

exports. The General Aviation industry is one of the few remaining U.S. industries that actually maintains a strong, positive foreign trade balance.

As one of the champions of General Aviation in the House of Representatives, I strongly support this resolution, and urge the Members of the House to pass it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, H. Res. 508, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the general aviation (GA) industry, which includes all civilian flying except scheduled passenger airlines activity, should be recognized for its contributions to the United States. I thank Representative FORTENBERRY for his leadership on this measure.

The United States has the most robust GA industry in the world. GA transports 170 million passengers annually, on over 230,000 aircraft. GA stimulates local and regional economies—it comprises over \$150 billion in direct and indirect economic output and supports almost 1.3 million jobs. Many of these jobs are high-skill jobs in manufacturing, avionics and technology development as well as flight training, maintenance, modification, and technical support.

In addition, GA provides communities with essential services, and affords large and small businesses the flexibility and mobility that they need to be successful in both large communities as well as small, rural ones. Many industries and public services depend on GA, including emergency medicine, firefighting, surveying wildlife, law enforcement, news services, energy exploration, and farming.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 508.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 508.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. 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 pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CLEAN COASTAL ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH ACT OF 2009

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2093) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2093

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. WATER POLLUTION SOURCE IDENTIFICATION.

(a) **MONITORING PROTOCOLS.**—Section 406(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "methods for monitoring" and inserting "protocols for monitoring that are most likely to detect pathogenic contamination".

(b) **SOURCE TRACKING.**—Section 406(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) **SOURCE IDENTIFICATION PROGRAMS.**—In carrying out a monitoring and notification program, a State or local government may develop and implement a coastal recreation waters pollution source identification and tracking program for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public and are not meeting applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators."

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 406(i) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(i)) is amended by striking "\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005" and inserting "\$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014".

SEC. 3. FUNDING FOR BEACHES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND COASTAL HEALTH ACT.

Section 8 of the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 877) is amended by striking "2005" and inserting "2014".

SEC. 4. STATE REPORTS.

Section 406(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as redesignated by section 2(b)(1) of this Act) is amended by striking "public" and inserting "public and all environmental agencies of the State with authority to prevent or treat sources of pathogenic contamination in coastal recreation waters".

SEC. 5. USE OF RAPID TESTING METHODS.

(a) **CONTENTS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.**—Section 406(c)(4)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking "methods" and inserting "methods, including a rapid testing method after the last day of the one-year period following the date of validation of that rapid testing method by the Administrator."

(b) **REVISED CRITERIA.**—Section 304(a)(9)(A) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(9)(A)) is amended by striking "methods, as appropriate" and inserting "methods, including rapid testing methods".

(c) **VALIDATION AND USE OF RAPID TESTING METHODS.**—

(1) **VALIDATION OF RAPID TESTING METHODS.**—Not later than October 15, 2012, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") shall complete an evaluation and validation of a rapid testing method for the water quality criteria and standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators described in section 304(a)(9)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(9)(A)).

(2) **GUIDANCE FOR USE OF RAPID TESTING METHODS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after completion of the validation under paragraph (1), and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, the Administrator shall publish guidance for the use at coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public of the rapid testing method that will enhance the

protection of public health and safety through rapid public notification of any exceeding of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators.

(B) **PRIORITIZATION.**—In developing such guidance, the Administrator shall require the use of the rapid testing method at those beaches or similar points of access that are the most used by the public.

(d) **DEFINITION.**—Section 502 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(26) **RAPID TESTING METHOD.**—The term "rapid testing method" means a method of testing the water quality of coastal recreation waters for which results are available as soon as practicable and not more than 6 hours after the commencement of the rapid testing method in the laboratory."

(e) **REVISIONS TO RAPID TESTING METHODS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon completion of the validation required under subsection (c)(1), and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall identify and review potential rapid testing methods for existing water quality criteria for pathogens and pathogen indicators for coastal recreation waters.

(2) **REVISIONS TO RAPID TESTING METHODS.**—If a rapid testing method identified under paragraph (1) will make results available in less time and improve the accuracy and reproducibility of results when compared to the existing rapid testing method, the Administrator shall complete an evaluation and validation of the rapid testing method as expeditiously as practicable.

(3) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Upon completion of the review required under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register the results of the review, including information on any potential rapid testing method proposed for evaluation and validation under paragraph (2).

(4) **DECLARATION OF GOALS FOR RAPID TESTING METHODS.**—It is a national goal that by 2017, a rapid testing method for testing water quality of coastal recreation waters be developed that can produce accurate and reproducible results in not more than 2 hours after commencement of the rapid testing method.

SEC. 6. NOTIFICATION OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES.

Section 406(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5) by striking "prompt communication" and inserting "communication, within 24 hours of the receipt of the results of a water quality sample,";

(2) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting "(i) in the case of any State in which the Administrator is administering the program under section 402," before "the Administrator" the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting at the end the following:

"(ii) in the case of any State other than a State to which clause (i) applies, all agencies of the State government with authority to require the prevention or treatment of the sources of coastal recreation water pollution; and";

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

"(6) measures for an annual report to the Administrator, in such form as the Administrator determines appropriate, on the occurrence, nature, location, pollutants involved, and extent of any exceeding of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators;"

SEC. 7. CONTENT OF STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS.

Section 406(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7) (as redesignated by section 6(3) of this Act)—

(A) by striking "the posting" and inserting "the immediate posting"; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) (as redesignated by section 6(3) of this Act) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) the availability of a geographic information system database that such State or local government program shall use to inform the public about coastal recreation waters and that—

“(A) is publicly accessible and searchable on the Internet;

“(B) is organized by beach or similar point of access;

“(C) identifies applicable water quality standards, monitoring protocols, sampling plans and results, and the number and cause of coastal recreation water closures and advisory days; and

“(D) is updated within 24 hours of the availability of revised information; and

“(10) measures to ensure that closures or advisories are made or issued within 2 hours after the receipt of the results of a water quality sample that exceeds applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators.”

SEC. 8. COMPLIANCE REVIEW.

Section 406(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “In the” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COMPLIANCE REVIEW.—On or before July 31 of each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall—

“(A) prepare a written assessment of compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements of this section for each State and local government and of compliance with conditions of each grant made under this section to a State or local government;

“(B) notify the State or local government of such assessment; and

“(C) make each of the assessments available to the public in a searchable database on the Internet on or before December 31 of such calendar year.

“(3) CORRECTIVE ACTION.—If a State or local government that the Administrator notifies under paragraph (2) is not in compliance with any requirement or grant condition described in paragraph (2) fails to take such action as may be necessary to comply with such requirement or condition within one year after the date of notification, any grants made under subsection (b) to the State or local government, after the last day of such one-year period and while the State or local government is not in compliance with all requirements and grant conditions described in paragraph (2), shall have a Federal share of not to exceed 50 percent.

“(4) GAO REVIEW.—Not later than December 31 of the third calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General shall conduct a review of the activities of the Administrator under paragraphs (2) and (3) during the first and second calendar years beginning after such date of enactment and submit to Congress a report on the results of such review.”

SEC. 9. PUBLICATION OF COASTAL RECREATION WATERS PATHOGEN LIST.

Section 304(a)(9) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PUBLICATION OF PATHOGEN AND PATHOGEN INDICATOR LIST.—Upon publication of the new or revised water quality criteria under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a list of all pathogens

and pathogen indicators studied under section 104(v).”

SEC. 10. ADOPTION OF NEW OR REVISED CRITERIA AND STANDARDS.

Section 303(i)(2)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(i)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “paragraph (1)(A)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (1)”.

SEC. 11. NATIONAL LIST OF BEACHES.

Section 406(g)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(g)(3)) is amended by striking “The Administrator” and all that follows through the period and inserting “Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall update the list described in paragraph (1).”

SEC. 12. IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON PATHOGENIC CONTAMINATION OF COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator shall conduct a study on the long-term impact of climate change on pathogenic contamination of coastal recreation waters.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) INFORMATION ON POTENTIAL CONTAMINANT IMPACTS.—The report shall include information on the potential impacts of pathogenic contamination on ground and surface water resources as well as public and ecosystem health in coastal communities.

(3) MONITORING.—The report shall address monitoring required to document and assess changing conditions of coastal water resources, recreational waters, and ecosystems and review the current ability to assess and forecast impacts associated with long-term change.

(4) FEDERAL ACTIONS.—The report shall highlight necessary Federal actions to help advance the availability of information and tools to assess and mitigate these effects in order to protect public and ecosystem health.

(5) CONSULTATION.—In developing the report, the Administrator shall work in consultation with agencies active in the development of the National Water Quality Monitoring Network and the implementation of the Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy.

SEC. 13. IMPACT OF EXCESS NUTRIENTS ON COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator shall conduct a study to review the available scientific information pertaining to the impacts of excess nutrients on coastal recreation waters.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit 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 study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) IMPACTS.—Such report shall include information on any adverse impacts of excess nutrients on coastal recreation waters, including adverse impacts caused by algal blooms resulting from excess nutrients.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Such report shall include recommendations for action to address adverse impacts of excess nutrients and algal blooms on coastal recreation waters, including the establishment and implementation of numeric water quality criteria for nutrients.

(4) CONSULTATION.—In developing such report, the Administrator shall consult with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies (including the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), States, and local government entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2093.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009 increases the authorization of appropriations for the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act, more commonly known as the BEACH Act bill, through 2014.

First signed into law in October 2000, the BEACH Act provides funding to States, to local governments and to tribes for the creation of coastal water assessment and for public notification programs that monitor our recreational waters.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2093, the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009, increases the authorization of appropriations for the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act, more commonly known as the BEACH Act, through 2014.

First signed into law in October 2000, the BEACH Act provides funding to states, local governments, and tribes for the creation of coastal water assessment and public notification programs that monitor our recreational waters.

Over the past nine years, my Subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, has held hearings on reauthorization of the BEACH Act and has received recommendations for statutory changes that would strengthen State coastal water quality monitoring and public notification programs.

I applaud the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. PALLONE, and our colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. BISHOP and Mr. HALL, for introducing this important legislation.

H.R. 2093, the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act, will increase the annual authorization for State and local monitoring and notification programs to \$40 million annually.

In addition, this legislation expands the eligible uses for grants under this program to better understand ongoing sources of contamination to the nation's beaches.

For example, H.R. 2093 allows States to utilize a portion of their BEACH grant funding to develop and implement pollution source identification and tracking programs for coastal recreation waters.

These programs will enable interested States to locate the likely sources of coastal water contamination.

This information will be critical to states to demonstrate ongoing sources of pollution to the nation's beaches.

With definitive information on the causes of coastal water contamination, States can take appropriate action to eliminate these ongoing sources, and ensure that the nation's coastal areas are safe for swimming and other recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, the House considered similar legislation to reauthorize and strengthen the BEACH Act.

That version, H.R. 2537, was approved by the House on a voice vote in April 2008.

Unfortunately, the 110th Congress adjourned before further consideration could be taken on that bill.

H.R. 2093 is modeled on the bill that passed the House in the last Congress.

However, one significant change is the adoption of a statutory deadline for the development of rapid testing methods for measuring the quality of coastal recreation waters.

The development of a rapid testing method will provide a significant safeguard against swimming-related illnesses by ensuring that the public is notified of potentially harmful waters within a few hours, rather than days, as under the current system.

H.R. 2093 adopts a statutory deadline of October 15, 2012 for the development of rapid testing methods, and requires states to implement such methods within one year of their validation by EPA.

This provision should enhance the protection of public health, and hopefully prevent families from coming into contact with harmful pollutants at their favorite beaches.

The bill also defines the term "rapid testing method" to mean "a method of testing the water quality of a coastal recreation water for which results are available as soon as practicable and not more than 6 hours after the commencement of the rapid testing method in the laboratory."

Mr. Speaker, as made clear in the Committee Report to accompany this legislation, the intent of this definition is to compress the time period for testing water quality to provide real-time information on the condition of coastal recreation waters.

The Committee received information on testing technologies that are currently available which can produce accurate results in two to three hours.

The intent of this legislation is to require that EPA validate a rapid testing methodology that can achieve accurate results as quickly as possible within the confines of existing technologies.

In addition, H.R. 2093 requires the administrator to periodically review the state of water quality testing technologies, and to validate new rapid testing methods that can shorten the time necessary to produce results on the condition of such waters, with a goal of 2-hour testing by 2017.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2093 also enhances existing public notification requirements, including making beach warnings and closures available on the Internet.

The bill also clarifies that the public must be notified within 2 hours after the appropriate State or local authority receives the results of a coastal water quality sample.

However, because many States utilize a system where two contaminated samples must be identified before a beach is closed, H.R. 2093 requires that beach closures or advisories must be made within 2 hours of the receipt of any water quality sample that ex-

ceeds public health limits, and that a warning sign be posted immediately, thereafter.

Again, precaution against potential public health impacts needs to be the focus of this program.

Finally, the bill requires EPA to conduct annual compliance reviews of state and local BEACH programs.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation that will make significant improvements to EPA's BEACH program.

Much of our efforts are to provide additional safeguards for our families to ensure they do not come into contact with potentially harmful pollutants and contaminants along the nation's coastlines.

I believe that this legislation accomplishes what we have tried to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the House is moving H.R. 2093, the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009. This is an example of the good we can accomplish when we're able to work in a bipartisan manner to address the Nation's water resources needs.

Our Nation has nearly 23,000 miles of ocean and gulf shoreline along the continental United States and 5,500 miles of Great Lakes shoreline. Beaches are an important part of American life, providing numerous recreational opportunities for millions of people, including swimming, fishing, boating, beach-combing, surfing, sunbathing, and bird-watching.

This bill enables the EPA and the States to complete the important work they have begun so they can better protect public health and safety and so that they can continue to improve the quality of our Nation's recreational coastal waters.

H.R. 2093 increases the authorized annual funding for grants to States from \$30 million to \$40 million, and it extends the program through fiscal year 2014. This will help ensure that the public can get timely warnings of potential health hazards associated with a trip to the beach.

H.R. 2093 also requires the EPA to review State compliance with the BEACH Act, and it provides the means for dealing with States that remain out of compliance. H.R. 2093 passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by unanimous vote.

I am pleased the House is moving H.R. 2093, The "Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009."

This is an example of the good we can accomplish when we are able to work in a bipartisan manner to address the Nation's water resources needs.

Our Nation has nearly 23,000 miles of ocean and gulf shoreline along the continental United States, and 5,500 miles of Great Lakes shorelines.

Beaches are an important part of American life, providing numerous recreational opportunities for millions of people, including fishing, boating, beachcombing, swimming, surfing, sunbathing, and bird-watching.

Each year, over 180 million people visit coastal waters for recreational purposes.

This activity supports over 28 million jobs and leads to investments of over \$50 billion each year in goods and services.

Public confidence in the quality of our nation's waters is important not only to each citizen who swims, but also to the tourism and recreation industries that rely on safe and swimmable coastal waters.

To improve the public's confidence in the quality of our Nation's coastal waters and protect public health and safety, Congress passed the "Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000," commonly called the "BEACH Act," in the 106th Congress.

The BEACH Act aimed to limit and prevent human exposure to polluted coastal recreational waters by assisting States and local communities to implement beach monitoring, assessment, and public notification programs.

The act also called on States with coastal recreational waters to adopt pathogen-related water quality standards, and directed EPA to conduct research and develop updated water quality criteria to protect human health.

Under the BEACH Act, EPA has been making grants to States to help them implement programs to monitor beach water quality and notify the public if water quality standards for pathogens are not being met.

An important indicator of progress to date is the fact that all eligible States are now implementing the beach monitoring, assessment, and public notification provisions of the BEACH Act.

The number of monitored beaches has increased from approximately 1,000 in 1997 to more than 3,700 in 2008.

In addition, EPA has strengthened water quality standards throughout all the coastal recreation waters in the United States.

All 35 States and Territories with coastal recreation waters now have water quality standards as protective of human health as EPA's water quality criteria. This is an increase from just 11 States and Territories in 2000.

Further, EPA has improved public access to data on beach advisories and closings by improving the agency's electronic data systems.

Moreover, EPA has been conducting cutting-edge research to support the development of new water quality criteria to protect human health from pathogens, and new monitoring methods to more accurately and rapidly detect pathogen contamination in recreational waters.

Faster and better decisions are good for public health and good for the economy in beach communities.

We are optimistic that this work will help State beach managers make the best decisions possible about keeping beaches open or placing them under advisory.

Although EPA and the States have made substantial progress in implementing the BEACH Act, there is important work left to do in the areas of monitoring, research, and updating existing water quality criteria.

H.R. 2093 recognizes this, and reauthorizes and amends the BEACH Act.

This bill enables EPA and the States to complete the important work they have begun, so they can better protect public health and safety and continue to improve the quality of our Nation's recreational coastal waters.

H.R. 2093 increases the authorized annual funding level for grants to States from \$30 to \$40 million, and extends the program through fiscal year 2014.

In addition, the bill requires the development and use of rapid testing methods and quick notification to State officials and the public if a problem is found.

This will help ensure the public can get timely warnings of potential health hazards associated with a trip to the beach.

H.R. 2093 also requires EPA to review State compliance with the BEACH Act, and provides means for dealing with States that remain out of compliance.

H.R. 2093 passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by a unanimous voice vote.

I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and especially thank the ranking member of the committee, Mr. MICA, for all their hard work that enabled us to bring to you today a consensus bill that enjoys strong, bipartisan support.

I urge all members to support the legislation.

I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and especially their staffs for their hard work on both sides. Also, I would like to thank Mr. MICA for his hard work in helping us to bring this forward.

Again, I urge adoption of this. I am so glad that it enjoys bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the full committee chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to compliment Ms. JOHNSON on her superb chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment where she has diligently pursued the work of the committee with numerous hearings—in-depth, thorough work on the precious resources we have of fresh water. All the water we have ever had and will have is with us today, and it's our responsibility to care for it. Her vigilance in holding these hearings over the last Congress and in this Congress have been superb.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) has been a splendid partner and a diligent worker on the issues of water resources. He understands the needs that come from his State of Arkansas, which is a Mississippi River State, which is a water-dependent State, and he has devoted great initiative to this work.

Also, we have had success. The old saying is "success has a thousand fathers." Mr. PALLONE, the gentleman from New Jersey; Mr. BISHOP and Mr. HALL—both members of our committee—have been strong supporters of this legislation.

I do have to give special recognition to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), who, over several Congresses, has championed this legisla-

tion, including the initial BEACH Act. The persistence with which Mr. BILBRAY pursues matters is remarkable, to say the least, and he has been single-minded in his pursuit of this particular issue.

We have here a very splendid bipartisan bill that improves on the previous legislation, that improves on the practices of the previous administration, which, frankly, neglected the needs of beaches. We provide State and local governments greater authority to use a portion of their beach grant funds to identify sources of beach water quality impairments, to track ongoing sources of pollution to coastal recreation waters and to establish the validation of a rapid testing method, which all Members of this body who represent coastal areas, whether they're the freshwater coast or the saltwater coast, have strongly urged. This legislation will define "rapid testing" as a method that can produce results as soon as practicable but not more than 6 hours after the commencement of the test.

All of the supporters, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who is just arriving, have urged action on this particular rapid testing issue, so we give it definition, and we give it urgency and fiscal support.

This is a very good bill, a product of a great deal of experience and interest and support from Members on both sides of the aisle—on the east coast, the west coast, the gulf coast, and the fourth coastline, which is the Great Lakes coast.

I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2093, the "Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009", as amended.

This legislation, and the underlying sections of the Clean Water Act that focus on coastal recreation water quality monitoring and public notification, are vital to protect the public from unwanted contact with potentially-harmful pollutants and contaminants in our coastal recreational waters.

I applaud the efforts of the primary sponsors of this legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and our colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. BISHOP and Mr. HALL, for shepherding this important legislation through the hearing process, through Committee markup, and to the Floor of the House today.

I also applaud the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), for his efforts back in 2000 to move the initial BEACH Act to the President's desk.

The BEACH Act that was signed into law in October 2000 authorized \$30 million annually for beach monitoring and assessment programs and public notification programs for fiscal years 2001 through 2005. It required States and tribes to determine minimum water quality standards that were considered "safe".

In many ways, the BEACH Act has proven successful in making the public aware of the presence of potentially harmful water contamination at local beaches, and has brought about a revolution in terms of States creating and implementing coastal recreational water

monitoring and notification programs. The benefits we have seen over the last nine years include uniform standards for coastal recreational water quality, and increased monitoring and notification of contamination of such waters.

However, in as much as the BEACH Act has been successful in providing more information to the public, the previous Administration's track record on utilizing all of the tools contained in the BEACH Act to protect human health was far less successful.

For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was given authority to promulgate standards for States that did not have sufficient standards, as compared to those in the 1986 Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria. EPA was given further direction to continue to study the impacts of waterborne pollutants and bacteria to human health, and to revise the criteria every five years as needed. Unfortunately, EPA failed to complete this task, as demonstrated by a lawsuit by advocates for safe beaches.

Similarly, the last Administration failed to utilize the authorities and direction of the initial BEACH Act to ensure the public has the best, most accurate, and timely information on the condition of their favorite beaches. For example, the BEACH Act called for the creation of a "National List of Beaches" that would provide the public with information on which beaches had in place monitoring and notification programs, and which did not. EPA was given the direction to periodically revise this list, based on the availability of new information.

I can assure my colleagues that latest list, published in 2004, is not the most up-to-date assessment of the condition of the nation's beaches. It is regrettable that the last Administration was unwilling to utilize the tools provided by Congress to ensure the protection of human health and safety.

I am hopeful that the Obama Administration will seize the opportunity to enhance the protection of human health and safety, and I expect that passage of the H.R. 2093 will aid in this effort.

H.R. 2093 increases by \$10 million annually the authorization of appropriations for EPA to issue grants to State and local governments for the implementation of coastal recreation water monitoring and notification programs.

In addition, the bill provides State and local governments the authority to use a portion of their BEACH grant to identify potential sources of beach water quality impairments. This authority will help State and local governments track ongoing sources of pollution to coastal recreation waters, and allow these entities to take the necessary next steps to control or eliminate these sources of pollution.

The bill also directs EPA to complete its review and publication of revised water quality criteria for coastal recreation waters by October 15, 2012, and to include with this publication, the validation of a "rapid testing method" for coastal recreation waters. H.R. 2093 defines a rapid testing method as one that can produce results "as soon as practicable" but not more than six hours after commencement of the test.

Today, the majority of States are utilizing culture-based testing methodologies for determining the presence of pathogens in coastal waters. This testing methodology typically requires 24 hours before results can be obtained, which can mean that one or two days

may pass before the public is made aware of the presence of potentially harmful contaminants.

H.R. 2093 directs EPA to reduce the testing time from the current 24 hours to less than six hours, with the hope that communities can provide same day results on the condition of their local waters. To be clear, this legislation does not require that an approvable test actually take six hours, but establishes six hours as the absolute maximum time allowed for an approvable rapid testing method. If science dictates that the amount of testing time can be less than six hours, this bill allows EPA to approve a "more rapid" testing methodology.

It is my understanding that the scientific community believes that current technology is capable of producing a reliable rapid testing methodology that can produce results in two to three hours. This technology could be readily adopted by EPA under the revised definition, and the Agency is encouraged to adopt the shortest, reliable testing methodology possible.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, this reauthorization of the BEACH Act focuses on providing State and local governments with the tools they need to protect public health and reduce the incidence of water-borne illness. As we are in the midst of the summer vacation season, let us make sure that a family trip to the beach will not also result in a trip to the doctor's office.

I urge my colleague to support H.R. 2093.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Again, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member and my chairman, Ms. Johnson. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I know that time is short, so I'll be very brief. This is a very important bill to the Nation's beaches, and I represent a coastal area.

Basically, a few years ago, we passed the original BEACH Act, which allowed for the testing of ocean waters so that people would know, as sort of a right-to-know measure, when to go into the water and when not to. It has been very successful in keeping beaches clean and in notifying people when they shouldn't go swimming or when beaches have been cleaned up and they can go back into the water. We found out that we needed some better protection, and that is what we're doing with this bill today.

It calls for more rapid testing, within 24 hours—well, within a few hours, I should say—because, in the past, sometimes it would take 24 to 48 hours before we would know whether beaches should be closed. So there is a much more rapid testing method, which is within a few hours. In addition to that, the grants allow for the support for actually preventing beach closings and for using the Federal money for tracking so that, actually, the waters do not become more polluted.

So there are a lot of improvements in this bill over the current BEACH Act, and I urge its passage. I think we can get it signed into law quickly.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the chairwoman for yielding, and I will be even more brief than Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply thank Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Chairman OBERSTAR, and Chairwoman JOHNSON for their leadership on this issue.

This bill builds on the successes of the original BEACH Act. It implements rapid testing procedures which are vitally important. It provides a significantly larger authorization for the grants, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of eastern Long Island, I would like to commend Chairman OBERSTAR, Chairwoman JOHNSON and Congressmen PALLONE and BILBRAY for their leadership and unwavering dedication to clean water issues. I would also like to thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee staff for their hard work and commitment to advancing this legislation to the full House today.

My district encompasses 300 miles of coastline, and I'm very proud to represent some of this country's most popular and beautiful beaches. Maintaining coastal health is an integral objective toward preserving the Nation's environment and sustaining the tourist economies of our States. The beach-going public that flocked to our Nation's shores this summer reminds us that we deserve pristine waterways to enjoy with our families and that we need to preserve them for future generations of Americans.

The water quality monitoring and notification grants established in the original BEACH Act have been absolutely vital to protecting the health of beachgoers on our shores. Today, with the consideration of H.R. 2093, the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2009, we can continue to assure the American public that preserving healthy shores is a priority of our environmental agenda.

After EPA reports marked progress but raised questions about the implementation of the BEACH Act, it has become clear that further development of the legislation was needed. That is why Mr. PALLONE, the author of the original BEACH Act, and I decided to pool our resources to advance better legislation to fix problems and fund grant programs.

The Pallone/Bishop/Bilbray legislation reauthorizes the BEACH Act through fiscal year 2013 and increases authorization for funding from \$30 million to \$40 million, annually. This bipartisan legislation requires development and implementation of rapid testing methods to ensure that the public is notified of potential health concerns related to water quality in hours rather than days and enhances existing public notification requirements.

In the 110th Congress, a nearly identical bill was agreed to by this committee and passed on the House floor—both by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on the bill.

One in ten tourists is destined for the beach this summer—providing our travel and vacation industries with customers and business. I

hope my colleagues agree that the BEACH Act is an excellent example of an effective government program that benefits communities in every region of the country and has yielded tremendous progress in restoring healthy shores.

Mr. Speaker, with the leadership and support of this body, we can ensure that beach visitors throughout the country are assured that local governments have all the resources they need to monitor recreational waters and alert the public of potential health hazards.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. PALLONE, and our colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. BISHOP and Mr. HALL, for introducing this important legislation. Further, I appreciate and respect the fact that Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MICA and Mr. BOOZMAN helped with this as well, so I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2093, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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 pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3326, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-233) on the resolution (H. Res. 685) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3326) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H.R. 1293, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 556, de novo;
- H.R. 509, de novo;
- H. Res. 616, de novo;