

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, line 14, strike “and”.

Page 27, after line 14, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraph accordingly):

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) STUDIES AND ENGINEERING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—When requested by an appropriate non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall undertake all necessary studies, engineering, and technical assistance on construction for any project to be undertaken under subsection (b), and provide technical assistance in obtaining all necessary permits for the construction, if the non-Federal interest contracts with the Secretary to furnish the United States funds for the studies, engineering, or technical assistance on construction in the period during which the studies, engineering, or technical assistance on construction are being conducted.

“(2) NO WAIVER.—Nothing in this section may be construed to waive any requirement of section 3142 of title 40, United States Code.

“(3) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by non-Federal interests under this subsection shall not be eligible for credit or reimbursement under subsection (d).

“(4) IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted from a non-Federal interest will not affect the impartial decisionmaking of the Secretary, either substantively or procedurally.”; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, this amendment should help projects be executed more quickly, and I appreciate my colleagues who worked on this: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MAST, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. WILSON.

I ask all my colleagues to support this. I think it is a good amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. HARPER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources,

and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS OUT OF SEQUENCE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 8 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 918, the following amendments printed in part A of House Report 115-711 may be considered out of sequence:

Amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

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

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 918 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1530

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARPER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-711 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 17, insert “, if determined necessary after taking into account all relevant factors (including past successful project completion)” before the semicolon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to introduce my amendment to H.R. 8, the Water Resources Development Act, to provide the Army Corps of Engineers greater flexibility and the ability to use a variety of factors in determining financial assurances with respect to section 404 permitted projects.

The Army Corps currently has considerable discretion at the district level on whether to require financial assurance or a bond of unauthorized projects. This includes a firm source of funding from a project or its history of successful completion of projects. The exclusion of this relevant data in determining a financial assurance requirement has led to uneven application of the Corps discretion at the district levels.

As a result, regulatory and financial requirements can be uncertain for even one private entity from Corps district to Corps district. My amendment will give a more uniform framework with a wider scope of factors used in determining the financial mitigation requirements for a 404 project.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment for regulatory certainty, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield to my colleague from Louisiana, GARRET GRAVES.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an important amendment in that it tries to ensure that mitigation banks and other types of mitigation mechanisms are viable options to be able to build projects.

In some cases, you have unavoidable impacts. We need to be able to have options to mitigate for those impacts so we can truly build projects.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio for raising this issue, for bringing this up. I do think that we need to continue working on refining the text a little bit and working together in a bipartisan manner with our friends on the other side of the aisle to get this to a place where everyone can agree.

Again, I think it is an important issue for us to address to ensure that mitigation credits are actually accessible, and I want to see if the gentleman will be willing to withdraw the amendment with the understanding that we are going to work with him to ensure that we can address this issue moving forward through the legislative process.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I think, with the comments from the subcommittee chairman and the chairman's willingness to work through this as we go through the process, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 7, insert "water storage," after "aquifer recharge."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, my amendment directs the Secretary of the Army to consider water storage when carrying out a water resource development feasibility study.

Section 109 requires the Secretary to consult with local governments and integrate their water management plans when developing a water resource development feasibility study. My amendment would include consideration of water storage when developing these studies.

Water storage is an essential tool that many States use to take full advantage of their water resources. In Florida, we receive over 50 inches of rain annually; however, we don't always get the rain where we need it. Water may be moved for flood control or water supply.

For example, from November 1, 2017, through June 4, 2018, the South Florida Water Management District moved approximately 151 billion gallons of water from Lake Okechobee to preserve optimal levels for the ecosystem.

In my own congressional district, our water management district uses water storage to maintain maximum levels in Lake Toho. Additionally, these storage areas provide wetland habitat to many endangered species. Water storage is important and should be a consideration when studying water resources feasibility.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this

amendment. This amendment clarifies the section on integrating the water resources planning to our bill and will help communities and the Corps work in partnership, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, again, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 120 and insert the following:  
**SEC. 120. NON-FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.**

Section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A)(i)—  
(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—  
(i) by striking "15" and inserting "20"; and  
(ii) by striking "prior to the date of enactment of this Act";

(B) in subclause (I)—  
(i) in the matter preceding item (aa), by inserting "that have been authorized for construction prior to the date of enactment of this Act and" after "not more than 12 projects"; and  
(ii) in item (bb), by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in subclause (II)—  
(i) by inserting "that have been authorized for construction prior to the date of enactment of this Act and" after "not more than 3 projects"; and  
(ii) by striking the semicolon and inserting "and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:  
"“(III) not more than 5 projects that have been authorized for construction, but did not receive the authorization prior to the date of enactment of this Act;” and

(2) in subsection (b)(8) by striking "2015 through 2019" and inserting "2019 through 2023".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Chairman, let me start by just thanking the chairman of this committee, and I thank his committee for working with me on my proposed changes and for including an additional amendment in the manager's package.

The amendment before us expands the number of projects eligible under

the non-Federal implementation pilot program, and, as you know, the pilot program was established by WRDA in 2014. What it does is, it allows projects that can demonstrate greater cost effectiveness, greater efficiency to receive direct funding. Savings from this program then go toward either deficit reduction and other Corps projects.

So the original pilot allowed for 15 projects. This expands the program to allow for a total of 32 projects. These projects will need to be authorized and meet the criteria under the program, and if more projects qualify under this pilot, it has the potential to save taxpayers more money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes additional changes to the pilot program that we authorized in WRDA 2014 for non-Federal implementation of Corps projects. This amendment will allow future projects to be included in the program. I appreciate my colleague's work on this issue, and I am prepared to accept the amendment at this time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. KEATING to offer amendment No. 5.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 122 the following (and renumber subsequent sections and the table of contents accordingly):

**SEC. 123. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR REGIONAL COALITIONS.**

Section 22(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) COMPREHENSIVE PLANS.—The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with any State, group of States, non-Federal interest working with a State or group of States, or regional coalition of governmental entities in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins, watersheds, or ecosystems located within the boundaries of such State, interest, or entity, including

plans to comprehensively address water resources challenges, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate Federal participation in carrying out such plans.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment would expand the Army Corps of Engineers’ authorization to permit cooperation with regional coalitions who are seeking to create or improve water infrastructure in their areas.

The amendment today would help achieve the goal by encouraging towns and counties to create partnerships with the Army Corps so they can pursue creative solutions to local infrastructure needs and they can do this together.

The reason for it is because watersheds do not follow municipal or even State boundaries, as we know, so it is regional approaches like the project in Mr. KEATING’s district that provide effective and efficient solutions.

So I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for offering this amendment. This amendment clarifies the Army Corps’ authority to provide assistance to regional coalitions under certain planning provisions. This is a good fix to the assistance program, and I am prepared to accept the amendment at this time.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, strike lines 15 and 16 and insert the following:

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

Page 30, line 17, strike “paragraph (5)” and insert “paragraph (4), as so redesignated”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Denham-Costa amendment makes permanent authority of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to enter cost recovery agreements for evaluation and processing of permits for public utility, natural gas companies, and railroad carriers.

The goal of this policy known as section 214 is to modernize the evaluation of permits to ensure critical infrastructure projects can be delivered to the public.

This policy can benefit the Central Valley, Napa, Sonoma, and other disaster stricken areas by allowing them to rebuild faster so families can turn on their lights and cool their homes.

I urge support of its passage, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my cosponsor.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to also thank the ranking member and the chair of the committee for allowing us to work with the committee for what is an important amendment.

The Denham-Costa amendment would make permanent the existing authority for utility companies to contribute to funds to expedite permit reviews for the Army Corps of Engineers.

□ 1545

Expedited permit review reduces project costs and enhances public safety by ensuring that projects are completed faster. It just makes good sense.

Projects could benefit from this permanent authority include work to stabilize aging transmission line towers in the San Francisco Bay, replacing natural gas transmission lines over and under waterways, and restoring water delivery systems associated with hydroelectric facilities.

A lot of good has come from this amendment. It has broad support from the utility industry and labor unions. I thank the author of this amendment for his good cooperation, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 16, strike “and”.

Page 32, line 21, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 32, after line 21, insert the following: (6) an analysis of whether or not the Army Corps of Engineers—

(A) considers cumulative benefits of locally developed projects, including Master Plans approved by the Corps; and

(B) uses the benefits referred to in subparagraph (A) for purposes of benefit-cost analysis for project justification for potential projects within such Master Plans.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which calls for a study on how the Army Corps of Engineers evaluates projects to advance flood control, hurricane and storm damage reduction, and promote water quality.

I thank my colleague, Mr. BABIN, for his work on this amendment with me, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work and collegiality in bringing this bill forward with us today.

The study in my amendment will look at how the Corps currently calculates the benefits of potential projects and how they can improve the calculation so that more worthwhile projects are approved. Specifically, the amendment tasks the National Academy of Sciences to study whether or not the Corps calculates the total benefits of a Corps project and considers them in evaluating the cost benefit of smaller segments or projects within that larger project. At the moment, it is unclear if the Corps can or cannot do this.

Can the Corps count the benefits of a larger overall project and apply them to the benefit cost of a smaller segment of that, that is smaller in scope?

Can the Corps always measure individual pieces of a project for justification purposes?

These are questions that need real answers.

Mr. Chairman, I raise this amendment today because this is a problem that affects cities and towns in my State and, frankly, across the country. In Connecticut, we have rivers that crisscross the State, leaving many of our communities subject to flooding.

Over the last 150 years, the city of Meriden has experienced 11 100-year floods, and the two most recent in the 1990s caused \$26 million of property damage. The good news is that this flooding is preventable by implementing flood prevention and mitigation efforts, which will protect life and property.

The city of Meriden has been working for 20 years on trying to get help from the Federal Government. It came to the Corps looking for help. At this

point, it has completed many portions of this project. It came to the Corps to ask for help with a feasibility study. They were told they could not. The Corps said, We cannot look at that because we can only look at this segment, we can't look at the benefit of the overall project.

This is not serving our community well, and it is, frankly, not serving other communities well either. So we want to ask the National Academy of Sciences to look at the overall benefit.

Budgets are tight. Everybody is bringing something to the table. Cities and States and the Federal Government need to do its charge. So we are asking this body to approve this measure to have the National Academy of Sciences look at, in fact, what does the Corps do, how can they do it better, and how can they leverage together the resources to help our cities and towns?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it will be very useful to know what the Corps, in fact, does in each and every district, and then, together, find a better way to move forward.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to provide better information to the Congress, to Federal agencies, and to public entities all over the United States to ensure that we understand the value of investments that we are making, to ensure that we understand the return on investment that we are making with public funds at the State and Federal levels.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Connecticut and I commend the gentleman from Texas for bringing this issue up. I think that there is much we can do to perfect the cost of benefit ratio process and information provided to the Congress to where we can make informed decisions to ensure that we are appropriately using the limited taxpayer resources that we have.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 8, insert "universities," after "research and development centers,".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds universities to the list of entities the Secretary of the Army Corps of Engineers should consider when submitting their report to Congress on the use of innovative materials in water resource development projects.

Section 128 requires the Secretary of the Army to submit to Congress a report that describes the activities of various entities involved in the development of innovative materials for water development projects. Currently, as written, the bill mentions centers of expertise, technological centers, technical centers, research and development centers, and other similar centers. Universities are often at the cutting edge of research and, therefore, should be specified for consideration in preparing the report.

While the current language could already include universities in the category of "other similar centers," such consideration would be discretionary. As such, a relevant area of activity may not be considered for the report because a single word was not added to the text. As Members of Congress, we ask for reports and recommendations from government entities so their expertise can be utilized in assisting the legislative process. Here, the activities conducted at universities should be considered so we can best capture the relevant information on the testing, research, development, and identification to best inform the Army Corps report and their congressional recommendations to resources development projects.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds universities to the list of organizations studying innovative materials that is already in our bill, but I am prepared to accept this amendment.

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SHUSTER for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 23, strike "and".

Page 36, after line 23, insert the following (and renumber the subsequent paragraph accordingly):

(2) provides recommendations to improve the capacity and preparedness of the Corps of Engineers workforce; and

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In order to successfully implement the many water infrastructure and conservation projects authorized under the Water Resources Development Act, Americans rely on the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Corps has approximately 37,000 dedicated civilians and military personnel delivering engineering services. They operate and maintain 13,000 miles of commercial ship channels, 12,000 miles of inland waterways, 700 dams, and have built 14,500 levees and works on more than 900 harbors.

Thus, our ability to build a robust infrastructure, to develop resources, and to implement environmentally conscious conservation projects, is inextricably linked to the strength of the Corps of Engineers' workforce. We should be doing everything we can to help the Army Corps of Engineers recruit, hire, and retain qualified employees to carry out duties that impact environmental sustainability and national security.

My amendment addresses this issue by requiring the comptroller general to provide recommendations to improve the capacity and preparedness of the Army Corps of Engineers' workforce in its report to Congress. In providing these recommendations, the comptroller general will evaluate many challenges, including, but not limited to, diversity, recruitment, retention, and on-the-job training.

I offer this amendment at a time when the national skills gap is at a record-high level. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are 6.7 million unfilled jobs across the country, where employers have openings but can't find prospective employees with the adequate skills or training to fill them. Nearly 600,000 of these jobs are in government services alone.

Despite bipartisan efforts to address this issue, the skills gap continues to rise each month, up from 6.1 million this time in 2017. We need to do better.

I am confident that my amendment will help develop a 21st century Corps of Engineers workforce, which will, ultimately, benefit infrastructure, national security, environmental sustainability, and the overall American economy.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. This amendment adds additional recommendations to a GAO study on workforce capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SHUSTER for his support.

Just this morning, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that there are currently more job openings than people looking for work. This amendment is an important step to closing the skills gap, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, line 23, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 37, line 4, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 37, after line 4, insert the following:

(3) describes how changes to the navigation industry workforce with which the Corps of Engineers collaborates may affect safety and operations within the navigation industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which simply adds an important aspect to a GAO study that is already in the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their leadership in crafting this bill, and also my friend on the other

side of the aisle, Representative WOODALL, for his support as well.

□ 1600

The underlying bill directs GAO to report to Congress on the preparedness of the Army Corps of Engineers to truly make it a 21st century agency. The study will investigate how the Corps of Engineers is supporting efforts to invest in recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce. It will examine how the Corps of Engineers is coping with the steady trickle of the baby boomer generation retiring, and it will also look at the Corps of Engineers and how it can better utilize available and existing technologies in fulfilling its mission.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to understand how the Corps of Engineers’ primary partner in the delivery of its services, the navigation industry workforce, is also managing the impending retirements of the baby boomer generation. We need to get a grasp on what the Corps of Engineers needs to do to prepare for the graying not only of its workforce, but also the workforce of the maritime and shipping sectors. What is more, it is critical to understand how all of this has a bearing on safety and operations within the navigation industry.

Mr. Chairman, in my home State of Washington, the average age of a maritime worker is 54 years old. And while the maritime sector is growing at a rate of 6.4 percent a year, there is a so-called silver tsunami looming in the next 5 to 10 years. The industries that the Corps of Engineers intimately works with are expected to be fighting to fill open positions even more than they are now. That is why, Mr. Chairman, my amendment directs GAO to make these additional considerations as it conducts its study.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment.

This amendment adds additional considerations to a GAO study that we have included in our bill. I believe looking at navigation safety is an important addition.

Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SHUSTER very much for accepting the amendment, and I urge support.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 3, after “storm damage reduction” insert “(including trough bars, coastal wetlands, and barrier coral reefs)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

REQUEST TO MODIFY AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified by striking “line 3” and inserting “line 2”.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I object to the modification.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, my amendment would direct the GAO study in section 130 to specifically consider trough bars, coastal wetlands, and barrier reefs in their study on the feasibility of natural features projects for the purposes of flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage reduction, and ecosystem restoration.

Section 130 directs the Comptroller General to submit to the Congress a study of consideration by the Corps of Engineers of natural features and nature-based features in the study of the feasibility of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage reduction, and ecosystem restoration.

Specifically, one aspect of the GAO study of consideration in H.R. 8 asks for an assessment of the costs, benefits, impacts, and tradeoffs associated with natural features and nature-based features, as well as the effectiveness of such features.

My amendment specifies some of the natural features and nature-based features that could and should be considered by adding the language: “(including trough bars, coastal wetlands, and barrier coral reefs)”.

In my home State of Florida, we are no stranger to the issue associated with natural features and the role they play in storm damage reduction, especially after the devastating effects of last year’s hurricane season, but this is by no means a Florida-specific issue. Hurricane Katrina and Superstorm

Sandy showed us firsthand what happens when natural flood protection features do not exist.

This amendment would serve to highlight important natural infrastructure options to the GAO study, namely, trough bars, coastal wetlands, and barrier coral reefs were specified with storm damage reduction concerns in mind. These natural structures buffer shorelines against waves, storms, and floods, which help prevent loss of life, property damage, and erosion.

For example, trough bars and sand dunes provide substantial protection from storm-induced erosion. The larger the trough bar, the more time it takes to be eroded by waves and the more protection it provides areas further landward. Coastal wetlands lower flood heights, filter floodwater, and protect from storm surges. Coral reefs reduce wave energy by an average of 97 percent, dissipating disproportionately more wave energy as wave energy increased. Taken together, these natural features would reduce storm damage and are items that would be specifically evaluated in the GAO study.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment as he originally intended. I understand he has some conforming and technical corrections he would like to make. We want to work with the gentleman as we move forward. We are willing to accept what he has offered today. Again, as we move through the process, we will work with the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his support.

The technical amendment was advised to us by the Parliamentarian.

I thank the chairman again for his support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 40, line 21, strike "in lieu of" and insert "or".

Page 41, line 1, strike "in lieu of" and insert "or".

Page 41, line 16, insert "or reimbursement of funds of an equivalent amount, subject to the availability of appropriations" before the period.

Page 41, line 21, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period.

Page 41, after line 21, insert the following: "(c) APPLICATION OF REIMBURSEMENT.—At the request of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary may apply such funds, subject to the availability of appropriations, equal to the share of the cost of the non-Federal interest of carrying out other flood damage reduction and coastal navigation projects or studies."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, this is a bipartisan amendment that I wrote with Members DELANEY, DUNCAN, and others, and I think it simply makes common sense. What it does is that it ensures the timely payback of advanced funds to a non-Federal sponsor.

What does that mean in English?

What that means is that we have a program called the advanced project agreements wherein you have a Federal actor and a local actor, and it can be that the local actor advances funds to speed the project's completion. What this amendment says is, if you have advanced beyond more than your share, then you, on a timely basis, would be paid back for more than your share.

Now, why is that important?

If we are going to be competitive as a country, what we need to recognize is that, indeed, time is money. One of the things most critical to improving our water resources is timely completion of these projects.

So this is ultimately about recognizing that time is money; recognizing that, to be competitive, we have got to speed the progress that we see on these kinds of projects; and, in fact, it ties to what we all know about competitiveness. I mean, getting things done means a bias for action; it means not waiting on others; it means showing initiative; it means, if you go the extra mile, you get rewarded for it.

Let me give one quick example.

In the port in Charleston, it is a \$558 million project. The Federal share is \$287 million; the non-Federal share is \$271 million.

In the case of South Carolina, they have gone ahead and saved, if you will, in their piggy bank \$300 million. If they advance the entire \$300 million, are they just out of luck or are they held to the original agreement of this is the Federal share and this is the State share, and therefore, even if you advance that money, you are going to get that additional \$29 million back?

That, to me, makes imminent common sense, because most of all what it does is it recognizes that time is money, and allowing local actors to move more quickly and not wait on Federal activity is something in all of our respective best interests.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

The amendment clarifies repayment requirements for funding advanced by a non-Federal sponsor. This is a good bipartisan amendment. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SHUSTER for agreeing to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the construction of a new lock at the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, is vital to our national economy, national security, and national need for new critical infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I didn't thank Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership on this important legislation, subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO and the other members of the committee and the staff as well.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is pretty straightforward. It simply expresses a sense of the Congress that the construction of a new lock at the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, is vital to our national economy, to our national security, and to our vital infrastructure.

Why? Well, really briefly, that lock is a gateway for the Port of Duluth and all of the commerce out of Lake Superior. That is the iron ore; that is the corn; that is the soybeans; that is the forest products, all of which are essential to our national security, our national economy.

I would just cite one thing. Homeland Security did a study. They found that 13 percent of the Nation's gross national product goes through those locks, which is why we have military protection there; because if those locks fail from a military attack or if they fail from obsolescence, which we are in danger of having occur, it would throw the country into a great depression.

So let me just conclude by saying that these locks and the rebuilding of them are vital to our national security, our national economy, and our vital important infrastructure.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for offering the amendment.

The amendment expresses a Sense of Congress that construction of a new lock at the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, is vital to our national economy, national security, and national need for new critical infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for bringing this to our attention, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:  
**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corps of Engineers shall make efforts—

(1) as part of the mission of the Corps, to identify and address with respect to covered communities any disproportionate and adverse health or environmental effects of the Corps' programs, policies, practices, and activities;

(2) to promote the meaningful involvement of communities of color in the Corps' project development and implementation, enforcement efforts, and other activities;

(3) to provide guidance and technical assistance to covered communities to increase understanding of the Corps' project planning and management activities, regulations, and policies; and

(4) to cooperate with State, Tribal, and local governments with respect to activities carried out pursuant to this subsection.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) COMMUNITY OF COLOR.—The term "community of color" means a community of individuals who are—

(A) American Indian or Alaska Native;

(B) Asian or Pacific Islander;

(C) Black, not of Hispanic origin; or

(D) Hispanic.

(2) COVERED COMMUNITY.—The term "covered community" means each of the following:

(A) A community of color.

(B) A low-income community.

(C) A rural community.

(D) A Tribal and indigenous community.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and madam ranking member.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment to this critical bill, which authorizes billions of dollars in Corps projects.

My amendment is very simple. I can keep it short. It would reaffirm the need for the Army Corps to make every effort to ensure, as part of their project planning and implementation process, the fair treatment of all communities in this vital process.

Mr. Chair, this amendment addresses the continuing concern that certain vulnerable communities affected by Federal actions often have little to no input into the planning and implementation of those activities, and they include low-income communities, both urban and rural, communities of color, and other marginalized groups such as Tribes.

By adopting my amendment, the Army Corps could lead in reforming how Federal agencies engage with vulnerable communities by working collaboratively with community stakeholders, by outreach, proactive outreach, and requiring really meaningful involvement and conversations with these communities of color, including Tribal communities, engaging them in developing Corps development of the projects and implementation.

□ 1615

I would ask that no one would object to requiring that the Corps spend more time listening to and validating community concerns and working to resolve them collaboratively at every step of the process, rather than waiting until a lawsuit occurs.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. This amendment helps ensure that, as part of the Corps' activities and mission, they are actively engaged with communities of color, low-income communities, rural

communities, and Tribes. This is important policy. I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:  
**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE.**

The Secretary of the Army shall prioritize the operation and maintenance of existing infrastructure, improve its reliability, and, as necessary, improve its resilience to cyber-related threats.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, the WRDA bill is an important bipartisan piece of legislation that provides for improvements to our Nation's water resources infrastructure, including ports and inland waterways, locks, dams, flood protection, and ecosystem restoration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud my good friend, Chairman SHUSTER, for his leadership on moving forward with yet another WRDA bill through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; and I am so proud to serve on that committee under his leadership.

But seldom in Congress do things actually end up being like they were promised; and I can tell you, under the leadership of this chairman, not only are we voting on yet another WRDA bill, but we are doing it in a transparent, policy-focused manner. And it is this return to regular order that the chairman has truly encouraged so many of his members, not only on the committee, but off the committee.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds one provision to this important bill: It directs the Secretary of the Army to prioritize the operation and maintenance of existing infrastructure and improve their reliability. The last thing the taxpayers want to do is spend needlessly money on expensive new infrastructure if the existing roadways, highways, bridges, ports, airports, water and sewer systems are aging and in disrepair.

We have heard all of this before from a number of our stakeholders and, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers, if America fails to invest in its existing ailing infrastructure by 2025, the U.S. economy can be

expected to lose almost \$4 trillion in Gross Domestic Product, resulting in a loss of some 2.5 million jobs.

Therefore, as we look at this legislation, it is critically important that we repair, rebuild, and modernize the infrastructure we have.

I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman explained, this is an important amendment. Cyber-related threats are a major concern to the Nation's critical infrastructure, and I believe this will help ensure that it is protected. I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. MAST

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . CLARIFICATION FOR INTEGRAL DETERMINATION.**

(a) WRDA 2000.—Section 601(e)(5)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-541) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) WORK.—The Secretary may provide credit, including in-kind credit, toward the non-Federal share for the reasonable cost of any work performed in connection with a study, preconstruction engineering and design, or construction that is necessary for the implementation of the Plan if—

“(i)(I) the credit is provided for work completed during the period of design, as defined in a design agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor;

“(II) the credit is provided for work completed during the period of construction, as defined in a project cooperation agreement for an authorized project between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor;

“(III) the credit is provided for work carried out before the date of the partnership agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor, as defined in an agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor providing for such credit; or

“(IV) the credit is provided for work carried out by the non-Federal sponsor in the implementation of an authorized project implementation report, and such work was defined in an agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor prior to the execution of such work;

“(ii) the agreement prescribes the terms and conditions of the credit, including in the case of credit provided under clause (i)(iii) conditions relating to design and construction; and

“(iii) the Secretary determines that the work performed by the non-Federal sponsor is integral to the project.”

(b) TIMING.—Section 601(e)(5) of the Act referred to in subsection (a) is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following (and redesignating any subparagraphs accordingly):

“(C) TIMING.—In any case in which the Secretary approves credit under subparagraph (B), in writing or by electronic agreement with the non-Federal sponsor, the Secretary shall provide such credit for work completed during the period of construction under an agreement that prescribes the terms and conditions for the in-kind contributions not expressly defined.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking the chairman, Chairman SHUSTER, and the committee for all of their work on WRDA. It has been timely, and they have been a joy to work with.

WRDA 2000, however, authorized a plan known as the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan and it granted the authority to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to provide credit to the State of Florida for reasonable cost of any work that was performed toward the completion of the project. However, current law does have some ambiguity that my amendment clarifies with respect to when the work is performed.

Now, the Army Corps ultimately has the discretion to determine what work performed by Florida is integral to the project, and this amendment makes no change to that discretion whatsoever.

Questions have been raised with regard to the scope of the Army Corps' authority to grant credit for work Florida has done that is not explicitly stated in the Project Partnership Agreement. My amendment clarifies that, so long as the Secretary and Florida agree that the work completed during the construction phase is integral to the project, the Secretary does, in fact, have the authority to provide credit for that work that is done.

I appreciate the full committee and the subcommittee's leadership working with me on this language, and I encourage my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does clarify there were crediting responsibilities between the Corps and non-Federal sponsors in the Everglades, so I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Chairman, again I applaud the committee on their work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . COST SHARE PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.**

Not later than September 30 of the first fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall pay the outstanding balance of the Federal cost share for any project carried out under section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 380).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, before I start, I would like to join my colleague from North Carolina in recognizing the leadership of Chairman SHUSTER on this important bill and the manner in which it is brought forward with full amendment process allowed.

My amendment is fairly simple. It simply asks that the Corps of Engineers would pay their bills. The Corps of Engineers, according to an authorization under WRDA of 1999, is allowed to enter into projects where a cost share is joined in with communities and organizations throughout the States.

Many locations in New Mexico are still owed money for projects that were commissioned over a decade ago. The town of Bernalillo, the city of Rio Rancho, the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, and the county of Bernalillo all have projects that are owed money.

One of those projects, a simple arsenic treatment facility, cost \$12 million. The Corps and the community both agreed that they would move forward with the project and the cost sharing agreement. A decade later, the Corps still owes money on that particular project.

At one point, the Corps expressed they had forgotten that they owed that money; so it is just important for the government to pay its bills on time.

This amendment is fairly simple and straightforward. It just authorizes that and ensures it.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the Secretary to pay the Federal cost share for projects in Central New Mexico. I appreciate the gentleman bringing it to our attention, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:  
**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . LOCKS ON ALLEGHENY RIVER.**

The Corps of Engineers may consider, in making funding determinations with respect to the operation and maintenance of locks on the Allegheny River—

- (1) recreational boat traffic levels; and
- (2) related economic benefits.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to acknowledge Chairman SHUSTER's leadership on this, and thank the entire committee and all the staff. I sure appreciate all the hard work.

This amendment allows the Army Corps of Engineers to strongly consider the large number of recreational boats that use the locks on the Allegheny River in my district when prioritizing operation and maintenance projects.

River communities on the Allegheny, like Kittanning, Ford City, Freeport, East Brady, and others, rely on recreational boating for their economic well-being. In recent years, the Army Corps of Engineers and a local non-profit, the Allegheny River Development Corporation, have developed a successful private-public partnership. Their partnership has resulted in private money being raised to keep the locks operational only on summer weekends and for recreational use. This amendment will allow the Army Corps of Engineers the flexibility it needs to help keep the locks open throughout the summer tourism months once again.

Speaking on this issue, a commissioner in Armstrong County once said to me: "You know, Washington has

taken away our coal jobs, now they're trying to take away our river."

Because of the hard work of people like Linda Hemmes and other community leaders, the river is still open to thousands of boaters who enjoy the Allegheny River on summer weekends. But even the weekend lock operations are still very much at risk, and it is my hope that this amendment will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to prioritize funding so the river remains passable all summer long for decades to come.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman explained, the Allegheny River, the locks, and the dams are, again, used considerably for recreational boat traffic, and the Corps should take this into consideration. This is a good amendment. I am prepared to accept it.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ASSISTANCE RELATING TO WATER SUPPLY.**

The Secretary may provide assistance to municipalities the water supply of which is adversely affected by construction carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Subcommittee Chairman GRAVES, and Ranking Member NAPOLITANO, and their staffs for working with us on this amendment.

The amendment simply provides communities with the certainty that the Army Corps has the authority to help them mitigate any detrimental impacts to municipal water supplies that may happen due to a Corps construction project. It is a commonsense amendment, and I am glad to offer it.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment assures the Corps of Engineers can help mitigate any detrimental impacts to the water supply as a result of a Corps of Engineers project. I appreciate my colleague's work on this, and I do accept this amendment and urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . NOISE POLLUTION ABATEMENT AND MITIGATION.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the potential opportunity for integrating noise abatement and noise mitigation technologies and practices into improvements and operations in harbors and inland harbors.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

□ 1630

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which simply asks the Corps of Engineers to explore what opportunities exist to incorporate noise abatement and noise mitigation technologies and practices in the Corps of Engineers.

Noise has a bearing both on the land and in water, and as maritime transportation and travel increase and as vessels increase in size, communities along our Nation's waterways stand to be affected the most.

Seattle's residential population and our maritime sector are both growing. And importantly, the liveability of our communities and the strength of our maritime sector will depend on how we address the challenges that come with that growth. At the same time, as sound travels more efficiently in the water, we need to be certain that we understand how we minimize the disruption to maritime environments.

Underwater wildlife—like the endangered southern residents, orcas—are especially vulnerable to noise destruction, because they are so dependent on underwater sounds for basic life functions. The Port of Vancouver, BC, recently investigated whether limiting the speed of ships would reduce noise and help our overall community. Over the period of the study, ambient noise dropped 44 percent. So research into this area is emerging, but it is clear that more needs to be done.

In providing guidance to mitigate noise in 2014, the International Maritime Organization identified more than just speed, but also ship design, on-board machinery, and navigation as factors to take into consideration.

In the Puget Sound region, the Corps of Engineers is uniquely placed to lead this effort and unite stakeholders behind solutions that protect the maritime environment, ensure the liveability of our communities, and support our growing maritime sector.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment that requires a study for the use of noise abatement technologies at ports. I think this is a good amendment, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much and I urge support. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. LOVE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROPERTY ACQUISITION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In requiring or acquiring an interest in land, the Secretary shall, in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, prefer the minimum interest

in real property necessary to support a project or action.

(b) DETERMINATION.—In determining the proper interest in land under subsection (a), the Secretary shall first consider a temporary easement estate or other interest designed to reduce the overall cost, reduce the time, and minimize conflict with property owners related to such action or project.

(c) PROCEDURES USED IN STATE.—The Secretary shall consider and attempt to replicate, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with Federal laws, the procedures that a State has used to acquire interests in land, provided that such procedures are generally consistent with the goals of a project or action.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment to H.R. 8, the Water Resources Development Act of 2018.

Madam Chair, my amendment is a commonsense and cost savings amendment that would allow the Army Corps of Engineers much-needed flexibility when acquiring certain rights to the procurement of land.

Specifically, it would direct the Secretary to prefer acquiring the minimum interest necessary in real property needed to support a project or an action. This allows flexibilities for the Corps to consider the use of a temporary easement estate or other interest to facilitate a reduction in overall project cost, to reduce project time, and minimize conflict with property owners related to the project or action.

This approach will allow the Corps to take a more sensible approach to projects and not force the Federal Government to purchase more property in order to undertake critically needed projects.

Historically, in my home State of Louisiana, many of the projects are accomplished through partnerships between the Federal Government and State and private landowners who often can offer more favorable and economical terms than the Federal Government's outright purchasing of property.

As we have heard throughout debate on the underlying bill, there are countless and widely known deficiencies in the way business is conducted by the Corps. Many of these issues are caused by bureaucratic regulations that get in the way of real progress being made in a manner that is responsible to the taxpayers we represent.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I want to thank my friend from Louisiana, a colleague, for offering this amendment.

As the gentleman stated, what is happening right now, the Corps of Engineers is requiring non-Federal entities, like the State of Louisiana and other States around the country and other private partners and local governments to acquire land in fee title, and then that is then absorbed as part of the overall cost of a project.

In many cases in our home State, 82 percent of coastal Louisiana is owned by private landowners. These landowners are willing to donate the project, servitude or easement to ensure these projects can be built. And these are environmental projects for coastal restoration and other wetland construction-type projects. It reduces overall project cost. It incentivizes cooperation between landowners and government entities trying to restore the coast. This is in the best interest of the Corps of Engineers. It is absolutely good policy, and I want to thank the gentleman for the amendment. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Chairwoman, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for supporting the bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment, as well as final passage of the chairman's bill.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NAVIGATION SAFETY.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) high use Federal navigation projects, including those with numerous deep draft vessel calls per year, should ensure safe 2-way traffic by design vessels recommended by authorized navigation studies; and

(2) the Secretary should consider the benefits of the safety modification or improvement to commercial navigation in evaluating such modifications or improvements.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the chairman of the committee. As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who has the

great privilege to represent four Texas ports in my district in Texas, it is truly an honor to offer this amendment today on their behalf.

Right now, the Corps of Engineers is in the midst of a study of the Houston Ship Channel to evaluate potential improvements. This study will examine the process for widening the channel and extending the 45-foot depth further inland. This is a necessary and well-intentioned study for an extremely worthy project.

However, everyone involved in producing it is discovering that the Corps processes involved are outdated and inefficient. These processes are unable to adequately evaluate the national benefits of the improvements being studied or the implications of major operational changes in the future.

As a result, unless reforms are made, this Corps study and others like it will not recognize the benefits of widening a waterway like the Houston Ship Channel in certain areas; areas that can lead to a restriction of one-way traffic in the future, as vessels become larger and larger over time.

The Houston Ship Channel is the busiest waterway in the Nation. It supports the top exporting region and the largest petrochemical manufacturing center in the United States. Ensuring an efficient waterway now and into the future is critical for the region, for the State of Texas, and for the Nation.

This amendment takes a first step in righting this process by having this Congress to make clear to the Army Corps of Engineers the importance and the benefits of projects to improve two-way traffic safety in high-volume areas in deep draft navigation channels.

And while I certainly want to go further and eventually get these formulas fixed into the law, I understand that this needs to be an incremental process.

I want to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and GRAVES, and Ranking Members DEFAZIO and NAPOLITANO, and their staffs, for working with us to get this process underway with this very commonsense amendment.

Madam Chairwoman, I urge adoption of my amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, this amendment intends to cut through the bureaucracy to expedite decisions that are being made. In the case of this amendment, it is designed to address an issue in Texas where you have high-volume port projects and there are safety and navigational improvements that are needed.

We support the intent of the gentleman's amendment to cut through the bureaucracy to ensure that decisions are expedited and cost savings result, and urge support of the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Chair, I also rise in strong support of amendment No. 8, by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

I am very proud to be the lead Republican cosponsor. The Texas Gulf Coast is not just the export capital of the United States and energy capital of the world, it is a national treasure lined with vibrant communities, fisheries, key military assets, and outdoor recreation that millions call home.

But as we saw with the 1900 Galveston hurricane; Hurricane Rita in 2005; Hurricane Ike in 2008; and Hurricane Harvey just last year, all of those great assets that I just spoke of are at risk of finding themselves literally in the eye of the very next storm.

That is why leaders in my State have come together to produce this, the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan, a roadmap for the local, State, and Federal officials to study and construct projects to keep our coastal communities safe, restore and preserve our beaches and wetlands, and provide energy security for all Americans.

A summary of the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan by the Texas General Land Office can be found at: <http://www.glo.texas.gov/coastal-grants/projects/texas-coastal-resiliency-master-plan.html>.

Madam Chair, this amendment will require the National Academy of Sciences to study and report on whether the Army Corps should measure the cumulative benefit of a holistic plan like the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan when determining benefit-to-cost ratios. I am confident that the answer will be yes. This study is an important step to get us there.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_. COST AND BENEFIT FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT.**

(a) **COST BENEFIT AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS.**—Section 5(a) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 650, chapter 377; 33 U.S.C. 701n(a)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **COST AND BENEFIT FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT.**—

“(A) **CONSIDERATION OF BENEFITS.**—In preparing a cost and benefit feasibility assess-

ment for any emergency project described in paragraph (1), the Chief of Engineers shall consider the benefits to be gained by such project for the protection of—

“(I) residential establishments;

“(ii) commercial establishments, including the protection of inventory; and

“(iii) agricultural establishments, including the protection of crops.

“(B) **SPECIAL CONDITIONS.**—

“(i) The Chief of Engineers may carry out repair or restoration work described in paragraph (1) that does not produce benefits greater than cost, if the non-Federal sponsor agrees to pay, or contribute to, an amount sufficient to make the remaining costs of the project equal to the estimated value of the benefits of the repair or restoration work and the Secretary determines the damage to the structure was not as a result of negligent operation and maintenance, and that repair of the project could benefit other Corps project missions.

“(ii) Non-Federal payments pursuant to clause (i) shall be in addition to any non-Federal payments required by the Chief of Engineers which are applicable to the remaining costs of the repair or restoration work.”.

(b) **CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.**—Notwithstanding a non-Federal flood control work's status in the Rehabilitation and Inspection Program, any unconstructed emergency project for the non-Federal flood control work that was formulated during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which this Act was enacted but that was determined to not produce benefits greater than costs shall remain eligible for assistance under Section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 650, chapter 377; 33 U.S.C. 701n) until the last day of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this Act was enacted if the non-Federal sponsor agrees, in accordance with section 5 as amended by subsection (a) of this section, to pay, or provide contributions equal to, an amount sufficient to make the remaining costs of the project equal to the estimated value of the benefits of the repair or restoration work and the Secretary determines the damage to the structure was not as a result of negligent operation and maintenance, and that repair of the project could benefit other Corps project missions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I wish to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their support of the amendment.

The purpose of this amendment is to help local communities recover from flood disasters. Under current law, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers can only repair a non-Federal levee if the flood protection benefit outweighs the cost. However, the standard can't always be met, especially in rural communities, with specific economic and demographic changes.

□ 1645

The Len Small Levee in southern Illinois is a perfect example. The levee breached in the winter floods of January 2016. Several thousand acres of infrastructure and agriculture land were destroyed when the levee gave way. The Corps estimated the cost of repairing the levee would be higher than its

flood protection benefits, leaving local residents with no recourse.

My amendment provides new hope in my district and elsewhere. It allows local sponsors to pay the difference between the cost of repairing a levee and its projected flood protection benefits.

My amendment does not increase the Federal Government's share of the costs for repairs. Let me repeat that. My amendment does not increase the Federal Government's share of the costs of the repairs. This is a fiscally responsible way to give a lifeline to rural communities struggling to rebuild after a disaster.

The amendment is supported by the National Waterways Conference and the American Farm Bureau.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, this amendment is designed to largely address, I think, a flaw that this underlying bill addresses in the cost-to-benefit ratio calculations used by the Corps of Engineers, by OMB, and others.

This particular amendment is focused on emergency repairs. What this does is it allows the non-Federal entities to pay a higher non-Federal cost share for repairs to levees.

There are many issues with how OMB and the Corps calculate cost-to-benefit ratios. This is a fix for emergency repairs while we work on the underlying bill for the larger fixes.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Mr. BOST for offering this amendment. We are prepared to accept it. I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. HECK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. HECK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . STUDY ON STORMWATER RUNOFF REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States

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 on the compliance of projects and properties constructed or renovated by the Corps of Engineers with stormwater runoff requirements.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include an analysis of—

(1) the extent to which the Corps of Engineers has complied with section 439 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17094) for projects and properties constructed or renovated since February 1, 2010;

(2) the feasibility of the Corps of Engineers to meet the requirement to restore the predevelopment hydrology of properties under the “maximum extent technically feasible” standard created under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007;

(3) potential changes to the Corps of Engineers' budgeting, planning, design, construction, and maintenance strategies that could increase the agency's ability to meet the requirement described in paragraph (2);

(4) potential changes to the guidance described in the Technical Guidance on Implementing the Stormwater Runoff Requirements for Federal Projects under section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act, issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated December 2009, that could increase the Corps of Engineers' ability to meet the requirement described in paragraph (2).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK. Madam Chair, my amendment is simply about making sure the Federal Government is setting the example in leading the way in addressing the single largest source of water pollution in America, which is stormwater runoff.

Most of us probably don't think about it, but, frankly, when rain falls—and it does a lot in my neck of the woods—and flows through our streets, it picks up all sorts of pollutants. We are talking about some really nasty stuff, frankly: toxic chemicals like arsenic and flame retardants, as well as oils and pesticides. This stormwater hurts our lakes, rivers, and waterways. In fact, in many bodies of water, it accounts for 80 percent of the pollution.

It not only hurts our environment. Just as importantly, it hurts our businesses that depend on clean water, as an example, Washington's shellfish industry, which employees literally thousands of people.

There are probably no places in America that are more impacted by stormwater runoff than in my home on the Puget Sound, which is the largest estuary in the United States. Studies by the Washington Stormwater Center in Puyallup, Washington, have shown that stormwater can kill a salmon within hours. They have time-lapsed films. But you don't have to watch them in time lapse because it happens that quickly.

Salmon and other fish are our way of life in Washington, and we are talking

major business impact—a \$30 billion economy.

Salmon also serve as a vital resource of immeasurable value to the 19 federally recognized Tribes in Puget Sound. They are the Salmon People, and salmon—chinook salmon, specifically—are also the prey of choice for our beloved southern resident orcas, which we are precariously close to losing altogether. There are fewer today than when they were listed under the Endangered Species Act many years ago.

So, if we fail to address the problem posed by stormwater, these resources will continue to decline, and our region will lose irreplaceable icons of life in the Pacific Northwest.

Now, granted, we are doing a lot to address this threat already, but it is nowhere near enough. If we are going to truly address the problem, then the Federal Government needs to set the example.

The good news is that Congress already knows this and acknowledges this because, in 2007, this body passed a law which requires Federal agencies to reduce stormwater runoff when they develop or redevelop property. That is just a commonsense requirement.

Since it was enacted over a decade ago, there has been no accountability for Federal agencies to show they are meeting these standards. So this brings us to my amendment. It would simply direct the GAO to study whether the Army Corps of Engineers has been able to meet these stormwater runoff mitigation requirements, and if they aren't, what changes they can make to improve their ability to meet them.

Madam Chair, if we are going to help our businesses and communities impacted by stormwater runoff, it is vitally important that the Federal Government set the example and lead the way.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, this amendment directs the Comptroller General to conduct a study and report on the Army Corps of Engineers' ability to comply with Federal stormwater requirements. This is an issue that affects districts across the United States.

I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for bringing this amendment up, for raising this issue, and we are prepared to accept it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO PUERTO RICO.**

(a) WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS IN PUERTO RICO.—It is the sense of Congress that the Corps of Engineers should proceed with a sense of urgency, and viewing requirements in the most favorable light, in evaluating and programming the actions to be taken to complete current phases, initiate pending phases, and prepare the reports necessary to proceed with the water resources projects necessary for flood control, dam repair, beach erosion control, and harbor navigation improvement in Puerto Rico, as well as for repair and mitigation required by hurricane and severe weather event damages that occurred between September 2017 and March 2018.

(b) CAÑO MARTIN PEÑA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should advance the project for ecosystem restoration, Caño Martín Peña, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, this amendment calls on the Army Corps of Engineers to consider urgently and favorably those projects and proposals pending before them for flood control, dam repair, beach erosion, and harbor navigation in Puerto Rico, as well as for the repair and mitigation required in the aftermath of Hurricanes Irma and Maria and, more specifically, that the Secretary should advance the project for ecosystem restoration at Cano Martín Peña in San Juan.

Between projects that had been proposed or planned before the disaster and those resulting from the disaster, the Army Corp of Engineers has before its consideration over 45 different projects or proposals for flood and erosion control for protection of life and property on the island. These projects are in all sorts of phases, from initial studies to planning, to pending construction start, to waiting for the next phase to be funded, and to inactive projects that may be reactivated.

While we wait for decisions, we have towns like Toa Baja where, during the last hurricane in September, more than 12,000 families were flooded out of their homes. Every decade, that kind of town suffers losses from different kinds of floods while there is a project already designed and approved that could have greatly mitigated that kind of a hazard

and by now would have cost less than the accumulated losses from the last hurricane.

Those are the kinds of projects that are already approved by the Army Corps in that part of this amendment. In Ciales and Guayanilla, the mayors have gathered the studies and plans, but it has not yet been made part of the Corps schedule.

Among the works that merit special attention is the Cano Martín Peña Project, which has been an example of community partnership and has been an important part of the Corps' program in Puerto Rico, for the ecosystem restoration, protection of lives in the community, and control of flooding in an area that extends from the San Juan business district to the international airport.

The community has been an outstanding local partner, showing great drive to move forward their part of the program, but the project has been very slow because of the limited funding by phases.

It is important at this point in time as we face a new hurricane season that our people get the sense of urgency from the Federal Government. When you know that the next storm is coming and danger is on the horizon, you will also want to know that the necessary work has been done. That is the reason this amendment is so important, and that is the reason I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting Chair. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, this amendment expresses the sense of Congress that projects in Puerto Rico in the aftermath of Hurricanes Irma and Maria be expedited, that these be considered a priority, and that the Corps of Engineers advance these projects as quickly as possible.

My friend from Puerto Rico hosted myself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Chairman SHUSTER, and others in Puerto Rico in the aftermath of the storms, and certainly the devastation there was extraordinary.

It is important to advance projects like this because as folks are looking at whether they are going to reinvest back in their communities, whether they are going to stay in their communities, whether they are going to rebuild their homes and businesses, knowing that things aren't going to be back in the same degree of vulnerability is very important.

We have got to send a message to these victims of hurricanes in 2017 and other disasters that these communities

are going to be built back smarter, they are going to be safer, and the investments they are putting back in their homes and businesses are wise investments.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. I want to thank her for her tireless work in the recovery of Puerto Rico. We are prepared to accept, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of dredged material management plans initiated in or after fiscal year 2018, the Secretary shall expedite the dredged material management plan process in order that studies make maximum use of existing information, studies, and innovative dredged material management practices, and avoid any redundant information collection and studies.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on how the Corps of Engineers intends to meet the requirements of subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Chair, my amendment would expedite the process the Army Corps of Engineers conducts to study and implement the dredged material management plans, or DMMPs.

In my home State of Ohio, the Port of Cleveland has had difficulty in recent years coming to a resolution with the Army Corps of Engineers over the disposal of dredged material from the Cuyahoga River's Federal navigation channel. While the channel depth is maintained each year, the uncertainty from year to year does not provide the confidence necessary to northeast Ohio's communities, and it does not give the Port of Cleveland the ability to conduct long-term planning without considerable and avoidable risks.

To help private and public entities working with the Army Corps on dredged material management plans, my amendment ensures the Army Corps works diligently with local partners to conduct the DMMPs in an efficient manner.

My amendment also directs the Army Corps of Engineers to consider

alternative uses for and creative tools to collect dredged material, lightening the load on contained disposal facilities and increasing their lifespan.

The Port of Cleveland and many entities across the country rely on these dredged material management plans. They should not have to wait as long as 4 years for these studies and plans to be completed.

In the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014, we implemented a 3 by 3 by 3 rule in which studies should cost no more than \$3 million, take no longer than 3 years, and include the district, division, and headquarters staff concurrently. When DMMPs are developed, they should be held to the 3 by 3 by 3 rule.

Madam Chair, I offer this amendment to provide a timely process for DMMP planning and implementation. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I don't plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BARTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1700

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for offering this amendment.

DMMP's dredged material management plans are plans to manage the sediment that results from dredging activities. It can hold up the navigation of channels for ships and vessels. It can obstruct activity at ports.

This is what the rest of the world would call common sense. It ensures that we are not collecting redundant information, we are building upon information that exists, and that we have a limit or goal of 2 years in completing this.

This makes sense. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment forth, which we are prepared to accept.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his support. He is absolutely right. When these projects are held up, economic activity can be stifled. We saw this happen in Cleveland. So it is very important this be adopted in the Water Resources Development Act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. —. FEASIBILITY OF CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIERS PROJECT, ILLINOIS.**

Section 3061(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114; 121 Stat. 1121) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Operation and maintenance of any project authorized to be carried out pursuant to the feasibility study identified in paragraph (1) shall be carried out at 80 percent Federal expense and 20 percent non-Federal expense.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—After construction of any project authorized to be carried out pursuant to the feasibility study identified in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with the Governor of the State in which the project is constructed and seek Congressional authority to construct any new technologies not included in the Chief's Report.”.

Page 52, after line 24, insert the following:

(21) Projects under the Great Lakes Mississippi River Interbasin Study Brandon Road Study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, addressing the issue of aquatic invasive species has not always been one where all of the Great Lakes States have seen eye-to-eye on. However, this amendment reflects an agreement between myself and my good friend, Mr. MITCHELL, as well as our two States and our two Governors.

First, this amendment clarifies that the operation and maintenance of any project authorized subsequent to the Chief's Report for the Brandon Road Study is done at an 80-20 Federal/non-Federal cost share. For reference, O&M on the existing electrical barriers in place on the Illinois River is at 100 percent Federal expense, as was authorized by Congress. So with this language, we are making it clear that Illinois wants to have some skin in the game on this project.

In addition my amendment requires the Corps, following the construction of any project authorized subsequent to the Chief's Report for the Brandon Road Study, to consult with the Governor of the State where the project is located and seek congressional approval before constructing any additional technologies at the project in the future.

Finally, as part of the compromise worked out with my colleagues from Michigan and other Great Lakes States, my amendment directs the Corps to expedite the completion of the Brandon Road Study, which we expect to be completed by next February.

Now, let me be clear. It is no secret that the State of Illinois has had concerns with this project and its potential impact on our economy. The Illinois waterway is a critical artery for the movement of agricultural goods and other products that support our region's economy, and disruptions to commercial navigation could have negative repercussions to our ability to get those goods to market.

In addition, my home State of Illinois has taken significant steps to reduce the Asian carp population by using existing measures. In fact, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources recently reported in 2012 the State has reduced the Asian carp population by 93 percent. Much of this is due to the critical Great Lakes restoration initiative funding, which I continue to proudly support.

Yet, in an offer of good faith, our Governor has submitted a letter of intent for the State of Illinois to serve as the non-Federal sponsor, and I look forward to working with my colleagues and urging the support of this amendment.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the result of a lot of work between a number of Great Lakes members. I appreciate everyone's work and consensus on this important issue. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend and partner on this amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS). We worked hard on this amendment. It is the result of hard work and agreements between all interested parties, Governors across the Great Lakes, and Members of Congress throughout the Great Lakes basin.

The Brandon Road Lock and Dam is a lock and dam complex on the Des Plaines River in Joliet, Illinois. It is one of the last stops along the waterway before Lake Michigan and the entire Great Lakes system.

Unfortunately, Asian carp exists in that waterway as well. This invasive species getting into the Great Lakes

would do unfathomable damage to our economy and ecology not just in my State, but to the entire Great Lakes basin. We must stop the spread of Asian carp, and the Brandon Road Lock and Dam offers the best and last chance to do so.

I appreciate the assistance of my good friend from Illinois and the Governor of Illinois for recognizing the problem. Stakeholders and members on this waterway leading to the Great Lakes use it for commerce. Those on the Great Lakes basin prioritize its use to stop Asian carp. It is vital to understand that, and all sides must know and agree we have to achieve both objectives sooner than later.

This is a complex problem. That is why we have asked the Army Corps of Engineers to release their study as soon as possible. This study will advise Congress and the American people about what options we have, what effects they could have, and how effective preventive measures could be.

Like many things in government, this project has seen delays. The report has seen delays. Time is our enemy here and we cannot have the final report delayed any longer.

My section of the Davis-Mitchell amendment adds the Brandon Road Study to the list of expedited studies. By ensuring timely completion, we can move forward on whatever is recommended in order to achieve two things: effective commerce on the river, while ensuring Asian carp do not invade the Great Lakes.

I support the amendment, I ask my colleagues to do so, and I want to express my appreciation to Mr. DAVIS for all the hard work he has put into resolving what has been an issue for a long time here in Congress. Together, we have come up with a good amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, again, I thank my good friend, Mr. MITCHELL. I would be remiss not to recognize my colleague from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who was very supportive. His efforts were very meaningful to this agreement.

Mr. Chairman, again, I hope that we can get this amendment accepted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 52, after line 16, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

(17) Project for navigation, San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is among the reports that the Corps of Engineers should expedite completion of. It is for the navigation project for San Juan Harbor.

This is another amendment for the release of a study that has been waiting for more than 12 years. These reports follow from a study authorized by a resolution of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 20, 2006. This is a project that has been approved and, according to the Corps, could enter the engineering and design phase within 1 or 2 years, once the reports and reviews are finally in.

It will increase the main channel depth to 44 feet and make it 100 feet wider, along with other modifications, to allow a safer and more efficient movement of traffic in the Harbor of San Juan and increasing economic activity at a time when the Puerto Rico economy needs every boost it can get. As everybody knows, during the last hurricane, the movement of ships was one of the biggest problems.

This would specifically be of importance in the case of a future emergency contingency. As we saw during the last year, one of the problems that arose was the congestion when needing to move those shipments. In the aftermath of hurricanes and flooding events, it becomes even more necessary, due to the incursion of debris and erosion from the surrounding bodies of water, which accelerate the natural deterioration of the harbor.

This is a project that has been approved and programmed. The amendment, again, is so that the reports on the studies performed over the many years will finally be completed so that the next stage of engineer and design can proceed. This is an infrastructure that needs to be up and running for the creation of American jobs and to prevent future damage.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Remember, one of the main problems on the island is the energy situation. We are an island. So we are importing all of the coal and all of the oil. If we want to move to an LNG facility, we need to have a wider and a deeper port. This is one of those biggest efforts. If we got this kind of study, we can have those ports and have those ships coming from the States and have a better opportunity to improve our economy and have more goods and materials arriving to the island.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's work on this important issue, and I believe all of us understand the importance of restoring Puerto Rico. So I am prepared to accept this amendment at this time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 52, after line 24, insert the following: (21) Project for ecosystem restoration, Warren Glen Dam Removal, Musconetcong River, New Jersey.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the Lance-Gottheimer amendment to the Water Resources Development Act of 2018. I thank Chairman SHUSTER and his committee for the tremendous work they have done on the underlying bill.

This amendment would direct the Secretary of the Army to expedite the completion of the Warren Glen Dam Removal Feasibility Study in the Musconetcong River, an important waterway in the congressional district I serve.

The 30-foot-high, 150-foot-wide Warren Glen Dam is currently one of the largest and most detrimental dams on the Musconetcong River in the State of New Jersey. The dam poses downstream safety risks, worsening the quality of drinking water in the region. The dam also blocks migratory fish from the Delaware River, including shad, alewife and herring. In 1981, the Army Corps classified this dam as a hazard to public safety. It must be removed.

The Musconetcong River is an important natural resource in our region of the country, and is well recognized for its scenic beauty, environmental significance, and diversity of wildlife. The restoration of the Musconetcong watershed will improve the water quality by creating a stronger freshwater flow to push down the salt line to enhance the protection of drinking water.

Removing the Warren Glen Dam would also open an additional 5 miles

to the Musconetcong as a free-flowing river for migratory fish. The Musconetcong watershed has the potential to become an even greater site for outdoor recreation and wildlife.

Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. GOTTHEIMER for joining me yet again on a bipartisan, problem-solving collaboration. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition but do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. This amendment directs the Secretary to expedite the completion of a feasibility study, which the gentleman has so eloquently explained to us. I am prepared to accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 52, after line 24, insert the following:  
(21) Project for flood control and water supply, Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I would like to recognize the leadership of Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and my friend and colleague, Mr. LARSEN.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have at the desk today will help start a Federal process in providing additional flexibility for storage of native and San Juan-Chama water to benefit the Middle Rio Grande region.

The Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority has been working for more than 5 years to obtain congressional authorization to increase storage in Abiquiu Reservoir by about 35,000 acre-feet. This will provide greater and much-needed flexibility for water operations to support municipal, agricultural, and environmental purposes.

This amendment starts that process by expediting the feasibility study for

Abiquiu Dam. According to the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission, the added storage will also provide opportunities to benefit acequias in northern New Mexico, many of which have the oldest water rights in the Rio Grande basin, but do not have any ability to store water for use in drought years; management of operations in the Middle Rio Grande for Endangered Species Act compliance; and for the Rio Grande Compact compliance for the State of New Mexico.

This project is supported by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, WildEarth Guardians, the Nature Conservancy, the Audubon New Mexico, the city and county of Santa Fe, the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission, the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, Rio Arriba County, and the Rio Chama Acequia Association.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, this amendment directs the Secretary, as he explained, to expedite the reports to the project for the Abiquiu Reservoir.

I know this is an important project to New Mexico. I am prepared to accept the amendment at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment so that these communities can move forward with this critical project, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 55, line 1, strike "\$3,000,000,000" and insert "\$3,025,000,000".

Page 57, line 24, strike "\$3,000,000,000" and insert "\$3,025,000,000".

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.**

Section 544(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-541; 114 Stat. 2675) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$40,000,000" and inserting "\$60,000,000"; and

(2) by striking "\$5,000,000" and inserting "\$10,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman

from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, No. 33, to H.R. 8 to improve available resources for the Puget Sound Adjacent Waters Restoration program, also known as PSAW.

The Puget Sound and the waters and wildlife that call it home are cornerstones of Washington State's cultural identity, maritime economy, and environment. As the Nation's largest estuary, a healthy Puget Sound is essential to supporting over 3,000 shellfish jobs and generating an estimated \$184 million in revenue annually.

Every EPA dollar spent on Puget Sound recovery efforts have leveraged more than \$24 in matching funds from State, local, and tribal partners. The PSAW program supports critical ecosystem restoration projects across 15,000 square miles of northwest Washington State, the Puget Sound drainage basin, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

The program is part of the larger Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project to restore and protect salmon habitat throughout the Sound, especially for endangered chinook and steelhead.

My amendment doubles the per-project funding cap for PSAW projects to \$10 million and raises the overall authorization level for the program by \$20 million. As a result, critical Sound nearshore restoration projects in Washington State would be eligible for PSAW funding. Increasing available funds on a project-by-project basis will ensure that the PSAW program is consistent with the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Program cap.

Recently, the CBO did an analysis of the amendment and found it will have little to no direct impact on the budget.

Mr. Chair, a special thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their leadership on this measure as well. I am pleased that we are moving forward on WRDA legislation that invests in the Nation's ports, channels, waterways, and other critical infrastructure to keep the U.S. maritime system competitive.

Maintaining the regular 2-year authorization of this legislation is critical to the Nation's economy and will encourage new, good-paying jobs in the Pacific Northwest. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to continue the robust Federal investment and stewardship needed to save the Sound.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

I was unclear about what this amendment did. Back home, I have a constituent by the name of Carson Frank. I went back and I talked to Carson about this bill, and he explained to me that this is consistent with section 206 of the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project and raises all the authorization levels. So I thank Carson from my home State of Pennsylvania for explaining this to me.

I am happy to support the gentleman's amendment so that this project will be completed in a timely fashion.

Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept the amendment at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.**

Not later than December 31, 2019, the Secretary shall expedite and complete the dredging of Plymouth Harbor, Massachusetts, as authorized by the Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 802, chapter 144) and the Act of September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1038, chapter 427).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, this amendment would direct the Army Corps to expedite and complete dredging in Plymouth Harbor in time for the 400th anniversary celebration of the Mayflower landing in Plymouth and Provincetown, Massachusetts.

This is a huge international event that will attract people from all over the world, particularly from Britain—including Plymouth, England—and it is going to be a significant revenue producer for our Commonwealth but also for our country.

The 2020 anniversary is a proud milestone for our country as we commemorate the 400th anniversary of the successful settlement of Plymouth by the Pilgrims; the essential contributions of the Aquinnah and Mashpee Wampanoag tribes; and the number of key events that followed, including the signing of the Mayflower Compact, the 50-year Plymouth Pilgrim-Wampanoag peace treaty, and of course, the first Thanksgiving.

For my entire time in Congress, I have worked closely with my constitu-

ents to prepare for this Plymouth 400 event.

The Plymouth Harbor dredging project has always been a cornerstone to these preparations. A centerpiece of the anniversary will be the return of the fully restored Mayflower Two, a full-scale replica of the original ship that brought the Pilgrims to Cape Cod in 1620. However, the Mayflower Two cannot return to her home in Plymouth Harbor unless much-needed dredging is completed by that time.

Further, we anticipate a maritime salute to mark the return of the Mayflower Two as part of the commemoration. We also expect significant uptick in corresponding maritime traffic.

The amendment is part of a final piece to ensure that 2020 will be a memorable year for our community and our country, and I look forward to the completion of this project and all the good that will follow.

This is something that is critical not only in terms of the event but making sure there is safe navigation, which we will have to be able to, in some way, counter the influx of marine traffic as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment that does direct the Army Corps to expedite the complete dredging in Plymouth Harbor, Massachusetts.

I know this project is important to the gentleman and to the State, so I am prepared to accept the amendment at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I just want to thank the chairman for his help working with this, and I want to say, you are welcome. In 2020, come be part of the celebration. It is so integral to our country, and it is something that will, I think, be a great revenue producer as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. JOYCE OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **BRANDON ROAD STUDY.**

The Secretary shall complete a final feasibility report for the Great Lakes Mississippi River Interbasin Study Brandon Road Study, authorized under section 3061(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1121) and section 1538(b)(1) of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 586) by the original deadline of February 2019.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his tireless work on this bill and for the fantastic job he has done throughout his career as the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Our Nation owes him a lot for his fine work.

My amendment requires the Army Corps to complete its final report for the Brandon Road Study by February 2019, which is the originally established deadline. The purpose of the Brandon Road Study is to evaluate options and technologies near the Brandon Road Lock and Dam site to prevent aquatic invasive species from reaching the Great Lakes; in particular, the Asian carp.

The study began in 2015. We were supposed to see the draft report by January of last year. It was delayed 6 months. We cannot afford any more delays. The sooner the final report is released, the sooner we can begin to implement methods and technologies that will keep the invasive Asian carp out of the lakes, which account for more than 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water supply.

Asian carp would devastate the ecosystem and the economy of the Great Lakes region. Studies show the impacts would include declines in native fish species and a one-third reduction of the total fish weight in Lake Erie.

We need to ensure that the Brandon Road Study is released by the February of 2019 deadline so we can move forward with the recommendations from the study and stop the invasive Asian carp from infiltrating one of the Nation's most critical water resources.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. The amendment, as he explained, directs the Secretary to complete the final feasibility report for the Great Lakes Mississippi River study on the Brandon Roads by next February.

Keeping this study on track is important. I understand my colleague's concern about not having it drag on without conclusion. I really appreciate the gentleman for offering this.

Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_. LAND CONVEYANCE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall convey to the City of Bainbridge, Georgia, without monetary consideration and subject to subsection (b), all right, title, and interest in and to real property described in subsection (c).

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance by the United States under this subsection shall be subject to—

(A) the condition that the City of Bainbridge agree to operate, maintain, and manage the property for fish and wildlife, recreation, and environmental purposes at no cost or expense to the United States; and

(B) such other terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the interest of the United States.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the real property conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership or the city ceases to operate, maintain, and manage the real property in accordance with this subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert to the United States, at the option of the Secretary.

(c) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is composed of the following 3 parcels of land:

(1) PARCEL 1.—All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in Land Lots 226. and 228, Fifteenth Land District, and Land Lots 319, 320, 321, 322, 323 and 358, Twentieth Land District, Decatur County, Georgia, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a concrete monument stamped “358” which is 950 feet, more or less, North of the South line and 600 feet, more or less, West of the East line of said Land Lot 358, at a corner of a tract of land owned by the United States of America at Lake Seminole and at plane coordinate position North 318,698.72 feet and East 360,033.38 feet based on Transverse Mercator Projection, Georgia West Zone;

Thence Due West 75 feet, more or less, to the contour at elevation 77.0 feet above Mean Sea Level;

Thence Northeasterly along the meanders of said 77.0 foot contour a distance of 20,600 feet, more or less, to the mouth of the entrance channel to the arena and boat basin;

Thence N 75° E 150 feet, more or less, to another point on said 77.0 foot contour;

Thence Northeasterly along the meanders of said 77.0 foot contour a distance of 3,300

feet, more or less, to a point which is on the boundary of said United States tract and on the boundary of a tract of land now or formerly owned by the City of Bainbridge, Georgia;

Thence along the boundary of said United States tract the following courses:

S 10° 52' E along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 830 feet, more or less, to a corner of said tract;

S 89° 45' E along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 700 feet, more or less, to a concrete monument stamped “J1A”, coordinates of said monument being North 328,902.34 feet and East 369,302.33 feet;

S 22° 25' W 62 feet, more or less, to a corner of another tract of land owned by the City of Bainbridge, Georgia;

S 88° 07' W along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 350 feet, more or less to a corner of said tract;

N 84° 00' W along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 100.5 feet to a corner said tract;

S 88° 07' W along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 300.0 feet to a corner of said tract;

S 14° 16' W along boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 89.3 feet to a corner of said tract;

Southwesterly along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract which is along a curve to the right with a radius of 684.69 feet an arc distance of 361.8 feet to a corner of said tract;

S 30° 00' W along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 294.0 feet to a corner of said tract;

S 10° 27' W along the boundary of said City of Bainbridge tract 385.0 feet to a corner of said tract;

N 73° 31' W 38 feet, more or less, to a concrete monument;

S 16° 25' W 563.7 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J7A”;

S 68° 28' W 719.5 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J9A”;

S 68° 28' W 831.3 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J12A”;

S 89° 39' E 746.7 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J11A”;

S 01° 22' W 80.0 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J11B”;

N 89° 39' W 980.9 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J13A”;

S 01° 21' W 560.0 feet to a concrete monument stamped “J15A”;

S 37° 14' W 1,213.0 feet;

N 52° 46' W 600.0 feet;

S 37° 14' W 1,000.0 feet;

S 52° 46' E 600.0 feet;

S 37° 14' W 117.0 feet to a concrete monument stamped “320/319”;

S 37° 13' W 1,403.8 feet to a concrete monument stamped “322/319”;

S 37° 13' W 2,771.4 feet to a concrete monument stamped “322/323”;

S 37° 13' W 1,459.2 feet;

N 89° 04' W 578.9 feet;

S 53° 42' W 367.7 feet;

S 43° 42' W 315.3 feet;

S 26° 13' W 654.9 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

Containing 550.00 acres, more or less, and being a part of Tracts L-1105 and L-1106 of Lake Seminole.

(2) PARCEL 2.—All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in Land Lot 226, Fifteenth Land District, Decatur County, Georgia, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point which is on the East right-of-way line of the Seaboard Airline Railroad, 215 feet North of the South end of the trestle over the Flint River, and at a corner of a tract of land owned by the United States of America at Lake Seminole;

Thence Southeasterly along the boundary of said United States tract which is along a curve to the right a distance of 485 feet, more or less, to a point which is 340 feet, more or less, S 67° 00' E from the South end of said trestle, and at a corner of said United States tract;

Thence N 70° 00' E along the boundary of said United States tract 60.0 feet to a corner of said tract;

Thence Northerly along the boundary of said United States tract which is along a curve to the right a distance of 525 feet, more or less, to a corner of said tract;

Thence S 05° 00' W along the boundary of said United States tract 500.0 feet to a corner of said tract;

Thence Due West along the boundary of said United States tract 370 feet, more or less, to a point which is on the East right-of-way line of said railroad and at a corner of said United States tract;

Thence N 13° 30' W along the boundary of said United States tract which is along the East right-of-way line of said railroad a distance of 310 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

Containing 3.67 acres, more or less, and being all of Tract L-1124 of Lake Seminole.

Parcels 1 and 2 contain in the aggregate 553.67 acres, more or less.

(3) PARCEL 3.—All that tract or panel of land lying and being in Land Lot 225, Fifteenth Land District, Decatur County, Georgia, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at an iron marker designated “225/226”, which is on the South line and 500 feet, more or less, West of the Southeast corner of said Land Lot 225 at a corner of a tract of land owned by the United States of America at Lake Seminole and at plane coordinate position North 330,475.82 feet and East 370,429.36 feet, based on Transverse Mercator Projection, Georgia West Zone;

Thence Due West along the boundary of said United States tract a distance of 53.0 feet to a monument stamped “225/226-A”;

Thence continue Due West along the boundary of said United States tract a distance of 56 feet, more or less, to a point on the East bank of the Flint River;

Thence Northerly, upstream, along the meanders of the East bank of said river a distance of 1,200 feet, more or less, to a point which is on the Southern right-of-way line of U.S. Highway No. 84 and at a corner of said United States tract;

Thence Easterly and Southeasterly along the Southern right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract a distance of 285 feet, more or less, to a monument stamped “L-23-1”, the coordinates of said monument being North 331,410.90 and East 370,574.96;

Thence S 02° 25' E along the boundary of said United States tract a distance of 650.2 feet to a monument stamped “225-A”;

Thence S 42° 13' E along the boundary of said United States tract a distance of 99.8 feet to a monument stamped “225”;

Thence S 48° 37' W along the boundary of said United States tract a distance of 319.9 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

Containing 4.14 acres, more or less, and being all of Tract L-1123 of the Lake Seminole Project.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and the committee staff for all of their assistance in helping to get this matter to the floor for consideration.

This amendment would convey three parcels of land known as the Earle May Recreational Area from the Army Corps of Engineers to the city of Bainbridge, Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, the Earle May Recreational Area is vitally important to the city of Bainbridge, Georgia. The city has had a long-term lease from the Army Corps of Engineers, and it has invested nearly \$150 million in improvements to this area for public use. These investments include a \$25 million water control plant, several sporting complexes, and many other facilities that attract visitors.

It is a destination for people from across the Southeast for its unique beauty and the recreational opportunities that are offered by the Flint River.

Continued improvements, however, could be done much more efficiently if the land were conveyed from the Army Corps to the city of Bainbridge. Since the original lease was initiated in 1980, any improvements that the city attempted to make had to undergo the very long and arduous process that the Army Corps of Engineers utilizes, and, therefore, it increased substantially the cost to the city, as well as the bureaucratic delays that occurred.

By transferring this land to the people of the city of Bainbridge, I am confident that a proper balance can be struck between the city and the Army Corps, and it will facilitate the recreational activities on the Flint River as well as navigation and flood control.

I would like to thank the chairman for his assistance and for agreeing to accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I appreciate his work on the issue, and I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I ask my colleagues in the House and I urge their support of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. BLUM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . CEDAR RIVER, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.**

The Secretary shall expedite completion of the project for flood risk management, Cedar River, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, authorized by section 7002(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1366).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment that prioritizes the completion of the flood mitigation project on the Cedar River in the First District of Iowa.

Ten years ago this week, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, experienced a devastating flood that resulted in billions of dollars' worth of damage. In 2014, Congress authorized the Army Corps of Engineers to complete a flood risk mitigation project on the Cedar River to prevent future floods. Two years ago, in the midst of another historic flood in Cedar Rapids, the 2016 WRDA included my amendment that prioritized the completion of the Cedar Rapids project. However, we are having the same discussion 2 years later for the 2018 WRDA.

The Federal Government has let down my constituents in Cedar Rapids and has not fulfilled its duty to provide the necessary resources to complete the flood mitigation project to protect this city. Working with my Iowa colleagues in the House and the Senate, I have attended countless meetings and sent numerous letters to the Army Corps and the Office of Management and Budget urging movement on this most important project, but it has yet to start.

It is past time the government fulfills its promise to my constituents in Iowa. This project is shovel ready, and Cedar Rapidian deserve completion to protect this vibrant city from future natural disasters.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. This is an important project for Cedar Rapids, Iowa. We have had many discussions about it. I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . CORPS OF ENGINEERS BRIDGE REPAIR AND DIVESTITURE PROGRAM FOR NEW ENGLAND EVACUATION ROUTES.**

Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary may repair or replace, as necessary, any bridge owned and operated by the Secretary that is—

(1) located in any of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; and

(2) necessary for evacuation during an extreme weather event.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would grant the Army Corps of Engineers the authority to repair or replace any Army Corps bridge that is necessary for evacuation during extreme weather or natural disaster in New England.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, the Bourne and Sagamore bridges represent the only roads for crossing the Cape Cod Canal by car. These bridges, owned by the Army Corps, have long reached the end of their working lives. In fact, the Army Corps is already spending a significant amount of funds just to keep the traffic on the bridges moving. Anyone who has gone there in the summer and experienced that can well attest to that.

We cannot risk the safety of those vital roadways at any time, let alone at a time of an emergency. As the Corps already knows, it is important that we recognize that the canal bridges and other critical evacuation infrastructure across the Nation play a fundamental role in providing for the public safety of countless Americans. Much of this State and local work required to ensure the long-term safety of the canal bridges is already under way.

I have also been working closely with the Army Corps leadership in New England and in Washington to ensure that the funding necessary for the safest, most resilient evacuation routes remains a priority.

This amendment would authorize the Army Corps to continue down the path towards long-term safety for the people in my region, the people in New England, and, importantly, the over half a million people that the population swells to just in that small area over the summer months. For that reason, I ask my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment that clarifies the Army Corps' authority to repair the Sagamore and Bourne bridges. This will help ensure the people can safely evacuate during an emergency situation. It is important to Massachusetts.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment. I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman again for his cooperation. This is a vital matter of public safety going forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PORT OF WHITMAN COUNTY.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the approximately 288 acres of land situated in Whitman County, Washington, contained within Tract D of Little Goose Lock and Dam.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means a tract or tracts of land owned by the Port of Whitman County, Washington, that the Secretary determines, with approval of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Secretary of the Interior acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, equals or exceeds the value of the Federal land both as habitat for fish and wildlife and for recreational opportunities related to fish and wildlife.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE.—On conveyance by the Port of Whitman County to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary of the Army shall convey to the Port of Whitman County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(c) DEEDS.—

(1) DEED TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary may only accept conveyance of the non-Federal land by warranty deed, as determined acceptable by the Secretary.

(2) DEED TO FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the Port of Whitman County by quitclaim deed and subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions the Secretary determines necessary to allow the United States to operate and maintain the Lower Snake River Project and to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) CASH PAYMENT.—If the appraised fair market value of the Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the appraised fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, the Port of Whitman County shall make a cash payment to the United States reflecting the difference in the appraised fair market values.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Port of Whitman County shall be responsible for the administrative costs of the transaction in accordance with section 2695 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) LIABILITY.—The Port of Whitman County shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out on the Federal land on or after the date of the conveyance.

(g) APPLICABILITY OF REAL PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the conveyance of the Federal land under this section.

(h) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and legal description of the Federal land and non-Federal land shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I applaud Chairman SHUSTER for getting WRDA back on a 2-year cycle and for his leadership on this important legislation.

In eastern Washington, we rely on rivers, locks, and dams to move goods through ports and to markets abroad. I represent the Columbia Snake River system, and this system is crucial to moving Washington wheat and potatoes. Today, I offer an amendment that authorizes a land transfer between the Army Corps of Engineers and Port of Whitman.

As introduced, the Port of Whitman Economic Expansion Act seeks to simply allow the port to accomplish their goals of providing additional jobs and opportunities in rural eastern Washington. To do this, they need this land transfer. This amendment simply authorizes this process. We have worked with the State and local community to ensure this process will meet fish and wildlife mitigation requirements as well as keep recreation opportunities available in the community.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO and their staff for their assistance, and I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. I know how impor-

tant it is to the State of Washington and her district and her constituents. I am prepared to accept the amendment at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . HAMPTON HARBOR, NEW HAMPSHIRE, NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.**

In carrying out the project for navigation, Hampton Harbor, New Hampshire, under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), the Secretary shall use all existing authorities of the Secretary to mitigate severe shoaling.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chair, my amendment is straightforward. It directs the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to use its existing authority to dredge Hampton Harbor in southern New Hampshire.

Hampton Harbor is New Hampshire's largest commercial fishing port, and it is a lifeline to the ocean for New Hampshire fishermen. Severe shoaling has made the water so shallow that it will soon become unnavigable. Some vessels must wait for the tides to be at their highest simply to enter the harbor. Over 1,500 recreational vessels, emergency response and patrol boats, and numerous commercial lobster and fishing boats could be cut off from the ocean.

The narrowing and shallowing of the harbor not only places unnecessary costs on local businesses, it is also a safety hazard. As access points to the harbor become tighter and the window for entering the harbor safely narrows, more boats must enter and exit the harbor at the same time. This greatly increases the risk of a collision.

A Hampton fisherman has warned in a letter to his local paper that: "Only a matter of time before there is a boat-to-boat or boat-to-wall collision, which will result in major property damage and possible human injury or death."

This project must move forward as soon as possible. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the

amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. I know the importance of it to Hampton Harbor and New Hampshire. I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER.**

The Secretary shall expedite the project for navigation for Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chair, my amendment simply directs the Army Corps of Engineers to expedite its existing Portsmouth Harbor Navigation Improvement Project.

Portsmouth Harbor is vital to both New Hampshire's economy and our national security. It is the only deep draft harbor located in the State of New Hampshire and is the port of entry for fuels that generate 20 percent of New Hampshire's energy.

□ 1745

The harbor is also home to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, where Granite Staters work on our Nation's advanced nuclear submarines. It is a challenging harbor to navigate—home to some of the fastest tidal currents on Earth. That is why it is so important that the Portsmouth Harbor project moves forward quickly. The harbor must remain safe and navigable.

The skilled sailors of the United States Navy can navigate this difficult waterway. It is vital that commercial traffic can also use the harbor safely and that commercial vessels do not delay the submarines' entry to the shipyard. In addition, a maritime incident triggered by this difficult water-

way could cause a devastating oil spill that would negatively impact the shipyard.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. This amendment that she explained so well expedites the navigation project for Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River, which I know many families live along that—the Jones, the Smiths, the Gosselins—and they are all very concerned about this, so I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ENCOURAGING NON-FEDERAL DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT SPONSORS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) when a State or subdivision of a State, individually or in partnership with a private partner, develops a reasonable alternative to the Federal standard for dredged material disposal facilities that meets relevant Federal environmental and dredged material placement and disposal requirements in coordination with a Corps of Engineers' District Office, it should receive preferred consideration by the Secretary; and

(2) the Secretary is encouraged to consider entering into agreements with non-Federal sponsors for the acquisition, design, construction, management, or operation and maintenance of dredged material disposal facilities, including port facilities, through section 217 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, let me start by thanking my colleague from Pennsylvania, the chairman of our committee, for his leadership in getting this bill to the floor.

The U.S. Army Corps plays a pivotal role in the transportation of all of our goods and services in the United States. They are tasked with maintaining navigation channels in our most active and commercial waterways. Unfortunately, carrying out this important work brings about challenges my constituents know all too well.

Last spring, the Corps released a 40-year dredged material management plan in an effort to identify placement sites for almost 11 million cubic yards of dredged material. Regrettably, the proposal was drafted by bureaucrats in Washington with very little community input.

Without knowledge of the local impact, the Federal plan would take 300 acres of pristine land from a third generation family farm, 30 acres in a residential neighborhood in my district, as well as 73 acres from a farm in Congressman KIND's district.

My own family lost their business through condemnation, so I am acutely aware of the damage the eminent domain process can sometimes have on families and communities. After several discussions with the Corps and letters from myself, they agreed that more public comment was needed and that a better solution may possibly exist.

I was pleased that the Corps scheduled several public meetings on the topic, and that the Corps worked with us to extend the open comment period several times. This process proved successful, and a number of innovative and thoughtful alternatives were submitted for consideration.

Yesterday, the St. Paul District Office of the Army Corps and the city of Wabasha, Minnesota, signed a memorandum of understanding for this 40-year plan. The memorandum of understanding describes a process by which the Corps can use existing authorities to collaborate with a non-Federal entity in order to allow for greater flexibility of material placement.

This proposal has the support of the district office, our local community, and the State of Minnesota. It is also environmentally friendly, as it could allow the dredged material to be used in a manner that benefits society, rather than taking up space on a pristine farmland. It also spreads the burden of a public benefit to everyone who benefits.

My amendment encourages the Army Corps' headquarters to fully consider this alternative plan, and alternatives like this, in the future. In its history, the Corps has rarely approved innovative plans such as this. Federal, local, and private partnerships are something that we should encourage, instead of putting roadblocks in the way.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I ask that the Army Corps fully consider inventive, but effective projects across the country it would affect.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering a commonsense amendment that encourages the Corps to consider reasonable alternative agreements between State and local entities and private partners. This makes a lot of sense to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. OLSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROJECT COMPLETION FOR DISASTER AREAS.**

The Secretary shall carry out expeditiously projects already authorized by the Army Corps of Engineers to reduce the risk of future floods and hurricanes in Texas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the greater Houston area, my home, was devastated by Hurricane Harvey. That was 10 months ago. We are still working to recover, and Texas is not alone. Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were impacted by a shattering hurricane season.

And we can't just focus on the last storm season. The 2018 hurricane season started on June 1. Tropical Storm Alberto hit the Florida Panhandle on May 25, 6 days before hurricane season. NOAA says that there is a 75 percent chance this Atlantic hurricane season will be near or above normal.

That is why we must act now to prevent damage from huge floods like Harvey. Congress worked in a bipartisan manner to pass the Bipartisan Budget Act to provide critical Army Corps funds to rebuild our communities and prepare for the next storm. Even though that money has been allocated, the work has not begun. While that is partly due to red tape at the Corps,

once work begins, we need to move that process quickly.

My amendment is simple. It says that the Army Corps needs to expedite previously authorized projects in the declared disaster areas of Texas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These projects will provide critical help for communities that are still recovering and mitigate future flooding and damage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by Mr. OLSON. It is a bipartisan effort. But it is also an effort to save lives, because in 2015 with the Memorial Day flood we had 7 people lose their lives; and, in 2016, with the tax day flood, we had 8 people lose their lives; and, of course, Hurricane Harvey claimed 68 lives across the State of Texas.

This is not only about dollars and cents, it is about saving lives, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman bringing this amendment to the floor and given that he said the historic hurricanes of 2017 this amendment is critical to that recovery, so I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for clearing the way for this amendment to be voted on on the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues who cosponsored this amendment, and I ask all of my colleagues to vote for this flood protection amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . HOUSTON AND COASTAL TEXAS.**

The Secretary shall expeditiously carry out flood and storm damage reduction stud-

ies to reduce the risk of damage from future floods and hurricanes in the Houston and Coastal Texas areas. In carrying out the studies, the Secretary shall leverage existing information and resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, when Hurricane Harvey hit Texas last year it put over 50 inches of rain into an area the size of New Jersey. It was the first category 4 hurricane to make landfall in the continental United States since 2004. It was an extraordinary amount of rain and a devastating event, leading to the largest housing disaster in the history of the United States.

This led to 1.4 million Texans evacuating their homes, and 300,000 households were left without power. There was over \$160 billion in damage. This is the second most expensive storm, Mr. Chairman, in American history, and the most expensive storm in Texas history. Hurricane Harvey was the third major flood to impact the people of Houston in my district since 2015.

Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly thank my good friend, Mr. AL GREEN. We have worked together in the Houston area in a bipartisan fashion. All of us in the Houston area—AL GREEN, GENE GREEN, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, TED POE, and MICHAEL MCCAUL, who is also working with us on this amendment and helped put this forward—all of us in the Houston area have worked together in a bipartisan fashion to help the people of Houston recover.

We were proud to work together with the Florida delegation to help the people of Florida recover from Irma and Maria—and Puerto Rico. As the only appropriator from southeast Texas, I was proud to spearhead that effort in putting together three emergency hurricane supplemental bills, for a total of \$141 billion, the largest amount of money the Corps commander tells me that he has ever seen in his 40 years of service at the Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for his support. I want to thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee, Mr. SHUSTER—he and I were elected together in 2000—for his support on this important recovery effort. We are approaching the 1-year anniversary of Harvey, and we have not forgotten the devastation that it brought to the people we represent.

After we passed that emergency appropriations bill, after those agencies had received that money, one of our most important and, frankly, frustrating jobs is getting the agencies to release the money, to get it into the hands of the homeowners who had suffered, the business owners who had suffered, and to make sure that the Army

Corps of Engineers is speedily carrying out the studies and recommendations that they have to do to build the flood control structures we need in southeast Texas.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. MCCAUL and I are putting forward today says, very clearly, that the Secretary of the Army shall expeditiously carry out these flood control studies and make sure that they are built as rapidly as possible. I can tell you from my position on the Appropriations Committee, as a subcommittee chairman representing southeast Texas, I will use all of the tools the Appropriations Committee has available to us, working with Chairman SIMPSON and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, to ensure the Corps moves rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his support of this amendment. And I also thank my colleague, AL GREEN, for his support on this amendment today. We have worked together arm in arm in helping people recover from these three disastrous floods over the last 3 years. This amendment will make sure the Army Corps of Engineers completes these studies rapidly, that they execute quickly, and build whatever is recommended to help protect the people of Houston and southeast Texas from the next storm. We are going to make sure, as the people's elected representatives, that our constituents' very scarce, hard-earned, and precious tax dollars are wisely and carefully spent in an expeditious way to rebuild and to protect us against the next giant storm.

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

□ 1800

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for offering this amendment.

As he clearly pointed out, this is important due to the historic hurricane season from last year. So I want to thank my good friends, Chairman CULBERSON and Chairman MCCAUL, for offering this. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), my colleague.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank all of my colleagues who have been associated with this amendment.

Mr. Chair, this has been a bipartisan effort. Mr. CULBERSON and I have worked together not only on this effort, but also to serve people.

We do have people who are still living in temporary shelter in Houston and we have people who are still awaiting FEMA's assistance. With some 4.7

million people in the area having been impacted, it is exceedingly important that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. Chair, I am appreciative that the chairman has indicated his support of it, and I thank Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, and other colleagues for bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with Chairman SHUSTER and with my colleagues in the House representing the great State of Texas in ensuring that this money gets out the door to our constituents as soon as possible to help them recover, and that the Army Corps of Engineers is moving as rapidly as humanly possible to complete these studies and build the flood control structures we have to have to protect the people of southeast Texas from the next storm.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 10, insert the following (and renumber the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

- (1) by striking section 9003;
- (2) by redesignating sections 9004 through 9008 as sections 9003 through 9007, respectively;
- (3) in section 9003(c) (as redesignated by this section), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) LEVEE SAFETY ACTION CLASSIFICATION.—In carrying out risk characterizations for levee systems, the Secretary shall include, as a part of any Levee Safety Action Classification, the following information—

“(A) a complete explanation of the way project condition, design, hydrology, flood frequency, probabilities of failure and overtopping and any other relevant factor were integrated in arriving at the rating assigned;

“(B) all incremental corrective actions that can be taken to progressively improve the relative levee safety action classification assigned to a levee system; and

“(C) the incremental costs associated with each corrective action in subsection (b).”;

(4) in section 9004 (as redesignated by this section), by striking subsection (b) (and redesignating the subsequent subsection accordingly);

Page 4, line 11, strike “9005(g)(2)(E)(i)” and insert “9004(f)(2)(E)(i) (as redesignated by this section)”.

Page 4, line 14, strike “9008” and insert “9007 (as redesignated by this section)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment deals with flood control levees and the way the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is assessing and rating these vital community-based, flood-defense systems.

The Corps has been developing levee risk ratings around the United States without the close involvement of local project sponsors, and this is unacceptable.

What is more, the agency is trying to characterize “flood risk to our communities” without routinely offering viable solution alternatives or well-informed site-specific cost estimates for these solutions. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Levee Portfolio Report from March of this year, the agency indicates the following on page 28: “. . . there may be reluctance to share risk information with the public when an immediate and viable risk management solution has not been identified.”

Reluctance? Reluctance indeed.

The Corps has been developing a risk-rating tool called the Levee Safety Action Classification, or L-SAC. Local levee systems and affected communities are labeled as either very high risk, high risk, moderate risk, low risk, or very low risk for flood inundation.

Thus far, 13 percent of the Corps' program levees are in the very high, the high, or the moderate risk categories.

Notably, these systems are estimated to have 8 million people that live or work behind them. My own district includes such an area near Freeport, Texas, where nationally-significant manufacturing and R&D operations have occurred since 1940.

These Corps ratings, which are to be widely broadcast to affected citizens, businesses, and community leaders, will have significant consequences for life safety and important secondary concerns like property values, economic development, zoning, and local governance.

These ratings have been formulated without the sort of close local engagement that is required for successful flood hazard mitigation. Moreover, according to the Corps itself, the ratings are not accompanied by viable solution alternatives and cost estimates for these solutions.

We can and must do better than this.

My amendment enhances the Corps' L-SAC risk tool. It should not only assess levee system locations, conditions, and failure consequences from a Federal perspective, but also include affected levee owners and operators in communities in a completely integrated way to assess, communicate, and mitigate the full range of flood risks.

Only then will we progressively improve the L-SAC scores and, more importantly, improve local safety conditions with viable long-term economic solutions.

This amendment does not remove Corps risk assessment and communication duties that were assigned by the

Congress in the 2007 WRDA. To the contrary, it supplements these duties by assuring, A, that individual levee system L-SAC ratings are transparent; and, B, that they play a meaningful role in expanding options and improving life safety outcomes.

This is a nonpartisan, meritorious proposal with national application. It increases transparency and it improves both risk communication and actual risk mitigation.

Finally, considering the scarcity of available taxpayer resources necessary for actual infrastructure improvements, my amendment also cuts some fat.

For example, number one, it foregoes reestablishment of the Committee on Levee Safety. That committee produced a draft report in January 2009, and later updated, that formed the basis of the 2014 WRDA, which, by and large, has not been executed.

Number two, the amendment eliminates the unfilled position of "Administrator of the Levee Safety Program" and accompanying authorization for "such staff as necessary." The Chief of Engineers, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, eight Corps Division Commanders, 38 Corps District Commanders, multiple agency programmatic chiefs, and existing staff would seem sufficient to me to execute appropriate levee-related policy authorized by Congress.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POLIQUIN). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, this amendment, while potentially well intended, could have the unintended consequences of weakening the Nation's safety standards for levees.

I understand the gentleman plans to withdraw the amendment, and I commit to continue working with the gentleman on the issue.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I do want to thank the gentleman from Texas for raising this issue. I actually agree with him that there are fundamental problems in the levee safety program right now: number one, the fact that the Corps produces these worst-case scenario outcomes that they apply to levees without publicly making the data available on how they came to those conclusions; number two, the fact that they fail to provide alternative improvements with associated cost estimates on how these systems could be improved and ensure the resiliency and performance of these systems.

There are many, many other concerns. I think the amendment does attempt to address some of those, but I think the gentleman also understands

that there are some concerns that have been raised that I think are legitimate.

Mr. Chair, I do want to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to withdraw the amendment. I would certainly be willing to work with the gentleman through that process to see if we can find something that everyone can agree to that makes sense without threatening the safety of our communities, which I know no one here wants to do.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, from the gentleman from Louisiana, if we can work together on this in attempting to address this.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 52, after line 24, insert the following:  
(21) Project for reformulation, East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, Queens, New York.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to expedite the Army Corps of Engineers' study of Superstorm Sandy recovery efforts, allowing a faster response to dangerous and economically damaging beach erosion in my district and the Rockaway Peninsula.

To this day, my constituents suffer from the after-effects of Hurricane Sandy. Though coastal recovery has contributed to positive economic development, the very same jobs created are now threatened by emergency beach closures.

Two weeks ago, only days ahead of beach season, of the beaches opening, 11 of our beaches' central blocks were deemed unsafe due to erosion, by the city of New York and all of the life-guards therein. As a result, it will be crippling to the vendors, whose entire livelihood depends on their seasonal income.

Last year alone, there were four nor'easters that further devastated our beachfront. We have already allocated funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to begin constructing coastal protections and prevent further ero-

sion. However, construction is not due to begin until 2019.

In that time, beaches will be left vulnerable to coastal erosion, threatening more closures, and impacting more jobs and economic activity in my district. This should be of concern to all taxpayers.

After Sandy, the Army Corps of Engineers dumped two Empire State Buildings' worth of sand on our beach for coastal recovery. Stalled efforts to address resiliency issues, such as this study, are allowing millions of Federal dollars to be literally washed away.

Mr. Chair, my constituents cannot wait until 2019 for construction of reinforced dunes, groynes, and jetties. The studies must be allowed to be improved and completed in a timely manner so as to not leave our beachgoers unsafe or our economy vulnerable.

While I will continue to push for a remedy for this summer—I am going to push to try to save some of it—it is my hope that by expediting this process, the beaches will be made safe and operational for my constituents as soon as possible, and certainly no later than spring season of 2019.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. Of course, with the devastating effects of Sandy on Queens, New York, I understand his concern.

Mr. Chair, given the impact of that storm and the importance of this amendment, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member from California for their understanding.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:  
**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . INCLUSION OF PROJECT OR FACILITY  
IN CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WORKPLAN.**

Any project or facility of the Corps of Engineers studied for disposition for which a final report by the Director of Civil Works has been completed shall, to the maximum

extent practicable, be included in the future workplan of the Corps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Subcommittee Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member NAPOLITANO, and their staffs for working with us on drafting this amendment.

My amendment requires the Corps to include any project or facility for which there is a final report for disposition from the Director of Civil Works to be in their future work plans, to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. Chair, it is a straightforward amendment. I am proud to offer it.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, which does require the Corps to include complete deposition studies in future Corps plans where practicable.

Mr. Chair, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After any flood event requiring operation or activation of any floodway or backwater feature within the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project through natural overtopping of a Federal levee or artificial crevassing of a Federal levee to relieve pressure on the levees elsewhere in the system, the Secretary shall expeditiously reset and restore the damaged floodway's levees.

(b) MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES PROJECT.—The term "Mississippi River and Tributaries Project" means the Mississippi River and Tributaries project authorized by the Act of May 15, 1928 (Chap. 569; 45 Stat. 534).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman

from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of my amendment which protects the Mississippi River and Tributaries System and its floodways. The MR&T is our Nation's most successful flood control and navigation system expanding from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, down through Louisiana near the Gulf of Mexico.

Since 1928, the MR&T has prevented \$1 trillion in flood damage and protected the lives of millions who live in the Mississippi Valley.

The MR&T's floodways and backwaters throughout the system relieve pressure on the Mississippi levees during flooding and are essential to keeping the system functioning. One of those floodways is in southeast Missouri, the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway.

In 2011, the Mississippi River experienced historic flooding, leading to the Army Corps' decision to intentionally breach, with explosives, the Birds Point Floodway. As a result, 130,000 acres of land were flooded, destroying people's homes, towns, and crops.

The people of southeast Missouri are resilient and, in the aftermath of this tragic action, tried to pick up the pieces and return to their lives. Unfortunately, it was not until over a year and a half later that the Army Corps returned the destroyed levees back to their original design. There were even some who indicated that perhaps these levees not be built back at all. That is truly unacceptable.

Floodway activation impacts not just residents in the floodways, but all of 4½ million people protected by the MR&T system. Floodways are a critical part of the MR&T, and their restoration after activation should never be in question.

My amendment ensures that, in the event of activation of any floodway or backwater feature within the MR&T, the Army Corps will prioritize expedient restoration of the damaged floodway's levees back to the original protection.

Activation of any floodway on the MR&T has serious consequences and should only be done as a last resort. This amendment simply ensures activated floodway is restored. My amendment is essential to the peace of mind of all people living near floodways and to the proper function of the MR&T.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) for offering this amendment.

There was something that the gentleman noted in the end that I wanted to make sure legislative intent is preserved here, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Missouri stated that the amendment is intended to restore floodways after they are opened up, such as Bird Point-New Madrid, as opposed to perhaps in south Louisiana where a crevasse could open up that would provide fresh water and sort of mimic that natural process that created coastal Louisiana and would currently restore coastal Louisiana wetlands.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ensure the intent of the amendment and that we have in legislative history here memorialized that this is intended to address the restoration of floodways as opposed to crevasses that may open in the aftermath of a flood.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would absolutely say that the gentleman from Louisiana is correct. It is for floodways and for restoration that have been activated.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 1.** MAINTENANCE OF HIGH RISK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—With respect to each project classified as class III under the Dam Safety Action Classification of the Corps of Engineers for which the Secretary has assumed responsibility for maintenance, as of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assess—

(1) the anticipated effects of the Secretary continuing to be responsible for the maintenance of the project during the period that ends 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act, including the benefits to the State and local community; and

(2) the anticipated effects of the Secretary not continuing to be responsible for the maintenance of the project during such 15-year period, including the costs to the State and local community.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completion of the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report summarizing the results of the assessment to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, thank you for recognizing me to discuss this revised Young amendment No. 49.

I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO's help and the help the majority and the minority staffs have given us with their assistance to get this amendment to the floor.

This amendment requires the Secretary to conduct an assessment of dams classified as Class III under the Dam Safety Action Classification of the Corps of Engineers. Once the assessment is complete, this amendment requires the Secretary to provide a report to Congress describing two things: what will happen to local communities should the Corps give up the control of dam versus what will happen if the Corps continues to maintain the dam. This amendment will show the importance of accurate design and construction.

Currently, there is a hole the size of a family sedan in a dam mitigation outlet tunnel that serves the city of Seward, Alaska. The Corps assumed responsibility for this dam, and the design and construction flaw will only get worse until the Corps fixes it, which they are committed to do. The current study for an alternative solution will not be completed until 2019.

This amendment is critical to the Alaska community because it prevents Seward from bearing undue hardship from frequent flooding and continuous damage to the outfall due to the unforeseen design faults. This amendment would continue to require the Corps to expedite the study and place a critical importance on fixing the dam system for my constituents in Seward.

I want to thank, again, Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and their staffs for working with me and my staff on this amendment and for supporting my efforts here today. We will continue to work further on this issue in conference, and I urge all my colleagues to support my amendment No. 49.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for offering this amendment. As always, the gentleman is looking out for the State of Alaska and also small and rural towns across America. So this is an important issue, and I thank my colleague for working on this amendment. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ CONTRIBUTED FUNDS FOR NON-FEDERAL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.**

Section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1572, chapter 688; 33 U.S.C. 701h), is amended by inserting after "authorized purposes of the project:" the following: "Provided further, That the Secretary is authorized to receive and expend funds, subject to the availability of appropriations, from an owner of a non-Federal reservoir to formulate, review, or revise operational documents for any non-Federal reservoir for which the Secretary is authorized to prescribe regulations for the use of storage allocated for flood risk management or navigation pursuant to section 7 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 890, chapter 665; 33 U.S.C. 709):".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chair of the committee and the ranking member and all of the staff for their support and work on this important amendment. It is a simple amendment to the Water Resources Development Act.

Today, as a result of action taken by the Congress in the previous WRDA bills, the Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to accept funds from non-Federal interests to update rules that govern the operations of reservoirs owned and operated by the Corps. Unfortunately, there are a number of facilities that are regulated but not owned by the Corps of Engineers, and previous WRDA bills have failed to provide similar authority to accept funds to update the operations manuals. These manuals are very important as it relates to flood control issues.

Although the Corps regulations specify that water operations manuals, including flood-control curves, should be reviewed and updated regularly, the reality is the Corps does not do this because they have got budget constraints.

A Government Accountability Office report released in July 2016 found that the Corps-owned projects for revisions to water control manuals are often a lower priority than other operations and maintenance activities, such as equipment repairs, sediment removal, or levee repairs. As a result, the Corps oftentimes does not get to funding these revised water control manuals.

This is important. We have floods all across the country, and it is important that these get updated.

Non-Corps section 7 projects have an even lower budget priority. The Merced Irrigation District in central California, which I have the honor to represent, is the owner of such a facility called New Exchequer Dam, an important reservoir that has served for decades and decades to provide water supply, flood control benefits for the people of the San Joaquin Valley.

The Merced Irrigation District wants to improve the spillway and water storage of Exchequer Dam and Reservoir, and it is going to fund all of the improvements. But it has been prevented from doing so for years because the Corps doesn't have the funding to review and to revise the project's water control manual. As a matter of fact, the last time it was updated was over 30 years ago, which is of concern.

So Merced offered—guess what—to pay for the process, but the Corps said, well, they can't do that because they are not legally able to accept the funds.

That doesn't make any sense. So this amendment would resolve this by giving the Corps the authority to accept funds to update operation manuals from the owners of all of section 7 private facilities that are, in fact, regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers.

So, for the good folks of eastern Merced County, this amendment will provide an opportunity for the Merced Irrigation District to explore the raising of the spillway gates at New Exchequer Dam, therefore increasing flood control protection and, at the same time, increasing the storage capacity of this reservoir that I said has existed for decades to, in some years, another 57,000 acre-feet of water.

57,000 acre-feet of water is an important addition. It is a lifeline—can be—to our way of life in areas like the valley where drought, as many as you have heard about, is an ever-present threat. Every drop of water counts.

So I want to thank the cosponsors of my amendment—Representative DENHAM, Representative GARAMENDI, and Representative MCCLINTOCK—for their working together on a bipartisan basis to provide not only tools for the Merced Irrigation District, but all other facilities, entities, local water agencies that have a similar type of project.

This is a good, commonsense amendment. I know of no opposition to it. Not seeing anyone else who would like to speak on it, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I want to thank the gentleman from California for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I actually want to discuss some of the provisions that were included in the manager's amendment that I think are very, very important.

Number one, there is a provision in the manager's amendment that provides for the Corps of Engineers to take a fresh look at the old river control structure, a structure that diverts 70 percent of the water on the Mississippi River system down the Mississippi, and 30 percent down the Atchafalaya.

That is a rigid structure that dates back decades and decades. It has not been revisited. The science has not been updated. It does not reflect the fact that we have additional monitoring stations; and so the plan, a rigid 70/30 split, doesn't maximize benefits to the lower system.

We could be maximizing crawfish production, coastal restoration, navigation features, flood control, and others, and it is not happening. So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to address that, to direct the Corps of Engineers to modernize this, to ensure that current best science is being applied; to ensure that the monitoring stations are being used and that we are having the best outcomes for ecological productivity, for coastal restoration, for navigation, and, importantly, for flood control, and then stop this rigid, antiquated system of an artificial 70/30 split.

Secondly, the amendment also provides for a pilot program for 5 years for an operations and maintenance contract, a 5-year operations and maintenance contract; instead of coming in and offering dredging contracts only when there is a shoal that has developed, instead, coming in and offering a longer term contract, over a 5-year period, and ensuring that navigation channels are certain that the navigability of these channels at the port facilities are accessible.

In many cases, vessels may actually start weeks in advance trying to get to the United States, and if these NAV channels aren't maintained, these boats don't have options but to divert to other ports that are lighter. It is expensive. We need to ensure the predictability and the certainty of our navigation channels, and the manager's amendment addresses that as well.

I want to thank the chairman again, Mr. SHUSTER, for including that. I want to thank Mr. DEFazio and Ranking Member NAPOLITANO for their work with us on that manager's amendment and those important provisions.

□ 1830

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment for his hard work on this piece of legislation. I appreciate all of his efforts and his knowledge he put

into making sure that bill is a good product.

Concerning Mr. COSTA's amendment, again, I believe it is a good amendment. It builds on WRDA 2016 on Corps-owned-and-operated dams, so I urge all of my colleagues to support it. I accept the amendment at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, line 24, insert "In making such information publicly available, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, endeavor to provide such information to all adjoining residential stakeholders of real property to which the Army Corps of Engineers holds an interest therein." after "holds an interest."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would direct the Secretary of the Army to endeavor to inform all residential property stakeholders of adjoining Army Corps of Engineers' interest in their adjacent property.

Section 137 of this bill would expand public access to residential real estate data by placing information related to all real property data that the Army Corps holds an interest in online. Not all constituents have easy access to the internet.

Elderly constituents may not be able to easily search information about Army Corps projects online. Thus, my amendment would expand access to the real estate information by directing the Secretary of the Army, to the maximum extent practicable, to endeavor to provide such information to all adjoining residential stakeholders of real estate with which the Corps holds an interest.

By informing residential stakeholders, we will ensure they are aware of how Army Corps property interests might influence their property values, the enjoyment of their property, or their way of life.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for offering this amend-

ment. This amendment does clarify the responsibilities of the Corps with respect to their rural neighbors, which for me, coming from rural Pennsylvania, it is extremely important, and I appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment. I am prepared to accept it at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. PAULSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 54, beginning on line 5, strike "the Secretary may not complete" and all that follows through "of the Senate on—" on line 9 and insert "the Secretary shall expedite completion of such study and shall produce a report on the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam that is separate from any report on any other lock or dam included in such study that includes plans for—".

Page 54, line 10, strike "the feasibility of".

Page 54, line 15, strike "and".

Page 54, line 16, strike "the preservation of" and insert "a partial disposition of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam facility and surrounding real property that preserves".

Page 54, line 18, strike the first period and insert "; and" and strike the closing quotation marks and second period and insert the following:

"(3) expediting the disposition described in this subsection (d)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, in offering this amendment, let me just start by letting folks know that I am offering this with my colleague, Representative ELLISON, who could not be with us today.

Back in 2015 there was a bipartisan coalition of Minnesota lawmakers working with the folks on the committee, acting to protect Minnesota's northern lakes and rivers from the spread of invasive species: specifically, Asian carp.

Asian carp have spread up the Mississippi River System compromising water quality and crowding out native fish and sensitive species. So Congress stepped in and decided to instruct the Army Corps of Engineers to close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock to commercial navigation to help mitigate the threat of the northern migration of this invasive species.

With the upper lock closed, the Corps of Engineers undertook a disposition

study of the lock and dam facility, and a vision for a visitor and interpretive center at that site became a consensus goal of the committee. The city of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board passed resolutions supporting repurposing the lock.

My amendment would expedite this study and expand upon this work by authorizing a study looking into modifications to the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam to preserve and enhance recreation opportunities for the space, as well as preserve the health of the ecosystem and maintain portions of the lock and dam necessary to help maintain flood control.

Now, the upper lock, which is located in the heart of the Twin Cities, is at the only major waterfall on the entire length of the Mississippi River. It presents a very unique opportunity to transform the waterfront of the Twin Cities. It is within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. It is culturally, historically, and recreationally significant to the city and to our State.

The Central Riverfront is a jewel of the State, and the Stone Arch Bridge and St. Anthony Falls are two iconic Minnesota features. The public interest here cannot be overstated, Mr. Chairman. There are several adopted plans for the area as a result, by the city, by the park board, by the downtown council, local neighborhoods, and the St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board. So, now, local governments have all come together, reflecting a readiness and a commitment to engage in this project. The upper lock disposition study should, therefore, move forward expeditiously.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Subcommittee Chairman GRAVES, for working with me on this amendment. I also want to thank my colleague, Representative ELLISON, who couldn't be with us.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for his hard work and good work on this solid amendment. These changes are bipartisan, and as I said, I really appreciate his efforts on this. I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairman and my colleagues again for supporting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RUTHERFORD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part A of House Report 115-711.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title I the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM.**

Section 3(c) of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426g(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$30,000,000” and inserting “\$45,000,000”; and  
(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

Page 55, line 1, strike “\$3,000,000,000” and insert “\$3,150,000,000”.

Page 57, line 24, strike “\$3,000,000,000” and insert “\$3,150,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 918, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Water Resources Development Act, which will increase funding for the Army Corps of Engineers' storm and hurricane restoration and impact minimization program.

As communities across the country come together to rebuild in the wake of unprecedented storms, this program funds vital coastal resiliency projects across the Nation. I emphasize “resiliency” because part of what this program does is save money by making cost-effective investments now that will prevent that money from having to be spent on costly recovery efforts in the future.

Over the past year, severe storms and hurricanes have devastated communities throughout our country, costing us billions of dollars in recovery efforts. We know that severe weather patterns are occurring at a more frequent rate, and with the 2018 hurricane season fast approaching, the cities and towns along our coasts need more resources to minimize the impacts of flooding, storm surges, and coastal erosion.

What we don't need are more outdated government projects that are wasting taxpayer dollars. And by cutting these, we fund the increases to this program. That makes this amendment fully offset and budget neutral.

Cities and towns in my district and throughout the country are undergoing studies to assess the feasibility of implementing beach erosion and control projects under the storm and hurricane restoration and impact minimization program today. By raising the cap on this program's authorization, we can ensure that the vital resources provided by the Army Corps are available to more districts throughout the country.

There are States across the Nation that have already benefited from this program, from Alabama to Louisiana, from Alaska to Florida, Ohio, Virginia, New Jersey, and Indiana. All of these States, in addition to my home State of Massachusetts, have benefited from this innovative program.

I am proud to have bipartisan support, and I think we need to come together to support this commonsense solution that will empower us to protect our coastal communities by leveraging private sector innovation to enhance coastal ecosystems, promote recreation, and save taxpayer dollars.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for offering this amendment, the program that assists communities in their efforts to recover and adapt to severe weather and natural disasters. It is a solid amendment. I support the amendment and accept it at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I would just like to thank the chairman for his help in supporting this amendment, and ushering it through the process. I think it is a good amendment, and I am proud to have bipartisan support for it.

Mr. Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this time, since this is the last amendment, to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member GRAVES for their support, but most of all, I want to thank our staff: Ryan Seiger, Mike Brain, Joe Sheehy, my own personal staff; but mostly, the legislative counsel, Kakuti Lin—it is a hard name—they worked tirelessly; and, of course, your staff, the Republican staff that worked with our staffs so well.

And I thank Mr. SHUSTER. This is an example of bipartisan work on this WRDA bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAULSEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of

the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 918, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1845

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Velázquez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 1 . . . POST-HURRICANE RECOVERY AND RESILIENCY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On August 26, 2017, Hurricane Harvey, a Category 4 storm, made landfall in Texas, resulting in 103 deaths in Texas alone.

(2) Approximately 336,000 Texas residents were left without electricity, and more than 17,000 homes sustained major damage.

(3) All in all, Hurricane Harvey tied with Hurricane Katrina as the costliest tropical cyclone on record in the United States, causing \$125 billion in damage.

(4) On September 6, 2017, Hurricane Irma, a devastating Category 5 storm, raked across the United States Virgin Islands with reported wind gusts of 225 miles per hour, killing four people.

(5) Soon after, on September 10, Hurricane Irma ripped across Florida with sustained wind speeds of 112 miles per hour.

(6) Hurricane Irma resulted in 84 deaths and caused \$50 billion in damage in Florida, making it the costliest hurricane in Florida history.

(7) Two weeks after Hurricane Irma struck the United States Virgin Islands, Hurricane Maria, also a devastating Category 5 storm, struck the United States Virgin Islands, killing three people and leaving more than 13,000 structures roofless and 100,000 people without power or other essential public facilities such as running water.

(8) On September 20, 2017, Hurricane Maria, by then a Category 4 storm, reached the shores of Puerto Rico with sustained winds of 155 miles per hour.

(9) The impacts of Hurricane Maria and Hurricane Irma were catastrophic, with

widespread devastation, uprooted trees, downing of weather stations and cell towers, and destruction and damage to homes throughout the islands.

(10) Hurricane Maria caused all 3.3 million people in Puerto Rico to lose electricity, and access to clean water and food became limited to most.

(11) According to recent press reports, full electrical power to Puerto Rico may not be restored until July or August of 2018, almost one full year after Hurricane Maria made landfall; this blackout is estimated to be the longest blackout in the history of the United States.

(12) Thousands of people, many more than the Commonwealth's estimate of 64, died in Puerto Rico as a result of the 2017 hurricanes, according to at least one recent study; health publications, such as the *New England Journal of Medicine*, have attributed this increase to the health care disruption for the elderly and the loss of basic utility services for the chronically ill.

(13) Despite the devastating impacts of the 2017 hurricane season, and the fact that, close to one year after landfall of Hurricane Maria, a significant percentage of Puerto Rico's population remains without basic public utility services, President Trump believes his administration's response to the natural disaster deserves a grade of 10 out of 10.

(14) Despite the dedicated humanitarian efforts of thousands of Corps of Engineers personnel in Puerto Rico since the 2017 hurricanes, the Secretary has not yet fully restored and increased the resiliency of the island's public infrastructure.

(b) RESTORATION AND RESILIENCY OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Secretary shall take all necessary and proper actions to restore, and increase the resiliency of, public infrastructure in the continental United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands for which the Secretary is responsible and that was damaged as a result of Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, or Hurricane Maria.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate today, Puerto Rico continues to reel from the aftermath of Hurricane Maria, a once-in-a-generation disaster that fueled a humanitarian crisis. Nearly all 3.3 million residents of Puerto Rico lost power following the hurricane. Drinkable water and adequate food supplies became scarce throughout the island. Many have since endured the longest blackout in U.S. history.

We all remember when President Trump went to Puerto Rico last September. While he was there, he said that—based on the then-reported 16 deaths—Maria was not “a real catastrophe. . . .”

Every day it becomes increasingly clear how out of touch that statement

was, and every day the magnitude of this disaster becomes clearer, as does the incompetence of this administration's response.

Just last week, the Harvard School of Public Health released a new estimate suggesting the death toll is staggeringly higher than previously thought. The Harvard study is just an estimate. However, if the number most often cited from that report—4,645—proves accurate, then Maria would rank as the second worst natural disaster in U.S. history. No matter what the President said, that is a real catastrophe.

Now, as Puerto Rico continues struggling as thousands still do not have electricity and as we still do not know the total number of lives lost, we are entering another hurricane season. Yet Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands remain vulnerable should another storm come barreling out of the Atlantic into the Caribbean and make landfall.

We should remember the 2017 hurricane season was not just devastating for the Caribbean. We cannot forget how the Houston area suffered under Hurricane Harvey. Houston's layout and the city's infrastructure also proved vulnerable to the flooding, causing \$125 billion in damage. Yet despite 2017 being one of the worst in history for natural disasters and even though we are entering another hurricane season, our public infrastructure systems remain vulnerable.

The motion to recommit is very straightforward. It would ask the Secretary of the Army Corps to work to restore and strengthen the resiliency of public infrastructure in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and in the mainland for areas damaged by Maria, Irma, and Harvey. This is common sense. It will mean we are better prepared for the next major hurricane. It could potentially save lives.

In Puerto Rico, for instance, this would allow needed upgrades to the Guajataca Dam. The 90-year-old dam, located on the northeastern shore of the island and owned by Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority, was severely damaged after Maria. While the Corps did good work preventing the collapse of the dam, this was a temporary band-aid. American families living in Puerto Rico still face imminent danger. The Corps should invest in this critical infrastructure project seeking to prevent future damage from another storm.

In other areas throughout Puerto Rico, rivers, lakes, and wetlands serve literally as sinks for water to drain into. To control massive flooding in the next hurricane season, the Corps needs to make the necessary investments for flood control, something else this motion will help advance.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, the administration largely abandoned Puerto Rico after Maria. Now we are learning the death toll from this tragedy will be heartbreakingly high. This Congress has a moral obligation to do everything possible to prevent future deaths and to protect our fellow citizens. That

is what this motion to recommit will do.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to recommit. This bill, H.R. 8, has many benefits to all 50 States and the territories, including Puerto Rico. It was put together in a bipartisan manner. We just here today adopted over 50 amendments in a bipartisan manner.

This bill asserts congressional authority and continues regular order of the Corps of Engineers in authorizing these programs. It is fiscally responsible. We fully offset new projects. Finally, it keeps American jobs by strengthening our competitiveness ensuring that our transportation system remains attractive to private-sector jobs, so I oppose the motion to recommit.

This being my last WRDA bill that I will ever be able to shepherd through the House, I am proud to be here. Hopefully we are going to have a conference report in the near future to be able to pass that on the House floor, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very proud of my term as chairman. One of the accomplishments I am most proud of is getting WRDA back on regular order, every Congress authorizing these important programs so that the Corps can move forward and the American people can benefit by these programs.

Again, I want to, first off, thank my Democratic colleagues and the Democratic staff on the other side of the aisle for their work, working together closely on this bill. Of course, I couldn't get this done without my dedicated staff who have worked so tirelessly, not only on this bill but over the past 5 years, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, a personal point of order that I would like to take is that in 2016 when we passed the WRDA bill, September 28, 2016, I woke up that morning and found out that my mother had passed away. But I could hear her voice in my head saying: Go to work. Do your job.

We came to work that day, and we were able to pass the WRDA bill in 2016. I was so proud that, as always, she was on my shoulder. This morning I woke up and didn't think about the date until I realized today, June 6, is my mother's birthday. It would have been her birthday. So, again, my mother who was always my greatest supporter and my greatest cheerleader was here again with me today. I can hear her voice telling me: Make sure you do your work.

Our family chain is broken, and nothing seems to be the same. But as God

calls one by one, that chain will link again. And today, as strong as ever, that link with my mother is with me. I want to thank my mother. I know she is watching down. Patricia Shuster, as always, is sitting on my shoulder, rooting me on to victory. So, again, today I am very, very proud of the WRDA bill. I am proud we are doing it on June 6, my mother's birthday.

Again, I thank everybody on both sides of the aisle for their efforts. Again, I oppose the motion to recommit and urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 8, the Water Resources Development Act of 2018.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1908

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5895, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3, SPENDING CUTS TO EXPIRED AND UNNECESSARY PROGRAMS ACT

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-712) on the resolution (H. Res. 923) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018, in accord-

ance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2100

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 9 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R.;

Passage of H.R. 8, if ordered; and

Adoption of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3249.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 8) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 227, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—180

|                 |               |            |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|
| Adams           | Brownley (CA) | Clay       |
| Aguilar         | Bustos        | Cleaver    |
| Barragán        | Butterfield   | Clyburn    |
| Bass            | Capuano       | Cohen      |
| Bera            | Carbajal      | Connolly   |
| Beyer           | Cárdenas      | Cooper     |
| Bishop (GA)     | Carson (IN)   | Correa     |
| Blumenauer      | Cartwright    | Costa      |
| Blunt Rochester | Castor (FL)   | Courtney   |
| Bonamici        | Castro (TX)   | Crist      |
| Boyle, Brendan  | Chu, Judy     | Crowley    |
| F.              | Cicilline     | Cuellar    |
| Brady (PA)      | Clark (MA)    | Cummings   |
| Brown (MD)      | Clarke (NY)   | Davis (CA) |