(3) otherwise supersede any State, local, or tribal law (including any regulation) applicable to the construction or operation of the project.

SEC. 10013. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may promulgate such regulations as the Secretary or Administrator determines to be appropriate to carry out this title.

SEC. 10014, FUNDING.

- (a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to each of the Secretary and the Administrator to carry out this title \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.
- (b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the funds made available to carry out this title, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, may use for the administration of this title, including for the provision of technical assistance to aid project sponsors in obtaining the necessary approvals for the project, not more than \$2,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 10015. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary or the Administrator, as applicable, shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report summarizing for the projects that are receiving, or have received, assistance under this title-

- (1) the financial performance of those projects, including a recommendation as to whether the objectives of this title are being met;
- (2) the public benefit provided by those projects, including, as applicable, water quality and water quantity improvement, the protection of drinking water, and the reduction of flood

TITLE XI-EXTREME WEATHER SEC. 11001. STUDY ON RISK REDUCTION.

- (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to carry out a study and make recommendations relating to infrastructure and coastal restoration options for reducing risk to human life and property from extreme weather events, such as hurricanes, coastal storms, and inland flooding.
- (b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include—
- (1) an analysis of strategies and water resources projects, including authorized water resources projects that have not yet been constructed, and other projects implemented in the United States and worldwide to respond to risk associated with extreme weather events:
- (2) an analysis of historical extreme weather events and the ability of existing infrastructure to mitigate risks associated with those events;
- (3) identification of proven, science-based approaches and mechanisms for ecosystem protection and identification of natural resources likely to have the greatest need for protection, restoration, and conservation so that the infrastructure and restoration projects can continue safeguarding the communities in, and sustaining the economy of, the United States;
- (4) an estimation of the funding necessary to improve infrastructure in the United States to reduce risk associated with extreme weather events:
- (5) an analysis of the adequacy of current funding sources and the identification of potential new funding sources to finance the necessary infrastructure improvements referred to in paragraph (3); and
- (6) an analysis of the Federal, State, and local costs of natural disasters and the potential costsavings associated with implementing mitigation measures.

- (c) Coordination.—The National Academy of Sciences may cooperate with the National Academy of Public Administration to carry out 1 or more aspects of the study under subsection (a).
- (d) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after completion of the study under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall—
- (1) submit a copy of the study to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and
- (2) make a copy of the study available on a publicly accessible Internet site.

SEC. 11002. GAO STUDY ON MANAGEMENT OF FLOOD, DROUGHT, AND STORM DAM-AGE.

- (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a study of the strategies used by the Corps of Engineers for the comprehensive management of water resources in response to floods, storms, and droughts, including an historical review of the ability of the Corps of Engineers to manage and respond to historical drought, storm, and flood events.
- (b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The study under subsection (a) shall address-
- (1) the extent to which existing water management activities of the Corps of Engineers can better meet the goal of addressing future flooding, drought, and storm damage risks, which shall include analysis of all historical extreme weather events that have been recorded during the previous 5 centuries as well as in the geological record;
- (2) whether existing water resources projects built or maintained by the Corps of Engineers, including dams, levees, floodwalls, flood gates, and other appurtenant infrastructure were designed to adequately address flood, storm, and drought impacts and the extent to which the water resources projects have been successful at addressing those impacts;
- (3) any recommendations for approaches for repairing, rebuilding, or restoring infrastructure, land, and natural resources that consider the risks and vulnerabilities associated with past and future extreme weather events;
- (4) whether a reevaluation of existing management approaches of the Corps of Engineers could result in greater efficiencies in water management and project delivery that would enable the Corps of Engineers to better prepare for, contain, and respond to flood, storm, and drought conditions;
- (5) any recommendations for improving the planning processes of the Corps of Engineers to provide opportunities for comprehensive management of water resources that increases efficiency and improves response to flood, storm. and drought conditions; and
- (6) any recommendations for improving approaches to rebuilding or restoring infrastructure and natural resources that contribute to risk reduction, such as coastal wetlands, to prepare for flood and drought.

SEC. 11003. POST-DISASTER WATERSHED ASSESS-MENTS.

- (a) Watershed Assessments.—
- (1) IN GENERAL.—In an area that the President has declared a major disaster in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), the Secretary may carry out a watershed assessment to identify, to the maximum extent practicable, specific flood risk reduction, hurricane and storm damage reduction, or ecosystem restoration project recommendations that will help to rehabilitate and improve the resiliency of damaged infrastructure and natural resources to reduce risks to human life and property from future natural disasters.
- (2) EXISTING PROJECTS.—A watershed assessment carried out paragraph (1) may identify ex-

isting projects being carried out under 1 or more of the authorities referred to in subsection (b)

- (3) Duplicate watershed assessments.—In carrying out a watershed assessment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use all existing watershed assessments and related information developed by the Secretary or other Federal, State, or local entities.
 - (b) PROJECTS.
- (1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out 1 or more small projects identified in a watershed assessment under subsection (a) that the Secretary would otherwise be authorized to carry out under-
- (A) section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s);
- (B) section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i);
- (C) section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330);
- (D) section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a);
- (E) section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577); or
- (F) section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426a).
- (2) Existing projects.—In carrying out a project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall-
- (A) to the maximum extent practicable, use all existing information and studies available for the project; and
- (B) not require any element of a study completed for the project prior to the disaster to be repeated
- (c) REQUIREMENTS.—All requirements applicable to a project under the Acts described in subsection (b) shall apply to the project.
 - (d) Limitations on Assessments.-
- (1) IN GENERAL—A watershed assessment under subsection (a) shall be initiated not later than 2 years after the date on which the major disaster declaration is issued.
- (2) $\it Federal share of the$ cost of carrying out a watershed assessment under subsection (a) shall not exceed \$1,000,000.
- (e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.— There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill S. 601 is pending.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 30 minutes and that we then return to S. 601, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

THE BUDGET

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I would like to speak for a few minutes

today about the importance of getting a budget done today, all the way through the process. Senator REID, our majority leader, last evening spoke again about the fact that we have had 15 days now of trying to just come together to create a conference committee to work out differences between the House and the Senate on a budget. For some reason, after talk for the last 3 years that I can remember from colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying that we need regular order, we need regular order, we need to get a budget done, they now are objecting to getting a budget done, which is extraordinary. The fact is that we cannot get a budget done if the House and the Senate do not appoint conferees and sit down and negotiate differences.

There are huge differences, I might add, between the House and the Senate. It is true that we will not accept, in the Senate, eliminating Medicare as an insurance plan for seniors and the disabled in this country, which the House does in their plan, turning it into a government voucher, putting seniors back into the private sector to try to find insurance. We certainly will not accept that, it is true. There are other areas of that budget we absolutely will not accept, but we know the first step in coming together to find something we can accept is to sit down and talk. I mean, I am very proud of what we were able to do in March. We had 110 amendments. We all remember. We were here until the wee hours of the morning. We got a budget done in regular order.

We have been hearing from colleagues across the aisle that we need to have regular order. I support that. In fact, I was proud of the fact that last year we did a farm bill in regular order and plowed through 73 amendments and worked together and passed a bipartisan bill. We hope we are going to be bringing a bill to the floor very soon as well to do it again.

I am a huge supporter of giving people an opportunity to state their differences, to be able to work out amendments, and to be able to get a bill done. We did that with 50 hours of debate on the budget, 110 amendments that we took up. We got it done. Now, all of a sudden, colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want regular order anymore. They have decided somehow that actively blocking us from actually getting a budget for the Nation is more advantageous to them for some reason or something that appeals to them more than actually getting the budget done.

I urge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take another look at this, to look at their own words over the last number of years. Our colleague from Texas who objected to the majority leader's motion to actually do the next step and get a budget done said back in January on national television: We have a crisis. Well, what was the crisis he was talking about?

There is no doubt the Senate has not done its job. The Senate should pass a budget.

Well, we did. We passed a budget. It may not be something my colleague from Texas supported. That is the democratic process. The majority of people agreed in this body, and we passed a budget. He may be more inclined to support the House budget, which eliminates Medicare as an insurance plan and does a number of other things that I think go right to the heart of middle-class families and so on. That is his right. That is a right we all have, to have a position as to which budget we support. But we also know that in the democratic process under our Constitution—and we all talk about the Constitution and the democratic process—the way we actually get to a final budget is to get folks in a room to talk, to negotiate, and to see if there is some way to work issues out. We are now being blocked from being able to get in the room to talk to each other

The American people want us to talk, want us to negotiate, want us to work things out. That is what we ought to be doing. So I would strongly urge that we move to conference. I do not know why in the world anyone would be objecting to putting together a group of people, Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans in the House, to sit down and work out the priorities for our country.

Will we have different perspectives on Medicare, whether we should have Medicare? Yes, we will. Will we have different perspectives on where the brunt of the cutbacks should be and whether middle-class families have been hit enough, which I believe they have? Yes, we will have a disagreement on how to balance the budget. But we all know that we need to get the job done. We have done our part in passing a Senate budget. The House passed a House budget. It is a very different vision of the world, different vision of what should happen in terms of innovation, education, and investing in the future of our country-very different views. But those views deserve to be aired sitting around a conference table to try to work out some way to come together to pass a budget.

I urge colleagues to stop obstructing, stop stalling, allow us to move forward in a balanced way, and give us the opportunity to do what everyone in the country wants us to do, which is to come up with a bipartisan, balanced, fair budget for the country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I speak in morning business, followed by the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. Ayotte.

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

(The remarks of Mrs. Murray and Ms. Ayotte pertaining to the introduction of S. 871 are located in today's Record under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOP MENT ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 601 is now pending.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want to speak now on a bill that Senator VITTER and I are very proud of. But, first, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the committee-reported substitute amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 799

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mrs. BOXER. Now I call up the Boxer-Vitter substitute amendment No. 799 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself and Mr. VITTER, proposes an amendment numbered 799.

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

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I will make an opening statement and then turn it over to my colleague, Senator VITTER, for his opening statement.

I want to just say this is a good day for the Senate to get on a bill that is a bipartisan bill, where we have had unanimous support in the Environment and Public Works Committee. This is a bill that will create or save half a million jobs for our Nation, and it has been a long time in coming. The last WRDA bill—the Water Resources Development Act—was in 2007. It took a lot of work to get here. The reason for that is we had to deal with changing the culture of the Senate away from earmarks in a bill like this where projects were named and figure out a way we could move forward with these projects without earmarks. It was difficult.

Senator VITTER and I and our staffs have worked hard to get to this point. I particularly want to say to both staffs that we couldn't have done it without your amazing focus. We are so appreciative.

Our bill did make it through EPW without a single "no" vote. Since then we have been working with almost every Senator to hear their ideas, to get their reactions, and to see if there were ways we could change the bill. This substitute Senator VITTER and I have put forward incorporates the