

evaluation, and technology development and media services.

The progress that has been made over the past 20 years in the education of children with disabilities has been impressive. However, it is clear that significant challenges remain. We must ensure that this crucial law not only remains intact as the centerpiece for ensuring equal educational opportunity for all children with disabilities, but also that it is strengthened and updated to keep current with the changing times.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to quote Ms. Melanie Seivert of Sibley IA, who is the parent of Susan, a child with Downs Syndrome. She states:

Our ultimate goal for Susan is to be educated academically, vocationally, [and] in life-skills and community living so as an adult she can get a job and live her life with a minimum of management from outside help. Through the things IDEA provides * * * we will be able to reach our goals.

Does it not make sense to give all children the best education possible? Our children need IDEA for a future.

Mr. President, IDEA is the shining light of educational opportunity. And, on this the 20th anniversary of the IDEA, we in the Congress must make sure that the light continues to burn bright. We still have promises to keep.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are in the process of talking about the Safe Drinking Water Act now, I understand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Good. I would like to do that.

Mr. President, I want to speak in behalf of this bill. I think it is one that is very important to all of us, certainly important to my State. I congratulate Senator KEMPTHORNE and Senator CHAFEE and Senator BAUCUS for the hard work and long time that has gone into it. This is an important bill. It has been very long in coming. Last year in the House we worked on this bill. I think it reflects a good deal of thoughtful consideration. Therefore, I believe it deserves the support of Members of this Senate.

It has been an inclusive process in which many people with many interests have been involved. It is important that be the case. We are talking here about a program that affects us all

over the country, a country in which the effects are quite different. Certainly some of the small towns in Wyoming have different problems than Pittsburgh or Los Angeles, and one of the efforts we have to make is to make it flexible enough to reflect that. I think this bill does that. Overregulation, certainly, has been on the minds of most people. It is much on the minds of the people I talk to in Wyoming. People are weary of the top-down kinds of regulations, that one-size-fits-all sort of thing. It is difficult to deal with that. I think this bill attempts to do that and does so in a very effective way.

The Safe Drinking Water Act, as it has been, has been an example of the old approach, regulating substances that do not even occur in drinking water and do not pose a risk in particular areas. I always think of the efforts we made in Pinedale, WY, which has a water supply. There is a very deep lake that is close. Even though the testing would show that water was of excellent quality, they were, at least ostensibly, required to invest a great deal of their taxpayers' money to do some things that probably were not necessary.

So people have asked for change and a new direction. The principle guiding this change is common sense. That is what I think we seek to do here, and the sponsors of the bill have done so, I think, successfully. It injects much-needed common sense into the regulatory process while doing a better job at protecting public health.

The current mandate that 25 contaminants be regulated every 3 years regardless of whether there is a risk is repealed. The risk assessment is inserted into the process. States' roles are increased. Water systems are able to focus their efforts and their resources monitoring contaminants that actually occur in the systems. And that is good. In a word, the bill shatters the status quo.

I again thank the sponsors for their attention to a State like Wyoming, which is different—small towns, different sources. So we have worked closely with Senators KEMPTHORNE and CHAFEE to ensure that our communities did have the opportunity to take advantage of the funding mechanisms and the regulatory relief that this bill provides. I thank them for that.

In addition, the small systems, as defined in this bill as those serving under 10,000, will be given special consideration when seeking ways to comply with the regulations.

The bill is not perfect, of course, and there has been a great deal of effort going on each day, and some things needed to be changed. But overall the bill is an excellent one, and is an effort that will reduce the cost to local communities, municipalities but allowing them to protect effectively.

So I urge my colleagues to support the bill. I hope the other body will act quickly, and the President will support our efforts. This bill is needed and we ought to move forward, and I urge that.

Mr. President, thank you. I yield the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his statement on the floor, and I also thank him for his great support in the Environment and Public Works Committee. We are very happy to have him as a cosponsor, and his addition to that committee on behalf of the voices of small town America and rural communities is extremely helpful. We thank him.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. I also want to thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his kind comments and for his help on this legislation. He is a very valuable member of our committee, and we appreciate everything he has done to help with this.

AMENDMENT NO. 3077

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senators KEMPTHORNE, BAUCUS, REID, D'AMATO, and MOYNIHAN, I send to the desk a printed amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), for himself, and Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. REID, Mr. D'AMATO and Mr. MOYNIHAN proposes an amendment numbered 3077.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 168, line 7, strike "GROUND WATER PROTECTION" and insert "WATERSHED AND GROUND WATER PROTECTION".

On page 173, after line 7, insert the following:

"(g) WATERSHED PROTECTION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

"(1) The heading of section 1443 (42 U.S.C.) is amended to read as follows:

"grants for state and local programs

"(2) Section 1443 (42 U.S.C.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) WATERSHED PROTECTION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) ASSISTANCE FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—The Administrator is authorized to provide technical and financial assistance to units of State or local government for projects that demonstrate and assess innovative and enhanced methods and practices to develop and implement watershed protection programs including methods and practices that protect both surface and ground water. In selecting projects for assistance under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority to projects that are carried out to satisfy criteria published under section 1412(b)(7)(C) or that are identified through programs developed and implemented pursuant to section 1428.

"(B) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—Federal assistance provided under this subsection shall

not exceed 35 percent of the total cost of the protection program being carried out for any particular watershed or ground water recharge area.

“(2) NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the authority of paragraph (1), the Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to the State of New York for demonstration projects implemented as part of the watershed program for the protection and enhancement of the quality of source waters of the New York City water supply system. Demonstration projects which shall be eligible for financial assistance shall be certified to the Administration by the State of New York as satisfying the purposes of this subsection and shall include those projects that demonstrate, assess, or provide for comprehensive monitoring, surveillance, and research with respect to the efficacy of phosphorus offsets or trading, wastewater diversion, septic system siting and maintenance, innovative or enhanced wastewater treatment technologies, innovative methodologies for the control of stormwater runoff, urban, agricultural, and forestry best management practices for controlling nonpoint source pollution, operator training, compliance surveillance and that establish watershed or basin-wide coordinating, planning or governing organizations.

In certifying projects to the Administration, the State of New York shall give priority to those monitoring and research projects that have undergone peer review.

“(C) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date on which the Administrator first provides assistance pursuant to this paragraph, the Governor of the State of New York shall submit a report to the Administrator on the results of projects assisted.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2003 including \$15,000,000 for each of such fiscal years for the purpose of providing assistance to the State of New York to carry out paragraph (2).”

On page 171, line 21, strike “20,000,000” and insert “15,000,000”.

On page 171, line 24, strike “35,000,000” and insert “30,000,000”.

On page 172, line 3, strike “20,850,000” and insert “15,000,000”.

On page 2, in the material following line 6, strike “Sec. 25. Ground water protection.” and insert “Sec. 25. Watershed and ground water protection.”

MR. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this authorizes the expenditure of \$15 million a year for 7 years to the year 2003 for the protection of the watershed of the city of New York. This is a very unusual approach that they are trying in New York in which, instead of building very, very expensive water treatment facilities that would amount to more than \$1 billion, they are trying to protect the watershed; in other words, the headwaters of the rivers that provide the waters for the city of New York up in the Hudson River Valley.

This provides authorization for \$15 million for 7 years to be of assistance in that effort.

As I say, this is an amendment by both New York Senators, Senators MOYNIHAN and D'AMATO. I think it is a good amendment, Mr. President.

MR. D'AMATO. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator MOYNIHAN, I wish to thank Senator CHAFEE and

Senator KEMPTHORNE for accepting this crucial amendment—an amendment that will protect the drinking water of 9 million persons.

New York City is home to our Nation's largest unfiltered surface water supply delivering 1.5 billion gallons per day. It is also, arguably, our Nation's best drinking water. To many, it would seem implausible that our Nation's largest city could have such high quality water and not require extensive filtration. However, extensive measures have been taken over the years to ensure the purity of New York City's water.

New York City's watershed actually consists of three distinct geographic areas that cover some 1,900 square miles in 8 counties in New York State—an area approximately the size of Rhode Island. Due to an act of the New York Legislature in 1907, and further amendments in 1953, New York City has been able to regulate activities that affect water quality in the watershed area. This capability caused its share of suspicion among farmers, homeowners, and local elected officials in the upstate watershed. As one might suspect, these individuals did not necessarily appreciate the city having a say as to how they could utilize their land.

With development creeping out of the metropolitan area and into the watershed area, many became concerned about the consequences of such growth on water quality. Echoing that concern, under the auspices of the 1986 Safe Drinking Water Act amendments, the EPA required New York City in 1989 to either further protect the watershed or filter. It was apparent that enhanced protection efforts would be necessary if the water supply for the city was to be preserved without spending billions of dollars to build filtration plants. This set in motion the impetus to negotiate a filtration avoidance plan that would meet the approval of the EPA, provide safe drinking water to New York City residents, and preserve the rights of upstate New Yorkers to prudently utilize their land. Until recently, the ability to balance all of these needs had not proven entirely successful and watershed protection efforts stalled.

In early November, though, New York Governor George Pataki announced what many had thought impossible. In an unprecedented agreement, the State of New York, the city of New York, environmentalists, local elected officials within the watershed and the Environmental Protection Agency all gave their approval to a plan to protect the New York City watershed and avoid large-scale filtration. Under the terms of the agreement, a total of \$1.2 billion will be spent by the city of New York over the next 15 years for water quality protection programs while upstate communities will continue to be able to grow and prosper in environmentally responsible ways.

Specifically, the city expects to increase its landholdings in the watershed threefold spending a minimum of \$260 million for purchases in the most sensitive areas from willing sellers. Also, the city will spend close to \$400 million on water quality protection programs in the watershed communities in addition to the programs required to be undertaken by EPA for the city to avoid filtration. Also, a new regional watershed council will be created to serve in an advisory role. The city will continue its plans to spend over \$600 million in already committed funds to build a filtration plant for the Croton watershed. Finally, the New York State Department of Health will approve and promulgate new watershed regulations to replace the existing outdated regulations.

By undertaking these activities, the city of New York will avoid the construction of a filtration system for the Catskill/Delaware watershed costing upwards of \$8 billion. The construction of such massive filtration plants would have likely dramatically increased water payments for each household in New York City.

While this historic agreement will lay the groundwork for the protection of New York's watershed, it will only be successful if effective and sophisticated monitoring is in place. It would not be fiscally wise to spend over \$1 billion without an ability to determine whether the protection efforts are working.

To address this concern, Senator MOYNIHAN and I have offered this amendment that will allow the EPA to spend up to \$15 million per year for 7 years in the State of New York in order to monitor and implement a host of watershed protection programs in the New York City watershed. Some of the projects that will be undertaken and in need of Federal assistance are: a phosphorus offset program designed to reduce the total amount of phosphorus in sensitive watershed basins; wastewater diversion; wastewater micro-filtration treatment; enhanced stormwater control activities; and agricultural and forestry best management practices. Federal funding could be utilized for up to 35 percent of a project's total cost. Should water quality decline, the EPA will have the ability to demand appropriate changes.

Our amendment is a perfect complement to the efforts being undertaken in New York State to protect the watershed in a scientifically sound and fiscally responsible manner. Under our amendment, scientists will be better able to monitor the quality of the drinking water of some 9 million people and prevent degradation of this vital watershed before it becomes a matter of concern. This will be able to be done at a spend-out rate of \$12 to every \$1 spent by the Federal Government.

I am pleased that the managers of this bill agree with the need to protect this precious resource. With the passage of this amendment, the State of

New York will be given an opportunity to further protect its valuable watershed. I am confident that the efforts undertaken in New York will be able to serve as a model for similar activities in other parts of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment (No. 3077) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the bill we have before us provides an excellent example of how good people, working together, can find a way to balance safety and cost concerns. I commend the bipartisan effort that developed the Safe Drinking Water Amendments Act of 1995. I also rise to thank these same chairmen and ranking members for agreeing to the amendment that Senator GORTON and I proposed regarding the city of Seattle's water supply that was approved earlier today.

Safe drinking water is probably the single most important thing a government can supply its people. This bill, S. 1316, accomplishes that task by giving the Environmental Protection Agency flexibility to set drinking water standards based on peer-reviewed science. It encourages State and local governments to become full partners in the development, implementation, and enforcement of drinking water regulations. It targets our scarce public resources toward greater health risks and away from more trivial risks.

S. 1316 will be particularly helpful for small systems serving fewer than 10,000 people. These small systems will be eligible for variances that allow them to use affordable treatment technology. While regulators may grant variances, S. 1316 also authorizes consumers to participate in the decision to grant a variance and requires variance renewals every 5 years. I have heard from many small communities about how burdensome the current Safe Drinking Water Act requirements are. I share their enthusiasm for the flexibility and innovation contained in this bill.

I also want to draw my colleagues' attention to the amendment Senator GORTON and I proposed regarding the city of Seattle water supply. With our amendment, Seattle will be able to provide its customers safer water, at a lower cost, and with a better taste than it could have under current filtration requirements. Our amendment will allow local governments that have undeveloped watersheds with a consolidated ownership to use a process other

than filtration if that alternative ensures significantly greater removal of pathogens.

The Seattle Water Department has concluded that ozonation, a process commonly used in Europe, may provide 100 times more protection from *Cryptosporidium* and other pathogens than would a filtration system. Should ozonation deliver as much protection as it promises, the people of Seattle will have safer water and will pay \$130 million less for that safety than they would have had to pay for a Cedar River watershed filtration system.

Mr. President, like all bills that pass through the process of compromise and negotiation, S. 1316 is not perfect. However, it is a good bill that goes a long way toward solving some of the more troublesome aspects of the current Safe Drinking Water Act. This bill offers responsible reform, flexibility, and balance. I have heard from a number of local governments urging my full support of this bill. I intend to offer that support, while at the same time voting in favor of stronger right-to-know provisions.

Again, I thank the chairmen and ranking members for their hard work on this bill and for accepting Sen. GORTON's and my amendment.

SEATTLE'S WATER SUPPLY

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Safe Drinking Water Amendments Act of 1995 and commend the managers on their excellent work. In addition, I would like to address the amendment that Senator GORTON and I proposed, which was accepted as a managers' amendment, that will provide the people of the city of Seattle with quality drinking water at an affordable price. Like this bill before us, our amendment seeks to protect our citizens from unnecessary costs while providing safe, high quality drinking water.

Our amendment requires the EPA to amend its drinking water protection criteria to allow a State to establish treatment requirements other than filtration where a watershed is uninhabited, has consolidated ownership and has controlled access. Our amendment allows an alternative to filtration where EPA determines that the quality of the source water and alternative treatment requirements established by the State ensure significantly greater pathogen removal efficiencies than would a combination of filtration and chlorine disinfection.

Mr. President, the Cedar River watershed is unique. The city of Seattle will own 100 percent of this 90,490 acre watershed by the end of the year. The city controls access to and activity in this watershed. It practices model land stewardship, supplying a wide variety of public values, including healthy populations of wildlife. In short, it is a crown jewel. It is the type of water supply all major cities should aspire to have.

The watershed met all of the criteria for remaining an unfiltered supplier for the first 18 months after passage of the

SDWA amendments of 1986. However, because of a severe drought and an abundance of wildlife, the watershed exceeded one of the unfiltered water criteria, that of fecal coliform. After receiving notification of noncompliance, the Seattle Water Department began investigating filtration and non-filtration systems to ensure it would satisfy requirements of the SDWA.

The water department discovered that a process widely used in Europe, called ozonation, would reliably remove more *cryptosporidium* and *giardia*—the pathogens of most concern—than would filtration. An ozonation facility would inactivate 99.999 percent of *cryptosporidium*, while filtration would inactivate only 99.9 percent. In simple terms, ozonation can be economically designed to provide two orders of magnitude, or 100 times greater protection than filtration. Not only is ozonation more effective against the most serious threats to the Seattle water supply, but it costs less and makes the water taste better.

The Seattle Water Department's studies indicate that an ozonation plant would cost its customers \$68 million, while a filtration plant would cost \$198 million. While Seattle water officials believe that the Cedar River water may require filtration sometime in the future, the system has a number of other more pressing needs—such as covering open, in-city reservoirs and installing a filtration plant in the Tolt River watershed—that make ozonation the best course for today. The ozonation plant will be built in such a way as to be compatible with a filtration plant should the need for one arise in the future.

Mr. President, this amendment offers the city of Seattle needed flexibility so that it can provide its customers the safest water at the lowest cost in the very near future. It is worth re-stating that this filtration flexibility may be given only where a watershed is undeveloped and, most importantly, the alternative to filtration proves to ensure significantly greater pathogen removal efficiencies. Delivering safe drinking water is the fundamental goal of this amendment and this bill.

Again, I thank the bill's managers for their assistance and support on our amendment and in developing the comprehensive, balanced Safe Drinking Water Amendments Act of 1995.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business for 5

minutes without the time being charged to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOSNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor of the Senate this evening to address an issue which is of great concern to this Nation and to many of my colleagues—and that is Bosnia. This past Monday, the President took his proposal to the American people and he appears to have listened to the majority of Americans by coming forward and stating his case for the United States' involvement in Bosnia.

Although the President was wise to come to the American people, I like many of my colleagues, cannot support the President's decision to send troops because I do not know that he has fully explained what "American values" are at stake in Bosnia.

In my home State of Colorado, I have five offices. Without exception, the phones have been ringing and my constituents have been voicing their concerns, their fears, their anger, and their opposition to the President's proposal. Today they see no threat to our national security or to our way of life, although they do have great empathy for the people in Bosnia.

Bosnia has proven to be a quagmire time and time again. I, like many of my colleagues, do not want to see our troops placed in harm's way in this region. We surely do not want to repeat the problems that we had in either Vietnam or Somalia.

I believe the new-found peace in Bosnia is untenable and cannot be guaranteed. I believe there are 120,000 Serbs over there who basically said the same thing.

It is foolish for us to believe that there will not be mission changes during our proposed 12-month involvement in the region. The environment in Bosnia will continue to change as time goes on, and we cannot predict what will be asked of us during the next 12 months. What starts out to be a peace-keeping mission will certainly become a nation-rebuilding mission at the expense of the American taxpayers.

I do not believe the President fully appreciates the fact that you cannot, under the best of circumstances, give a definitive end date for involvement in that military mission.

By nature, military missions are unpredictable. We have no way to determine how long it will take before peace is freestanding in the region. In 12 months, the Bosnian peace may be at a pivotal stage so that we cannot pull out, we cannot bring our troops home, and that is what I fear the most.

That region has a history of internal struggles. The country is torn and has always been torn by deeply held religious beliefs, and we cannot socially engineer a peace. Peace will never come easily to this region, and there are still those today who oppose the agreement.

I am most concerned that the United States will be making up 30 percent of the NATO force in addition to all of the air support and the logistics of the mission. This is far more than any of the other 15 NATO members. As a result, we will also be contributing a large part of the funds for this mission. In this time of fiscal restraint of asking everyone to do more with less, I cannot understand how the President can ask us to ante up for this commitment, continue to insist on increased levels of domestic spending, and still work to balance the budget in 7 years as he has indicated he would.

I support our treaty obligations to NATO. However, in this instance I feel our obligations simply do not outweigh our concerns for our American youngsters that we have to send into harm's way.

We all support the efforts to end the atrocities and suffering. However, I do not believe that we have any vital national security interests in that region, as we did in the Gulf war. I also believe that we have a humanitarian interest in the region, but I do not think the American people solely support the humanitarian rationale as justification for sending our ground troops into Bosnia. Certainly Coloradans do not.

Above all, we cannot afford to forget the reality of the situation we are sending our troops into: A newly founded and untenable peace. In that environment, there will undoubtedly be continued hostilities. I am absolutely convinced that we will have American dead by Christmas, if not by hidden enemy, certainly from one of the 6 million buried mines that still exist.

The parents and families of these Americans we are asking to go to Bosnia are those the Congress and the President must answer to. I believe that we should be most thoughtful before this administration puts us in a position where we might have American youngsters dead by Christmas.

With that, I yield the floor, Mr. President.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. I ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of the time on the Boxer amendment, the amendment be laid aside and there be 10 minutes equally divided between the two managers to offer a series of cleared amendments, and following the disposition of those amendments and the expiration of time, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the Boxer amendment, to be followed immediately by third reading and final passage of S. 1316, as amended, all without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I just want to make sure, since there will be intervening discussion between the explanation of my amendment and the vote, I ask that we could have a minute on each side just before the vote to restate it.

Mr. CHAFEE. I say this to the distinguished Senator. If we are going to vote and people know we are going to go to final passage right after this, frankly, if we have nothing to do, no cleared amendments, I see no reason that there even would be 10 minutes. So let us see how it works out. I will say this to the Senator. If there is a long intervening time, I will make sure she gets a minute to explain her amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. That is all I need. I will certainly trust my chairman, whom I respect very much, as I respect the ranking member and subcommittee chair. And if the Senators want, I can send up the amendment and we can start the clock running on the 15 minutes per side.

Mr. CHAFEE. All ready to go. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 3078

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, under the previous order, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 3078.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Section 20, Page 140, line 11—add at the end the following new subparagraph:

(F) CONSUMER CONFIDENCE REPORTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall issue regulations within three years of enactment of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1995 to require each community water system to issue a consumer confidence report at least once annually to its water consumers on the level of contaminants in the drinking water purveyed by that system which pose a potential risk to human health. The report shall include, but not be limited to: information on source, content, and quality of water purveyed; a plainly worded explanation of the health implications of contaminants relative to national primary drinking water regulations or health advisories; information on compliance with national primary drinking water regulations; and information on priority unregulated contaminants to the extent that testing methods and health effects information are available (including levels of cryptosporidium and radon where States determine that they may be found).

(ii) COVERAGE.—Subsection (i) shall not apply to community water systems serving fewer than 10,000 persons or other systems as determined by the Governor, provided that such systems inform their customers that they will not be complying with Subsection (i). The State may by rule establish alternative requirements with respect to the form and content of consumer confidence reports.