaged Somali youth, many of whom had never left the Twin Cities. Ka Joog regularly hosts conferences and roundtables on issues affecting the Somali community, gathering local, state, and federal officials to discuss gang violence, job opportunities, education, health and medical disparities, and the prevention of terrorism. Not only does their work solve many problems through discussion, coalition building, and personal engagement, it also demonstrates to youth who feel left out of the political process that they too can accomplish their goals by working hard and working together.

Ka Joog has already helped thousands of Minnesota youth, and it is poised to help even

more in the future. On behalf of all Minnesotans, I thank Ka Joog for its public service.

HONORING THERESA M. DESFOSSES ON BEING INDUCTED INTO THE RV/MANUFACTURED HOUSING HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Theresa M. Desfosses of Scarborough, Maine on being inducted into the RV/Manufactured Housing Hall of Fame.

In August 2013, Theresa Desfosses was inducted into the RV/Manufactured Housing (RV/MH) Hall of Fame, becoming only the fifth member from New England, one of only a few women, and the first Mainer to receive the honor. Inducting its first class in 1972, the RV/MH Hall of Fame was established by the RV/MH Heritage Foundation to recognize individuals that have made a significant, positive impact on the manufactured housing industry.

Throughout her career, Theresa has helped grow and advance the manufactured housing industry on the national and state levels. On the national level, she most recently served on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee, advising the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on manufactured housing regulations and safety standards. On the state level, Theresa was instrumental in establishing the Manufactured Housing Association of Maine as well as Maine's Manufactured Housing Board, serving on its Board of Directors for many years.

Theresa has not only helped transform the manufactured housing industry, but has also had a direct impact on the lives of her fellow Mainers. As owner of State Manufactured Homes, a third-generation family business, Theresa has provided affordable, accessible homes to more than 700 Maine families. Her tireless work ethic and commitment to Maine have made our state a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in recognizing the extraordinary accomplishments of Theresa M. Desfosses and congratulating her on being inducted into the RV/MH Hall of Fame.

IN MEMORY OF JOANN KOOBATIAN

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Foothill High School's choir teacher, JoAnn Koobatian, who sadly passed away on Friday, October 18 after an eight-year battle with a rare form of cancer. She was just 47.

JoAnn, an East Bay native, joined the faculty at Pleasanton's Foothill High School in 1996. She was vital to rebuilding its choir program, which had disappeared from the school's curriculum in the 1980s.

Since reviving the choir program, JoAnn's ability to connect with students made it extremely popular. Because of her dedication and passion for teaching music, she was named Pleasanton's Teacher of the Year for 2011.

Even while battling cancer for many years, JoAnn continued doing what she loved—teaching—and she always encouraged the best from her students.

Her students showed their love and devotion for their beloved teacher by hosting many local fundraisers to help JoAnn and her family pay for her medical expenses. JoAnn's legacy will continue in the lives of the students she touched.

I want to express my deepest condolences to JoAnn's husband Richard and daughter Amanda. JoAnn will be missed dearly. Her life is truly an inspiration to students, faculty, and the entire Foothill community.

CONGRATULATING BRAD WILLIAMS ON HIS SELECTION AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL APARTMENT ASSOCIATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Brad Williams of Dallas, Texas, on his upcoming installation as chairman of the board of directors for the National Apartment Association (NAA), which will take place on November 8 in Dallas.

Mr. Williams and his work exemplify the spirit of business in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. He has forty years of experience in property management and, with Lincoln Property Company, manages 50,000 rental units in both Texas and the Midwest. He also has a history of leadership in the rental housing industry. He is a past president of the Apartment Association of Greater Dallas and of the Texas Apartment Association (TAA). He has chaired the Texas and National Legislative Committees; and, for the last three years, he has served as chairman of the NAA's Political Action Committee (NAAPAC). Mr. Williams has also worked as Secretary on the Executive Committee for the NAA.

Rental housing is a crucial and growing industry in Dallas, where almost half of the city's people live in apartments. Many of these buildings are new and bring construction, innovation, and an economic boost to the area. Nationwide, 35 million people reside in apartments which contribute $1.1 trillion and 26 million jobs to the economy—from construction and skilled trades to leasing, operations, management, and even to the various businesses that surround residential buildings. To help ensure that rental housing is of a quality worthy of the public, the NAA makes it its mission "to serve the interests of multifamily housing owners, managers, developers and suppliers and maintain a high level of professionalism in the multifamily housing industry to better serve the rental housing needs of the public." Founded in 1939, the NAA today consists of 170 local and state affiliates, 63,000 members, and 6.8 million homes.

Mr. Williams is a native of Dallas, where he now lives with his wife, Ginny. He is a graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School and received a degree in History from the University of Texas. He earned his Certificate of Real Estate from Southern Methodist University and his designation as a Certified Property Manager from the Institute of Real Estate Management.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Chairman-elect Brad Williams and wishing him well as he guides the National Apartment Association through the upcoming year.

IN HONOR OF BISHOP DONALD HILLIARD, JR.

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bishop Donald Hilliard, Jr. on his 30th Pastoral Anniversary. As Senior Pastor at Cathedral International, Dr. Hilliard continues to provide outstanding spiritual leadership to the Perth Amboy, Asbury Park and Plainfield communities.

Dr. Hilliard received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Eastern College, Master of Divinity degree from Princeton Theological Seminary and Doctor of Ministry degree from the United Theological Seminary. He was ordained in 1978 by the Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc. and was consecrated a bishop in 1995. Dr. Hilliard became the Senior Pastor of Cathedral International at the age of 26.

Under Dr. Hilliard's leadership, the membership of Cathedral International has grown from 125 congregants in 1983 to 6,000 members today. The church is also expected to expand to a fourth location in Cranbury. In addition to leading Cathedral International, Dr. Hilliard is also the Founder and Presiding Bishop of the Covenant Ecumenical Fellowship and Cathedral Assemblies, Inc. and mentors other pastors. He founded and currently serves as CEO of the Cathedral Community Development Corporation, which provides resources and services to the community. He is also a member of many other religious and community organizations, including the NAACP.

Over the years, Dr. Hilliard has been recognized by various organizations for his contributions to the church and community. He has received the New York City Council of Churches' Clergy of the Year Award, the Perth Amboy Chamber of Commerce Executive of the Year Award and the National Conference for Community and Justice Humanitarian Award, among several others.

Dr. Hilliard is the son of Alease Hilliard-Chapman and the late Donald Hilliard, Sr. He is married to Pastor Phyllis Thompson-Hilliard and together they have three daughters.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the 30th Pastoral Anniversary of Bishop Donald Hilliard, Jr. His leadership, service and dedication to the church and community are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

RECOGNIZING WALTER MORRIS

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of the first African-American paratrooper to be enlisted in the U.S. Army. Walter Morris, a retired Second Lieutenant who passed away at the age of 92, was the first African-American man accepted for airborne duty in the Army. At a time where segregation existed prevalently in our country, Mr. Morris broke a barrier, setting the precedent for an additional 400 Black paratroopers to serve before the end of World War II.

At the time, then Sergeant Morris led training sessions to mimic parachute practice after duty hours to raise the morale of African-American soldiers. It is the strength, courage, dedication, and camaraderie of Mr. Morris for which I am humbled to honor his life here today.

Mr. Morris was an original member of the Triple Nickels, a battalion later assigned to a secret mission titled Operation Firefly, a maneuver for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Triple Nickels had to minimize the damage from aerial attacks by Japanese balloon bombs over the Pacific Northwest coast. The Army kept this operation secret because they wanted to disguise the fact that the Japanese balloon bombs had actually reached the U.S. coastline.

Mr. Morris's actions paved the way for African-American soldiers to become part of one of the most prestigious departments of the U.S. Army, the 82nd Airborne Division. He co-founded the African-American Cultural Association, an education facility for adults and children. Now in its 34th year, the association is a way to ensure the legacy of the Triple Nickels.

Together with Lt. Morris's two daughters, grandson, and two great-grandsons, we remember the life of an American Hero—someone who stood tall in the face of adversity and in unison with his fellow soldiers and his country.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANNETTE BOWLING

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and servant of humankind, Mrs. Annette Bowling, Executive Director of the Albany Advocacy Resource Center (ARC). The Albany ARC will honor Mrs. Bowling for her forty years of dedicated service and leadership at their 50th anniversary celebration on Thursday, October 24, 2013 at 6 o'clock in the evening at the Albany Hilton Garden Inn in Albany, Georgia.

The Albany ARC was founded in 1963 to advocate on behalf of persons with disabilities in the Albany, Georgia community. In its fifty years of operation, it has become one of the largest and most successful private provider agencies in the state of Georgia.

Mrs. Bowling began working at the Albany ARC in 1974 after her son was the first child in the state of Florida to undergo open heart surgery. As a single mom, she relied on the support she received from her community to get through this difficult time. This inspired her decision to dedicate her life to helping others and she then embarked on what was to be a long and fulfilling career at the Albany ARC.

Mrs. Bowling's work with the Center since 1974 has made a difference in the lives of many Georgians, and has helped improve the quality and dignity of life for those individuals served by the Albany ARC. When she first arrived in Albany, there were no community services or resources for people with disabilities. Since then, she has passionately directed and advocated for many programs to improve the lives of so many Georgians with disabilities. Truly, any cause to which Annette Bowling's name was attached commandeered respect.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays once said, ''He who starts behind in the race of this life, must forever remain behind or run faster than the man in front.'' Mrs. Bowling has been the driving force behind programs that have helped improve the quality of rehabilitation and disability services for those who need these services to help them to ''catch up.'' She has contributed significantly to the Albany ARC, making it the great community resource that it is today.

In addition to her work with the Albany ARC, Mrs. Bowling has served on many regional and statewide boards of directors, including the ARC of Georgia, Southwest Georgia Area Health Education Center, Southwest Georgia Easter Seals, Community Institute of Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, and the Georgia Budget Policy Committee. She also serves as Chairperson of the Division of Rehabilitation Services Council of the Georgia Department of Medical Assistance and has co-chaired the Governor's Blue Ribbon Taskforce on Community Based Services. Her office is filled with hundreds of awards and honors but the trophy that Mrs. Bowling is most proud of is the incarnation of her vision that those with disabilities can be productive members of society.

Mrs. Bowling has accomplished much in her life but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of her husband of thirty-two years, George, her son and her granddaughter.

Shirley Chisholm once said that, ''Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth.'' Mrs. Bowling has certainly paid her rent and paid it well. Winston Churchill said, ''We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give.'' Through every stage of her life, Mrs. Bowling has always given of herself to others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the more than 700,000 people of Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to a phenomenal woman, Mrs. Annette Bowling, and in thanking her for her forty years of dedicated service to the Albany Advocacy Resource Center, to the Albany, Georgia community and to thousands of families with disabilities across our great state of Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO MS. DAWN DAUER

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Dawn Dauer of Cape Girardeau, Missouri for her outstanding accomplishments and contributions to the local community. Ms. Dauer currently works as a Community Bank President for the Bank of Missouri and serves in the Young Bankers Division and on the Government Relations Committee of the Missouri Bankers Association. Outside of work, she is heavily involved in several different community organizations including the Saint Francis Medical Center Foundation Board, the Southeast Missouri State University Foundation Board, the Missouri Innovation Corporation Board of Directors, the Evangel University Alumni Board of Directors, the Old Town Cape Economic Restructuring Committee, the Cape Girardeau Area Chamber of Commerce, and Cape First Church.

Ms. Dauer enjoys being able to mentor students from Evangel University in their career and life decisions. She reaches out to young women who are right out of college or trying to find a career path, and guides them to be the best they can be. Ms. Dauer sees her volunteerism and work in the community as her own form of ministry. I am grateful that we have such caring and hardworking members of the Cape Girardeau community, such as Ms. Dawn Dauer. It is my pleasure to recognize her achievement before the House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on October 22, 2013. Due to a death in the family being Rita Miskewicz of Summerville, South Carolina, I was unable to make it to Washington. Listed below is how I would have voted if I had been present.

Roll No. 551—H.R.185, Paul Brown United States Courthouse, ''aye''; Roll No. 552—H.R. 3205, Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, ''aye''; Roll No. 553—On approving the journal, ''aye.''

HONORING L. GOEBEL PATTON FOR HIS YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE TO SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring L. Goebel Patton on his 100th Birthday—tomorrow, October 24, and in recognizing his many

years of community service in Southern Illinois.

Considered by many as ''Mr. Southern Illinois,'' Goebel Patton has worn many hats in his 80+ years of service to the people in his region. Educator, administrator, board member, lodge member, church and community leader, mentor—While this is an impressive list, it does not encompass all the roles that Goebel Patton has filled in service to the people of Southern Illinois.

Goebel Patton began his career as an educator at Logan School in West Frankfort, Illinois in 1931, just prior to his 18th birthday. He served as principal of several area elementary and middle schools before serving as Principal and Superintendent at Frankfort Community High School from 1946–1960. Between 1960 and 1970, Patton put his years of experience in education to use as Director of Public and Professional Relations for the Illinois Education Association before returning to Southern Illinois as Superintendent of Frankfort Community School District No. 168, the school district that he was instrumental in forming, from 1970 to 1984.

A member of the Second Baptist Church in West Frankfort for over 75 years, Patton has had the same impact and influence in that congregation as in his community. He was instrumental in constructing two sanctuaries for the church and organized a weekly Men's Prayer Group in 1990.

Patton has served on virtually every community and charitable organization in Franklin County. The list includes: Lions Club, Masonic Lodge, Salvation Army, Franklin-Williamson Human Services, Egyptian Council, Boy Scouts, JALC Foundation, SIU Foundation and the American Cancer Society. As chairman of the fund raising committee, he helped raise $600,000 for an Aquatics and Activity Center in West Frankfort. A banquet room in the center was named in his honor.

After his 98th birthday, Patton received a six year appointment to the Board of Trustees of a new private college being organized in West Frankfort. When asked about taking on such a lengthy commitment at his age, he repeated one of his favorite quotes for which he is famous in Southern Illinois—''Community service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy on this earth.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing L. Goebel Patton a Happy 100th Birthday and thanking him for a lifetime of community service.

OFFERING A SUMMARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING ON FLORIDA WATERWAYS ISSUES

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on October 3rd, we held an historic bipartisan Congressional briefing on issues affecting the St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee waterways, bringing national attention to the issue of toxic waters that have been plaguing the Treasure Coast. For both those who were unable to attend and for those that were there, I hope the following summary of the briefing will be helpful. For more information on the briefing, including a full transcript and video and presentations from panelists, please visit: www.PatrickMurphy.house.gov/IndianRiverLagoon.

COMMUNITY VOICES

It was great to see so many familiar faces from the district who were able to attend our briefing. There was an overwhelming showing of support, with over a hundred community members who came to bring national attention to this pressing issue, leaving us with standing room only. The bus full of dozens of residents that held fundraisers to make the long journey up to Washington, D.C. was unprecedented, and their presence helped demonstrate the gravity of this issue and its impact on the lives of those in the affected communities.

We heard from a variety of community members throughout the briefing including children who told of how their summer was dramatically affected by the pollution in the river, and long-time residents who have seen the problem year after year. We all came together to send many decision makers at the local, state, and federal levels a clear message: This is a serious problem that demands solutions.

PANELIST INPUT

Though because of the government shutdown our federal agency panelists could not attend the briefing, our state and local panelists gave many perspectives and insights into federal, local and state work underway and also discussed what else needs to be done in order to fully address the issue. They included:

Secretary Herschel Vinyard, Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Ernie Barnett, Assistant Executive Director, Everglades Ecosystem Restoration, South Florida Water Management District

Dr. Tom Van Lent, Senior Scientist, Everglades Foundation

Senator JOE NEGRON, Chair of State Select Committee on the Indian River Lagoon and Lake Okeechobee Basin

Representative Matt Caldwell, Florida House of Representatives—District 79

Representative Heather Fitzenhagen, Florida House of Representatives—District 78

Thomas MacVicar, MacVicar Consulting, Inc.

Mark Perry, Executive Director, Florida Oceanographic Society

Martin County Commissioner Chair Sarah Heard

St. Lucie County Commissioner Frannie Hutchinson

Lee County Commissioner Larry Kiker

Mayor Kevin Ruane, Sanibel, Florida

Todd Bonlarron, Legislative Director, Palm Beach County

Mr. Roland Ottolini, Director, Lee County Division of Natural Resources

Dr. Brian LaPointe, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute, Florida Atlantic University

The panelists highlighted many important points and everyone agreed that continuing to fight and urge for funding for existing Army Corps projects is crucial, such as the C–44 Indian River Lagoon Project, Herbert Hoover Dike repairs, and other Everglades restoration projects to provide relief to our imperiled waterways. There was also consensus that provisions in the House Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) will help to move forward on Everglades ecosystem restoration, which has a huge impact on our area. After passing WRRDA, we will continue to pressure the Army Corps to complete the Chief's Report for the Central Everglades Planning Project so that these important projects can move forward as well.

MEMBER ADVOCACY

I also was thankful that over 20 Members of Congress came to learn more about this issue and to hear directly from community members on how these toxic waters have affected them. Below is a list of which Members of Congress attended and some of the comments they made:

Senator BILL NELSON—

''There are way too many nutrients in [the water], and I am sure you have already had the testimony of what happens when there is too many nutrients. It is not only that bottle, but that has been going on for years.''

''We have got to continue the appropriations for the Everglades restoration. We have to keep the fire under the Army Corps of Engineers.''

''My ask of you all would be to keep up the pressure.''

House Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI—

''When PATRICK MURPHY came in with that bottle I was not sure what was going on. When he told me what that water was, it was really shocking.''

''The fact that all of you are here is a tribute to how important the issue is . . . I think your being here and their support for this elevates this to an issue of national significance.''

House Democratic Whip STENY HOYER (who was so moved by the briefing that he visited the district on October 14th to see the problem firsthand)—

''This is a crucially important issue, not just for Florida, but also for our nation. This is an extraordinary resource, and Florida is a resource. I want to thank you for doing those carwashes to come up here. Saying democracy works is a little tough today, but I have been in office for 45 years. Democracy works. Democracy works because conscientious people take their time and effort to communicate their concerns.''

House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER—

On WRRDA legislation: ''We worked very hard in the committee to produce a bipartisan product and went through a number of listening sessions from local stakeholders to industries and companies that have interests in the ports, harbors, waterways, and environmental restoration projects.''

''Both Republicans and Democrats both saw the need to make sure we move these projects forward faster and I think anybody that runs any type of organization knows that time is money. So, we get this done faster and we can save money and get these projects closer to completion.''

House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Ranking Member NICK RAHALL

House Natural Resources Committee Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO

Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment Ranking Member TIM BISHOP

Co-chair of the Everglades Caucus Rep. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

Co-chair of the Everglades Caucus and the Florida Delegation Rep. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Member Rep. CHERI BUSTOS

Florida Congressional Delegation Members: Rep. CORRINE BROWN; Rep. TED DEUTCH;

Rep. LOIS FRANKEL; Rep. JOE GARCIA; Rep. JOHN MICA; Rep. BILL POSEY; Rep. TOM ROONEY; Rep. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ; Rep. DANIEL WEBSTER; Rep. TED YOHO.

Every Member who attended was provided a comprehensive information on this issue, as well as actions Congress can take to help address this problem.

While I was extremely pleased to have a number of my colleagues attend this briefing to hear directly from our community, we have a long and challenging fight ahead of us to get the message to 200 other Members of the House to ensure that Congress continues to fund and authorize projects and initiatives that will help clean the waters of our local rivers and estuaries.

COMMON GOALS

One of the goals of this briefing was to isolate common goals among the many parties and stakeholders in the room. Some of the reoccurring points many stakeholders agree on that need work on the federal level are:

Continue to advocate to Members of Congress the importance of Everglades restoration funding

The shocking photos provided by local residents depicting this devastation to the ecosystem were on full display to all Members, as well as the presence of so many concerned citizens speaking personally about how these discharges have impacted them and the community. This education aspect of the briefing was crucial. With the 22 Members who attended, they now can help garner support for important measures related to local environmental projects when they come up for a vote, helping us advocate for the passage of the House Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) and including needed funding in the Administration's budget. But our advocacy work isn't done. We still must make the case that Everglades restoration funding is an important goal that ALL Members of Congress should support.

Funding to complete Everglades restoration projects

Everyone agreed that continuing to fight and urge for funding for existing Army Corps projects is crucial. With the involvement of Congress and federal agency officials, we can work together to prioritize funding for ongoing projects such as the C–44 Indian River Lagoon Project, the Kissimmee River restoration project, and other Everglades restoration projects that once completed will provide relief to our imperiled waterways. In order for the entire system to function better, many key components must be able to function. Completing projects that are already under construction will help us most effectively clean the waterways of southern Florida.

Continued funding to rehabilitate the Herbert Hoover Dike

One of the biggest problems affecting our waterways is that Lake Okeechobee can only retain a specific amount of water safely. That is why the community agrees that the Army Corps must continue its work of rehabilitating the Herbert Hoover Dike to get it to a state where it can contain more water safely. Holding more water in the lake is the most effective method of water retention in the area, and while this will be a long term project, Congress must act to continue to fund the critical work of rehabilitating this vulnerable structure.

Passing the House WRRDA bill

There was also consensus that provisions in the House WRRDA bill will allow state and federal actors to move forward on Everglades ecosystem restoration, which in turn benefits our district. In addition to passing WRRDA, we also need to continue to pressure for the Chief's Report for the Central Everglades Planning Project (CEPP) so that these important projects can move forward as well. While the CEPP Chief's Report isn't scheduled to be complete until 2014, the timing of passing a final WRRDA bill will be crucial.

Urging the Corps to safely reexamine the Lake Okeechobee Release Schedule

Another issue that was discussed is the need for the Army Corps to reevaluate at what level the lake can safely retain water by reassessing the Lake Okeechobee Release Schedule (LORS). I sent a letter to Army Corps officials just prior to the briefing but we must continue to urge them to take this action to reduce these harmful discharges from the lake into the St. Lucie.

Getting federal agencies more involved on the ground

Unfortunately, due to a government shutdown, our federal agency panelists were unable to attend. Although we were still able to have a robust and important conversation, it is vital that these federal agencies become more involved. They each have a role to play, and their engagement can be helpful to addressing the river issue. I will be working with my colleagues who attended the briefing to push for this involvement from agencies such as the Army Corps, NOAA, and Fish and Wildlife, as well as invite these officials to see the damage firsthand so they see the urgent need to move forward with these ongoing projects.

There was also unity on the state moving forward quickly and aggressively with their water quality implementation plans.

MOVING FORWARD

The briefing successfully brought this important issue into the national spotlight. Unfortunately, we are dealing with a Congress that could not even come together to keep the government open, so a fight for funding to address the pollution impacting our local waterways in the current "no spending" climate will be a challenge, but is a challenge we must take on. There is a difference between wasteful spending, something I've been tackling in the past 10 months, and smart investments such as these projects needed to help our local environment, that provide a three-to-one return on investments. While I can't promise that this issue will be solved in the next year or even the next several years, I do promise to do everything I can to move us towards this end. I remain focused on this issue of great concern to our community, our environment, our economy, and our entire way of life.

HONORING MR. KENNETH TILSEN

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kenneth Tilsen and recognize his contributions to the expansion of liberty and justice inside and outside the courtroom.

Mr. Tilsen measured his success by the number of people he helped, by the body of law he fought to uphold, and by the countless hours he worked to amplify the voices of disadvantaged and oppressed peoples. Born to immigrant parents in 1927, Ken learned compassion and understanding through example. His father founded the first company to build integrated housing in Saint Paul. Ken grew up in St. Paul's most racially diverse neighborhood, and attended integrated Marshall High School. He studied Law at the University of Minnesota, graduating at the top of his class in 1950. After practicing as a managing partner at a major firm in the Twin Cities, Mr. Tilsen left to begin his own private practice, so that he could represent anti-war, anti-draft, and civil rights cases. As his son described, "he wanted to define for himself a better kind of law practice and be a better kind of lawyer." And that is exactly what he did.

Mr. Tilsen's career traces a line through some of the most important social movements of our time. He defended the Minnesota 8, who were accused of raiding Selective Service offices in protest of the draft; he represented the Southern Landowners Alliance of Minnesota in a long battle to protect wilderness and farmland from unneeded power lines; he fought as one of the major attorneys of the Wounded Knee Legal Defense/Offense Committee against FBI and police misconduct, and continued the fight against historical revisionism of that case for decades afterward. He worked for the Venezuelan whistle-blower Rene Hurtado, the University of Minnesota's Afro-American Action Committee, and the protesters from the 2008 Republican National Convention in St. Paul. Many powerful individuals disapproved of his work, and he paid for his activism through years of harassment, and even questioning by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

But Mr. Tilsen's body of work did not go unnoticed, and he was recognized with awards such as the ACLU Earl Larson Award, the National Lawyers Guild Lifetime Contribution to Social Justice Award, and being named one of "Minnesota's 100 most influential lawyers of all time."

Mr. Tilsen practiced law until 1993, turning then to teaching at the Hamline University School of Law. "Ken loved the law," his son wrote. "He was personally offended when it was twisted to serve the rich and powerful at the expense of normal people trying to live their lives." He used that passion to better the law—to better the state of Minnesota and to better the United States of America. The legacy Mr. Tilsen leaves is a valuable lesson to every citizen: that our government is only as strong as those who are willing to fight for "the little guy."

THE PASSING OF BILLY THOMPSON HARDMAN

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Georgia lost a true champion and advocate for our great State last week. Billy "Bill" Thompson Hardman spent much of his life working to put Georgia on the map as a destination for both domestic and international tourists. His efforts, which spanned decades, helped draw millions to enjoy the wonderful natural and manmade wonders Georgia has to offer.

Bill was born in Colbert, Georgia on June 5, 1926. He served in the U.S. Merchant Marines in World War II, after which he attended Piedmont College and Mercer University.

In 1959, Bill was appointed Georgia's first tourism director, where he served for more than a decade. During his tenure, he built the state's first eight welcome centers, launched a tourism advertising program, conducted the nation's first Governor's Conference on Tourism, and promoted Georgia throughout the U.S., Canada, and Europe. Bill founded Hardman Productions after leaving state government in 1970. His company conducted a variety of events, including travel and RV trade shows.

During this time, Bill was hired to lobby on behalf of the Georgia World Congress Center. He met his goals of raising public support for the Center and ensuring that the Center would be built in Atlanta.

Bill also served as chairman of the Travel Association of America, now the U.S. Travel Association. He served more than 40 years on that association's board, which gave him the distinction of having the longest tenure of any member.

I have tremendous respect and admiration for all Bill did to promote tourism in Georgia and grow that industry into such a meaningful part of our State's economy. My family and I extend our prayers and thoughts to the large family and extensive circle of friends Bill leaves behind. Bill's impact on Georgia will be felt for generations to come, and we are grateful for his legacy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF BEATRICE MURPHY

HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the birthday of Beatrice Schaumberg Murphy who is turning 100 years old today. When Beatrice was born in 1913, Woodrow Wilson was President and her life has spanned sixteen presidencies.

She married Frank Murphy on October 28, 1934, and I'm told they celebrated more than 60 wonderful years together. Their marriage produced four sons, Franklin, Marvin, Jerome and David. Beatrice assumed the role of mother, homemaker and involved herself with the family dairy farm. She is also proud of her role as grandma having been blessed with 15 grandchildren and 28 great grandchildren.

Beatrice contributes her excellent quality of life at her age to ''being positive, looking forward to things, being satisfied with what I have; which is good family and friends''. Beatrice also says, ''The ability to make friends is pretty important when you're my age. Many of my old friends aren't around anymore, so I have to keep making new ones!''

That is an outlook on life I hope we can all embrace. It is my honor to recognize this amazing woman on her 100th birthday. Beatrice, Happy Birthday!

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. SHETAL SHAH

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Shetal Shah and his efforts to promote the well-being of our nation's most vulnerable population, our children.

As a neonatologist and researcher, Dr. Shah has made many meaningful contributions to the medical field, notably in the area of vaccination rates. As legislative chairman of District II of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Dr. Shah has been tireless in his advocacy efforts in pursuit of increased access to health care for children and greater funding for pediatric research. His breadth of knowledge has helped to inform policy decisions on both the state and federal level.

I offer my gratitude to Dr. Shah on behalf of myself and on behalf of those who are undoubtedly better off due to his efforts.

RECOGNIZING HONORABLE JEFFREY R. HUGHES FOR 19 YEARS OF SERVICE AS A BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Judge Jeffrey R. Hughes and his commendable service to Michigan's Western District as a Bankruptcy Judge.

Judge Hughes served Michigan's Western District as a United States Bankruptcy Judge for over 13 years. Further, his service to the state has been a long time commitment, as he has worked for Michigan communities for over 30 years.

Judge Hughes received his Bachelor's in Economics from the University of Michigan in 1977 and his J.D. cum laude from the University of Michigan in 1980 where he was an active member of Phi Beta Kappa. From there he remained in his home state, practicing law for Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett LLP for 20 years specializing in bankruptcy law and litigation. Throughout this experience he never forgot his local communities, participating in many community-based programs coordinated through the firm. Also during this time, Judge Hughes was annually recognized in ''The Best Lawyers in America'' until his appointment to the bench in 2000.

After 13 years of service to the nation and to West Michigan, he retired from Federal employment in September of 2013. Judge Hughes is a regular speaker at seminars, including those sponsored by the Institute for Continuing Legal Education and the American Bankruptcy Institute. In addition, he appears as a guest instructor each semester at Cooley Law School's Grand Rapids campus and has participated in the extern programs offered by Cooley Law School's Michigan campuses and Michigan State University Law School. While Judge Hughes will no longer be a Federal judge, he continues to ardently serve those in Michigan.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Hughes for his service to Michigan and the Western District.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REGINALD LAWSON, SR.

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Reginald ''Reggie'' Lawson, Sr., a New Orleans resident who exemplified the true value of citizenship and worked every day to improve his community. Mr. Lawson recently passed away after a battle with cancer. While today I am saddened by his passing, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Lawson and the inspiration he provided to all those who desire to improve their own corner of the world.

Mr. Lawson grew up in a single-parent household in public housing. He graduated from St. Augustine High School in New Orleans, where he played football and sang in the Glee Club, and was a proud Purple Knight alumnus. After studying at LSUNO and Straight Business School, he became a realtor in 1963. He remained in that trade for the rest of his life and developed a passion for helping those shut out of home ownership.

In 1993, an important event for both Mr. Lawson and the St. Roch neighborhood occurred: Mr. Lawson moved to a house across the street from St. Roch Park. His love for the neighborhood and his desire to improve it led him to found the Faubourg St. Roch Improvement Association in 1995. His hard work and determination made him a key figure and leading force in the drive to improve St. Roch.

Mr. Lawson's effect on the neighborhood can be seen in a wide variety of areas, including the physical improvements to the park, the development of youth sports teams, and the sponsorship of health and housing fairs by the Faubourg St. Roch Improvement Association. However, the best evidence of the great and positive influence he had comes from the testimony of those whose lives he touched. He was known throughout the city as ''the face of St. Roch.'' His hard work and dedication were widely noted and he served as an example of the good that a responsible member of a community can have on the lives of those around them.

I want to join his family, the people of the St. Roch neighborhood, and the city of New Orleans in celebrating the life of an exceptional citizen.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL FRANKLIN E. CHALK, SR.

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Colonel Franklin E. Chalk, Commander, 186th Air Refueling Wing, Key Field Air National Guard Base, in Meridian, Mississippi, for his 35 years of faithful service to our country.

A native of Meridian, Mississippi, Colonel Chalk attended Meridian Community College and received an Associate of Arts Degree in Accounting in 1974. After enlisting in the Mississippi Air National Guard and completing Undergraduate Navigator Training, he attended Mississippi State University—Meridian where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting in 1984. Colonel Chalk received a Masters of Commercial Aviation from Delta State University on Dec. 14, 2002.

Colonel Chalk received his commission through the Academy of Military Science, Knoxville, Tennessee on Nov. 16, 1978. After commissioning, he attended Undergraduate Navigator Training, Mather Air Force Base, California, which he completed on Nov. 17, 1979. On Dec. 27, 1979, he graduated from Tactical Navigation Training at Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina.

Colonel Chalk served as the 153rd Air Refueling Squadron Detachment Commander while deployed in support of Operation Phoenix Duke II, Rhein Main Air Base, Germany, flying numerous air refueling missions over former Soviet Bloc countries. He also served as Detachment Commander for Operation Deliberate Forge, Operation Joint Forge, Istres, France and Operation Northern Viking, Keflavik, Iceland. Colonel Chalk was activated Oct. 17, 2001, deploying as Commander, 341 EARS, Incirlik Air Base, Turkey in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. He has served as the Commander of the 478th Expeditionary Operations Squadron, Manta, Ecuador, the 506th Expeditionary Air Refueling Squadron, Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, and Viking South, Bahia Blanca, Argentina in support of the 2005 Summit of the Americas.

His awards and decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal with one device; Air Medal; Aerial Achievement Medal; Air Force Commendation Medal with two devices; Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with two devices; Combat Readiness Medal with two devices; National Defense Service Medal with one device; Kosovo Campaign Medal with two devices; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Armed Forces Service Medal with one device; Humanitarian Service Medal; Air Force Overseas Ribbon Short; Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Gold Border; Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon with four devices; Armed Forces Reserve Medal with one device; Air Force Training Ribbon; Mississippi Magnolia Cross; Mississippi Magnolia Medal; Mississippi War Medal with one device; Mississippi Emergency Service Medal.

Prior to achieving the position of Commander, Colonel Chalk served as Vice Commander, 186th ARW. Other military assignments include Squadron Navigator, Chief of Standardizations and Evaluations, Training Officer, Air Operations Officer, Squadron Commander, and Operations Group Commander.

As Commander, of the 186th Aerial Refueling Wing, Colonel Chalk distinguished himself by navigating the base through some of the most tumultuous times Key Field Air National Guard Station had seen since its inception in 1939. Due to a realignment of mission in the Base Realignment and Closure Round of 2005, Key Field lost its aerial refueling mission. When the last KC–135 refueling aircraft left in 2011, Key Field performed numerous different missions on behalf of the United States of America on numerous different platforms. Of particular note, Colonel Chalk's leadership in the establishment of the MC–12W Project Liberty program significantly bolstered the Department of Defense intelligence gathering capabilities, directly contributing to the demise of countless enemy combatants and the safe return of American ground forces. Colonel Chalk also oversaw the standup of the C–27J Joint Cargo Aircraft program, and was instrumental in Key Field's designation as the C–27J Flying Training Unit for the United States Air Force. Ultimately in 2012, under Colonel Chalk's command, Key Field, the birthplace of aerial refueling, saw the return of the KC–135R aerial refueling mission.

Since coming to Congress in 2009, I have personally worked with Colonel Chalk to ensure Key Field was home to an enduring flying mission. I am pleased to say that under his leadership, the base has received that flying mission and is well positioned to play an integral role in the peace and security of this nation for many years to come.

I wish Colonel Franklin E. Chalk Godspeed as he retires and enters this next phase of his life. On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Colonel Chalk for his commitment, sacrifice, and contribution to this great nation in protecting it and our way of life.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY TO ALLOW FOR MONTHLY INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS FOR FLOOD INSURANCE UNDER THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968, TO CAP THE ANNUAL COST OF FLOOD INSURANCE UNDER THAT ACT, TO PROVIDE FOR A TEN-YEAR PHASE-IN OF PREMIUM INCREASES RESULTING FROM THE ENACTMENT OF THE BIGGERT-WATERS FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2012, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Homeowners Flood Insurance Relief Act of 2013. This legislation seeks to ensure the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) remains affordable for homeowners and sustainable for taxpayers. Homeowners across the country face significantly increased rates as a result of reforms made to address the solvency of the program in 2012. Congress reformed the NFIP in 2012 as part of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. These reforms required premiums to reflect the cost of coverage to ensure the program was solvent, but rates are increasing so quickly that the reforms may be counterproductive. As the Tampa Tribune recently noted, ''For properties in low-lying areas, especially near the coast, annual rates may double or go up tenfold, depending on base flood elevation, exceeding $20,000 a year in some cases.'' Congress did not intend to create such significant increases, and they have the potential to harm the program by limiting program participation and freezing the already fragile housing market. The bill would cap a homeowner's premiums to being no more than the appraised value of the structure over the course of a thirty-year mortgage. It also phases-in rate increases over ten years and would allow homeowners to pay premiums on a monthly basis, rather than an annual lump sum. These commonsense changes will ensure that the homeowners stay in the program and any increased premiums do not harm the housing market's recovery. This legislation continues the intent of the NFIP is to protect homeowners from devastating floods while ensuring the program is able to cover its costs. I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this legislation through Congress.

[From the Tampa Tribune]

FLOOD INSURANCE RATE HIKES THREATEN 'OLD FLORIDA' COMMUNITIES

(By Josh Boatwright)

PASS-A-GRILLE.—Many of the beach cottages, motels and storefronts on this barrier island have been here nearly 100 years.

They've endured a series of tropical storms but avoided a direct hit.

While dozens have been razed in recent decades, some replaced by palatial beach homes, Pass-A–Grille's character as a quiet Gulf Coast village has essentially endured.

What residents and merchants fear may wipe out their beloved historic district isn't a catastrophic flood—it's rising flood insurance costs.

''There aren't too many places like this in Florida anymore. We've got all these McMansions and condos,'' said Bill Thompson, a member of the St. Pete Beach Historic Preservation Board.

''If it [flood insurance reform] goes into effect, we're going to lose our historic properties in Pass-A–Grille. There's just no two ways about it.''

For coastal towns that have built a community, and tourism economy, around offering visitors an authentic ''Old Florida'' experience, unaffordable flood insurance rates could drive shopkeepers out of business and retirees on fixed incomes out of their homes.

Only 20 percent of all policies provided by the National Flood Insurance Program nationwide will see their premiums rise this year as a result of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act. The changes are set to take effect Tuesday, unless Congress acts to stop or delay that from happening.

But as the government removes grandfathered rates for thousands of homes built before modern flood maps, owners of historic properties face a dilemma: raise their floor height above base flood elevation or pay exorbitant premiums.

There's another option Pass-A–Grille residents especially fear, and that's tearing down the old bungalows and replacing them with multimillion-dollar homes built to modern flood standards.

Former St. Pete Beach city commissioner Bev Jackson envisions rows of uniform two- and three-story homes raised above garages such as the Florida Panhandle community that became famous for its uniformity as a set for the 1998 film ''The Truman Show.''

''We're going to be Seaside,'' Jackson said.

The full impact of the federal flood insurance reform still remains foggy for many historic districts along Florida's coast.

In St. Augustine, the oldest European settlement in the United States, shops, restaurants and cathedrals built of wood and coquina shell flood frequently when big storms sweep over the nearby Matanzas River.

Rather than raise these aging structures above flood elevation, many property owners are encouraged to take other measures, such as installing dams on their doorways to keep water out, city Planning Director Mark Knight said.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which runs the flood insurance program, allows historic districts to avoid regulations meant to make property owners either raise their building heights or rebuild according to current code.

Improvements that increase a property's value by 50 percent or more generally trigger those requirements, but cities can make historic buildings exempt from the rule, as long as nothing is done to compromise their historic characters.

Those rules will still apply under Biggert-Waters, but historic properties won't be exempt from the same rate hikes facing all other older homes.

For properties in low-lying areas, especially near the coast, annual rates may double or go up tenfold, depending on base flood elevation, exceeding $20,000 a year in some cases.

Because flood coverage is required only for holders of federally backed mortgages, Carl Hollenback says he'll drop his policy on the Seahorse Restaurant in Pass-A–Grille if rates climb as expected under the new law.

''I'll take my chances,'' said Hollenback, who has paid off his mortgage on the restaurant.

The Seahorse has operated as a restaurant for 75 years at the corner of Eighth Avenue and Pass-A–Grille Way, directly across the street from the Intracoastal Waterway.

In Hollenback's 35 years of ownership, the restaurant has flooded 15 times, being located at one of the lowest points on a narrow stretch of land between the Gulf of Mexico and the intracoastal.

Each time, he wipes down the tile floor, lets the building air out and reopens. He filed one claim when a commercial fryer he had just bought for $4,500 was ruined; he got back $2,400.

Many residents are galled by what they see as the unfairness of the national flood program, which has collected about $16 billion from Floridians in the past 35 years—four times more than what they received back in claims.

Amy Loughery, the longtime owner of the boutique store Bamboozle on Eighth Avenue, says the government encouraged communities such as hers to embrace preservation by becoming part of the National Register of Historic Places. The new law undermines that preservation goal, she said.

''Which is it? We encouraged all these homeowners to keep their smaller properties, keep within the historic guidelines of our community,'' said Loughery, who has served on the city's preservation board.

''Only now we're going to say, oops, sorry; we're going to rip that rug right out from under you.''

Loughery leases her store, a 1930s-era building, and doesn't yet know how much of an increase to expect in her rent in the coming years.

While state and federal grants are available to help homeowners purchase and restore historic properties, there's no assistance available to defray ongoing costs such as maintenance and insurance, said Anne Peery, executive director of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation.

The changes to the flood insurance law won't impact all Florida towns equally, but preservationists such as Peery worry it will cause more people to shy away from investing in historic properties.

The funky beach cottages in Florida's most famous waterfront town, Key West, will largely be unaffected by Biggert-Waters because most of them were built on high ground and remain above base flood levels, said Diane Silvia, preservation planner for Monroe County.

What will become of the rickety wooden restaurants and shops that have come to characterize Old Florida in towns such as Cedar Key and Apalachicola isn't clear yet.

City leaders in Apalachicola had sought to cap building heights at about two stories to maintain the quaint character of this waterfront town, which has buildings dating back to the 1830s.

That may be impractical, as most of the town is already below base flood elevation and will need to rise to avoid high premium costs, said Anita Grove of the Apalachicola Bay Chamber of Commerce.

''It's going to take some time to absorb everything that's happening,'' Grove said.

Bruno Falkenstein has spent years studying FEMA's flood program, which he blames for driving Pass-A–Grille property owners to prefer new construction to restoration.

As a former St. Pete Beach commissioner, Falkenstein urged the city to adopt the exemption that allows owners to improve historic buildings without bringing them up to flood code.

His grandfather moved here after World War II on the recommendation of a fellow soldier who told him that Pass-A–Grille was paradise.

His family owns several properties, including the two-story Hurricane restaurant on Gulf Way.

FEMA, he says, has long used a broad brush to create its flood maps, ignoring the fact that few Pass-A–Grille homes have sustained serious flood damage in the past 100 years.

Flood premiums ought to be based on history. Most properties in his community have clearly stood the test of time, he said.

''When you start looking at the history and you start saying to yourself 'What did they do at the turn of the century? Why was it that they built the homes like they did?' '' said Falkenstein.

''The homes themselves, when they were originally built, were elevated. It's almost like the old-timers knew the height where the water was going to come.''

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF POWDER SPRINGS

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, every now and then, we have the opportunity to step back and reflect on our history, our accomplishments and struggles and think about how we want to shape our future. October brings a special opportunity for such reflection, as the City of Powder Springs, in my home district in Georgia, observes its 175th Anniversary. Considering that our nation is only 237 years old that is cause for much celebration.

Few people know that Powder Springs is not the original name of the City. It was first incorporated as the town of Springville in 1838. While settlers first came to the town in search of gold, they quickly discovered the medicinal properties of the seven mineral springs in the area. In the 1850s Springville widely became known as a health resort, and people came from great distances to experience the springs. The mineral water from these springs caused the sand around the springs to turn black, resembling gunpowder, which lead the city to be incorporated as Powder Springs in 1859.

The next several decades were hard on Powder Springs. The Civil War put an end to the use of the area as a health resort. After the Civil War, a thriving agricultural industry sprung up, but the coming of the boll weevil in the 1920s and the Great Depression devastated the region.

But the hard-working people of Powder Springs never gave up. With a population quickly approaching 16,000, the city is once again prospering. Its beautiful parks, nature trails and recreation centers draw in visitors from afar. The Silver Comet, for example, is a well known 59-mile ''rails to trails'' multi-use trail that runs through the heart of the City. Residents also have access to over 100 acres of permanently protected green space. I am always amazed at the level of community involvement in Powder Springs, which in part streams from the excellent leadership of Mayor Pat Vaughn, who was the city's first female mayor. My fellow colleagues, I hope you will join me in celebrating this historical milestone and this remarkable city.

HONORING MR. PHILLIP R. ROBERTS ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted public servant, Mr. Phillip R. Roberts, who will be retiring from the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) this month after a distinguished 32-year career in Federal service.

Mr. Speaker, Phil has provided a career full of exceptional leadership and strategic vision that have significantly contributed to safeguarding U.S. national security interests and strengthened our national intelligence and military intelligence capabilities during a challenging period in our nation's history. Throughout his career and in assignments around the globe, Phil has demonstrated an unyielding dedication to duty and an innate ability to inspire enthusiasm and the commitment to serve in those around him.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen firsthand the fruits of Phil's labor in my Congressional District where he was instrumental in the development of the DIA BRAC relocation effort to Charlottesville, VA. Since 2010 Phil has served as the first Chief of DIA's Field Support Activity at Rivanna Station in Charlottesville, working to bring onboard over 800 analysts to the Rivanna Station site to support DIA's Military and Counter-Proliferation Analysis and Scientific & Technical Collection efforts. Phil has worked tirelessly to ensure that DIA has been a good neighbor to the local community forging many important relationships with Charlottesville area governments, charities and institutions such as the University of Virginia.

Prior to his assignment in Charlottesville, Phil served three years as the DIA Chief of Staff. As Chief of Staff, Phil functioned as the

Agency's Chief Operating Officer and supervised the Agency's acquisition, financial, human capital, information technology and mission services elements spanning DIA's global footprint of over 150 countries.

Earlier assignments for Mr. Roberts include a tour in London as DIA's Chief Liaison to the United Kingdom and a tour as the Vice Deputy Director for Analysis for DIA where he oversaw over 2,000 military and civilian personnel, providing all-source intelligence analysis to the Combatant Commands including deployed U.S. and allied forces; the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Roberts has represented the Director, DIA at the NATO Intelligence Board and has also served as the Chief, Operational Support Group, where he was responsible for the production of all-source intelligence on foreign infrastructure and operational environment related issues, in support of deliberate and crisis planning requirements worldwide.

In August 1998, Mr. Roberts became a member of the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service when he was selected to be the Chief, Office for Counterproliferation Support:In this capacity, he was responsible for the production of all-source intelligence on foreign, nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare programs in support of U.S. counterproliferation efforts. From 1993 to 1998, Mr. Roberts was the Senior Intelligence Officer, Office for Counterproliferation Support.

From 1991 to 1993, Mr. Roberts served as the Director, Office of General Military Intelligence Functional Management. In this capacity, he oversaw program planning and budget execution for approximately $520 million and over 7,000 personnel. During this period, Mr. Roberts chaired the Council of Intelligence Producers where he played a key role in the largest reallocation of Defense intelligence resources in the post-Cold War period. From 1989 to 1990, as the Special Assistant for Intelligence Production, Directorate for Research, he directed the production of finished intelligence and data base maintenance of over 800 analysts. Prior to 1989, Mr. Roberts served in other supervisory and analytical positions including Chief, North Korean Military Capabilities Branch, and Senior Intelligence Officer, Asia Division.

A career intelligence professional, Mr. Roberts has received the Presidential Rank Award of Meritorious Executive and is a recipient of the Defense Intelligence Agency medals for Exceptional Civilian Service and Meritorious Civilian Service, two Defense Intelligence Agency Director's Awards, and the Director of Central Intelligence Diversity Management Award.

Mr. Speaker, while DIA and the Intelligence Community will be losing a leader who has answered the call of public service at such critical points in our nation's history, I know that Phil will be happy to spend more time with his wife Teresa and children Taylor, Jonathan and Jordan. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation and my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives, I thank Phil Roberts and his family for his years of service to our country and wish him the very best in his retirement from the federal government.

HONORING MS. JULIE METZGER

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Julie Metzger of Cape Girardeau, Missouri for her achievements and impact in the community. A graduate of Southeast Missouri State University and St. Louis University, Ms. Metzger now serves as the Director of Case Management and Social Services at Southeast Missouri Hospital. She provides education, support, counseling, crisis intervention, and advocacy to patients and their families during difficult times. She has also published educational materials to help other volunteers and professionals in the social work field. Ms. Metzger also mentors and supervises student interns from a number of local universities. In addition to her social work, Ms. Metzger volunteers for many councils and foundations such as the American Cancer Society, Reach to Recovery, American Academy of Bereavement, the American Case Management Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the Court Appointed Special Advocates.

Ms. Metzger has managed to achieve so much and help so many people, all the while fighting a battle with breast cancer. Having reached the five-year mark as a cancer survivor, she has used her experience to educate and support other women fighting cancer. Ms. Metzger has provided hope and inspiration for so many women and I truly admire her strength and dedication to helping others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 547–549. Had I been present I would have voted: rollcall No. 547: "no"—On Motion To Table the Motion To Appeal the Ruling of the Chair; rollcall No. 548: "no"—On Passage; rollcall No. 549: "no"—On Agreeing to the Grayson Amendment.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN BILL YOUNG

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of solemnity that I wish to honor the passing and memory of our colleague, Congressman C.W. Bill Young, who passed away on October 18, 2013, at the age of 82.

Congressman Young was the most senior Republican in both houses of Congress and represented the best of public service. He served in the Florida State Senate for ten years before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Tampa Bay area in 1970. In his nearly 43 years in Congress, Congressman Young worked hard for the people of his district and was especially tireless in supporting military personnel and their families—both legislatively and personally. He and his wife, Beverly, were known for their countless visits to wounded soldiers. Himself a veteran of the Army National Guard and Reserves, Young was the current chairman of the Defense subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and he had previously chaired that full committee from 1999 to 2005.

With decades of experience, Young naturally became a source of guidance for many of his colleagues. He had a balanced and well-regarded approach to the issues and affairs of Congress, and his personal kindness was known to many. While this moment is significant for the people of the 13th District of Florida and for the House itself, my prayers today are especially with Young's wife, Beverly, their three sons, and all of his loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring and remembering Congressman Young.

A TRIBUTE TO LOIS O'KEEFE

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to give congratulations on the retirement of my District Director, Lois O'Keefe. This is truly a bittersweet moment for me. I have known Lois for over 20 years just before I began my legislative career in the Wisconsin State Assembly. She has been a volunteer, an employee and most importantly a friend.

I am happy that Lois will begin a new journey after having such an illustrious career as a public servant. Lois O'Keefe has been employed by two U.S. Senators, Senators Proxmire and Kohl and a U.S. Congresswoman. The labor movement has also been an important part of her career. She was appointed as the Regional Representative of the Secretary of Labor for the Midwest Region in Chicago. During the Clinton Administration, Lois O'Keefe served under Secretaries Robert Reich and Alexis Herman. She also served as a union organizer for the Service Employees International Union representing workers who cared for the elderly. It is clear she has a passion for government service.

Lois O'Keefe also has a passion for working with youth. She ran the REACH Youth Program at the Milwaukee Private Industry Council and worked with the Milwaukee Job Corps to start an internship program in my district office.

Lois also has lived the reality of many women, juggling work and child care issues to return to school when her four children were young, ages 7–14. She earned both a BA in Political Science and an MA in Industrial and Labor Relations. After nearly 10 years on my staff serving as a caseworker and then District Director, I wish you well my friend.

While you have closed this door, another one is opening for you so that you may pursue life at your own special pace. Lois can now travel the world, which is something that I know she has wanted to do for a long time.

Lois O'Keefe, thank you for your service to the 4th Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent due to the passing of my close personal friend and was not present for rollcall votes on Tuesday, October 22, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: H.R. 185—To designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse"—"yes"; H.R. 3205—Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act—"yes"; Journal Vote—"yes."

HONORING KEVIN SHANLEY OF GLADSTONE, NEW JERSEY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Kevin Shanley of Gladstone, New Jersey. Kevin was a fine leader of the Newark Museum whose contributions will long be remembered. Kevin was also a successful businessman, a generous and caring philanthropist and a wonderful father and grandfather.

Kevin served as the Chairman of the Newark Museum for over 25 years. Under his leadership the museum underwent its largest expansion to date with the completion of its North Wing. His work at the museum expanded its mission and brought in objects and ideas that educated and inspired.

Kevin was a generous and caring philanthropist. He served as President and Treasurer of the Victoria Foundation, which assists young children and their families in the Newark community. Kevin also served on the Board of Trustees of New Jersey Futures, as a regent of St. Peter's University in Jersey City and on the boards of many other organizations. He was also a successful businessman working with a number of major companies. There he mentored many of his colleagues who appreciated his sound perspective and high degree of integrity.

Kevin's long devotion to his civic and personal responsibilities will forever be his legacy.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,078,769,687,926.64. We've added $6,451,892,639,013.54 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed three votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 551, rollcall No. 552, and rollcall No. 553.

CRUCIAL NEGOTIATIONS ON HOW TO RESOLVE BUDGET CHALLENGES

HON. DAVID B. McKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, for months the President repeatedly pledged that he would initiate long overdue negotiations on matters ranging from tax reform to regulatory reform and work with Republicans on the flaws emerging with his health care law. His stipulation was that Congress must first reopen government and raise the debt limit. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, last week I voted to end the budget impasse and tentatively cooperate with the President. While this agreement does not solve our long term challenges, it does allow us to move forward and begin crucial negotiations on how to resolve our budget challenges.

Throughout the fall, President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID demanded a blank check and refused to negotiate. This plan is not a blank check. It was forged through negotiations and provides a short term extension for funding at lower spending levels than the Senate wanted. It includes a long overdue conference on a federal budget. The plan also includes a much needed change in the Affordable Care Act to ensure the income of individuals receiving subsidies is verified instead of relying on an honor system.

Most importantly, the plan ensures a host of other negotiations pledged by the President will move forward so we can address our growing debt, improve our economy, and fix the problems with the health care law. President Obama has promised on numerous occasions that once the government was open and the debt ceiling was raised he would be willing to negotiate "on anything." This includes the budget, economic reforms, entitlement programs, and even the health care law. In the next few months the American public should be keenly aware whether he does what he said he would do. Finally Congress can hold the President accountable for his pledge to negotiate with Congress over these impediments to economic recovery.

Over the past several weeks, conservatives put up a strong fight to stop President Obama's health care law from being fully implemented. After trying to defund the law, delay it for a year, and ensure fairness so that members of Congress don't get special treatment, it became clear that our tactics weren't working and we needed to regroup.

Given that Republicans are a minority in Washington we need to be realistic about what we can achieve. That does not mean we will give up the fight. We just need to be smart about where and when we choose to fight and pick battles we can win.

As we move forward with negotiations over the budget and other issues, we need to focus on ways we can achieve our objectives. We need to seek true reforms that don't just put off hard decisions to the next crisis. The challenges we face—a weak economy, a growing debt, a health care law that isn't working—are too important to just push off into the future.

The next step to overcome these challenges is for the President and Senator REID to open the negotiations we were promised.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL DARRELL D. JONES

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Lieutenant General Darrell D. Jones, Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel, and Services, Headquarters United States Air Force, for his 34 years of faithful service to our country. The Air Force's senior personnel officer, General Jones is responsible for comprehensive plans and policies covering all life cycles of military and civilian personnel management, including military and civilian end strength management, education and training, compensation, resource allocation, and the worldwide United States Air Force services program. Over the course of Lieutenant General Jones' distinguished career, he commanded a squadron, group, two wings and a direct reporting unit. As previous Commander, Air Force District of Washington, and Commander of the Air Force Forces for Joint Forces Headquarters-National Capital Region, he organized, trained and equipped combat forces for aerospace expeditionary forces, homeland operations, civil support, national special security events and ceremonial events. He also provided major command-level support for 60,000 worldwide military and civilian personnel and was the Uniform Code of Military Justice authority for 40,000 Airmen.

General Jones graduated from Mississippi State University's Reserve Officers' Training Corps Program in 1979. He began his career as a personnel officer at Williams Air Force Base, Arizona in the Consolidated Base Personnel Office. He excelled in a variety of jobs as the Chief of Customer Assistance, Chief of Quality Force, and Chief of Personnel Utilization. Immediately after this assignment, then-Lieutenant Jones reported to Randolph Air Force Base, Texas where he was the Chief of the Assignment Analysis Branch and later the Executive Officer to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel at Headquarters Air Training Command. Then-Captain Jones reported to Washington, District of Columbia as part of the very elite Air Staff Training Program as a personnel adviser and board member of the Secretary of the Air Force Personnel Council.

Then Captain-Jones and later Major-Jones held the first of his many assignments as a

leader in our Air Force, becoming the Consolidated Base Personnel Office Chief and Director of Personnel, and Commanding the Mission Support Squadron at McConnell Air Force Base. As a testament of his skills and abilities, he was chosen to attend in-residence professional military education at Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Upon graduation, he showcased his talent in a variety of joint positions at Headquarters United States European Command, Stuttgart, Germany. He was the Chief of Entitlements, Compensation and Education, followed by Chief of the World War II Commemoration Branch and later Deputy Chief of the World War II Commemoration Division. Now-Lieutenant Colonel Jones was selected to return to Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama as an Air War College Student with a follow-on assignment to Headquarters United States Air Force as the Chief of Force Structure Plans and Policies in the Military Personnel Policy Directorate. Later, he was selected by the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel as the Chief of the Personnel Issues Team.

Based on his successes and ready for increased responsibilities, now-Colonel Jones took command of the 62nd Support Group at McChord Air Force Base, Washington. He then became the Director of Personnel at Headquarters Pacific Air Forces at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii followed by Commanding the 66th Air Base Wing at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts. Later, he was selected as the Director of Manpower and Personnel at Headquarters United States Central Command at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

Then-Brigadier General Jones took command of his second wing, the 37th Training Wing at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, the largest wing in the Air Force at 21,000 people and graduating 60,000 Airmen from basic, technical, international and joint training annually. He followed command to Washington, District of Columbia, where he became the Director of Force Management Policy, Headquarters United States Air Force. In this position, he established force management policies guiding accessions, assignments, evaluations, skills analysis, promotions, readiness, retraining, separations and retirements of the Air Force's human capital. He also oversaw aspects of total force management to include contingency, mobilization, training management, and rated force policy.

Now-Major General Jones with his vast knowledge and experience took command for a fifth time as the Commander of Air Force District of Washington and Commander of the Air Force Forces for Joint Forces Headquarters-National Capital Region at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. He was again extremely successful in this position which ultimately led to his most recent assignment as the Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel and Services, Headquarters United States Air Force where he and his team were responsible for comprehensive plans and policies covering all life cycles of military and civilian personnel management, and the delivery of fully-qualified, ready Airmen for the Joint warfighter while also meeting all the needs of our Airmen and their families. He planned, directed and evaluated programs, ensuring a qualified, productive and well-maintained work force of over 180,000 civilian employees. Additionally, he oversaw the execution and programming of the Manpower, Personnel and Services portfolio with an annual $40.9 billion personnel budget for 660,000 military and civilian total force Airmen.

Under General Jones' leadership, the Air Force implemented sweeping policy changes to enlisted developmental special duty assignments and the Air Force fitness program. He led the Secretary of the Air Force-directed Personnel Readiness Review task force, ensuring our current population is ready to meet the needs of current and future war time requirements. Additionally, he led the Air Force Personnel Center in a historic consolidation with the former Air Force Manpower Agency and Air Force Services Agency, integrating three unique functional areas designed to reduce overhead, achieve efficiencies and maximize customer service. Finally, he guided Air Force senior leadership through the impacts of the Secretary of Defense's General Officer Efficiency Study. He provided critical Congressional interaction to ensure all timelines of the reductions were met. In every instance, General Jones was a steadfast advocate promoting the Air Force's mission, and its over 660,000 Total Force Airmen and their families.

Today, I wish Lieutenant General Darrell "DJ" Jones good luck and Godspeed as he retires and enters this next phase of his life. On behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank General Jones, his wife Holly, their sons, Taylor and Stewart, and daughter-in-law Lindsay for their commitment, sacrifice, and contribution to this great Nation in protecting it and our way of life.

HONORING MARCUS D. WOODS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Marcus D. Woods. Marcus is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Marcus has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Marcus has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Marcus has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Marcus D. Woods for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING MS. LINDA McKINNIS

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Linda McKinnis of Cape Girardeau for her charitable work in Southeast Missouri. An event and wedding designer by profession, Ms. McKinnis volunteers her design expertise to a number of local groups. She has provided design services for the United Way of Southeast Missouri, the Southeast Missouri University Booster Club, and La Croix United Methodist Church.

Most notably, Ms. McKinnis founded the International Crisis Aid, Heartland hub dedicated to helping victims of sex trafficking in the United States. She has worked to raise money and spread awareness of the issue of sex trafficking by selling ICA's can tab bracelets. She has inspired many more people to volunteer and advocate on behalf of this important issue. I offer congratulations to Ms. McKinnis on her outstanding achievements and look forward to her future work in the Cape Girardeau community.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE MARINE BARRACKS IN BEIRUT, LEBANON

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of the terrorist attack on the Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, which took the lives of 241 American servicemen, as well as 58 French servicemen in a separate building. It was the deadliest attack on the Marine Corps since Iwo Jima during World War II.

This attack against our country by Hezbollah, which was coordinated with the Iranian regime, marked the first major terrorist attack targeting the U.S. This is the same Iranian regime that continues to sponsor terrorism, develop nuclear weapons and threatens the U.S. and our allies in the Middle East still today.

In some respects it was an opening shot fired in a battle that continues to this day against radical Islamists and terrorist elements bent on the destruction of this country and all that it represents.

I have visited the site of the barracks near the airport. Today, there's nothing left but a parking lot—not even a memorial or plaque to recognize the lives that were lost. In a cruel twist of history, the airport itself, which the Marines were guarding in 1983, is now controlled by Hezbollah.

However, there are now memorials to the servicemen at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut as well as at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. This morning, the 30th Beirut Observance Ceremony was held at the memorial at Camp Lejeune.

Today we pause to remember those lost in the attack—to honor them and their family members. We remember their sacrifice and reaffirm our commitment to learn the lessons of the past to prevent such tragedies in the future.

As President Reagan said in a televised address from the Oval Office following the attack, the Americans serving in Beirut, "were not afraid to stand up for their country or, no matter how difficult and slow the journey might be, to give to others that last, best hope of a better future. We cannot and will not dishonor them now and the sacrifices they've made by failing to remain as faithful to the cause of freedom and the pursuit of peace as they have been."

REMEMBERING MR. JOSHUA RABORN

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Mr. Joshua Raborn of Victorville, CA who passed away on October 16, 2013 after a fatal motorcycle accident.

A dedicated public servant, Joshua served in the United States Marine Corps as a Lance Corporal before becoming a firefighter with the United States Forest Service. He held the position of Lead Water Tender Operator on the San Bernardino National Forest, Mountain Ranger District.

Joshua started his career in 2008 as a seasonal firefighter with the Big Bear Hotshoots. In 2009, he was admitted into the Wildland Firefighter Apprenticeship Program before entering Basic Academy number 49 and the Advanced Academy in 2010. After converting to full-time in January of 2011, Joshua spent the remainder of his career on the Mountaintop Ranger District as the lead water Tender Operator at Deerlick Station number 12 in Hesperia.

In a very special way I would like to extend my most sincere thoughts and prayers to Joshua's wife Kristen, his four kids, and his parents. His work, legacy, and dedication will never be forgotten by all who were fortunate enough to know him.

HONORING ENZO ANTHONY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Enzo Anthony. Enzo is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 41, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Enzo has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Enzo has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Enzo has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Enzo led a reforestation effort, planting over 900 saplings across four acres at the Circle O Tree Farm and Quail Preserve in Marceline, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Enzo Anthony for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO RIVERSIDE COUNTY'S RECIPIENTS OF OPERATION RECOGNITION

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a group of individuals—heroes—who are receiving the recognition and honor they deserve for their service to our country. Operation Recognition is operated by the Riverside County Office of Education with assistance from the Riverside County Department of Veterans' Services. The program awards high school diplomas to veterans who missed completing high school due to military service in World War II, the Korean War, or the Vietnam War, or for those who were interned in WWII Japanese-American relocation camps.

A recognition ceremony will be held on November 12, 2013, for the following individuals who received their high school diplomas through Operation Recognition:

Austin Elmer Lee Acord; David M. Barnes; Kenneth James Becker; Raymond Frederick Carter; Robert Dale Cloyd; Michael William Divel; Alan F. Gonsalves; Larry James Lyon; Cruz Martinez; Frank Ramirez Rodriguez; Frank Sandwell; Samson Charles Trevino; and Ruben David Zamora.

Our country owes a debt of gratitude to all the above recipients for their service and sacrifice. I salute all of these individuals and congratulate them on receiving their high school diploma.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING OF RUNAWAY AND FOSTER YOUTH

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my former life, I was a criminal court judge for 22 years and spent 8 years as a prosecutor in Texas.

Child abusers are the worst criminals in our society.

But too often the justice system ignores the victim.

So Congressman JIM COSTA (D–CA) and I founded the Victims' Rights Caucus.

The VRC is currently focused on combating human trafficking.

This topic is of particular interest to me because my hometown of Houston, Texas is unfortunately a hub for this despicable crime.

Many are not aware that modern day slavery occurs right here in the United States.

The problem is very real, especially amongst vulnerable youth in the child welfare system.

This is Anna's story which Shared Hope International shared with me.

After Anna's family passed away, she was placed in the foster care system at the age of three.

She was shuffled from home to home until age 12 when she was finally adopted by a loving family.

But Anna began hanging out at the corner store without her family knowing.

There, she met a person whom she thought she could trust.

Little did she know that the person she met at the corner store was not actually a friend at all.

One day, when she got into a fight with her parents, she called her "friend" from the store, who promptly picked her up.

Anna didn't know that this call would change her life forever.

Her "friend" was actually a trafficker.

He was violent.

He beat her and sold her body.

The emotional, physical and sexual abuse continued.

He threatened her family's lives if she called the police.

She was told the police would arrest her.

And that's exactly what happened.

The police did arrest her.

She was treated like a criminal, not a victim.

Anna became convinced that her family no longer wanted her.

She felt helpless and scared.

After almost four years of this unspeakable abuse, Anna eventually escaped and was reunited with her family.

Through strength, a resilient spirit, and with the help of her mother, Anna vowed to make a difference one victim at a time.

She now has a ministry for sex trafficking survivors and runs an outreach program for at-risk youth.

Unfortunately, Anna's story is not unique.

The scars from the foster care system stayed with her and made her vulnerable to trafficking.

Many foster youth have experienced neglect, physical, emotional, and/or sexual abuse.

These factors make children more susceptible to trafficking.

The child welfare system has tremendous problems and one major challenge is to not only put a roof over a child's head, but to instill values—like self-worth—in each child.

Child sex predators try to steal the soul of their victim when they are assaulted.

I will soon introduce the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act with Congresswoman MALONEY. THE COMPANION WILL BE OFFERED BY SENATOR CORNYN and Senator WYDEN.

This bill will create a grant program to help State and local governments develop and implement comprehensive victim-centered programs.

The bill creates a "Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund" at the Treasury, financed through fines on persons convicted of human trafficking and child exploitation crimes, which can be used to fund support programs for victims of human trafficking.

Criminals will literally pay for their crime and for the system they have created.

Included in the bill are a number of other provisions to ensure victims receive justice and traffickers and buyers are prosecuted.

In this country we have 5000 shelters . . .

For animals, according to the ASPCA.

These shelters are great.

I got my Dalmatians from a shelter.

But we have less than 300 beds for domestic minor sex trafficking victims according to a recent survey by Shared Hope International.

We must have facilities to rescue and restore these victims.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act builds upon the End Sex Trafficking Act, that

I have already filed with Congresswoman MALONEY. This bill will help combat human trafficking by targeting the criminals who purchase sexual acts and ensuring they are prosecuted as human traffickers.

This bill goes after the anonymous buyers of child sex slavery.

Target the demand in order to stop the sale of children.

The days of boys being boys are over and the long arm of the law must go after these consumers.

Justice demands it and justice is what we do in this country. And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE VETERANS OF HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN COLORADO

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic veterans of Honor Flight Northern Colorado as they travel to Washington, DC to visit the memorials that stand in our Nation's capital. The members of this 11th Honor Flight Northern Colorado trip include veterans from multiple wars and different generations, linked together by their service to our Nation.

Eighteen years ago, Honor Flight began its mission to fly veterans of World War II to Washington, DC, so that each person who bravely served could experience the monuments and memorials honoring them. Having now expanded to serve veterans from every corner of the country, and conflicts beyond World War II, the Honor Flight program has become a national expression of gratitude to our veterans. Of the 118 veterans on the most recent flight, 40 served in World War II, 75 in Korea, and 3 in Vietnam.

Our gratitude extends well beyond the physical memorials dedicated to those who courageously risked their lives to preserve our inherent rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We know that without the bravery of our veterans, our Nation would not be able to stand as the shining city on the hill for the world to see. Today we honor those who risked their lives to ensure that the United States remains the greatest Nation on earth for generations to come:

Homer Andersen, Ernest Baugh, Norman Bever, William Compton, Alton Cooper, Arthur Cushing, Robert Davis, Harold Dawe, Jr., Richard Doyle, Robert Eldridge, Stewart Fonda, Jr., Donald Forry, Albert Gablehouse, Charles Gebauer, William Hammond, Sidney Hanks, William Hargis, Walter Hayward, Herman Huwa, Reinard Janssen, Donald Larson, Evelyn Lee, John MacQueen, Robert Martin, Isaac Martinez, George Norton, Eugene Olson, Herbert Pugh, Thomas Ramm, Eugene Replogle, William Ripple, Max Rodgers, Loyal Smoke, Glen Springer, Harold Sutton, Donald Steinshouer, Roger Van Thorre, Charles Webb, James Whitley, Lawrence Zuppan, Harry Ahlbrandt, Wallace Akers, Ronald Anderson, Joseph Annello, Filbert Baca, Gilbert Ball, Delbert Black, Keith Bordewyk, Delmar Bonser, Emilio Brito, Dorn Brunner, Charles Crihfield, Marvin Crihfield, Charles Dunfee, Sr., Thomas Eckrich, Verne Einspahr, Virtus Einspahr, Theodore Farwell, Edwin Foss, Robert Frank, Loren Garretson, Scott Goshorn, Earl Graham, Howard Hanson, Fred Hara, Jerry Herring, Bernard Hill, John Holloway, Harold Hoyland, Vealess Hudspeth, William Hughes, Jimmie Hylton, John Jacobson, Ray Jacoby, Richard Jaggers, Kenneth Jan, Frances Killinger, Jr., Raymond Kosley, Edward Krivonak, William Krupke, Pat Lanphear, Owen Lecheler, Clarence Lueb, Robert MacLauchlin, Roquez Martinez, Horacio Masearenas, Edward Minch, Robert Muller, Leonard Peatrowsky, William Phillips, Dean Pope, Charles Pugh, George Pugh, Teddy Putnum, Tommy Richie, Theodore Roos, Leonard Schmidt, Paul Schroeder, Lloyd Seekamp, Robert Sharritt, Richard Sherman, James Sparks, Boyd Stark, Harvey Steward, Joseph Stockert, Richard Stoner, Jr., Leo Thielen, John Toth, John Wachsmann, Benjamin Wagner, Roger Warden, Jr., Robert Weber, Lester Weers, James Weitz, and Russell Zingelman.

TRIBUTE TO MS. TAMEKA KYLES

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Tameka Kyles, a College Access Coordinator for Southeast Missouri State University. Ms. Kyles works to educate and prepare underserved high school students and first generation college students for post-secondary education. She also provides financial literacy services to these students and their families. Another important aspect of Ms. Kyles' service is to reach out to at-risk and low-income students in the area and mentor them in job training. Receiving her Masters of Public Administration from Southeast Missouri State University, Ms. Kyles is working for a better future for the community's youth. She is also a member of the Gibson Recovery Center Board of Directors and the Cape Central Senior High School A+ Advisory Board. In the past, she has volunteered with the Boys and Girls Club of Cape Girardeau, mentoring young men and women.

Ms. Kyles is especially proud that her job enables her to empower girls and women through education and employment. To further this goal, she co-founded the Sisters' Professional Network, which provides opportunities for professional women to share ideas, network, and enhance each other's personal and professional lives. I am impressed with Ms. Kyles' dedication to the local community and her proactivity in addressing local issues.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 22, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on No. 551 and No. 552 and I would have voted ''nay'' on No. 553.

RECOGNIZING DANIEL A. SCHWAGER

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Ethics, and with and on behalf of my colleague, Representative Sánchez, the Ranking Member of the Committee, we rise today so that we may recognize the dedicated service of Daniel A. Schwager to the House of Representatives. Dan has served as the Chief Counsel and Staff Director to the Committee on Ethics during the 112th and 113th Congresses.

Dan has a long and admirable career as a nonpartisan public servant, much of it in the field of government ethics. During his tenure with the Committee, he has continued to demonstrate his commitment to ethics, to public service, and to ensuring that public servants meet the highest ethical standards.

The Committee on Ethics is the only standing committee of the House whose membership is evenly divided between each political party. The Committee includes five members of each party. Also, unlike other committees, the day-to-day work of the Committee on Ethics is conducted by a staff that is nonpartisan by rule. Under House rules, the Committee has the jurisdiction to administer travel, gift, financial disclosure, outside income, and other regulations; advise members and staff; issue advisory opinions; and investigate potential ethics violations. As Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Dan led the Committee's nonpartisan professional staff and helped the Committee fulfill these vital responsibilities to the House and to the American people.

Dan's commitment to integrity and rigorous open-mindedness have been an asset to the Committee in advising the Committee and its Members as they carry out the Committee's important service to the House. His advice and counsel have greatly assisted the Committee as it achieved such milestones aimed at continuing the Committee's commitment to providing excellent customer service to the House community as issuing new privately sponsored travel regulations, updating the Committee's financial disclosure systems and guidance, and launching the Committee's new Web site.

On behalf of a grateful Committee and community, we thank him for his service and wish him and his family all the best in his transition to the next phase of his career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on October 22, 2013 because I was undergoing a medical procedure. Had I been present, I would have ''yea'' on rollcall votes Nos. 551, 552, and 553.

I was also not present for the first series of votes on October 23 because I was travelling to Washington from my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes Nos. 554 and 555.

TRIBUTE TO MAURICE LYONS

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, Chairman Maurice Lyons. Maurice passed away on Wednesday, October 16, 2013. A long time resident of Riverside County, he was a pillar of the community and he will be deeply missed.

Maurice was born January 21, 1950, in Riverside County as one of nine children and raised a Morongo Tribal Member. He grew up on the Morongo Indian Reservation where he would later attend Banning High School. Maurice quickly became involved in the betterment of the Morongo Indian Reservation following his completion of school when he gained a job as a machine operator with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, where he would remain a dedicated employee for over seventeen years.

Maurice's investment back into his community did not stop with his work, as he also became actively involved in public service beginning in 1994. Maurice served as Tribal Housing Commissioner, Chairman of the Morongo Head Start Parent Policy Committee, and Chairman of the Board of the National Indian Child Welfare Association. He was elected Tribal Chairman in July 2001 and faith in his leadership remained for years to come as he was reelected as Chairman in 2003, and again in 2005.

He worked closely with state and federal legislators on Native American and Morongo tribe related issues affecting government and economic development. Through his leadership, he made it a priority to improve the quality of life on the reservation through a betterment of youth programs created to preserve local Indian culture and customs. With a deep commitment to his history and heritage, Maurice kept the Morongo culture alive by encouraging education of youth in language and tradition.

Maurice quickly became a voice for Riverside County. He served on the Riverside National Cemetery's governing board and was instrumental in establishing the MIA–POW monument which has become a fixture in the community. He represented the Morongo tribe with the National Indian Gaming Association, which hosts 70 member states, and with the Tribal Alliance of Sovereign Indian Nations, a regional federation of 13 tribal governments. He was honored by the Council of Energy Resource Tribes for his national leadership in preserving tribal sovereignty.

Maurice was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He is survived by his wife, Sandra Lyons; children, Tammie Lynn Lyons, Ernest Lewis Lyons, Melissa Renee Lyons, Maurice William Lyons, Joseph Rafael Lyons, Onoalyse Onjaleeen Lyons, Joshua Nicholas Bau Lyons, Isabella Ryanne Lyons, Kyle Munson, Andre Petkov, Angel Raelyna Gonzales, Erika Gonzales; 13 grandchildren; and two great-grandchildren. On Saturday, October 19, 2013, a Memorial Service honoring Maurice's extraordinary life was held at the Morongo Reservation Community Center.

Maurice will always be remembered for his devotion to family, caring nature and selfless giving. He demonstrated an incredible work ethic, generosity, contributions to the community and love of family, and I can personally attest to Maurice's professionalism and positive attitude. These achievements and qualities are a testament to a life lived well and a legacy that will continue. I extend my condolences to Maurice's family and friends. Although Maurice may be gone, the light and goodness he brought to the world remain and will never be forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 551, H.R. 185—To designate the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse" in Sherman, Texas, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 552, H.R. 3205—Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 553, on approving the Journal, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

LUMBERTON—THE ALL-AMERICA CITY

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this most important subject of my hometown of Lumberton, North Carolina. Credit.com has used wrong figures and erroneously reported that Lumberton is the "poorest city in America." I strongly urge that the facts be accurately presented and this report be corrected to reflect the current economic situation in Lumberton and Robeson County.

Lumberton's economic, social, historical and cultural strides and values have been honored on the national and state levels.

Twice Lumberton has been chosen as an All-America City because of its clear vision on promoting the positive attributes of diversity. Lumberton has been named a "Main Street City" on the state level, and its Downtown Historic District has been recognized on the national level. Its schools have produced leaders recognized on the national and state levels in areas such as business, banking, literature, athletics, government, law, military, education, religion, health care and the arts.

With its strong sense of purpose, a community filled with people who are willing to roll up their sleeves and work, and its partnership of elected officials, community leaders, businesses, and economic development team, Lumberton will continue to march forward and meet the challenges of the day. However, Lumberton should not have one hand tied behind its back with this inaccurate report, and we urge an immediate correction in this economic indicator.

Like many other small towns and communities, Lumberton has its challenges and obstacles to overcome, but the foundation on which this community was built is strong and solid. Indeed, Lumberton lives up to its motto of "Progressus cum Concordia" or "Progress with Harmony".

Among the many positive economic, social, and geographic attributes Lumberton has includes: ideally situated on I–95 as the halfway point between New York and Miami; over 1600 rooms of hotels and suites; national and state historical attractions; numerous meeting and gathering facilities; a wide variety of restaurants and local entertainment establishments; a nationally-designated black water river voted as one of the top ten natural wonders in North Carolina; a multi-racial community and a workforce committed to helping others and building a better tomorrow; and a strong faith-based community with a broad range of places to worship and a diverse number of ministries, demonstrating positive values of service and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, Lumberton and its elected officials, businesses, community leaders, economic development officials, and citizens are all dismayed at this recent inaccurate article and stand ready to showcase all the positives that Lumberton and Robeson County, North Carolina have to offer. We hope that everyone will come and visit and see first-hand the great people that live in Lumberton, the purpose in which they are committed to improving their city, and the partnerships they are willing to form to keep moving Lumberton forward. You will be glad you came.

HONORING WALTER L. ANTHONY IV

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Walter L. Anthony IV. Walter is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 41, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Walter has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Walter has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Walter has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Walter helped renovate the entrance to Walt Disney Municipal Park in Marceline, Missouri, by constructing an eight foot by 27 foot garden box, filling it and leveling the soil before planting 17 plants, including five knockout rose bushes.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Walter L. Anthony, IV for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING LAKE FOREST CHARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lake Forest Charter Elementary School, an outstanding school from my district, for being selected as a 2013 National Blue Ribbon School.

Lake Forest Charter is a special school in a special city. After the 2005 disasters of Hurricane Katrina and the levee failures left the school and the area devastated, current CEO Mardele Early, dedicated teachers, and devoted families banded together to rebuild and reopen the school. That effort illustrates vividly the commitment of the faculty and staff and the level of parental involvement that are the foundation of Lake Forest's success.

Lake Forest Charter's Blue Ribbon Schools selection is in the ''Exemplary High Performing'' category. This award is given to some of the highest performing schools across the nation, and I am proud that Lake Forest is receiving national recognition for the outstanding education it provides to local school children. With more than 80 percent of its students qualifying for free or reduced lunches, Lake Forest Charter has consistently been one of the top schools in Louisiana. It is one of only two schools in the state that are National Title I Distinguished Schools for Exceptional Performance and repeatedly has had every one of its 4th and 8th graders pass the required statewide tests.

Every child in this nation deserves a quality education and it is schools like Lake Forest Charter Elementary School that bring us closer to making that a reality. I commend the faculty, staff, parents, and students for all their hard work and congratulate them on this prestigious award.

RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST LATTER–DAY SAINTS AND THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize the organizational partnership between the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and the Boy Scouts of America. This year marks the 100th anniversary of their partnership that enriches the lives of over 300,000 young men each year across the country. I am pleased that Northern Indiana will join the nationwide celebration as the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day and the Boy Scouts of America Saints reflect back on a century of achievement and success fostered through this special bond.

There are more than 32 Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and Boy Scout of America organizations in the Second District involving all levels of scouting, including Eagle Scouts. Their presence has certainly contributed to strong leadership skills and personal growth for the Boy Scouts, in addition to helping countless others in our communities.

The Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and Boy Scouts of America organize a myriad of activities, such as mentoring youth and volunteering in local events. This partnership also reaches out to the less fortunate and host educational outdoor experiences for our communities. As a result, over 1,000 Hoosier Boy Scouts make important strides to enrich their faith and garner lasting leadership skills each year. There is no doubt that these fine young men will be the leaders of tomorrow, finding positive ways to shape our society. It is a privilege to congratulate the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints and the Boy Scouts of America as they celebrate 100 years of partnership.

CONGRATULATING RON AND LISA GREENWOOD

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in recognition of Ron and Lisa Greenwood, who will be presented and honored with the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation's Founders Award for their dedication and commitment to the veterans of Ventura County.

As a decorated combat veteran in Vietnam, Ron knows the complexities of those who return from war. His personal experience and struggles with PTSD and social integration challenges allow him to relate to the issues that our returning veterans face. Committed to supporting our veterans, Ron has worked closely with many veterans' advocacy and community groups.

His personal narrative resonates in all aspects of his work. As President at Global Energy & Technology, Inc., Ron continues to give back to the community and to our veterans. He has provided employment opportunities, as well as professional guidance, to many of our returning servicemembers.

Similarly, Lisa Greenwood has also been a tireless advocate in her pursuit of giving back to our veterans and their families. She has worked with the Association of Service Disabled Veterans (ASDV) in Washington, DC. She is currently the National Chair of the Silver Star Women of America, an arm of the Association of Service Disabled Veterans, and has testified before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

With an extensive background and service history, Ron and Lisa opened the doors of the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation in 2009. With the Greenwood's vision, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation has been able to successfully assist returning veterans in reaching their full potential. The Gold Coast Veterans Foundation has given our local heroes the resources to become productive and responsible citizens while helping them to make an easy transition back into their communities.

Their steadfast commitment to Ventura County's veterans has been invaluable and their work and efforts to address the needs of returning veterans are emblematic of their work that the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation accomplishes on a daily basis. The Greenwoods have created an organization that has far reaching impacts on our community.

In 2010, in collaboration with the Ventura County Community Foundation, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation founded the Ventura County Veterans Fund to specifically facilitate the transition of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans back into our community. Their mission is to provide employment assistance, counseling, education, and housing to all of our returning veterans.

Earlier this year, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation opened its Veterans Service Center to provide health and human services to Ventura County's veterans. This organization cultivates an open forum for veterans' groups and organizations that serve to develop and care for veterans. Their mission is not only to provide care, but to encourage, inspire, and motivate.

I applaud Ron and Lisa Greenwood for their continued generosity and dedication to serving our brave servicemembers and their families. It is my sincere honor to join the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments and contributions of Ron and Lisa Greenwood, and I commend them for the difference that they make in the everyday lives of our veterans.

TRIBUTE TO MS. FRANCES GOULD

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Frances Gould of Cape Girardeau, Missouri. Ms. Gould works as the Southeast Region Field Support Manager of the Missouri Division of Family Services, where she oversees adoption, foster care, and interstate placement of children. She is an active member of the Community Caring Council, Southeast Missouri State University Alumni Board of Directors, and Centenary United Methodist Church, among other organizations. Ms. Gould also advises the women of Alpha Delta Pi sorority at Southeast Missouri State University.

Ms. Gould has enjoyed the opportunity to give back to her community and enhance the well-being of women and children. Although there are some heartbreaking stories, she is inspired by the many success stories she has helped create. I believe that Ms. Gould is a positive role model for the women she works with and is an incredible asset to our community.

NORTHMORELAND TOWNSHIP VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company of Dallas, Pennsylvania.

Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company was chartered in 1981 in order to provide fire protection to the local community

which had long relied on other jurisdictions for this important undertaking. Township supervisors decided that the company would rely solely on fundraising and other sources of income rather than on taxpayer dollars, a decision which still stands to this day.

Today, Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company has over 70 members, including more than 40 volunteers who actively respond to calls. The additional members are responsible for important functions including fundraising, accounting, and other day to day business operations. Since its founding, the company has been active in updating their equipment and training procedures to ensure they are leaders in fire protection. The members of this company continue to risk their own lives to ensure the safety and well-being of the residents of Northmoreland Township.

Mr. Speaker, since 1981 members of the Northmoreland Township Volunteer Fire Company have proudly protected their community from fire and other disasters. Therefore, I commend all those personnel who have faithfully served at this fire house and congratulate them on the dedication of their newest building addition and acquisition of a new ladder truck.

REMEMBERING MR. MAURICE LYONS

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Maurice Lyons, who passed away October 16, 2013. Mr. Lyons has left those living in the Morongo Basin with a legacy of public service and dedication to community.

Mr. Lyons became well known throughout the Morongo Basin during his 15 years of leadership as chairman of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Raised on the Morongo Reservation as one of nine children, Lyons entered public service in 1994 as a tribal housing commissioner and chairman of the Morongo Head Start parents committee. Soon after he was elected to the Morongo Tribal Council and was elected Tribal Chairman in 2001, serving a total of three terms.

In addition to his leadership on the Tribal Council, Mr. Lyons established himself as a community leader through his role in developing the Morongo School, a college preparatory academy that opened on the reservation in 2010.

In addition he served as president of the board of directors for National Indian Child Welfare Association and spearheaded a national drive that raised more than $500,000 toward the cost to build a National American Indian Veterans monument at Riverside National Cemetery.

Today, I join with the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and with the entire Morongo Basin in remembering this extraordinary public leader who served as an inspiration to all those who knew him.

TRIBUTE TO PARAMESHWARAN ''RAVI'' RAVISHANKER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Perris, California and greater Riverside County are exceptional. Riverside County has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Parameshwaran ''Ravi'' Ravishanker is one of these individuals. This year, Mr. Ravishanker will end his tenure as the Deputy General Manager of the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) after over 20 years of service.

Under his guidance as Assistant General Manager and Deputy General Manager, Mr. Ravishanker has helped EMWD become an industry leader in water and wastewater management. He is responsible for having helped EMWD reach a historic water rights settlement with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, which was signed into law by the President of the United States on July 31, 2008. This settlement has resulted in the recharging of an overdrawn groundwater basin, helping to secure water reliability in the region for future generations.

Mr. Ravishanker has been instrumental in the surface and groundwater basin plans for the Santa Ana Watershed and San Jacinto Watershed, which have a combined population of just fewer than five million people. He helped initiate the implementation of three groundwater desalination facilities, a multipurpose wetlands facility and five wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, Mr. Ravishanker helped develop a water resources management plan that helped maximize state and federal funding opportunities, resulting in a more sustainable water supply portfolio for the District.

Mr. Ravishanker previously served as a United Nations Consultant and the Deputy General Manager of the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority. He has dedicated his career to the water industry and has always worked with a commitment to resource and environmental sustainability.

In light of all Mr. Ravishanker has done for the city of Perris and the greater community, it is only fitting that he be honored for his many years of dedicated service. Mr. Ravishanker's tireless passion for the industry in which he serves has contributed immensely to the betterment of Riverside County and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I commend Mr. Ravishanker for his tireless work with the Eastern Municipal Water District. I know that many are grateful for his service and salute him as he prepares to end his tenure later this year.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF ''BLACK HAWK DOWN''

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the veterans of the battle in Mogadishu, Somalia on October 3rd, 1993—commonly referred to now as ''Black Hawk Down''—gathered at two different events in Fort Bragg, North Carolina and in Texas at the ranch of Ross Perot, Jr., to observe the 20th anniversary of these events and remember the 18 servicemen who were killed in action.

I submit for the RECORD a statement I received from Lt. Gen. William G. ''Jerry'' Boykin who was the commander of Delta Force during this battle, which took the lives of 18 men and wounded 73 others.

As Lt. Gen. Boykin notes in the statement, ''What came next was hours of fighting between ninety-nine Americans and tens of thousands of the Somali militia, all armed with rifles, grenades, and rocket propelled grenades (RPG) and determined to kill as many Americans as possible. The battle was now a matter of principle. No American would be left behind. It made no difference that the two pilots were already dead, their bodies would be brought out and returned home with dignity. No man was willing to leave his comrade's body because each man lived by an ethos known as the 'Ranger Creed', which says in the fifth stanza 'I will never leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy . . .'''

BLACK HAWK DOWN TWENTY YEARS LATER

(By Lt. Gen. William G. ''Jerry'' Boykin)

October 3rd, 1993 was a day when ''Uncommon valor was a common virtue,'' according to John O. Marsh, Jr., the former Secretary of the United States Army. Known to his friends as Jack, Marsh was speaking at a memorial service at the Delta Force facilities at Fort Bragg, North Carolina in November, 1993, just days after the unit had returned from Mogadishu, Somalia, where sixteen of their comrades had died and another 72 had suffered wounds. The battle that Marsh was referring to was later chronicled in the Ridley Scott and Jerry Bruckheimer movie ''Black Hawk Down.'' Last week two key commemoratives occurred in different places which drew the participants of that battle together to honor their fallen comrades. The first was at Ft Bragg, NC on October 3rd where Rangers, Delta Force personnel, aviators from the 1/60th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, and a small number of US Navy and US Air Force warriors gathered on the twentieth anniversary. On the 5th of October, many of the same group, along with family members, attended an event sponsored by Ross Perot Jr at his ranch in Grapevine Texas. Both events were characterized by solemn camaraderie and stories of old team mates who never made it home from that battle. Jack Marsh was right about the valor shown that day in the most intense firefight that US troops had been in since the Viet Nam conflict.

One of the somewhat obscure facts about the ''Blackhawk Down'' battle is what those men were fighting for. The mission that day was to capture three Somali militiamen who were part of the network of a brutal tribal leader named Mohammad Aideed. That mission was accomplished fairly quickly and the task force was preparing to return to their base when a Blackhawk helicopter, call sign

Super 61, was shot down in the vicinity of the Bakkarra market. The pilot and co-pilot were killed on impact and trapped in the twisted wreckage. Two other crew members survived the crash along with three of the Delta Force operators, all of which were injured. Every man from the task force was directed to leave their targets and to get to the crash site and to recover the bodies of the dead crewmembers and protect the survivors until they could be evacuated. Some of the injured survivors were evacuated fairly quickly by the quick reactions of courageous helicopter pilots who saw the situation and reacted instantly. After a very tough block-by-block street fight, the task force finally assembled around the crash, only to discover that the bodies of their comrades were hopelessly entangled in the wreckage and would be nearly impossible to remove without tools, which the task force did not have. What came next was hours of fighting between ninety-nine Americans and tens of thousands of the Somali militia, all armed with rifles, grenades, and rocket propelled grenades (RPG) and determined to kill as many Americans as possible. The battle was now a matter of principle. No American would be left behind. It made no difference that the two pilots were already dead, their bodies would be brought out and returned home with dignity. No man was willing to leave his comrade's body because each man lived by an ethos known as the ''Ranger Creed'', which says in the fifth stanza ''I will never leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy . . .'' So the die was cast and it quickly became obvious to all the Americans in Mogadishu that until the necessary tools arrived that would allow the task force to rip the helicopter apart, the battle would continue; and it did, for eighteen hours. Additional casualties were taken by the task force as they stayed and defended the bodies of Cliff Walcott and Donovan Briley. It was not until just before daylight on October 4th that a relief force carrying the necessary equipment was able to reach the surrounded Americans and extract the two bodies. At that point, the entire force fought their way out of the city and back to their base on the airfield in Mogadishu.

While the cost was high, every man knew that he had done what was expected of him and had no regrets. Fighting and sacrificing for a fellow warrior is fundamental to the warrior ethos. These men battled against incredible odds to defend fallen comrades and did so without hesitation or reservation. Honor was preserved but at a price. Given the same dilemma again, it is a sure bet that every man would do the same thing. That is one of the things that makes a man a warrior and America is blessed to have people that know that there are some values for which they will risk everything, including their lives.

HONORING JAY DOUGLAS WEEKS OF LEBANON TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the Honorable Jay Douglas Weeks of Lebanon Township, New Jersey. Jay leaves a long legacy of courage, honor and distinguished public service.

Jay started his life of service by volunteering for the Marines. He was taught to fly and excelled in combat maneuvering and navigation. He mastered fighter jets and bravely served on many important missions. In his professional life, Jay crafted his love of the skies as a pilot for United Airlines.

Jay continued his dedicated public service on the Lebanon Township Committee. There he had a long and accomplished tenure, including serving many terms as Mayor. He also volunteered his time with organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Elks and the Free Masons. He was also a lifelong sportsman and outdoorsman. Jay was a wonderful husband to Matilda and a beloved father, grandfather and great grandfather. Jay's devotion to others and his love of life will be sorely missed.

HONORING MS. CANDICE DAVIS

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Candice Davis of Jackson, Missouri for her outstanding achievements and service to our nation. Ms. Davis served in the United States Navy for nine years as a journalist and public affairs officer. Stationed abroad in Sicily, Bosnia, and Kosovo, she was a news anchor, radio host, and television travel show host. She then spent time in Jacksonville, Florida before reaching her final duty station in Denver, Colorado at the Navy Recruiting District. In this position, Ms. Davis excelled in marketing the Navy to the region and expanding recruitment efforts. She spearheaded efforts to get recruiters more involved in charity and community work.

After being honorably discharged from the Navy, Ms. Davis completed her education at Southeast Missouri State University, graduating Magna Cum Laude. She now works as a media specialist with the Missouri Department of Conservation, encouraging the community to discover the power of nature. She believes that those who participate in outdoor recreation experience less stress and are more confident and that individuals can truly go on to be anything they want to be. This is the message Ms. Davis imparts to interns in her office, in addition to sharing her military stories. I thank Ms. Davis for her service to our nation and I am impressed by her continued work to better our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ASSUMPTION CATHOLIC SCHOOL

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Assumption Catholic School on its 50th Anniversary. Since 1963, Assumption Catholic School has been providing outstanding Catholic education to Perth Amboy and the surrounding communities.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary began plans to establish a parochial school after encouragement by then Archbishop Metropolitan Constantine Bohachevsky. Construction began in 1960 and the school was opened in 1963. In 2007, its name was changed from Ukrainian Assumption School to Assumption Catholic School.

Since its establishment, Assumption Catholic School has grown considerably. Its first class in 1963 consisted of 25 first and second grade students. Each successive year, a grade level was added to the school and by 1969 the school encompassed kindergarten through eighth grade. A pre-kindergarten program was added in 2002. Nearly 800 students in 44 classes have graduated from Assumption Catholic School since 1970.

Assumption Catholic School has been led by four principals since 1963—Sister Josepha, Sister Vladimyra, Melanie Lawrence and Michael Szpyhulsky. Sister Josepha and Mrs. Lawrence also taught at the school. Under the leadership of each of these principals, Assumption Catholic School saw continued growth, expansion and technological upgrades. In addition to the dedicated leadership, faculty and staff of the school, Assumption Catholic School is also supported by the Ukrainian Assumption parish and the students' parents who are very active in school activities and benefits.

In 1996, Assumption Catholic School became the first Catholic school in Perth Amboy to receive Middle States Accreditation.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the 50th Anniversary of Assumption Catholic School. Its educational excellence is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

CONGRATULATING THE KAYNE ANDERSON CAPITAL ADVISORS FOUNDATION

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in recognition of the Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation, who will be honored with the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation's General Roger L. Brautigan Leadership Award for their unparalleled commitment to the needs of veterans in Ventura County.

Founded in 2011, Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation supports numerous organizations that aim to empower and enrich the lives of individuals and community. The Foundation's model of generosity and compassion reflects a new culture of giving that encourages their employees to increase their individual contributions and participation in charitable activities.

Through the support of the Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation can continue to provide essential services and funding to countless projects including housing coalitions, courts, memorials and activities that all serve the same mission to better the lives of all veterans and their families in California's central coast.

No one embodies the spirit of this generosity more than Gary Ghazarian, partner at Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors. As a Board Member of the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation, Gary has personified the true meaning of philanthropy and has been a stellar example

reflection of the quality of people and work that Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors and its foundation embodies. Because of generous people like Gary and organizations such as the Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation, the Gold Coast Veterans Foundation has received its largest donation to date.

I commend Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors Foundation and its generous contributors for their selfless work and dedication to Ventura County's veterans. I am pleased to extend my most sincere congratulations on their award and this well-deserved recognition.

C.W. BILL YOUNG DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in proud support, and as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 3302, which the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the ''C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.''

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. MICHAUD of Maine, for working together to expedite the consideration of this fitting tribute to one of the most beloved members to serve in this body.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting tribute to one of the greatest champions of the men and women who don the uniform in defense of our nation, the late C.W. BILL YOUNG of Florida, who died last Friday, October 18, 2013, at the age of 82.

Mr. Speaker, BILL YOUNG was more than a great legislator. He was a good man. Virtually every member who served with BILL has a story about how the gentleman from Florida lent his ear or helping hand to help advance a critical project or further a legislative priority. I am no exception.

Earlier this year, Chairman YOUNG worked with me to win inclusion in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act, of my amendment providing increased funding and support for medical research related to Triple Negative Breast Cancer. Chairman YOUNG also helped me to $10 million in increased funding to support work to assist service members suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorders (PTSD). This act of kindness on the part of BILL YOUNG is changing lives in my congressional district, which is home to one of the nation's largest concentrations of veterans suffering from PTSD. BILL's compassion for our veterans and his colleagues knew no limits.

BILL YOUNG was born December 16, 1930 in Harmarville, Pennsylvania. A flood washed away his home at age 6 where he lived with his single mother. An uncle had a hunting camp in Florida, so the family moved there when he was 16. YOUNG dropped out of St. Petersburg High School to support his ill mother, Wilma M. (Hulings). He joined the Army National Guard and served from 1948 to 1957.

In 1960 YOUNG was elected to the Florida Senate, where he served from 1961 to 1970, and was minority leader in that chamber from 1966 to 1970. Until 1963, YOUNG was the only Republican Senator in Florida.

From 1999–2005, Congressman YOUNG served as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, overseeing the entire federal discretionary budget. In fact, the last time the United States had a balanced federal budget was under his Chairmanship.

Throughout his service on the Appropriations Committee, YOUNG has been dedicated to improving the quality of life of the men and women who serve and who have served in the military. He regularly met with enlisted personnel and officers to assess their needs, and as a result, Congress has invested in improved base housing, better medical care, increased pay, and more modern equipment for the military.

YOUNG has also been a leading advocate for increased biomedical research. During his Chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee, he successfully led the effort in Congress to double federal medical research funding over five years. He has likewise led the fight for federal funding for a variety of medical issues, including an increased immunization rate for preschoolers, improved public health programs nationwide, and cures for Parkinson's and Alzheimer's Diseases.

Throughout his career of public service, YOUNG has been a strong advocate for the needs of Pinellas County. Among other issues, he has worked to ease congestion along U.S. Highway 19; attract high-tech jobs to St. Petersburg; improve health care for low-income children and families; protect the neighboring MacDill Air Force Base; build a state of the art medical center for veterans at Bay Pines; ensure a steady supply of water for the Tampa Bay area; and offset the effects of erosion on the area's beaches.

For nearly two weeks YOUNG had been hospitalized with back problems that stemmed from a 1970 small plane crash. Despite the circumstances, Congressman YOUNG vowed to beat his illness and battled valiantly until the very last day, when he finished his journey on earth and ascended to the heavens.

Congressman YOUNG was the longest serving Republican member of the House and respected by all who knew him. He served over 50 years in public office and worked with 8 presidents of the United States. His presence will be forever missed and we all mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to his family and friends.

But BILL YOUNG's good work lives on. And in renaming the Veterans Affairs Medical Center at Bay Pines as the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, we consecrate a monument to a remarkable public servant that exists to carry on the work to which BILL YOUNG dedicated his life: serving those who risked their lives to keep us free.

Mr. Speaker, none of us who knew and admired BILL YOUNG will ever forget him or the way he brightened the lives of all the people he served. He was one in a million and he will be deeply missed. He will never be replaced. He was an American original. He was my friend.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANT ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act. The bill would require the states to obtain information about the true ownership of the corporation, when incorporation papers are filed with the state.

As some have put it, this bill is a ''no-brainer.'' And it is fairly straightforward: it would require that the person creating the corporation state the ''beneficial owner'' of the corporation and provide sonic form of identification.

Although this is as straightforward as it sounds, the implications for law enforcement are broad reaching. Criminal organizations are infamous for using shell corporations, both foreign and domestic to open bank accounts, launder money, perpetrate fraud, and finance terrorism. And it isn't difficult for them to do. Virtually no states require people applying to create corporations to provide the identity of the corporate owner. As a result, just about anyone can easily manipulate the system to fund criminal activity.

Here is an example from an investigation in New York by the Manhattan District Attorney. The office announced investigations involving the movement of funds through banks in New York by entities controlled by the Iranian Military. In at least two cases, domestic shell companies were opened. in two different states to further secret Iranian interests. Through a New York shell company, individuals working on behalf of the government of Iran were able to move funds to secret accounts held in offshore jurisdictions. Shockingly, the offshore government was able to give the Manhattan DA more information about the ownership of the New York entity than the state of New York could.

Although the DA does not contend that requiring a declaration of beneficial ownership would have stopped this activity, it would have at least been a piece of evidence to go on. And if the declaration of beneficial ownership had been required but falsified, it would have been an extra tool for law enforcement to shut down the entity and prosecute the perpetrators.

The bill I am introducing today will provide the kind of transparency that law enforcement needs to investigate financial crimes. However, it is narrowly drafted so that it is not overly burdensome on either states or incorporating entities. In fact, most corporations would be exempt from the bill's requirements including companies that are already regulated by federal banking regulators and companies that are over 20 employees and $10 million in revenue.

This bill is meant to capture beneficial ownership information from companies that are able to escape regulation and oversight through other federal entities.

Senator LEVIN has already introduced a similar bill in the Senate, and President Obama was the lead sponsor when he was a

U.S. Senator. The G–8 countries recently pledged to implement incorporation transparency as well.

As Global Witness has stated, ''Setting a standard for collecting information about the true owner of a company would level the playing field between the states while preventing terrorists, drug traffickers and kleptocrats from hiding behind corporate secrecy.''

The bill is supported by both Global Witness and Global Financial Integrity, as well as numerous law enforcement associations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, the National Narcotic Officers' Associations Coalition, the United States Marshals Service Association, and the Association of Former ATF Agents.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY WEEK

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nation's healthcare quality and patient safety professionals who work every day to ensure that our health system delivers high quality, cost-effective and safe care. During National Healthcare Quality Week, October 20 through 26, healthcare facilities nationwide celebrate the efforts of those professionals to improve health care. Healthcare quality and patient safety professionals make a positive contribution to our care by monitoring clinical processes and outcomes, analyzing data to improve systems, and helping to integrate new, evidence-based practices.

I am proud to note that their professional organization, the National Association for Healthcare Quality, NAHQ, is headquartered in Chicago, Illinois and is in my district. Its 5,400 individual members and 100 institutional members bring expertise to healthcare quality in all settings and specialty areas. They are the on-the-ground professionals who are helping healthcare facilities meet Obamacare's focus on improving quality care while reducing costs.

Quality professionals address many issues in the healthcare workplace, including ensuring that a patient's medications are reconciled, healthcare-associated infections are prevented, and the quality of care is continually improved. They strive to assure that the progress their facility makes on these and many other issues are reported in an accurate and transparent manner.

I applaud our health professionals whose job is to ensure that patients receive safe and quality health care and urge my colleagues to do the same.

ON THE 57TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HUNGARIAN UPRISING OF 1956—HUNGARY REMAINS A NATION OF PATRIOTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of the Hungarian freedom fighters who rose up against the communist tyranny that was imposed on their country after World War II. Many men and women died in that uprising—a courageous fight against incredible odds, as the Soviets sent in tanks to restore the puppet regime they installed in 1948.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman or Co-Chairman of the Helsinki Commission I have been on human rights missions to Hungary many times over the years. One of the things that most impresses me about this country is the deeply admirable patriotism of so many Hungarians. By patriotism I mean something very different from nationalism—whereas nationalists resent and are aggressive toward other countries, patriots love and defend their own country and its best traditions, and allow—invite—other people to love their own countries and traditions.

This summer I visited Hungary on a congressional delegation ably led by my colleague on the Helsinki Commission, Senator Roger Wicker. We met with Prime Minister Orban and others, and it is in connection with this anniversary and our meeting with Prime Minister that I'd like to place into the record a recent interview Prime Minister Orban gave to the Telegraph.

I commend this to my colleagues as the words of a Prime Minister who thinks seriously and speaks frankly about issues facing his country and Europe as a whole.

VIKTOR ORBAN INTERVIEW: ''PATRIOTISM IS A GOOD THING''—THE PRIME MINISTER OF HUNGARY, VIKTOR ORBAN, TELLS THE TELEGRAPH WHY HIS COUNTRY AGREES WITH BRITAIN IN ITS CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE ''CREEPING'' POWER OF BRUSSELS

(By Charles Moore)

15 OCT 2013

Viktor Orban has just had a good meeting with David Cameron. It was easier than his first with Margaret Thatcher (in 2001). ''I am not satisfied with you,'' were, he recalls, her first words. She was angry that Hungary was not doing more to help protect Nato's soldiers from Serb aggression.

Despite this rebuff, Mr Orban is a Thatcher admirer. His political career began in 1988 when he was one of 37 young students and intellectuals founding a party to attack Communist rule in his country.

''Her role was very important: she was always in favour of freedom, always anti-Communist. She said, 'There is no such thing as society.' I like that remark very much because in European politics people were always talking in artificial sociological language. Social engineering was very popular.''

When he attended Lady Thatcher's funeral in April, he was pleased that the Bishop of London explained what she really meant by those famous words. ''The funeral was very moving and very British—not tragical, as it would be on the Continent—more of a tribute.''

Young Viktor, a clever boy from a country background, won a George Soros scholarship to Oxford to study civic society as seen by liberal political philosophers such as John Locke. He loved the ''electrifying dance'' of ideas there; but this was the autumn of 1989 and the Berlin Wall was coming down. Here was the chance actually to build a liberal civic society at home. ''I said to myself, 'Viktor, what are you doing here?' and I took the occasion of our first free elections in March 1990 to go back.''

He became prime minister for the first time in 1998, until 2002, and then, after wilderness years, returned to power with a landslide in 2010. His time in office has been controversial. He has been accused, often by European Union officials, of too much nationalism, of suppressing media freedom, politicising the judiciary and the central bank, and even of stirring up ethnic tensions. Has the great liberal freedom-fighter narrowed? Is there a risk that he could become an authoritarian strongman, the Vladimir Putin of his country?

''The risk is there,'' Mr Orban rather surprisingly admits, though it is much smaller if Hungary is economically successful. He thinks that circumstances have changed. [Update: The office of the Prime Minister of Hungary has asked the Telegraph to clarify the reference to Vladimir Putin in this interview. Mr Orbin intended to assent to there being a risk that he could come to seem like a Putin of Hungary, not actually to become one.]

For 200 years, the ''No. 1 motivation'' for Hungarians was to catch up with more competitive Westerners. Until the credit crisis, Mr Orban believed that this could only be achieved by the ''ever-closer union'' of Europe. Now he has his doubts.

The crisis shows that it is not obvious that the EU can do better than independent nations. Unlike the British, he cannot rule out joining the eurozone, because of its centripetal pull for a small country like his, ''but I don't urge it. To stand alone on your own feet is more important than ever.'' Hungary certainly should not join until it reaches 90 per cent of the GDP of those already in, he believes; right now it is in the low sixties.

''As I get older [he is still only 50], I tend to be more sceptical. Values are more important than money. National sovereignty is more and more important in my mind. The question 'Who is governing us?' is the key question.''

So he supports David Cameron's efforts to change the European rules: ''We shall need a new basic treaty eventually.'' He wants to join Britain in resisting ''the creeping movement of Brussels to eat up national sovereignty''.

The old answer that everything Westerners did was better is now ''stupid''. In the 1980s, the question Hungarians faced was ''how to get rid of things''—Communism, state oppression, overregulation. Now that should stop. There are things which should be upheld in the interests of civilisation, not jettisoned: ''It would be a sad story to get rid of religious belief, national identity, family and even sexual identity. That's not freedom.''

In some schools on the continent, the idea has got about that ''children should not be brought up as girls or guys'', but to choose their sexual identity later. ''Sometimes there is a separate changing room for those who don't know who they are,'' he exclaims.

What does he say to accusations that he is stirring up old ethnic, territorial passions in the region? Some blame him for the rise of the fascistic Jobbik party in Hungary. His answer is based on his belief that ''Xenophobia is dangerous; but patriotism is a good thing''. Ethnic disputes, often about land, are ''a part of life in Eastern Europe'', he says.

''How do we live with this?'' he asks, ''The solution is not to lie.'' Radicals of both left and right get about 15 per cent of the vote between them. That is too high for comfort, but ''far away from being a majority''.

At the heart of the problem in Europe, Mr Orban believes, is the fact that the Communists were never fully defeated. Communism as an ideology ''has no message for our future'', but, unlike Nazism, it prevailed for so long (40 years in Hungary's case) that its leaders, who ''were not stupid guys'' created a culture which maintained their power. They upheld envy ''as a perception of life'', making people ''disagree with the world as it is and try to destroy it''.

They also inculcated a belief in ''entitlements without any personal effort''. In Hungary, Communism brought about what he calls ''a learned helplessness'', a deliberate destruction of personal responsibility, which crushed the middle class.

We discuss the row here about Ed Miliband and his Marxist father. Without commenting on the Labour situation, Mr Orban says that there is a family tree passing from Communism through ''the '68 generation'' (such as the former revolutionary, now MEP, Daniel Cohn Bendit) to Brussels bureaucrats and the media today.

''The Communist heritage has a marriage with the radical liberals today. That genealogy exists in Europe.'' He detects it in the doctrine of European human rights and the attempts by the European Commission to impose cultural and constitutional uniformity on member states.

For conservatives, he goes on, this is difficult, because ''we find we must argue, and conservatives generally prefer just to live. We are shy to invest the energy, but we must do so at a European level.''

Personally, Vilctor Orban is not shy. He is up for the fight. ''Boxing is a noble sport,'' he declares pugnaciously. In the West, politics is often ''just a career''. For him, he says, it is much more. He remembers the hard times in the late 1980s when Fidesz, his then tiny party, was opposed by the Soviets, by trade unions, militias and the state apparatus. ''We were surrounded, and we won. Compare the risk now—it's nothing. It's just a peanut.''

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAJOR OWENS

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, for more than two decades, Congressman Major Owens served the citizens of Brooklyn, New York in the United States Congress. He was a humble man of great character and dedicated his life to public service. Congressman Owens was an extremely important member of the U.S. House of Representatives, who was an expert in education policy. In Congress, he fought to secure $100 million in federal funds for historically black colleges and spearheaded efforts to increase federal involvement in reducing high school dropout rates.

Congressman Owens used his position within the halls of Congress and in the community to ensure that every American lived a better life. Congressman Owens provided leadership within the Congressional Black Caucus fighting for the rights of minorities in addition to advocating for workers and the poor and middle class families. Congressman Owens was also an advocate for disabled Americans playing an instrumental role in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in Congress.

It was an honor to serve with him as a colleague and a privilege to know him as a dear friend. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Maria and his family during this very difficult time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for medical reasons, I was unable to be in Washington, D.C. for the roll call vote on H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye. I've heard from manufacturers, workers, and farmers in Illinois about the importance of an efficient and modern water transportation system that allows them to move their products to market. Investing in our ports, waterways, and other water infrastructure is key to keeping our economy competitive and creating jobs and much needed economic growth. While not perfect, H.R. 3080 represents true bipartisan compromise that will allow us to move forward with reform that is long overdue.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE ON THE DEATH AND RECOGNIZING THE EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO FLORIDA AND AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE OF THE HONORABLE C.W. BILL YOUNG

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in proud support, and as an original co-sponsor of H. Res. 384, which expresses the condolences of the House on the death and recognizes the extraordinary contributions to our nation of Congressman C.W. Bill Young of Florida, who died last Friday, October 25, 2013.

I thank the bipartisan leadership of the House and the Chair and Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee for working together to expedite the consideration of this fitting tribute to one of the most beloved members to serve in this body.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 384 recognizes the extraordinary contributions of Bill Young to public life in Florida and the United States. It is both fitting and proper that the People's House pay this tribute to a pioneering and path breaking man who devoted his life to serving the people.

Mr. Speaker, this happy moment stands in stark contrast to the sorrowful evening of October 18, 2013, when we learned that our dear friend and colleague, the great Bill Young, had lost his life.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Young was more than a great legislator. He was a good man. Virtually every member who served with Bill has a story about how the gentleman from Florida lent his ear or helping hand to help advance a critical project or further a legislative priority. I am no exception.

Earlier this year, Chairman Young worked with me to win inclusion in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act, of my amendment providing increased funding and support for medical research related to Triple Negative Breast Cancer. Chairman Young also helped me to $10 million in increased funding to support work to assist service members suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorders (PTSD). This act of kindness on the part of Bill Young is changing lives in my congressional district, which is home to one of the nation's largest concentrations of veterans suffering from PTSD. Bill's compassion for our veterans and his colleagues knew no limits.

Bill Young was born December 16, 1930 in Harmarville, Pennsylvania. A flood washed away his home at age 6 where he lived with his single mother. An uncle had a hunting camp in Florida, so the family moved there when he was 16. Young dropped out of St. Petersburg High School to support his ill mother, Wilma M. (Hulings). He joined the Army National Guard and served from 1948 to 1957.

In 1960 Young was elected to the Florida Senate, where he served from 1961 to 1970, and was minority leader in that chamber from 1966 to 1970. Until 1963, Young was the only Republican Senator in Florida.

From 1999–2005, Congressman Young served as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, overseeing the entire federal discretionary budget. In fact, the last time the United States had a balanced federal budget was under his Chairmanship.

Throughout his service on the Appropriations Committee, Young has been dedicated to improving the quality of life of the men and women who serve and who have served in the military. He regularly met with enlisted personnel and officers to assess their needs, and as a result, Congress has invested in improved base housing, better medical care, increased pay, and more modern equipment for the military.

Young has also been a leading advocate for increased biomedical research. During his Chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee, he successfully led the effort in Congress to double federal medical research funding over five years. He has likewise led the fight for federal funding for a variety of medical issues, including an increased immunization rate for preschoolers, improved public health programs nationwide, and cures for Parkinson's and Alzheimer's Diseases.

Throughout his career of public service, Young has been a strong advocate for the needs of Pinellas County. Among other issues, he has worked to ease congestion along U.S. Highway 19; attract high-tech jobs to St. Petersburg; improve health care for low-income children and families; protect the neighboring MacDill Air Force Base; build a state of the art medical center for veterans at Bay Pines; ensure a steady supply of water for the Tampa Bay area; and offset the effects of erosion on the area's beaches.

For nearly two weeks Young had been hospitalized with back problems that stemmed from a 1970 small plane crash. Despite the circumstances, Congressman Young vowed to beat his illness and battled valiantly until the very last day, when he finished his journey on earth and ascended to the heavens.

Congressman Young was the longest serving Republican member of the House and respected by all who knew him. He served over 50 years in public office and worked with 8 presidents of the United States. His presence will be forever missed and we all mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to his family and friends.

None of us who knew and admired Bill Young will ever forget him or the way he brightened the lives of all the people he served. He was one in a million and he will be deeply missed. He will never be replaced. He was an American original. He was my friend.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 24, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 29

Time to be announced

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine tackling diseases of aging, focusing on research collaboration.

SD–562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine broadband adoption.

SR–253

OCTOBER 30

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1562, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, S. 1557, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals, S. 1561, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve provisions relating to the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees, H.R. 2094, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements), S. 1302, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans, H.R. 2747, to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, and the nominations of Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and James Cole, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel, both of the Department of Education, and Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and any pending nominations.

SD–430

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1074, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Easter Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, S. 1132, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, S. 161, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana.

SD–628

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John B. Owens, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Matthew Frederick Leitman, Judith Ellen Levy, Laurie J. Michelson, and Linda Vivienne Parker, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, and Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD–226

NOVEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on the national defense; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217, following the open session.

SD–G50

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, October 28, 2013.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 29 public bills, H.R. 3309–3337 and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 98; and H. Res. 389–390 were introduced. **Pages H6767–69**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6770–71**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 2850, to require certain procedures in the conduct by the Environmental Protection Agency of its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–252). **Page H6767**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Stewart to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6679**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:45 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6691**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H6691, H6758**

Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 3080, to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States and to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, by a yea-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 560. **Pages H6696–H6758**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–24 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. **Page H6721**

Agreed to:

Gibbs manager's amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that adds a new section that provides for expediting the completion of any on-going feasibility study for a project initiated prior to enactment and clarifies that the Corps of Engineers is authorized to move to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design activities immediately after completing a feasibility study. Amends Section 107 of H.R. 3080 to add a savings clause to ensure work carried out under an existing statute related to navigation that is repealed in H.R. 3080 can continue if initiated prior to enactment. Adds a new section providing non-Federal interests the ability to carry out work at their own expense for a project where a final feasibility report has been completed but has not received authorization from Congress. Requires the non-Federal interest to carry out work subject to any State or Federal permitting requirements and to carry out the project in accordance with the final feasibility report. Amends Section 120 of H.R. 3080 to request the Corps of Engineers to review the uses and economic feasibility of non-structural alternatives in their review of existing authorities for carrying out work after a storm event. Amends Section 102 of H.R. 3080 to add natural gas companies to the entities eligible to contribute funds to Corps of Engineers to expedite the processing of permits within the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers. Makes other technical and conforming changes to H.R. 3080; **Pages H6738–40**

Shuster en bloc amendment that consists of the following amendments printed in H. Rept.

113–251: Mullin amendment (No. 4), as modified, that specifies that due to ongoing drought in many parts of the United States, state agencies are finding it difficult to maintain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission-licensed lake levels. Not later than 180 days after enactment, FERC is to initiate an assessment of the effects of drought conditions on these lakes and report to Congress—specifically looking at existing FERC-licensed lakes with rule curves in areas of drought and the effect long-term licenses have on state agencies being able to meet all their obligations; Jackson Lee amendment (No. 9) that provides that in making recommendations pursuant to Section 118 of the Act, the Secretary shall consult with key stakeholders, including State, county, and city governments, and, where applicable, State and local water districts, and in the case of recommendations concerning projects that substantially affect under represented communities the Secretary shall also consult with historically Black colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions; Grimm amendment (No. 10) that modifies Section 118 to require the Secretary of the Army to include project recommendations made in the study for flood and storm damage reduction related to natural disasters under title II of division A of the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 within the Secretary's Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development; Peters (CA) amendment (No. 11) that adds a subsection specifying that the Secretary of the Army coordinates with the Administrator of the FEMA to disseminate the emergency communication of risk to the public through widely used and readily available means; Stutzman amendment (No. 12) that provides that the Secretary of the Army shall not require the removal of levee vegetation until the Corps of Engineers' policy guidelines on vegetation management for levees have been reviewed and adopted. Provides an exception for vegetation that presents an unacceptable safety risk; Pierluisi amendment (No. 14) that adds Puerto Rico to the provision of law that would be updated for inflation by Section 137 and that authorizes the Secretary of the Army to waive local cost-sharing requirements up to a specified dollar amount for studies and projects in certain U.S. territories; Cotton amendment (No. 15) that allows non-Federal entities (regional authorities or municipalities) and the Army Corps of Engineers to collaborate on a proposal to sell any excess water supply in order to address an oversupply of water resulting from the 1958 Water Supply Act. This would not authorize the Corps to actually sell the water or release the water from storage; Hastings (WA) amendment (No. 17) that ensures that Congress continue the practice of authorizing project purposes at Corps of Engineers dams or reservoirs; McCollum amendment (No. 18) that establishes a multiagency effort to slow the spread of Asian carp in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio River basins and tributaries by providing technical assistance, coordination, best practices, and support to State and local governments in carrying out such activities; Thompson (CA) amendment (No. 19) that requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct an assessment on the impacts of aquatic invasive species on Federal assets and current Federal spending on aquatic invasive species prevention; Brownley amendment (No. 20) that requires the Army Corps to consider activities of the Secretary of the Navy when assessing the operation and maintenance needs of harbors and the equitable distribution of funds; Lowenthal amendment (No. 21) that requires the Secretary to include "expanded uses" of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in the assessments and prioritization of operations and maintenance reports to Congress; Brownley amendment (No. 22) that requires GAO to study and report to Congress on the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports; and include recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports; and Schneider amendment (No. 23) that expands congressional reporting requirements to include recommendations for mitigating current problems and limiting the construction backlog;

Pages H6743–46

Flores amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that prohibits programs or actions authorized under this Act from further implementation of coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components under Executive Order 13547. Requires the Secretary of the Army to conduct and submit a study detailing all activities engaged in and resources expended in furtherance of Executive Order 13547. The study also should include any budget requests for fiscal year 2014 for support of implementation of Executive Order 13547, and be submitted to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation (by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 557); and **Pages H6741–43, H6755–56**

Richmond amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that directs the Corps to calculate the national benefits of proposed flood protection projects, including benefits from a reduction in national and regional economic losses, as well as the

protection of evacuation routes (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 559).

Pages H6752–54, H6757

Rejected:

Young (AK) amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that sought to require USACE to contract with private sector surveying and mapping firms, wherever practical, in performance of surveying and mapping services and activities for Corps projects. Would require the Secretary to issue agency guidance to encourage use of the private sector for surveying and mapping services, and require a process to provide oversight of the performance of compliance with the guidance; **Pages H6746–48**

Bentivolio amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that sought to increase the amount of backlogged projects to be de-authorized, beyond what is initially de-authorized in the bill from $12,000,000,000 to $35,000,000,000;

Pages H6749–50

Velázquez amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that sought to establish a national water-based freight policy to improve the movement of freight and cargo over waterways, canals, ports, and harbors; **Pages H6751–52**

DeFazio amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that sought to delay the application of environmental ''streamlining'' provisions in the bill until the Secretary certifies that there is sufficient funding to reduce the current backlog of authorized Corps projects to less than $20 billion; more than $40 billion in projects have already been authorized using existing environmental review processes, but have yet to receive funding for construction (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 556); and **Pages H6740–41, H6755**

Hastings (FL) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that sought to include operation and maintenance costs associated with sand transfer plants in the annual operations and maintenance budget of the Corps of Engineers (by a recorded vote of 133 ayes to 287 noes, Roll No. 558).

Pages H6748–49, H6756–57

Withdrawn:

Jones amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have exempted the disaster restriction on projects which non-Federal interests may contribute to and **Pages H6750–51**

Gardner amendment (No. 24 printed in H. Rept. 113–251) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have established the Office of Water Storage at the Army Corp of Engineers to serve as an initial point of contact for the acquisition or satisfaction of a Federal permit for a water storage facility. **Pages H6754–55**

H. Res. 385, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 271 ayes to 147 noes, Roll No. 555, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 225 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 554. **Pages H6696–H6706**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the 241 Americans who were lost in the bombing in Beirut on October 23, 1983.

Page H6755

Meeting Hour: Agreed that the order of the House of January 3, 2013 regarding morning hour debate not apply tomorrow, and when the House adjourns tomorrow, October 24th, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 28th, when it shall convene at 12 noon for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Further agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, October 24th. **Page H6760**

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Representatives Slaughter, McIntyre, and Cohen. **Page H6762**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6705–06, H6706, H6755, H6756, H6756–57, H6757, H6758. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Committee Meetings

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE NAVY'S 30 YEAR SHIPBUILDING PLAN

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Project Forces held a hearing entitled ''An Independent Assessment of the Navy's 30 year Shipbuilding Plan''. Testimony was heard from Eric Labs, Senior Analyst for Naval Weapons and Forces, Congressional Budget Office; and Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service.

IMPACTS OF A CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND SEQUESTRATION ON ACQUISITION AND MODERNIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled ''Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Acquisition and Modernization''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General James O. Barclay III, Deputy Chief of Staff, USA; William A. LaPlante, Principal Deputy to Secretary of the Air

Force for Acquisition, USAF; Lieutenant General Michael R. Moeller, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Plans and Programs, USAF; Vice Admiral Allen G. Myers, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources, USN; Heidi Shyu, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, USA; Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, USN; Lieutenant General Glenn M. Walters, Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources, USMC.

EVOLUTION OF WIRED COMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communication and Technology held a hearing entitled ''The Evolution of Wired Communications Networks''. Testimony was heard from John D. Burke, Board Member, Public Service Board, State of Vermont; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATION TO FURTHER REDUCE IMPEDIMENTS TO CAPITAL FORMATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Legislation to Further Reduce Impediments to Capital Formation''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PREVENTING AND ADDRESSING SEX TRAFFICKING OF YOUTH IN FOSTER CARE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing entitled ''Preventing and Addressing Sex Trafficking of Youth in Foster Care''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Paulsen; Slaughter; Poe (TX); and Bass.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''PPACA Implementation Failures: Didn't Know or Didn't Disclose?'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, October 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 4:30 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, with a vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Thursday, October 24

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 12 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E1561
Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1562
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1554
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1550
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1562, E1564
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1547
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1559, E1561, E1563
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1557
Collins, Doug, Ga., E1552
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1560
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1559, E1563
Duckworth, Tammy, Ill., E1567
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E1548, E1552
Enyart, William L., Ill., E1550
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1548
Gabbard, Tulsi, Hawaii, E1556
Gardner, Cory, Colo., E1560
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1558, E1559, E1560, E1561
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E1553, E1557
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1553
Hurt, Robert, Va., E1555
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1565, E1567
Keating, William R., Mass., E1547
King, Peter T., N.Y., E1553
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E1547
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1547
Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E1547
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E1557, E1564
McIntyre, Mike, N.C., E1561
McKinley, David B., W.Va., E1557
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1565
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1549, E1556
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E1549
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1556
Murphy, Patrick, Fla., E1550, E1551
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1549, E1564
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1559
Ribble, Reid J., Wisc., E1553
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E1553, E1562
Roe, David P., Tenn., E1560
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1557
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1548
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1566
Schweikert, David, Ariz., E1548
Scott, David, Ga., E1555
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1566
Smith, Jason T., Mo., E1550, E1556, E1558, E1560, E1562, E1564
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1549
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1557
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1562
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E1567
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1550
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1558, E1563

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.