Price Rock 'n Play Sleeper, which have been linked to the deaths of at least 50 infants. While there have been four recent recalls related to this product type, similar unsafe products of this type remain on the market. These products are deadly, and their design is inherently unsafe and incompatible with expert safe sleep recommendations, including from the American Academy of Pediatrics. This legislation would help prevent more families from experiencing the tragedy of losing a child by banning the products' manufacture, import, and sale.

The Safe Cribs Act of 2019 (H.R. 3170) would ban crib bumper pads. Bumper pads have led to dozens of infant suffocation deaths and do not offer protection to babies. These products are also inconsistent with expert safe sleep recommendations. Maryland, Ohio, New York State, Chicago, Illinois, and Watchung, New Jersey have taken action to protect babies. If H.R. 3170 becomes law, all babies in the Unites States would be similarly protected. This legislation would help prevent more families from experiencing the tragedy of losing a child to crib bumper pads by banning their manufacture, import, and sale altogether.

The STURDY Act (H.R. 2211) would direct the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to create a mandatory clothing storage unit standard to help prevent furniture tip-overs. According to the CPSC, one child dies every ten days from a tip-over. Stronger product testing and safety requirements could prevent these fatalities. This bill is critically important because it would establish a strong mandatory standard for furniture stability. The STURDY Act would require the CPSC to create a mandatory rule that would: cover all clothing storage units, including those 30 inches in height or shorter; require testing to simulate the weights of children up to 72 months old; require testing measures to account for scenarios involving carpeting, loaded drawers, multiple open drawers, and the dynamic force of a climbing child; mandate strong warning requirements; and require the CPSC to issue the mandatory standard within one year of enactment. To protect children from furniture tip-overs, we need a strong mandatory standard and the STURDY Act includes those critically needed provisions.

These bills offer a vital opportunity to protect children from preventable injuries and deaths. We urge you to support these child health and safety bills, and to vote ''yes'' on them as they move to the House floor.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Academy of Pediatrics, Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, Center for Justice & Democracy, Child Care Aware of America, Child Injury Prevention Alliance, Children's Advocacy Institute, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Reports, Cribs for Kids, Inc., First Focus Campaign for Children, Keeping Babies Safe, Kids In Danger, MomsRising, National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, National Consumers League, Parents for Window Blind Safety, Public Citizen, Safe Kids Worldwide, Safe States Alliance, The Society for Advancement of Violence and Injury Research (SAVIR).

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alaska Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Alaska Public Interest Research Group (AkPIRG), American Academy of Pediatrics—Arizona Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics—California Chapter 3, American Academy of Pediatrics—Hawaii Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics Georgia Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, New York Chapter 1, American Academy of Pediatrics New York Chapter 2, American Academy of Pediatrics, New York Chapter 3, American Academy of Pediatrics, Vermont Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, Colorado Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, Orange County Chapter, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Arkansas Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics California Chapter 1, American Academy of Pediatrics, Chicago Consumer Coalition, Children's Health Alliance of Wisconsin, Consumer Assistance Council, Inc., Consumer Assistance Council, Inc., DC Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Delaware Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Empire State Consumer Project.

Florida Chapter—American Academy of Pediatrics, Idaho Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Illinois Action for Children, Illinois Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Indiana Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Iowa Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Island Pediatrics of Honolulu, Kentucky Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Louisiana Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Maine Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, Maryland Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, Massachusetts Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Michigan Chapter American Academy of Pediatrics, Minnesota Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Missouri Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Nevada Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, New Jersey Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, New Mexico Pediatric Society, North Carolina Pediatric Society, Ohio Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, OHSU/Doernbecher Tom Sargent Safety Center, Oklahoma Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Ounce of Prevention Fund, Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, South Dakota Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Sudden Infant Death Services of Illinois, Inc., Tennessee Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Virginia Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics, Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, Wisconsin Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Wyckoff Hospital, Wyoming Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3172, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to provide that inclined sleepers for infants and crib bumpers shall be considered banned hazardous products under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT REPORTING EFFICIENCY AND AGREEMENTS TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2019

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 150) to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act of 2019'' or the ''GREAT Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) modernize reporting by recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by creating and imposing data standards for the information that those recipients are required by law to report to the Federal Government;

(2) implement the recommendation by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget contained in the report submitted under section 5(b)(6) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) relating to the development of a ''comprehensive taxonomy of standard definitions for core data elements required for managing Federal financial assistance awards'';

(3) reduce burden and compliance costs of recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by enabling technology solutions, existing or yet to be developed, for use in both the public and private sectors to better manage the data that recipients already provide to the Federal Government; and

(4) strengthen oversight and management of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by agencies by consolidating the collection and display of and access to open data that has been standardized and, where appropriate, increasing transparency to the public.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms ''agency'', ''Director'', ''Federal award'', and ''Secretary'' have the meanings given those terms in section 6401 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 4(a) of this Act.

SEC. 4. DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 63 the following:

''CHAPTER 64—DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING

''§ 6401. Definitions

''In this chapter:

''(1) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' has the meaning given the term in section 552(f) of title 5.

''(2) CORE DATA ELEMENTS.—The term 'core data elements' means data elements relating to financial management, administration, or management that—

''(A) are not program-specific in nature or program-specific outcome measures, as defined in section 1115(h) of this title; and

''(B) are required by agencies for all or the vast majority of recipients of Federal awards for purposes of reporting.

''(3) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(4) EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.—The term 'Executive department' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 5.

''(5) FEDERAL AWARD.—The term 'Federal award'—

''(A) means the transfer of anything of value for a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, including financial assistance and Government facilities, services, and property;

''(B) includes a grant, a subgrant, a cooperative agreement, or any other transaction; and

''(C) does not include a transaction or agreement—

''(i) that provides for conventional public information services or procurement of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the Government; or

''(ii) that provides only—

''(I) direct Government cash assistance to an individual;

''(II) a subsidy;

''(III) a loan;

''(IV) a loan guarantee; or

''(V) insurance.

''(6) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the head of the standard-setting agency.

''(7) STANDARD-SETTING AGENCY.—The term 'standard-setting agency' means the Executive department designated under section 6402(a)(1).

''(8) STATE.—The term 'State' means each State of the United States, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

''§ 6402. Data standards for grant reporting

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) DESIGNATION OF STANDARD-SETTING AGENCY.—The Director shall designate the Executive department that administers the greatest number of programs under which Federal awards are issued in a calendar year as the standard-setting agency.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this chapter, the Secretary and the Director shall establish Governmentwide data standards for information reported by recipients of Federal awards.

''(3) DATA ELEMENTS.—The data standards established under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum—

''(A) standard definitions for data elements required for managing Federal awards; and

''(B) unique identifiers for Federal awards and recipients of Federal awards that can be consistently applied Governmentwide.

''(b) SCOPE.—The data standards established under subsection (a)—

''(1) shall include core data elements;

''(2) may cover information required by law to be reported to any agency by recipients of Federal awards, including audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of this title; and

''(3) may not be used by the Director or any agency to require the collection of any data not otherwise required under Federal law.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

''(1) render information reported by recipients of Federal awards fully searchable and machine-readable;

''(2) be nonproprietary;

''(3) incorporate standards developed and maintained by voluntary consensus standards bodies;

''(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting and reporting principles; and

''(5) incorporate the data standards established under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).

''(d) CONSULTATION.—In establishing the data standards under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Director shall consult with—

''(1) the Secretary of the Treasury to ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) incorporate the data standards established under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note);

''(2) the head of each agency that issues Federal awards;

''(3) recipients of Federal awards and organizations representing recipients of Federal awards;

''(4) private sector experts;

''(5) members of the public, including privacy experts, privacy advocates, auditors, and industry stakeholders; and

''(6) State and local governments.

''§ 6403. Guidance applying data standards for grant reporting

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this chapter—

''(1) the Secretary and the Director shall jointly issue guidance to all agencies directing the agencies to apply the data standards established under section 6402(a) to all applicable reporting by recipients of Federal awards; and

''(2) the Director shall prescribe guidance applying the data standards established under section 6402(a) to audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of this title.

''(b) GUIDANCE.—The guidance issued under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) to the extent reasonable and practicable—

''(A) minimize the disruption of existing reporting practices of, and not increase the reporting burden on, agencies or recipients of Federal awards; and

''(B) explore opportunities to implement modern technologies in reporting relating to Federal awards;

''(2) allow the Director to permit exceptions for classes of Federal awards, including exceptions for Federal awards granted to Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations consistent with the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), if the Director publishes a list of those exceptions and submits the list to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

''(3) take into consideration the consultation required under section 6402(d).

''(c) UPDATING GUIDANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once every 10 years, the Director shall update the guidance issued under subsection (a).

''(2) PROCEDURES.—In updating guidance under paragraph (1), the Director shall, to the maximum extent practicable, follow the procedures for the development of the data standards and guidance prescribed under this section and section 6402.

''§ 6404. Agency requirements

''Not later than 1 year after the date on which guidance is issued or updated under subsection (b) or (c), respectively, of section 6403, the head of each agency shall—

''(1) ensure that all of the Federal awards that the agency issues use data standards for all future information collection requests; and

''(2) amend existing information collection requests under chapter 35 of title 44 (commonly known as the 'Paperwork Reduction Act') to comply with the data standards established under section 6402 of this chapter, in accordance with the guidance issued by the Secretary and the Director under section 6403 of this chapter.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 63 the following:

''64. Data standards for grant reporting ..... 6401''.

SEC. 5. SINGLE AUDIT ACT.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 7502(h) of title 31, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''in an electronic form in accordance with the data standards established under chapter 64 and'' after ''the reporting package,''.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Section 7505 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) Such guidance shall require audit-related information reported under this chapter to be reported in an electronic form in accordance with the data standards established under chapter 64.''.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance requiring audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, to be reported in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64 of that title, as added by section 4(a) of this Act.

SEC. 6. CONSOLIDATION OF ASSISTANCE-RELATED INFORMATION; PUBLICATION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION AS OPEN DATA.

(a) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Director shall, using the data standards established under chapter 64 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 4(a) of this Act, enable the collection, public display, and maintenance of Federal award information as a Governmentwide data set, subject to reasonable restrictions established by the Director to ensure protection of personally identifiable information and otherwise sensitive information.

(b) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary and the Director shall require the publication of data reported by recipients of Federal awards that is collected from all agencies on a single public portal, which may be an existing Governmentwide website, as determined appropriate by the Director.

(c) FOIA.—Nothing in this section shall require the disclosure to the public of information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Freedom of Information Act'').

SEC. 7. EVALUATION OF NONPROPRIETARY IDENTIFIERS.

(a) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—The Director and the Secretary shall determine whether to use nonproprietary identifiers described in section 6402(a)(3)(B) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 4(a) of this Act.

(b) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In making the determination under subsection (a), the Director and the Secretary shall consider factors such as accessibility and cost to recipients of Federal awards, agencies that issue Federal awards, private sector experts, and members of the public, including privacy experts, privacy advocates, transparency experts, and transparency advocates.

(c) PUBLICATION AND REPORT ON DETERMINATION.—Not later than the earlier of 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act or the date on which the Director and the Secretary establish data standards under section 6402(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 4(a) of this Act, the Director and the Secretary shall publish and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives a report explaining the reasoning for the determination made under subsection (a).

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to require the collection of data that is not otherwise required under any Federal law, rule, or regulation.

SEC. 9. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 150.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1700

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

The Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, introduced by Representative VIRGINIA FOXX and myself, would standardize reporting for recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements.

Grant recipients often have to report the same information in different ways because Federal agencies do not use the same forms or even the same terms to describe required information, often making it difficult for organizations and businesses to apply for Federal grants.

Under this bill, the Director of OMB and the Secretary of Health and Human Services would be required to establish governmentwide data standards for grant reporting. This bill would encourage OMB and HHS to make the information grant recipients report fully searchable and machine readable. This would provide greater transparency into the money spent on grants because spending data would be more usable.

This bill would require that data collected from grant recipients be published on a single public portal.

The bill we are considering today is a version that the Senate has amended and makes certain technical changes to that bill. This is a good, commonsense measure that will ease burdens on the private sector and improve the efficiency of government operations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of our bill, one that now awaits a final vote in Congress before it heads to the President's desk.

I thank Representative JIMMY GOMEZ for helping author this piece of legislation, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, or GREAT Act. Representative GOMEZ has been a tremendous partner on this bipartisan, bicameral bill to create more transparency, efficiency, and accountability in the Federal grant reporting process, and I thank him for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, according to USAspending.gov, in 2019, the Federal Government awarded $764.9 billion in grants funding to State agencies, local and Tribal governments, agencies, nonprofits, universities, and other organizations. Roughly translated, this equates to the gross domestic product of Switzerland—or more than the GDP of every country outside the G20.

Within our Federal Government, there are 26 agencies awarding Federal grants, and all of them continue to rely on outdated, burdensome, document-based forms to collect and track grant dollars. Society has moved into a new age of information and technology, and it is time that our government follow suit.

The GREAT Act represents bipartisan legislation to modernize the Federal grant reporting process. It would do so by mandating a standardized data structure for information that recipients report to Federal agencies. Unless the reporting requirements for Federal grants are searchable, the auditing process will continue to yield waste and inefficiency at best and, potentially, fraud and abuse at worst.

Adopting a governmentwide open data structure for all the information grantees report will alleviate compliance burden, provide instant insights for grantor agencies and Congress, and enable easy access to data for oversight, analytics, and program evaluation.

Digitizing and, therefore, automating the reporting process would have a twofold effect:

First, it would allow greater scrutiny of how the money is being spent.

Second, it allows grantees to maximize every dollar they receive from the government to ensure it goes back into communities, supporting local businesses, organizations, and education.

Lastly, the GREAT Act has received a broad breadth of support from an array of good government groups and associations within the grant recipient community.

The coalition endorsing the GREAT Act includes the Association of Government Accountants, the Bipartisan Policy Center, the American Library Association, the Data Coalition, the Grant Professionals Association, the Native American Finance Officers Association, and the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition.

In order to fix the way Federal grants are reported, we must move from a document-centric reporting system to a data superhighway. I urge my colleagues in the House and the Senate to support the GREAT Act and bring grant reporting into the 21st century.

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers on my side.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our current post-award grant reporting process is a cumbersome, document-based process. It burdens administrators and grant recipients. It hinders agencies in their ability to manage grant programs and conduct performance evaluations.

These problems are exacerbated for those conducting governmentwide and congressional oversight work, but that comes to an end today if we pass this bill. As I said earlier, this week's vote on the GREAT Act is the legislation's final stop in Congress before it heads to the President's desk.

In addition to thanking Representative GOMEZ, I thank Senators LANKFORD and PETERS and their staffs for their tireless work this Congress. Put simply, we could not have gotten this important legislation through Congress without their sponsorship of the Senate companion bill and their advocacy throughout this process.

Further, I thank my House bill's original cosponsors for their work on this bipartisan achievement: Congressman GOMEZ, Congressman WALKER, Congressman QUIGLEY, Congressman DESJARLAIS, Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, Congressman PALMER, and Congressman KILMER.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the fragmented, decentralized, and redundant grant reporting structure ends this week.

Instead, we usher in a new age, one that moves this government spending from Document Street to a data superhighway with the passage of this legislation. When we do, it will mark a great moment not just for our Nation's grant recipients and those working for the common good but, ultimately, the American taxpayer.

The transparency, accountability, and efficiencies that this legislation is bound to produce are ultimately intended for them. I proudly ask that my colleagues support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Representative FOXX, for her partnership on this legislation.

I know, during such a historic week on a variety of fronts, this bill might be little noticed 20, 30, or 40 years from now, but what people should notice is that a progressive Democrat from Los Angeles and a conservative Member from North Carolina could spot a problem that was impacting our constituents, our businesses, our nonprofits, and that we saw a problem that needed a solution. It might not always be the perfect solution, but it is definitely a great solution. What we are showing is that we can work, once again, for the American people.

I thank the gentlewoman for her example, and I know that, in the future, we can continue to work together on even bigger and more meaningful legislation. Let's let this be a reminder that

our country continues to work on behalf of everyone.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 150.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF THE SPOKANE RESERVATION EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 216) to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 216

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1927 to 1931, at the direction of Congress, the Corps of Engineers investigated the Columbia River and its tributaries to determine sites at which power could be produced at low cost;

(2) under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)), when licenses are issued involving tribal land within an Indian reservation, a reasonable annual charge shall be fixed for the use of the land, subject to the approval of the Indian tribe having jurisdiction over the land;

(3) in August 1933, the Columbia Basin Commission, an agency of the State of Washington, received a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission for water power development at the Grand Coulee site;

(4) had the Columbia Basin Commission or a private entity developed the site, the Spokane Tribe would have been entitled to a reasonable annual charge for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe;

(5) in the mid-1930s, the Federal Government, which is not subject to licensing under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.)—

(A) federalized the Grand Coulee Dam project; and

(B) began construction of the Grand Coulee Dam;

(6) when the Grand Coulee Dam project was federalized, the Federal Government recognized that—

(A) development of the project affected the interests of the Spokane Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; and

(B) it would be appropriate for the Spokane and Colville Tribes to receive a share of revenue from the disposition of power produced at Grand Coulee Dam;

(7) in the Act of June 29, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 835d et seq.), Congress—

(A) granted to the United States—

(i) in aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Columbia Basin Project, all the right, title, and interest of the Spokane Tribe and Colville Tribes in and to the tribal and allotted land within the Spokane and Colville Reservations, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time; and

(ii) other interests in that land as required and as designated by the Secretary for certain construction activities undertaken in connection with the project; and

(B) provided that compensation for the land and other interests was to be determined by the Secretary in such amounts as the Secretary determined to be just and equitable;

(8) pursuant to that Act, the Secretary paid—

(A) to the Spokane Tribe, $4,700; and

(B) to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, $63,000;

(9) in 1994, following litigation under the Act of August 13, 1946 (commonly known as the ''Indian Claims Commission Act'' (60 Stat. 1049, chapter 959; former 25 U.S.C. 70 et seq.)), Congress ratified the Colville Settlement Agreement, which required—

(A) for past use of the land of the Colville Tribes, a payment of $53,000,000; and

(B) for continued use of the land of the Colville Tribes, annual payments of $15,250,000, adjusted annually based on revenues from the sale of electric power from the Grand Coulee Dam project and transmission of that power by the Bonneville Power Administration;

(10) the Spokane Tribe, having suffered harm similar to that suffered by the Colville Tribes, did not file a claim within the 5-year statute of limitations under the Indian Claims Commission Act;

(11) neither the Colville Tribes nor the Spokane Tribe filed claims for compensation for use of the land of the respective tribes with the Commission prior to August 13, 1951, but both tribes filed unrelated land claims prior to August 13, 1951;

(12) in 1976, over objections by the United States, the Colville Tribes were successful in amending the 1951 Claims Commission land claims to add the Grand Coulee claim of the Colville Tribes;

(13) the Spokane Tribe had no such claim to amend, having settled the Claims Commission land claims of the Spokane Tribe with the United States in 1967;

(14) the Spokane Tribe has suffered significant harm from the construction and operation of Grand Coulee Dam;

(15) Spokane tribal acreage taken by the United States for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam equaled approximately 39 percent of Colville tribal acreage taken for construction of the dam;

(16) the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam; and

(17) by vote of the Spokane tribal membership, the Spokane Tribe has resolved that the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to provide fair and equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe for the generation of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration or the head of any successor agency, corporation, or entity that markets power produced at Grand Coulee Dam.

(2) COLVILLE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''Colville Settlement Agreement'' means the Settlement Agreement entered into between the United States and the Colville Tribes, signed by the United States on April 21, 1994, and by the Colville Tribes on April 16, 1994, to settle the claims of the Colville Tribes in Docket 181–D of the Indian Claims Commission, which docket was transferred to the United States Court of Federal Claims.

(3) COLVILLE TRIBES.—The term ''Colville Tribes'' means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

(4) COMPUTED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The term ''Computed Annual Payment'' means the payment calculated under paragraph 2.b. of the Colville Settlement Agreement, without regard to any increase or decrease in the payment under section 2.d. of the agreement.

(5) CONFEDERATED TRIBES ACT.—The term ''Confederated Tribes Act'' means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation Grand Coulee Dam Settlement Act (Public Law 103–436; 108 Stat. 4577).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) SPOKANE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—The term ''Spokane Business Council'' means the governing body of the Spokane Tribe under the constitution of the Spokane Tribe.

(8) SPOKANE TRIBE.—The term ''Spokane Tribe'' means the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation, Washington.

SEC. 5. PAYMENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) INITIAL PAYMENT.—On March 1, 2022, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for fiscal year 2021.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2023, and March 1 of each year thereafter through March 1, 2029, the Administrator shall pay the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) MARCH 1, 2030, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Not later than March 1, 2030, and March 1 of each year thereafter, the Administrator shall pay the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 32 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 6. TREATMENT AFTER AMOUNTS ARE PAID.

(a) USE OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5 may be used or invested by the Spokane Business Council in the same manner and for the same purposes as other Spokane Tribe governmental amounts.

(b) NO TRUST RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY.—Neither the Secretary nor the Administrator shall have any trust responsibility for the investment, supervision, administration, or expenditure of any amounts after the date on which the funds are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5.

(c) TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The payments of all amounts to the Spokane Business Council and Spokane Tribe under section 5, and the interest and income generated by those amounts, shall be treated in the same manner as payments under section 6 of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan Distribution of Judgment Funds Act (100 Stat. 677).

(d) TRIBAL AUDIT.—After the date on which amounts are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5, the amounts shall—