

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1135.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER
DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1967) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1967

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 “Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY FOR PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UTILIZING MULTIPLE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS.

Section 9(c)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “and pumped storage hydropower development exclusively utilizing Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs” after “including small conduit hydropower development”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), a valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to consider a bill that aims to remove barriers to improve our Nation’s water and power infrastructure.

Just last Thursday, the House passed a bill designating the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency when it comes to permitting new and expanded

water storage projects. Today, the bill before us seeks to clear up regulatory confusion over the development of new pumped storage hydropower.

Hydropower can and should be part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy now and well into the future. It is a reliable and emissions-free source of electricity that accounts for a majority of the Nation’s total renewable electricity generation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have over 60 operating hydropower facilities that generate more than 1,100 megawatts, including new projects such as Carter Lake, South Canal, and Ridgway Reservoir. However, as is the case nationwide, there is potential for new hydropower generation in Colorado.

My bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act, H.R. 1967, looks to pave the way for additional clean hydropower generation by clearing up regulatory permitting confusion at existing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.

We worked with our colleague from central Washington State, Mr. NEWHOUSE, on this bill. His interest stems from a real-life example of where it is unclear whether the Bureau of Reclamation or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have permitting jurisdiction on pumped storage hydropower projects at the Columbia Basin Project.

The project’s proponents want to build a project that pumps water to and from two of the project’s reservoirs for hydroelectric generation. But because of potential dual permitting requirements, there have been serious delays in bringing this potential 500 megawatt project online.

Similar to a public law authored in 2013 by our committee colleague and fellow Coloradan, SCOTT TIPTON, that cleared up confusion on the Bureau of Reclamation’s pipes and canals, my bill makes it clear that the Bureau of Reclamation is the lead agency that will oversee pumped storage development for projects exclusively utilizing the agency’s facilities.

The regulatory clarification in my bill will help pave the way for more pumped storage by incentivizing developers who will, in turn, pay the American taxpayers for the use of Federal facilities.

In a hearing earlier this spring of the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee, which I chair, even our friends on the other side of the aisle agreed that we should be doing all we can to incentivize clean, renewable hydropower generation at existing Federal facilities. That is why this bill was passed by the House Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent in April.

I urge my House colleagues to join me in promoting clean, renewable hydropower generation as part of our Nation’s all-of-the-above energy strategy by supporting this bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1967 would amend the permitting process for pumped storage hydropower projects utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

Currently, hydropower projects involving Reclamation facilities are subject to either the FERC permitting process or the Reclamation permitting process, based on whether a Reclamation facility was originally authorized for hydropower development.

The unique nature of pumped storage projects, which require the use of multiple separate reservoirs, can mean that a single proposed project can be subject to both Reclamation and FERC’s permitting processes, since different reservoirs are under different agency jurisdiction.

If enacted, H.R. 1967 would subject pumped storage projects using multiple Reclamation reservoirs to just the Reclamation permitting process instead of the process for both Reclamation and FERC.

Like FERC, Reclamation’s permitting project requires authorized pumped storage projects to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and other statutory requirements.

While I believe that H.R. 1967 is a commonsense bill and I support its passage, I also support ongoing efforts to incorporate feedback from the Colville Tribe in Washington State as this bill advances to the Senate and proceeds through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I had the remarkable opportunity to live in Switzerland for 4 years, and hiked and climbed many of the Alps. It was fascinating to see the high-altitude dams that made hydropower the dominant form of power in the country. Eighty percent of all electricity was hydropower or nuclear.

I thank my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN from Colorado Springs, for his leadership on this issue. I encourage unanimous passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as this Chamber considers H.R. 1967, the “Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act,” I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project’s potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as this chamber considers H.R. 1967, the “Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydro-power Development Act,” I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related to a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project’s potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1967, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION’S PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res 397) solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 397

Whereas more than 250,000 Americans died in the Second World War to liberate Europe from the scourge of genocidal fascism;

Whereas in the wake of the cataclysm of the Second World War, the United States,

Canada, and European partners founded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Washington in 1949;

Whereas the foundation of NATO is collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty which states that, “The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”;

Whereas NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

Whereas Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty has only been invoked once in history when alliance members came to the aid of the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas NATO allies and partners, including Canada and countries in Central, Eastern, and Northern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy of promoting a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

Whereas at the Wales Summit in 2014, NATO leaders agreed that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation’s gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

Whereas multiple Presidents have reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the collective defense guarantees in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) solemnly reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(2) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation’s gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(3) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(4) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. 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 any extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Speaker RYAN and Minority Leader PELOSI. I

want to thank Leader McCARTHY and Minority Whip HOYER for their leadership on this important resolution and, of course, Ranking Member ENGEL, who has also been a strong supporter of the NATO alliance.

Mr. Speaker, in 1949, 12 free, democratic nations bound themselves together in an unprecedented defense alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These founding members acted in the aftermath of the Second World War to promote peace in Europe, to promote their freedom, and to face the threats they saw emerging on the horizon. Now, more than six decades later, this alliance has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security, and it has attracted other freedom-loving democratic nations to join its ranks.

Of course, article 5’s principle of collective defense has been key to the success of the alliance, and we will not forget how the United States has benefited from that principle as NATO members unanimously elected to come to our support after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber attacks, nonconventional attacks by terrorist groups against our people, these are threats that NATO’s founders could not have anticipated, yet they are the challenges that we must act now to address. We are stronger, no question, when we act together.

Now, Moscow’s strategic objective is to break apart the NATO alliance to boost Russian geopolitical influence in Western Europe. In light of this, it is even more important that NATO members meet the standard of investing 2 percent of their GDP on defense. We appreciate the few who already meet the minimum requirement: Estonia, Greece, Poland, and the U.K. At the administration’s urging, others have stepped up their game, such as Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, but others have further to go.

This resolution calls on NATO members to meet these commitments while also reaffirming our commitment to NATO and to the article 5 provision for collective defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. Let me start by thanking the leaders on both sides of the aisle who worked to bring this measure forward: Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI; the majority leader, Mr. McCARTHY; the minority whip, Mr. HOYER; and my friend from California (Mr. ROYCE), our chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, NATO has been the most effective alliance of the 20th and 21st centuries. It stood as a bulwark against communist aggression during the Cold War. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, it has played a critical role in building an integrated Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.