

Buck Hice (GA)
 Bucshon Higgins (LA)
 Budd Hill (AR)
 Burchett Holding Rice (SC)
 Burgess Hollingsworth Riggelman
 Byrne Hudson Roby
 Calvert Huizenga Rodgers (WA)
 Carter (GA) Hurd (TX) Roe, David P.
 Chabot Johnson (LA) Rogers (AL)
 Cheney Johnson (OH) Rogers (KY)
 Cline Johnson (SD) Rose, John W.
 Cloud Jordan Rouzer
 Cole Joyce (OH) Roy
 Collins (GA) Joyce (PA) Rutherford
 Comer Katko Scalise
 Conaway Keller Schweikert
 Cook Kelly (MS) Scott, Austin
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Shimkus
 Crenshaw King (IA) Smith (MO)
 Curtis King (NY) Smith (NE)
 Davidson (OH) Kinzinger Smith (NJ)
 Davis, Rodney Kustoff (TN) Smucker
 DesJarlais LaHood Spano
 Diaz-Balart LaMalfa Stauber
 Duncan Lamborn Stefanik
 Dunn Latta Steil
 Emmer Lesko Steube
 Estes Long Stewart
 Ferguson Loudermilk Stivers
 Fitzpatrick Lucas Taylor
 Fleischmann Luetkemeyer Thompson (PA)
 Flores Marshall Thornberry
 Fortenberry Massie Timmons
 Foxx (NC) Mast Tipton
 Fulcher McCarthy Turner
 Gaetz McCaul Upton
 Gallagher McClintonck Wagner
 Gianforte McHenry Walberg
 Gibbs McKinley Walden
 Gohmert Meadows Walker
 Gonzalez (OH) Miller Walorski
 Gosar Mitchell Waltz
 Granger Moolenaar Watkins
 Graves (GA) Mooney (WV) Weber (TX)
 Graves (LA) Mullin Webster (FL)
 Graves (MO) Murphy (NC) Wenstrup
 Green (TN) Newhouse Westerman
 Griffith Norman Williams
 Grothman Nunes Wilson (SC)
 Guest Olson Wittman
 Guthrie Palazzo Womack
 Hagedorn Palmer Woodall
 Harris Pence Wright
 Hartzler Perry Yoho
 Hern, Kevin Porter Young
 Herrera Beutler Posey Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt Hunter Serrano
 Bishop (UT) Lieu, Ted Simpson
 Brown (MD) Merchant Wasserman
 Carter (TX) Meuser Schultz
 Gabbard Rooney (FL)
 Gooden Sensebrenner

□ 1417

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE
 TALENT BY UNLOCKING RE-
 SOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5363) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 319, nays 96, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 659]

YEAS—319

Abraham	Evans	Luján	Spanberger	Tonko	Walden
Adams	Finkenauer	Luria	Spano	Torres (CA)	Walker
Aguilar	Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Speier	Torres Small	Waltz
Allen	Fletcher	Malinowski	Stanton	(NM)	Waters
Allred	Fortenberry	Maloney,	Stauber	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Amodei	Foster	Carolyn B.	Stefanik	Trone	Welch
Armstrong	Foxx (NC)	Maloney, Sean	Steil	Turner	Westerman
Axne	Frankel	Matsui	Stevens	Underwood	Wexton
Balderson	Fudge	McAdams	Stivers	Upton	Wild
Barr	Gallagher	McBath	Van Drew	Van Drew	Wilson (FL)
Barragán	Gallego	McCarthy	Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Wilson (SC)
Bass	Garamendi	McCaull	Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Wittman
Beatty	Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Womack
Bera	Garcia (TX)	McEachin	Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Bergman	Golden	McGovern	Titus	Wagner	Young
Beyer	Gomez	McHenry	Tlaib	Walberg	Zeldin
Bilirakis	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley			
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney			
Bishop (UT)	Gotttheimer	Meeks			
Blumenauer	Granger	Meng			
Blunt Rochester	Graves (GA)	Mitchell			
Bonamici	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar			
Bost	Green, Al (TX)	Moore			
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	Morelle			
Brindisi	Guthrie	Moulton			
Brooks (IN)	Haaland	Burgess			
Brownley (CA)	Harder (CA)	McArdle			
Buchanan	Hartzler	McCurdy			
Buchshon	Hastings	McCurdy			
Bustos	Hayes	McCurdy			
Butterfield	Heck	McCurdy			
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	McCurdy			
Carbajal	Higgins (NY)	McCurdy			
Cárdenas	Hill (AR)	McCurdy			
Carson (IN)	Himes	McCurdy			
Carter (TX)	Hollingsworth	McCurdy			
Cartwright	Horn, Kendra S.	McCurdy			
Case	Horsford	McCurdy			
Casten (IL)	Houlihan	McCurdy			
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	McCurdy			
Castro (TX)	Hudson	McCurdy			
Chabot	Huffman	McCurdy			
Chu, Judy	Huizenga	McCurdy			
Cicilline	Hurd (TX)	McCurdy			
Cisneros	Jackson Lee	McCurdy			
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	McCurdy			
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	McCurdy			
Clay	Johnson (GA)	McCurdy			
Cleaver	Johnson (LA)	McCurdy			
Cline	Johnson (SD)	McCurdy			
Cohen	Johnson (TX)	McCurdy			
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	McCurdy			
Cole	Kaptur	McCurdy			
Connolly	Keating	McCurdy			
Cook	Keller	McCurdy			
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	McCurdy			
Correa	Kelly (MS)	McCurdy			
Costa	Kennedy	McCurdy			
Courtney	Khanna	McCurdy			
Cox (CA)	Kildee	McCurdy			
Craig	Kilmer	McCurdy			
Crist	Kim	McCurdy			
Crow	Kind	McCurdy			
Cuellar	King (NY)	McCurdy			
Cunningham	Kinzinger	McCurdy			
Davids (KS)	Larsen (WA)	McCurdy			
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	McCurdy			
Davis, Danny K.	Latta	McCurdy			
Davis, Rodney	DelBene	McCurdy			
Dean	Delgado	McCurdy			
Defazio	Demings	McCurdy			
DeGette	DeSaulnier	McCurdy			
DeLauro	Deutch	McCurdy			
DeBene	Diaz-Balart	McCurdy			
Dingell	Dingell	McCurdy			
Doggett	Douglas	McCurdy			
Doyle, Michael F.	Dunn	McCurdy			
Engel	Engel	McCurdy			
Escobar	Escobar	McCurdy			
Eshoo	Eshoo	McCurdy			
Espaillat	Espaillat	McCurdy			

[Roll No. 659]

YEAS—319

Spanberger	Tonko	Tonko
Spano	Torres (CA)	Torres Small
Speier	Torres (CA)	Waltz
Stanton	(NM)	Watson Coleman
Stauber	Trahan	Watson
Stefanik	Trone	Welch
Steil	Turner	Westerman
Stevens	Underwood	Wexton
Stivers	Upton	Wild
Upton	Van Drew	Wilson (FL)
Van Drew	Vargas	Wilson (SC)
Waters	Veasey	Wittman
Watson Coleman	Velázquez	Womack
Wexton	Visclosky	Yarmuth
Wild	Womack	Young
Wilson (FL)	Yardumian	Zeldin

NAYS—96

Amash	Gianforte	Gianforte
Arrington	Gibbs	Gibbs
Babin	Gohmert	Gohmert
Bacon	Nunes	Nunes
Baird	Olson	Olson
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Palazzo
Banks	Palmer	Palmer
Biggs	Posey	Posey
Griffith	Ratcliffe	Ratcliffe
Grothman	Rice (SC)	Rice (SC)
Hagedorn	Rice (NE)	Rice (NE)
Harris	Riggleman	Riggleman
Buck	Rosen	Rosen
Hern, Kevin	Rouzer	Rouzer
Hice (GA)	Roy	Roy
Higgins (LA)	Rutherford	Rutherford
Holding	Schweikert	Schweikert
Horn, Kendra S.	Jordan	Jordan
Horsford	Shimkus	Shimkus
Hough	Cheney	Cheney
Hough	King (IA)	King (IA)
Hough	LaHood	LaHood
Hough	LaMalfa	LaMalfa
Hough	Lamborn	Lamborn
Hough	Taylor	Taylor
Hough	Timmons	Timmons
Hough	Tipton	Tipton
Hough	Webster (TX)	Webster (TX)
Hough	Wenstrup	Wenstrup
Hough	Williams	Williams
Hough	Yoho	Yoho

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt	Marchant	Smith (WA)
Brown (MD)	Meuser	Wasserman
Gabbard	Rooney (FL)	Schultz
Gooden	Sensebrenner	Woodall

□ 1427

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I missed the first vote series today. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 657, “nay” on rollcall No. 658, and “yea” on rollcall No. 659.

TRIBAL COASTAL RESILIENCY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials on H.R. 729.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 729.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1430

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 729) to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes, with Ms. PINGREE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in the resolution and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, today I am truly honored to bring to the floor a bipartisan bill championed by many colleagues from throughout the country and many individuals and organizations passionately committed to our oceans, lakes, and coastlines and to the ecosystems, communities, and economies that depend on them.

I especially want to recognize my colleagues who introduced and advocated the measures that are incorporated in this bill: Representatives KILMER, HUFFMAN, WITTMAN, QUIGLEY, PALLONE, PINGREE, NORTON, CARBAJAL, RUPPERSBERGER, and YOUNG.

This bill consolidates 10 bipartisan bills, cosponsored by a total of 24 of my minority colleagues, that tackle the crisis and challenge of our time: climate change.

Climate change, of course, knows no partisan, country, or other manmade boundaries. It indiscriminately threatens us all, but it is especially insidious as it applies to our world's oceans, lakes, and coastlines.

Earlier this year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a special report on ocean and cryosphere in a changing climate, making crystal clear that our oceans and coasts are under mortal threat.

Over 40 percent of Americans live in coastal counties right on our oceans and lakes. These communities not only account for nearly half of our U.S. gross domestic product, but they are on the front lines of climate change and need resources today to help prepare for and respond to the effects of

climate change, including flooding, sea level rise, severe weather, coastal erosion, and changing water conditions that affect ecosystems and fish populations.

They need help, and as we help them, we help all of us. We know from a generation of data now that every dollar invested in predisaster mitigation saves at least \$6 in recovery costs. H.R. 729 includes bipartisan measures that will do this in four ways.

First, it will improve coastal resilience and economic enhancement by making several important updates to the Coastal Zone Management Act, a then-revolutionary law from 1972 to establish a partnership between the Federal Government and coastal and Great Lakes States. It will also help communities implement climate-resilient living shoreline projects that use natural materials to protect communities and ecosystems instead of hard or armored walls and infrastructure that we know are less effective.

Second, it will reinforce fish habitat conservation and fisheries research. It will also authorize steady funding for the U.S. Geological Survey to conduct science and research activities to support fishery management in the Great Lakes and to restore the loss of basic fishery science capabilities and accelerate implementation of new technology.

Third, recognizing that responsible management of the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes relies on robust data, this bill will reauthorize the integrated coastal and ocean observation system and, for the first time, formally authorize the digital coast partnership, both of which are led by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Finally, H.R. 729 will update the National Sea Grant College Program to ensure the United States has a strong marine and coastal science and policy workforce so that we can continue to develop smart policy solutions in the future.

This bipartisan bill is supported by a plethora of diverse organizations across our country, including the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the Teddy Roosevelt Conservation Project, the American Sportfishing Association, and Ocean Conservancy.

It won't, in and of itself, solve climate change. That takes a much larger, more focused, and deliberate international effort. But it will move our Federal policy into the present and the future as to what risks arise for our oceans, lakes, and coasts and their communities, and this bill is an imperative step in the difficult process we face.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, December 6, 2019.
Chairman RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 2405, the "National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2019," which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources on April 30, 2019.

In the interest of expedience in the consideration of H.R. 2405 the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will waive formal consideration of the bill. This is, however, not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Science Committee over the subject matter contained in H.R. 2405 or similar legislation.

Thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. Thank you for your cooperation on this legislation.

Sincerely,
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Chairwoman, Committee on Science,
Space, and Technology.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2019.

Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JOHNSON: In recognition of the goal of expediting consideration of H.R. 2405, the "National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2019," which was referred solely to the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Natural Resources appreciates the decision by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology ("Science Committee") not to pursue its request for a sequential referral of the bill as to any provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Science Committee.

The Committee on Natural Resources acknowledges this action with the mutual understanding that, in doing so, the Science Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claims over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee on Natural Resources agrees to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chair, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, as we approach this particular piece of legislation, there are other issues that seem to be floating around at this time of year that seem to have sucked all the air out of Congress. Everyone seems to be talking about impeachment instead of this stuff. But I realize it is important for the majority party to try and give the illusion that we are actually doing something, and, therefore, we have this bill before us.

If this bill is indeed the vision that the majority party wants to say is their way of helping climate control or helping the costs and the betterment of our seas and oceans, if this is their philosophy, if this is their vision, and if this is their new, really big and giant kind of really cool thing that they are

going to bring out here as their statement of what is going to happen, then they ought to be embarrassed in some way.

This bill is like getting that Christmas package, and once you tear off all the pretty wrapping paper and the satin bows, Madam Chair, you will realize, and Americans will realize, this piece of legislation is an empty box. There is nothing there.

There are 10 bills that we have here. Three would actually qualify to go as suspensions. We have no qualms with those. But it is certainly not groundbreaking new ideas that are coming up here.

In fact, one of those bills is the one from Mr. KILMER. He has a great bill. It has one small problem with it that could create a problem in the future, and there was a Democrat amendment that was proposed to the Rules Committee which would be a perfect solution.

Unfortunately, of all the 29-plus amendments the Rules Committee decided to make in order, the one that actually fixes something that we would support, they decided not to make that in order. It is great. It is marvelous. We will try to fix it over in the Senate side.

Of the other bills, four of them do absolutely nothing. In fact, the testimony we had in committee on those bills was they are presently being done by the status quo. The agency said in their testimony that they have the power and the authority to do this already. The only thing you are going to add by combining these extra bills, Madam Chair, is simply a \$1.4 billion cost increase to it.

There are four of these bills that have no Senate counterpart, which means we can pass them over here, but they are going nowhere in the Senate.

So, once again, this is simply a lost opportunity to do something when we have so many significant issues. In fact, in the Rules Committee last night, they mentioned some of the things we need to do before next Friday, like the NDAA, which should have been done in September; or the USMCA, which was ready to go in August; or the funding bill that we need to do, which we should have had done by June; or even the backlog maintenance bill that Mr. KILMER and I have, which has 330 sponsors and cosponsors and still has yet to have a vote on this floor.

Those actually solve problems. They do something. But we are not scheduling that stuff. So we are sitting here with this illusion of coming up with something.

Some of these bills will make amendments to the Coastal Zone Management Act, an act that was signed into law by Richard Nixon, which gives the Democrats kind of an ironic sense of humor in actually doing that kind of amendment in the atmosphere of this particular time period.

Then we also have a whole bunch of amendments that were made in order.

Four of those 29 amendments are actually bills that other people have proposed.

Since nothing is really being done in the legislative process here, this seems to be like the only game in town, so why not add your bill on to it?

We saw the same thing happening on the NDAA when we did several things that were in the purview of our committee that were added to that bill having nothing to do with the military, but it was the only thing going in town, so add your bill on top of it.

Of those bills, three of them had absolutely no hearings whatsoever; they are just new. They have been added on here, and we are going to try and do this and bypass the entire system which is supposed to be the way you actually do legislating in this body.

One of them did have a hearing. Unfortunately, it was last Congress when we were in charge. I guess that is close enough for government work here.

But the problem that we do simply have is that there are so many potential problems with this bill.

Now, two of these bills that have been added to this have some specific issues which we will talk about in the course of the discussion that we have around the bill: one of them dealing with, once again, whether a city is the same thing as a State for coastal management planning; one of them will be dealing with some of the programs that are going to be mandatory under this particular folderol of legislation that has been kind of cobbled together as if this were a good, bright, and comprehensive approach to try and solve problems in America.

Madam Chair, I don't want to be too critical because I realize one of these bills in here is yours. At the same time, this package of bills is not a great idea; it is not grand philosophy; and it doesn't solve anything. In fact, for the majority of it, you already have the power to do it. You don't need this stuff in here. There are better ways of doing it, and this is certainly not one of those ways.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), who is the introducer of the bill in chief.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I thank my friend from Hawaii for yielding time.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act, a package of 10 bipartisan bills that will make significant strides to address the critical challenges our coastal communities face as a direct result of climate change and sea level rise.

Madam Chair, this is Taholah, the lower village of the Quinault Indian Nation. This photo doesn't show someone canoeing on a river or on a lake. It shows someone canoeing through the streets of their village after seawater flooded the area during a storm.

Far too often and far too many times, we have seen more severe storms and rising sea levels threaten communities like this. In my region, we have seen it in La Push, where the Quileute Tribal School is in the crosshairs of a rising ocean.

We have seen coastal challenges threaten public safety, public access, and cultural landmarks for these Tribes and others, including the Hoh and Makah Tribes. These communities are seeing the impact of climate change right now.

Breached seawalls, persistent flooding, mold damage, tsunami threats, and coastal erosion put homes at risk. They put schools serving Tribal youth at risk and community centers serving elders at risk, not to mention important cultural sites that date back generations.

Unfortunately, these threats from changing landscapes and weather events can't be adequately addressed by Tribal governments alone because they don't have the resources. While the Federal Government has resources to help coastal communities, there is no ability under current law to make direct applications for this funding.

Madam Chair, I grew up on the Olympic Peninsula. I have seen, firsthand, challenges faced by coastal communities; and, today, in the face of these threats, with this bill, we say that we are not going to tell these communities that they are on their own, because today's proposal includes my bill, the Tribal Coastal Resiliency Act, which aims to uphold Tribal sovereignty by modernizing NOAA's Coastal Zone Management grant program to allow Tribal governments to directly compete for these grants instead of requiring them to petition States to prioritize these projects.

□ 1445

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. This is about helping communities that face more severe storms and increased flooding in my region and around the country. This is about the Federal Government upholding its trust responsibility. This is about making a difference for coastal communities.

Madam Chair, let's pass this bill and help our communities.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Chair, the package before us represents the misguided partisan nature of this majority infecting everything Congress touches. This package highlights the real lost opportunities before us because of the majority's insistence on impeachment all the time.

The Democrats have rallied and promised real sweeping policies to create jobs, address our trade challenges, tackle our national energy needs, and fight wildfires. Yet, they have been so consumed with attacking our President and impeachment that they have nothing to show for it.

So to save face, Speaker PELOSI loaded up her giant jumbo jet, wasted taxpayer dollars gallivanting around Spain to simply talk about climate change. This coming week, she has scheduled a series of bills on the House floor in the name of “combating climate change” that are actually re-treads of programs that are already authorized and actions that are already being taken by the Federal Government.

H.R. 729 is clear proof that the Democrats have no agenda and have no plan other than to impeach President Trump. Most of the bills included in this package before us today duplicate existing authority that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, already has under the Coastal Zone Management Act, CZMA. Also, under Tribal CZMA, living shoreline and climate change, NOAA and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have for fishery research and management, like the Great Lakes fishery, or NOAA has for Digital Coast data platforms. This package represents deeply misguided priorities based off misguided efforts.

Now, let's start with the premise that we need to designate a city, a non-coastal city, as a participating member of the Coastal Zone Management Act. Why would we declare the District of Columbia a “coastal city” and give them veto power over Federal actions affecting its coastal zone, once it develops an approved coastal zone management program? Political partisan power.

What does this threaten?

What happens when the District of Columbia expresses concerns with the impacts of expanded Federal operations at Naval Station Norfolk? What happens when the Federal Government wants to expand the Wilson Bridge and I-495? Does D.C. get veto authority? This bill could grant them that authority.

Next, let's be clear, the loan guarantee program under the Working Waterfront program will simply put the American taxpayer on the hook for local defaults with little or no adequate oversight.

While the National Sea Grant Program is popular among coastal members, this bill establishes a mandatory fellowship program that provides free graduate students to staff, and, yes, Democratic congressional offices, at taxpayer expense.

Finally, according to the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, the cumulative cost of this package to the American taxpayers would be upwards of \$1.4 billion over the authorized periods, with the potential for an additional cost of \$292 million outside of

the authorized windows. Yet, here we are with massive new authorizations in the bill package that are unnecessary, and like all things in this Congress, are much higher than current levels of spending.

The agencies responsible for carrying out most of this legislation stated that it can do, and is doing, most of these functions under current law.

So why are we here? To create giant authorization slush funds that future Democratic Congresses working with future Democratic Presidents will have available to funnel money to their schemes to combat climate change. We should reject this package before us. We should pass the USMCA. We should focus on infrastructure permitting and reforming the way we approve major projects in this country to create jobs and move America forward.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 729, which includes the text of my bill, the Great Lakes Fishery Research Authorization Act.

The Great Lakes hold 18 percent of the world's fresh water supply, and over 35 million people depend on the lakes for drinking water, recreation, fish and wildlife-related activities, industrial water supply, and commercial navigation.

The Lakes support more than 1.5 million jobs and generate \$62 billion in wages. Of those jobs, more than 50,000 are directly sustained by the Great Lakes' \$7 billion fishing industry.

The Great Lakes Science Center has field operations in 5 of the 8 Great Lake States and owns and operates a fleet of large research vessels that monitor the Lakes and the fishery to ensure that these crucial ecosystems stay healthy and productive.

The Center is the only agency that conducts multi-jurisdictional, lake-wide scientific assessments in the Lakes, and is crucial for protecting and preserving this incredible resource and economic driver.

Due to the unique governance structure of the Great Lakes, where there is no Federal water, NOAA, which normally manages fishery science, has no jurisdiction, and GLSC falls under the umbrella of the USGS.

Unfortunately, unlike coastal fishery management agencies, the GLSC has had to piece together funding from the USGS base appropriation since it has no formal authorization or dedicated line item. It has been forced to cobble together funding from three or four different sources within USGS every year, and as a result, has lagged far behind its peers in introducing 21st century technology to properly and effectively monitor the Lakes. In fact, its funding has even been raided and diverted to other projects, including to fossil fuel extraction research.

The Great Lakes Fishery and Research Authorization Act would fix this problem and give the GLSC the

dedicated funding it needs. This bipartisan bill, which, I will add, has more Republican than Democratic cosponsors, will correct the authorization and funding deficiencies in a transparent manner and in a way that puts the Great Lakes on par with other maritime environments in the Nation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, even though this is another wonderful program that already has three different agencies that do the same thing and they have the authority to do it, in the Christmas spirit—maybe the gentleman from Michigan will find the error of his ways—in the Christmas spirit, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend and I thank, too, Mr. QUIGLEY, who just spoke, as the two of us are the bipartisan sponsors of the Great Lakes Fisheries Authorization Act, and we are glad that it is part of this package.

And I rise, obviously, in support, Madam Chair, today for this package of bills to help protect our coast and the Great Lakes.

You know, in the southwest there is a saying, “Don't mess with Texas.” Well, as one that grew up on the shores of Lake Michigan, there is a saying that we have, too, “Don't mess with the Great Lakes.”

This issue is deeply personal. It is one of great importance to the Nation. Our Great Lakes hold 18 percent of the world's fresh water supply, covers some 9,000 miles of shoreline, and this helps generate over \$7 billion a year in sport and commercial fishing industry alone. This bill would authorize the U.S. Geological Survey Great Lakes Science Center to conduct science and research activities to support fishery management decisions in the Great Lakes.

Funds are going to be used to restore the loss of basic fishery science capabilities, accelerate the development of invasive species controls and the restoration of native species, and implement advanced autonomous and remote sensing technologies. Current authorizations for the U.S. Geological Survey Great Lakes Science Center is confusing and funding is often piece-meal. In the past, the funds have been diverted to other unrelated purposes and disrupted ongoing research. That has got to change.

With dedicated funding and clear authorization, the U.S. Geological Survey Great Lakes Science Center will, in fact, be able to better ensure the health of the Great Lakes ecosystem. This is going to help enhance our coastal resilience, restore fish habitat, and protect our important coastal economies.

I support the legislation.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the chair of the Natural Resources Committee Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, it is great to follow those warm, bipartisan remarks from my friend from Michigan, because, after all, even though you wouldn't know it from the ranking member's remarks, we are here to consider a package of bipartisan bills that provide commonsense, science-based solutions for issues facing our coastal communities. These bills reflect putting aside our differences and looking at the facts for the sake of our constituents in coastal economies around this country.

Last week, I attended the U.N. Climate Conference in Madrid. We were focused on international action on climate change, and specifically, the role of the oceans.

Because of climate change, coastal cities will be devastated from sea-level rise, and commercial fisheries could be either totally collapsed or moved beyond the reach of our coastal communities, all in my children's lifetimes.

So, yes, adaptation and mitigation will be costly, but the cost of doing nothing is exponentially higher. And the cost of inaction continues to increase every day that special interests concerned with keeping the status quo are put ahead of our oceans, our coasts, and future generations.

Now, this package of bills will provide tools and resources coastal communities need to prepare for the impacts of climate change and to protect local economies.

One section is based on my bill, the National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act. It updates the Sea Grant program to better respond to the needs of the coastal communities through research, education, and extension programs. It also helps develop the coastal and marine research and policy workforce that our country needs to respond to these challenges.

Reauthorizing this important program is critical. To date, the program has improved the resilience of 462 coastal communities. It has also been an incredibly successful program in terms of leveraging Federal resources with State and local funds to meet the growing needs of these communities.

Last year, Sea Grant's work supported over 7,000 jobs, over 1,500 businesses, and it resulted in \$624 million in economic benefits. This program consistently has bipartisan support because of its effectiveness and importance to communities around this country.

So, again, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, even though it has been said, you have already read it in some reports from the chairs of the committee of jurisdiction as well as the committee that could have sequential referral of this, that they approve adding some of the amendments we are going to be talking about later into this package. I think the same thing is actually having a

hearing and allowing members of those committees to have their will and say something.

The process is not to allow the chairman to determine what bills will or will not be added—what bills will or will not be. It is to allow the members of the committee to have that kind of input, and this process is eliminating that kind of input.

Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK). He knows more about this issue than the rest of us on the floor combined.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this measure. A collection of minor, flawed bills was presented to our Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife a few months ago, and instead of correcting the flaws, they have simply been repackaged and rebranded as a landmark climate change bill.

The net result is the climate is going to continue to change and our country will be about \$1.5 billion a year poorer for it.

Take, for example, H.R. 1023 included in this package, it creates a new Federal fishery monitoring program for the Great Lakes Basin. Well, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service already conduct similar fishery studies right now. Instead, this bill would task an agency that has little experience in fishery, science, and management, the U.S. Geological Survey, to do basically the same thing.

And this is especially baffling since we are currently paying NOAA some \$28 million a year for ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes research, and another \$2.9 million for interjurisdictional fisheries grants, which could be used for Great Lakes management and science.

Another measure is H.R. 2405, this reauthorizes NOAA's Sea Grant Program, bumping it \$10 million higher than currently appropriated, and then increasing that authorization by nearly 5 percent annually thereafter. This program is one that the President rightly sought to eliminate in his budget in order to free up funding for NOAA to complete its most important core functions.

Another bill in this package purports to modernize and enhance the Coastal Zone Management Act. This is my favorite. What it actually does is to place the seaside resort of Washington, D.C., into the Coastal Zone Management Act. Now, I don't deny that Washington is a world-class swamp, but it is not a coastal community, and placing it in a coastal zone doesn't make it one. What it does do is to rob legitimate coastal communities of funding and influence, and it opens the door to further encroachments as more and more inland cities seek to claim coastal zone status.

Another measure thrown into this package is H.R. 3115. This bill, which never had a hearing and was rushed

through markup, costs over \$631 million and inserts Federal priorities into coastal zone management, which counters the CZMA's original intention of assessing coastal management needs according to the unique and diverse conditions and desires of the communities along our coast.

□ 1500

Another measure thrown into this package is H.R. 1314, which reauthorizes the Integrated Ocean Observing System. Now, this system is good. It provides data to coastal communities and local fishermen on weather conditions. It is critical. So far, so good.

But then it follows up on very good public policy with very bad fiscal policy by providing open, limitless authorization of funds for the program. It should be amended to set specific authorization limits, as Senate versions of the measure have done.

Madam Chair, I fail to see how this package would provide new benefits to coastal States other than, apparently, the coastal community of Washington, D.C. Further, NOAA already does most of the work that this package claims to authorize. This is duplicative and wasteful of our resources at a time when the Nation is running dangerously high deficits.

And, as I said, it is going to require another \$1.4 billion of Federal spending; that is about \$11 from the earnings of every family in the country. I think that is an expensive press release for something that does so little that we are not already doing.

And, with that, I would ask that the bill be rejected.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a valued member of our Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, Americans depend on their oceans. In Lowcountry, the ocean drives our tourism economy and is integral to who we are, which is why we need bold action to protect our coastal communities from the growing threats of sea level rise and storms, increasing both in frequency and severity.

H.R. 729 is an important step in this direction and will empower coastal communities to better prepare for and respond to our rapidly changing coastlines. It will promote development of climate-resilient shorelines that protect our coasts from storms and improve fish and wildlife habitats. It will shore up working waterfronts, which face their own challenges caused by a changing environment.

H.R. 729 will be a lifeline to our coastal communities at a time when they need it most, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical legislation.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, there is a reason that the Digital Coast Act is bipartisan and bicameral: We all have a stake in protecting our shorelines.

Our country's 95,000 miles of shoreline—not just our oceans, but our rivers, streams, and lakes—are home to more than 42 percent of our country's population and millions of businesses that supply most of our gross domestic product.

Unfortunately, current coastal maps and geospatial data are woefully inadequate, outdated, or even nonexistent.

My bill, the Digital Coast Act, which is part of this package, will allow professionals at NOAA to begin a comprehensive mapping process of our Nation's fragile shorelines.

Coastal communities will be able to use the data to better prepare for storms, manage floods, restore ecosystems, and plan smarter developments near America's coasts, harbors, ports, and shorelines.

NOAA will train decisionmakers at the local and State level on how to use the datasets to answer questions about storm surge, erosion, and water level trends. The data will also be available on NOAA's website for free and easy public access, so every citizen can leverage the expertise of the Federal Government.

Every day, planners in our hometowns are asking questions, such as, what is the storm surge in this community, how much is the bluff going to erode, or what are the water level trends at the marina where we want to build a new dock?

I represent Maryland, home of the Chesapeake Bay, which provides \$1 trillion to the economies of its watershed. So, protecting the shores of the bay means protecting jobs.

The bill's Republican cosponsor, Mr. DON YOUNG, represents Alaska, a State with 44,000 miles of coastline. There, they rely on their shipping channels for goods from the lower 48 States. They need mapping for search and rescue operations and to support the fishing industry, which is their largest private-sector employer.

The Digital Coast Act will arm local planners and managers with the high-tech data they need to make smart decisions and investments that could save people's lives.

In addition to the bill's Republican cosponsor, Congressman YOUNG, I would like to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Ranking Member BISHOP for their hard work on this package, even though I understand Ranking Member BISHOP has some issues. And I also would like to thank Senators TAMMY BALDWIN and LISA MURKOWSKI for championing the bill in the Senate.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland. He has got a good bill. It should be a suspension. We wouldn't even ask for a vote for it. There is nothing wrong that.

Mr. KILMER's H.R. 729 is a good, decent bill. What is so sad is the Democrats have decided to take these two decent bills that should be suspensions and hold them as hostage to tack a whole bunch of other really crappy stuff on with them as well, and that is the sad part of this.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding the time.

I rise today in support of the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act, H.R. 729. I also rise as a proud Floridian and as the chair of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. Our select committee is tasked with developing a climate action plan in the coming months.

Communities across America are grappling with the rising costs of the climate crisis. Here in Congress, we are working to be good partners with our neighbors and communities back home and provide the tools they need to take care of America's diverse and vital coastal communities.

That is why, last month, I visited two of my colleagues in south Florida, Congresswoman DONNA SHALALA and Congresswoman DEBBIE MUCARSEL-POWELL—they are in the Florida Keys and Miami Beach—to see how their communities are responding to climate change. Here we are with Lad Akins of the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation. They are doing a lot, but we have to do more.

Across the Keys and Miami Beach, and all across this great country, local officials are taking bold action to adapt to sea level rise and make their communities more resilient, but they need our help.

That is why Congress must ramp up bold climate legislation, like this bill, which includes 10 separate measures to help coastal communities become more resilient.

One of these bills will create a grant program for coastal communities to create living shorelines. Another will expand the use of climate data, which is so vital to determining how we are going to mitigate and how we are going to adapt.

This Congress will continue to act on the climate crisis. Next spring, our select committee will release a bold climate action plan, which will serve as a roadmap for committees to take additional action.

But Chairman GRIJALVA and the Natural Resources Committee are ahead of the game, and I want to thank him and his committee members and professional staff for their deep commitment to America and the places we hold dear as we work to tackle the rising cost of climate.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) so he can

once again explain how there are three good bills in this package and a whole lot of other bad ones.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, as we heard in the Rules Committee debate yesterday, this package of bills before us is the first major package put forth by House Democrats to solve the climate crisis that we hear about daily.

Many House Democrats ran their last elections on the platform of putting forth real, tangible solutions to this situation. Unfortunately, they have not lived up to those promises and are letting their constituents down with this package.

As Ranking Member BISHOP mentioned, this package is a hodgepodge of provisions that reinstate current Federal authorities, all to the tune of nearly 1.4 billion taxpayer dollars.

Let's examine just a few of the provisions in this bill:

Section 102 authorizes a Living Shoreline Grant Program. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, "The agency currently provides financial and technical assistance to coastal communities for the use of living shorelines through existing programs." CBO estimates that this provision will cost American taxpayers \$300 million.

Section 103 authorizes the Working Waterfronts Grant Program. According to NOAA, "Under the CZMA, coastal States have the discretion to use funding for many of the purposes that would be addressed by the Working Waterfronts Grant Program." The CBO estimates this provision will cost American taxpayers upwards of \$23 million.

Section 106 authorizes coastal climate change adaptation planning and preparedness grants. According to NOAA, under the CZMA, coastal States already have the discretion to use funding to develop and implement adaptation plans. CBO estimates that this provision will cost American taxpayers upwards of \$114 million.

Subtitle A of title II authorizes the National Fish Habitat Conservation Through Partnerships program, at a cost to American taxpayers of nearly \$40 million. Supporters of this provision have stated its great success, which is very true. However, this program has been successfully leveraging Federal and State funds since 2006, all under existing Federal funding. That leads me to question why we are now authorizing an additional \$40 million for something that we have already been spending on since 2006.

Ultimately, this package is a deceitful attempt to act on climate policy. Democrats have promised sweeping policy reforms and under-delivered in a major way. I would urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise to support H.R. 729.

I thank Congressman CASE for yielding to me and call attention to the

Great Lakes Fishery Research Authorization Act, which authorizes the U.S. Geological Service Science Center for the Great Lakes and commend Congressman QUIGLEY for his hard work on the legislation.

This service protects the Great Lakes Fishery from voracious, destructive, invasive species that threaten the integrity of our entire Great Lakes system.

Today, in our district, the Geological Service is leading the charge to identify and contain grass carp, a pernicious invasive whose population threatens to explode but for the work of the Federal science agencies.

Every day, our country sits in neutral with inadequate direction to the Geological Service we allow invasive species to undermine the multibillion-dollar Great Lakes Fishery.

The Great Lakes have come a long way since the Cuyahoga River caught fire 60 years ago and since has healed, but we have a long way to go.

With this authorization, the Geological Service will be able to conduct deepwater ecosystem science to help us better understand fish movement and behavior; and, for my district, which contains the most productive, shallowest, and warmest \$7 billion fishery of the Great Lakes, the western basin of Lake Erie, the service's work protects the region's priceless ecological and economic future.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 729.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the chair of the full Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, last week, I was honored to attend the United Nations Climate Change Conference with Speaker PELOSI and my Democratic colleagues in Congress.

That conference focused on the urgent need to prevent climate change from destroying our oceans. The consensus is clear: Oceans across the planet are already being damaged, and coastal communities everywhere are hurting.

At the conference, we were asked how we plan to respond to the climate crisis. We could either plan now and build a sustainable future or delay and pay a very, very heavy price. To me, that was an easy choice.

While we need to end our dependence on fossil fuels, we also need to plan for the impacts we already know are coming for millions of Americans.

This package of bills does that. Forty percent of Americans live in coastal counties. From fishing to shipping to recreation and tourism, American jobs depend on healthy, resilient coasts. These communities need the tools to protect themselves.

We need to support our coastal communities in their adaptation and resilience planning, especially indigenous and disadvantaged communities that are often most at risk. We need to sup-

port all these communities and fund adaptation and coastal planning that will protect these communities and their ways of life.

This bipartisan package, led by Members from across the country and across the aisle, will help communities on the front lines of climate change prepare for and respond to the impacts of climate change that endanger livelihoods, communities, and ecosystems.

I commend the many sponsors on this important work and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 729.

□ 1515

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding. I thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his work on this committee, and I thank the ranking member even though we don't seem to agree on too much about this bill.

I rise today in support of H.R. 729, which includes my bipartisan bill to protect America's working waterfronts at a time when environmental pressures and rapid development threaten their future. More than 30,000 Mainers rely on marine-related industries for their livelihoods. Yet out of 5,000 miles of coastline, just 20 miles of workable waterfront remain in our State.

Coastal communities across the country are feeling that same squeeze. Further reducing our usable coastline will adversely impact everything from aquaculture and boatbuilding to coastal tourism and commercial fishing.

My bill will help to reverse this disturbing nationwide trend of shrinking waterfronts. It will protect jobs and preserve the character of coastal communities. It establishes a working waterfronts grant program and a 5-year loan fund pilot program for waterfront preservation. It sets up a task force within the Department of Commerce to identify and prioritize critical needs for the Nation's working waterfronts.

Through the task force, the bill will also help communities identify and mitigate the impacts of the climate crisis. At a time when 42 percent of Americans live in coastal communities, this task force is not only a vital planning measure for today, it will support the generations who will follow us.

For 8 years, House leadership on the other side stalled critical initiatives like this one to address the climate crisis. The scope and severity of this crisis require comprehensive action. Though my bill addresses just one small piece, it will make all the difference for communities in my State and across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of working waterfronts and vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 90 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act, which includes legislation to improve ocean data collection and information sharing between Federal agencies and coastal observation partners.

Our coastal communities rely on accurate ocean data and monitoring for information about ocean acidification, harmful algal blooms and hypoxia forecasting, tsunami preparedness, navigation, and port security.

I worked with my fellow co-chair of the House Oceans Caucus, DON YOUNG, to reintroduce the Integrated Coastal Ocean Observing System Act, which is included in this bill and will allow the Integrated Ocean Observing System to strengthen its work using satellites, buoys, underwater gliders, and tide gauges to deliver accurate and continuous data on our oceans and coasts.

Mapping the ocean floor is expected to be a top priority as the United Nations' Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development begins in 2021. We must strengthen investments in the Integrated Ocean Observing System and ocean monitoring so we can meaningfully contribute to these efforts.

I thank my colleague from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership on this issue, and I thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his support. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, one of the things that the other side has been talking about is how we need a vision and need to plan for the future, which is true. The only problem is that the stuff we have before us isn't it. This is a collection of minor programs that already exist and changing them in ways that sometimes make no difference but sometimes have some negative counterpoints.

There is one bill that was just talked about here that if there is a default on that bill, all of the sudden now, the Federal Government is on the hook to pay for that. It was never that way before.

Those are minor changes that if we were handling these bills separately, if they were actually being done in an appropriate way, we could talk about those minor changes in there. But once you put them all together in a package with a couple of really good things to lead the way, everything kind of falls in place.

Let me give you another example. One of the issues that comes in the folderol of bills that are underneath this is the Sea Grant Fellowship Program, which is currently discretionary. This bill would make it mandatory. Sounds kind of nice.

The program places fellows in the executive branch. We have no problem with that whatsoever, but what this bill would do, one of the things in the weeds of this concoction of bills that has been cobbled together, is it would use taxpayer dollars to supply free staff for Members of Congress. That concept is just plain wrong.

The underlying program is not bad. Reauthorizing is not bad. That one change in there is wrong. If we were doing these bill-by-bill, talking about them one-by-one instead of trying to add them all together in a big package of nothing, if we were dealing with that, we could be talking about those specific issues and making those kinds of decisions.

That is the way legislation ought to be done. This is not the way legislation ought to be done.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I want to assure the ranking member that the program I am discussing does not already exist, but it should.

I rise today to express my strong support for the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act, which includes the text of my bill, the District of Columbia Flood Prevention Act of 2019. I thank my friend Natural Resources Committee chair RAÚL GRIJALVA and Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee chair JARED HUFFMAN for including my bill in this legislation.

This legislation would amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to include the Nation's capital in the definition of "coastal state." Our bill would correct an apparent oversight in the omission of the District of Columbia from the CZMA and would make the District eligible to receive Federal coastal zone management funding, including flood mitigation and prevention funds for the Nation's capital.

Importantly, the District is located on two rivers, the Anacostia and the Potomac, which are tidally influenced and show tangible salt water effects and fish and are a part of an intertidal-zone existing between high and low maritime tides. D.C. has suffered substantial coastal floods in the past and has also experienced numerous instances of riverine and interior flooding, such as the massive flood of 2006, which flooded Constitution Avenue and caused millions of dollars in damage to the National Archives, the Internal Revenue Service, and other Federal buildings.

Despite these factors, D.C. was omitted from the list of eligible States and territories in the CZMA. The oversight probably occurred because the CZMA was passed in 1972 before the District achieved home rule. Because territories are included in the definition of "coastal states" under the CZMA, it appears that the District omission is a mistake which only Congress can correct.

I appreciate the gentleman for including my bill in this bill.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act. This strong, bipartisan package is a combination of months of work in the Natural Resources Committee. It includes many key priorities for the Great Lakes region, including Representative QUIGLEY's Great Lakes Fishery Research Authorization Act.

This bipartisan legislation will strengthen our understanding of Great Lakes fisheries and provide additional resources for research into the Great Lakes Basin's fisheries and biology.

Cutting-edge technologies authorized by the Great Lakes Fishery Research Reauthorization Act will enable scientists to deliver near-real-time data on quickly emerging crises, such as potential fisheries crashes or new and very unwelcome invasive species like the Asian carp.

Additionally, the package includes key sportsmen's priorities like the National Fish Habitat Conservation Through Partnerships Act, which builds off State- and locally led joint ventures to better conserve wildlife and fish habitats.

As one of the co-chairs of the Great Lakes Task Force here in Congress, I urge all of my colleagues to support these important provisions and vote in favor of the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Madam Chair, I was sitting in my office in a meeting and looked up at the TV screen on C-SPAN, and I watched our distinguished chairman put up a chart that said that for every \$1 you invest in proactive predisaster mitigation, you get \$6 in cost savings.

I was somewhat shocked because I have used that statistic over and over again, and I have also used the statistic that the Congressional Budget Office has a study that says you get \$3 in cost savings for every \$1 you invest. The Corps of Engineers has a study that says you get \$7.92 for every \$1 you invest. The National Institutes for Building Standards says you get \$11 in cost savings for every \$1 you invest.

You know what? Every single time I have tried to do this, my good friend has voted against me—every single time.

This bill is designed to send out press releases. Let me be clear: Right now, we have well over \$100 billion in resiliency projects that are needed across the Nation. Just last year, under a Republican Congress, we put tens of billions of dollars into funding those resiliency projects through the Corps of Engineers, through FEMA. So taking an existing program that manages our coastal resources and expanding the eligibility, expanding the uses of funding without adding new funds, all that is doing is further complicating the

very mission that the majority is trying to achieve.

The bill goes on further to give USGS permanent authority, or at least authorizing them over the long-term, for fisheries management—you know, USGS, our fisheries agency. No, they don't manage fisheries. That would be NOAA.

This program also takes funds and does a set-aside of authorization for Tribes under a coastal zone. We have learned over and over again that the way that you manage your coastal resources is by integrated management, not by breaking it up further and further into smaller and smaller pieces.

We already have 35 coastal States and territories. We need to have integrated management. We don't need to have Louisiana doing something to mess up Mississippi or Texas. We need to make sure that we are looking at it holistically as a Nation.

I have been one of the biggest advocates in this Congress for being proactive and making investments in our communities. I represent south Louisiana, one of the most disaster-impacted areas in our entire Nation. The people I represent have been through it all, Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, Isaac. We have had high water on the Mississippi River 4 years of the last 6, record high water draining from Montana to New York to Canada on down.

This is not the right approach. This is a flawed approach.

I can't even believe I am standing here. My friends have voted against me every single time we have tried to do thoughtful, integrated approaches to protect our coastal communities, protect our ecological resources. To come in and do this in a partisan manner and do it in a way that is totally hypocritical over previous actions is ridiculous.

Madam Chair, I urge rejection of this bill and ask that we sit down in a bipartisan manner and work out bipartisan solutions.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

What the gentleman from Louisiana was saying is exactly right. Actually, he had an amendment that could have helped with that problem that was not made in order by our crack Rules Committee. I am sure if he would promise to shave next time he speaks, they probably would make it in order the next time we have this bill.

□ 1530

Not only are there a lot of bills that are basically meaningless because the authority is already there, there are a few situations simply when the new additions to it do not make sense.

One of the speakers in here was talking about one of the coastal zone management amendments to add Washington, D.C., to the coastal zone management plan, which would be good except that, first of all, Washington, D.C., is not a State, and, secondly, it is not even a coastal State.

It would actually make more sense to have my hometown, because at least we are on the Great Salt Lake and have brackish water that could be included in part of this thing.

It also would make a problem of simply reducing the total amount of funds that go to the 35 States that actually have their programs already here. It is not a problem for Utah. We are not part of it. But those States that have coasts, they will have their programs reduced because of this.

More importantly, it provides jurisdictional problems in how the city of Washington, D.C., would interface with the Federal Government.

Now, those are not insurmountable problems, but they should have been worked out, and they could have been worked out if you are actually dealing with these things in a logical, sequential way instead of lumping them all together into some kind of overall program that actually doesn't necessarily meet the guidelines of what we are trying to accomplish.

But, as I said, there are three of these bills that are in here that could easily have gone in suspension. We would have done it.

There is another bill in here that, had one amendment been made, it would have easily solved the problem, and it should have been done.

But for the bulk of these bills—minor changes in here, but the bulk of these bills can actually be done under current statutory authority.

As we had testimony from NOAA, on one of the bills, they simply said the agency already provides financial and technical assistance through existing programs. There was no reason to add that particular bill to this list.

Another one that was on this list that tries to do the CZMA, under their authority, States have discretion to use funding for many of the purposes of the working waterfronts grant program that were proposed by this particular bill. They can do it now. There is no additional authority that is needed.

Then, another one of the bills that is part of this falderal of legislation under one umbrella said that the coastal States already have discretion to use funding to develop and implement adoption plans, and they gave a specific example of how one of the States that does use that, NOAA gave the example of how that flexibility already exists.

But we are saying over and over again, one of the problems we have with this is that you have taken one really decent bill by Mr. KILMER, a couple of others that should have easily been in suspensions, and have used them as a hostage to add up a whole bunch of other stuff to it.

Then, if you look at some of the amendments that were made in order, obviously, when you take other bills that have not had hearings, they haven't gone through the process, we are going to try and now add them on to this, well, why would anyone want

to do that, except we are giving the illusion of getting something done.

And this is the only game in town that is going through, so why not try and put as many bills as you can? That way, somebody could stand up and say, "Look, we just passed 16 bills. Wouldn't it be nice if the Senate picked them up?"

Well, that is not the way we are doing it. We are adding 16 bills. Most of them have no Senate counterpart. Most of them will never be done in the Senate. If the Senate actually deals with this issue at all, they are going to separate it and divide it up and do it piecemeal, which is the way we should have done it in the first particular place.

If this package of bills is really a philosophy, a vision of the future of what we are going to do to make either the air better or the climate safer or water more drinkable, it doesn't happen in this bill.

These things are simply a retread of ideas that, in reality, the authority they are trying to develop is actually already in existence. They are doing it. Except that every once in awhile, in one of these bills, you will add a little tweak here or a little tweak there that basically is something that is wrong, that it should not be doing:

Creating a program to provide interns for our offices without having it come out of our own budgets, that is not a great idea, but it is in here;

Creating new areas for something that is not a State, that is not even a coastal State, so they can get part of that money, that is not a great idea, but it is part of it that is in here.

Those are the things that, if we did things per regular order, if we actually tried to be logical about taking a bill and discussing it and then coming up with a solution to some of the problems, we could easily do that in a bipartisan way.

But we don't do that. Instead, we just lump everything together in one package in an effort to say, "Look, we are being productive." But we are not solving a problem. We are not doing anything that is moving the ball forward. All we are doing is checking a box, saying, yes, we were here on this particular day, and giving the illusion of some kind of activity.

What we really need is activity. What we really need is to get on with things that are of significance that should have been done well before now, like the NDAA and the trade treaty and our budget and the backlog maintenance bill. All of those things should be done, but they are not being scheduled.

And still we are coming up with a series of bills that don't make the case; they are not ready for prime time.

This is a package that we will send over to the Senate, if indeed it is passed in here, and it will be ignored or it will be stripped apart; and we will be asking the Senate to do what we should have done in the first place: taking these things in a logical, se-

quential way, trying to solve some of the major problems that are there.

And reauthorizing something that is already in existence doesn't need to actually be something we spend our time doing that particular thing.

So, actually, in the spirit of Christmas, you'll be sorry if you are actually going to vote for this. Only if you spell "you'll," Y-U-L-E, and then it can be a pun.

Is the gentleman satisfied?

Madam Chair, this is fun.

This is not a solution. This is not a vision. This is not anything that really moves us forward. This is something that should have and could have been done in a much, much better way.

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, first of all, I thank the members of my majority who rose in favor of this bill as well as the few members of the minority who did as well.

And I again thank the 24 Republicans who supported a portion of this bill that is at least a start on the challenge of our time: climate change and the impacts on our oceans, on our coastlines, and on our lakes.

The ranking member complains on several fronts. The first front he complains on is that this is just an illusion, that this is just moving the ball nowhere at all.

I completely reject that. I completely reject the notion that strengthening our Federal programs that are directly related to resiliency of our coastlines, that are directly related to good science applied to our oceans and lakes, that are directly related to finding good, solid public-private partnerships to address the incredible negative impacts of climate change and other causes on our oceans and coastlines is not moving the ball forward.

In fact, I would suggest that the illusion we are talking about is the illusion that the ranking member cares at all about these issues because, if you look at the record of addressing these issues under the Republican majority, that record is zero. They have not moved any balls forward whatsoever.

And further, pardon me for distrusting the current administration, because the ranking member complains that NOAA and other Federal agencies are already exercising flexibility on many of these programs—fine. Administrative flexibility is one thing, and all power to good people and NOAA who are trying to do the right thing, but that is different from a congressional mandate to do something.

The reason for the concern is staring us in the face. Every year of this administration, there have been proposed disastrous budget cuts to NOAA and other ocean-related programs. For the current fiscal year, 2020, a cut of 18 percent was restored by the House majority: cuts to eliminate or severely decrease funding to our critical ocean

and coastal programs, Sea Grant, coastal zone management, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, hydrographic surveys and ocean observing, climate change research, programs that manage coral reefs and marine mammals and sea turtles, and many more.

So pardon me if we are distrustful of this administration or of future administrations on severely restricting the flexibility that these programs have to administer critical needs for not only our country, but our world.

Pardon me, but it is a congressional mandate in these areas that is really necessary.

The ranking member and his colleagues complain that we are not advancing climate change by a step. If they want to advance climate change with us, then join us in a major climate change initiative; join us in returning to the Paris climate accord; join us across the board.

The ranking member complains that no due consideration was given to these many bills. In fact, these bills were heard; they were discussed; and, with the exception of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), there were no Republican amendments offered to any of these bills.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) complains that we should not spend more on our oceans, lakes, and coastal cities; we should not anticipate disaster mitigation. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) argues that, in fact, there is not a positive cost benefit in these programs and their funding going forward.

The citation for that information is the National Institute of Building Sciences, based on 23 years' worth of data from FEMA, the Economic Development Administration, and HUD.

Investments upfront for the impacts of climate change and other man-made causation to our oceans and lakes and coastlines is, in fact, a major return to not only our communities, but to all parts of our country.

The gentleman complains, and the minority would have you believe, that this is a mandatory increase of over \$1 billion in Federal funding. It is not. It is discretionary, in large part, to the Appropriations Committee.

So, as we go into the amendment process, I appreciate my colleagues' support, and I truly hope that this can be a bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I commend my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee and the authors of the bill's various provisions and amendments for their work on H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act. I am proud to support this critical bill aimed at equipping coastal and great lakes communities with the tools they need to enhance resiliency planning efforts; implement forward-thinking solutions to address intense climate impacts; and ensure a cleaner, safer, and more sustainable future.

Orange County is ground zero for the climate crisis. Families living on the coast know

that rising sea-levels, frequent flooding, coastal erosion, and increasingly severe weather events are a clear and present danger to our lives and livelihoods. This legislation protects and preserves coastline, helps communities create and enact resiliency measures, and improves ocean monitoring and research. Climate change is here, and we must continue to take bold and swift action to protect coastal communities.

The first of my two amendments to the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement act authorizes a prize competition to stimulate innovation to advance coastal risk and resilience measures. My second amendment requires the development of a catalog of research on applicable coastal risk reduction and resilience measures to evaluate effectiveness, eliminate redundancies, encourage cooperation, and make research findings available to the public. These amendments strengthen the underlying bill, and I appreciate the opportunity to offer to advocate for the millions of Americans who live and work in coastal communities.

I urge adoption of my amendments to this important piece of legislation and final passage of the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chair, I rise to express my strong support for the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act (H.R. 729), which contains a number of important provisions, including the text of my bill, the District of Columbia Flood Prevention Act of 2019 (H.R. 2185). I thank my friend, Natural Resources Committee Chair RAÚL GRIJALVA, and Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee Chair JARED HUFFMAN, for including my bill in this legislation. This legislation would amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA) to include the nation's capital in the definition of "coastal state." Our bill would correct an apparent oversight in the omission of the District of Columbia from the CZMA and would make the District eligible to receive federal coastal zone management funding, including flood mitigation and prevention funds.

Importantly, the District is located on two rivers, the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, which are tidally influenced and show tangible salt water effects (and fish) and are part of an "intertidal-zone" existing between high and low maritime tides. D.C. has suffered substantial coastal floods in the past and has also experienced numerous instances of riverine and interior flooding, such as the massive flood of 2006 which flooded Constitution Avenue and caused millions of dollars in damage to the National Archives, the Internal Revenue Service and other federal buildings.

Despite these factors, D.C. was omitted from the list of eligible states and territories in the CZMA. This oversight probably occurred because the CZMA was passed in 1972—before the District achieved home rule. Because territories are included in the definition of "coastal states" under the CZMA, it appears that D.C.'s omission is a mistake, which only Congress can correct.

A member of the other side complained that the District should not be included in the bill. However, scientists have predicted that the tides on the Atlantic Coast could rise two to four feet by the year 2100, causing private and federal property worth as much as \$7 billion in the District to be routinely under threat by floodwaters. Because of these factors, the

District should be eligible under the CZMA, just like the states and territories already listed in the CZMA.

I urge support for this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-40 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 729

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

SECTION 1. FRONT MATTER.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act".

(b) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

Sec. 1. Front matter.

TITLE I—COASTAL RESILIENCE AND ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT

Sec. 101. Grants to further achievement of tribal coastal zone objectives.

Sec. 102. Living Shoreline Grant Program.

Sec. 103. Working Waterfronts Grant Program.

Sec. 104. Working Waterfronts Preservation Fund; grants.

Sec. 105. Eligibility of District of Columbia for Federal funding under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

Sec. 106. Climate change preparedness in the coastal zone.

TITLE II—FISHERY RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—National Fish Habitat Conservation Through Partnerships

Sec. 201. Purpose.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Sec. 203. National Fish Habitat Board.

Sec. 204. Fish Habitat Partnerships.

Sec. 205. Fish Habitat Conservation Projects.

Sec. 206. Technical and scientific assistance.

Sec. 207. Coordination with States and Indian Tribes.

Sec. 208. Interagency Operational Plan.

Sec. 209. Accountability and reporting.

Sec. 210. Effect of this subtitle.

Sec. 211. Nonapplicability of Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Sec. 212. Funding.

Sec. 213. Prohibition against implementation of regulatory authority by Federal agencies through Partnerships.

Subtitle B—Great Lakes Fishery Research Authorization

Sec. 214. Definitions.

Sec. 215. Findings.

Sec. 216. Great Lakes monitoring, assessment, science, and research.

Sec. 217. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—MEETING 21ST CENTURY OCEAN AND COASTAL DATA NEEDS**Subtitle A—Digital Coast**Sec. 301. **Findings.**Sec. 302. **Definitions.**Sec. 303. **Establishment of the Digital Coast.****Subtitle B—Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System**Sec. 304. **Staggered terms for National Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Advisory Committee.**Sec. 305. **Integrated coastal and ocean observation system cooperative agreements.**Sec. 306. **Reauthorization of Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009.****TITLE IV—NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS**Sec. 401. **References to the National Sea Grant College Program Act.**Sec. 402. **Modification of Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship.**Sec. 403. **Modification of authority of Secretary of Commerce to accept donations for National Sea Grant College Program.**Sec. 404. **Repeal of requirement for report on coordination of oceans and coastal research activities.**Sec. 405. **Reduction in frequency required for National Sea Grant Advisory Board report.**Sec. 406. **Modification of elements of National Sea Grant College Program.**Sec. 407. **Direct hire authority; Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship.**Sec. 408. **Authorization of appropriations for National Sea Grant College Program.**Sec. 409. **Technical corrections.****TITLE I—COASTAL RESILIENCE AND ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT****SEC. 101. GRANTS TO FURTHER ACHIEVEMENT OF TRIBAL COASTAL ZONE OBJECTIVES.**(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:**“SEC. 320. GRANTS TO FURTHER ACHIEVEMENT OF TRIBAL COASTAL ZONE OBJECTIVES.**“(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary may award competitive grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of the objectives of such Tribe for its Tribal coastal zone.**“(b) COST SHARE.**—“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out with a grant under this section shall be—

“(A) in the case of a grant of less than \$200,000, 100 percent of such cost; and

“(B) in the case of a grant of \$200,000 or more, 95 percent of such cost, except as provided in paragraph (2).

“(2) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a grant to an Indian Tribe, or otherwise reduce the portion of the share of the cost of an activity required to be paid by an Indian Tribe under such paragraph, if the Secretary determines that the Tribe does not have sufficient funds to pay such portion.“(c) **COMPATIBILITY.**—The Secretary may not award a grant under this section unless the Secretary determines that the activities to be carried out with the grant are compatible with this title and that the grantee has consulted with the affected coastal state regarding the grant objectives and purposes.“(d) **AUTHORIZED OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSES.**—Amounts awarded as a grant under this section shall be used for one or more of the objectives and purposes authorized under subsections (b) and (c), respectively, of section 306A.“(e) **FUNDING.**—Of amounts appropriated to carry out this Act, \$5,000,000 is authorized to carry out this section for each fiscal year.**“(f) DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:“(1) **INDIAN LAND.**—The term ‘Indian land’ has the meaning that term has under section 2601 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501).“(2) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term ‘Indian Tribe’ means an Indian tribe, as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).“(3) **TRIBAL COASTAL ZONE.**—The term ‘Tribal coastal zone’ means any Indian land of an Indian Tribe that is within the coastal zone.“(4) **TRIBAL COASTAL ZONE OBJECTIVE.**—The term ‘Tribal coastal zone objective’ means, with respect to an Indian Tribe, any of the following objectives:

“(A) Protection, restoration, or preservation of areas in the Tribal coastal zone of such Tribe that hold—

“(i) important ecological, cultural, or sacred significance for such Tribe; or

“(ii) traditional, historic, and esthetic values essential to such Tribe.

“(B) Preparing and implementing a special area management plan and technical planning for important coastal areas.

“(C) Any coastal or shoreline stabilization measure, including any mitigation measure, for the purpose of public safety, public access, or cultural or historical preservation.”.

(b) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall issue guidance for the program established under the amendment made by subsection (a), including the criteria for awarding grants under such program based on consultation with Indian Tribes (as that term is defined in that amendment).(c) **USE OF STATE GRANTS TO FULFILL TRIBAL OBJECTIVES.**—Section 306A(c)(2) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1455a(c)(2)) is amended by striking ‘and’ after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting ‘; and’, and by adding at the end the following:

“(F) fulfilling any Tribal coastal zone objective (as that term is defined in section 320).”.

(d) **OTHER PROGRAMS NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the ability of an Indian Tribe to apply for, receive assistance under, or participate in any program authorized by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) or other related Federal laws.**SEC. 102. LIVING SHORELINE GRANT PROGRAM.**(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator shall make grants to eligible entities for purposes of—

(1) designing and implementing large- and small-scale, climate-resilient living shoreline projects; and

(2) applying innovative uses of natural materials and systems to protect coastal communities, habitats, and natural system functions.

(b) **PROJECT PROPOSALS.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall—

(1) submit to the Administrator a proposal for a living shoreline project, including monitoring, data collection, and measurable performance criteria with respect to the project; and

(2) demonstrate to the Administrator that the entity has any permits or other authorizations from local, State, and Federal government agencies necessary to carry out the living shoreline project or provide evidence demonstrating general support from such agencies.

(c) PROJECT SELECTION.—(1) **DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA.**—The Administrator shall select eligible entities to receive grants under this section based on criteria developed by the Administrator, in consultation with relevant offices of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, such as the

Office of Habitat Conservation, the Office for Coastal Management, and the Restoration Center.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In developing criteria under paragraph (1) to evaluate a proposed living shoreline project, the Administrator shall take into account—

(A) the potential of the project to protect the community and maintain the viability of the environment, such as through protection of ecosystem functions, environmental benefits, or habitat types, in the area where the project is to be carried out;

(B) the historic and future environmental conditions of the project site, particularly those environmental conditions affected by climate change;

(C) the ecological benefits of the project; and

(D) the ability of the entity proposing the project to demonstrate the potential of the project to protect the coastal community where the project is to be carried out, including through—

(i) mitigating the effects of erosion;

(ii) attenuating the impact of coastal storms and storm surge;

(iii) mitigating shoreline flooding;

(iv) mitigating the effects of sea level rise, accelerated land loss, and extreme tides;

(v) sustaining, protecting, or restoring the functions and habitats of coastal ecosystems; or

(vi) such other forms of coastal protection as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(3) **PRIORITY.**—In selecting living shoreline projects to receive grants under this section, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to a proposed project to be conducted in an area—

(A) for which the President has declared, during the 10-year period preceding the submission of the proposal for the project under subsection (b), that major disaster exists pursuant to section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) because of a hurricane, tropical storm, coastal storm, or flooding; or

(B) that has a documented history of coastal erosion or frequent coastal inundation during that 10-year period.

(4) MINIMUM STANDARDS.—(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall develop minimum standards to be used in selecting eligible entities to receive grants under this section, taking into account—

(i) the considerations described in paragraph (2); and

(ii) the need for such standards to be general enough to accommodate concerns relating to specific project sites.

(B) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing standards under subparagraph (A), the Administrator—

(i) shall consult with relevant offices of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, such as the Office of Habitat Conservation, the Office for Coastal Management, and the Restoration Center; and

(ii) may consult with—

(I) relevant interagency councils, such as the Estuary Habitat Restoration Council;

(II) State coastal management agencies; and

(III) relevant nongovernmental organizations.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—A grant awarded under this section to an eligible entity to carry out a living shoreline project may be used by the eligible entity only—

(1) to carry out the project, including administration, design, permitting, entry into negotiated indirect cost rate agreements, and construction; and

(2) to monitor, collect, and report data on the performance (including performance over time) of the project, in accordance with standards issued by the Administrator under subsection (f)(2).

(e) COST-SHARING.—(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section to carry out a living shoreline

project shall provide, from non-Federal sources, funds or other resources (such as land or conservation easements or in-kind matching from private entities) valued at not less than 50 percent of the total cost, including administrative costs, of the project.

(2) REDUCED MATCHING REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN COMMUNITIES.—The Administrator may reduce or waive the matching requirement under paragraph (1) for an eligible entity representing a community or nonprofit organization if—

(A) the eligible entity submits to the Administrator in writing—

(i) a request for such a reduction and the amount of the reduction; and

(ii) a justification for why the entity cannot meet the matching requirement; and

(B) the Administrator agrees with the justification.

(F) MONITORING AND REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall require each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section (or a representative of the entity) to carry out a living shoreline project—

(A) to transmit to the Administrator data collected under the project;

(B) to monitor the project and to collect data on—

(i) the ecological benefits of the project and the protection provided by the project for the coastal community where the project is carried out, including through—

(I) mitigating the effects of erosion;

(II) attenuating the impact of coastal storms and storm surge;

(III) mitigating shoreline flooding;

(IV) mitigating the effects of sea level rise, accelerated land loss, and extreme tides;

(V) sustaining, protecting, or restoring the functions and habitats of coastal ecosystems; or

(VI) such other forms of coastal protection as the Administrator considers appropriate; and

(ii) the performance of the project in providing such protection;

(C) to make data collected under the project available on a publicly accessible internet website of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(D) not later than one year after the entity receives the grant, and annually thereafter until the completion of the project, to submit to the Administrator a report on—

(i) the measures described in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) the effectiveness of the project in increasing protection of the coastal community where the project is carried out through living shorelines techniques, including—

(I) a description of—

(aa) the project;

(bb) the activities carried out under the project; and

(cc) the techniques and materials used in carrying out the project; and

(II) data on the performance of the project in providing protection to that coastal community.

(2) GUIDELINES.—In developing guidelines relating to paragraph (1)(C), the Administrator shall consider how additional data could safely be collected before and after major disasters or severe weather events to measure project performance and project recovery.

(3) STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall, in consultation with relevant offices of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, relevant interagency councils, and relevant nongovernmental organizations, issue standards for the monitoring, collection, and reporting under subsection (d)(2) of data regarding the performance of living shoreline projects for which grants are awarded under this section.

(B) REPORTING.—The standards issued under subparagraph (A) shall require an eligible entity receiving a grant under this section to report the data described in that subparagraph to the Administrator on a regular basis.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 to the Administrator for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025 for purposes of carrying out this section.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means any of the following:

(A) A unit of a State or local government.

(B) An organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(C) An Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

(3) LIVING SHORELINE PROJECT.—The term “living shoreline project”—

(A) means a project that—

(i) restores or stabilizes a shoreline, including marshes, wetlands, and other vegetated areas that are part of the shoreline ecosystem, by using natural materials and systems to create buffers to attenuate the impact of coastal storms, currents, flooding, and wave energy and to prevent or minimize shoreline erosion while supporting coastal ecosystems and habitats;

(ii) incorporates as many natural elements as possible, such as native wetlands, submerged aquatic plants, oyster shells, native grasses, shrubs, or trees;

(iii) utilizes techniques that incorporate ecological and coastal engineering principles in shoreline stabilization; and

(iv) to the extent possible, maintains or restores existing natural slopes and connections between uplands and adjacent wetlands or surface waters;

(B) may include the use of—

(i) natural elements, such as sand, wetland plants, logs, oysters or other shellfish, submerged aquatic vegetation, native grasses, shrubs, trees, or coir fiber logs;

(ii) project elements that provide ecological benefits to coastal ecosystems and habitats in addition to shoreline protection; and

(iii) structural materials, such as stone, concrete, wood, vinyl, oyster domes, or other approved engineered structures in combination with natural materials; and

(C) may include a project that expands upon or restores natural living shorelines or existing living shoreline projects.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 103. WORKING WATERFRONTS GRANT PROGRAM.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 321. WORKING WATERFRONTS GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) WORKING WATERFRONT TASK FORCE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall establish a task force to work directly with coastal States, user groups, and coastal stakeholders to identify and address critical needs with respect to working waterfronts.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the task force shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and shall include—

“(A) experts in the unique economic, social, cultural, ecological, geographic, and resource concerns of working waterfronts; and

“(B) representatives from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Office of Coastal Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency,

the United States Geological Survey, the Navy, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Economic Development Agency, and such other Federal agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(3) FUNCTIONS.—The task force shall—

“(A) identify and prioritize critical needs with respect to working waterfronts in States that have a management program approved by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 306, in the areas of—

“(i) economic and cultural importance of working waterfronts to communities;

“(ii) changing environments and threats working waterfronts face from environment changes, trade barriers, sea level rise, extreme weather events, ocean acidification, and harmful algal blooms; and

“(iii) identifying working waterfronts and highlighting them within communities;

“(B) outline options, in coordination with coastal States and local stakeholders, to address such critical needs, including adaptation and mitigation where applicable;

“(C) identify Federal agencies that are responsible under existing law for addressing such critical needs; and

“(D) recommend Federal agencies best suited to address any critical needs for which no agency is responsible under existing law.

“(4) INFORMATION TO BE CONSIDERED.—In identifying and prioritizing policy gaps pursuant to paragraph (3), the task force shall consider the findings and recommendations contained in section VI of the report entitled ‘The Sustainable Working Waterfronts Toolkit: Final Report’, dated March 2013.

“(5) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the task force shall submit a report to Congress on its findings.

“(6) IMPLEMENTATION.—The head of each Federal agency identified in the report pursuant to paragraph (3)(C) shall take such action as is necessary to implement the recommendations contained in the report by not later than 1 year after the date of the issuance of the report.

“(b) WORKING WATERFRONT GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) The Secretary shall establish a Working Waterfront Grant Program, in cooperation with appropriate State, regional, and other units of government, under which the Secretary may make a grant to any coastal State for the purpose of implementing a working waterfront plan approved by the Secretary under subsection (c).

“(2) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall award matching grants under the Working Waterfronts Grant Program to coastal States with approved working waterfront plans through a regionally equitable, competitive funding process in accordance with the following:

“(A) The Governor, or the lead agency designated by the Governor for coordinating the implementation of this section, where appropriate in consultation with the appropriate local government, shall determine that the application is consistent with the State’s or territory’s approved coastal zone plan, program, and policies prior to submission to the Secretary.

“(B) In developing guidelines under this section, the Secretary shall consult with coastal States, other Federal agencies, and other interested stakeholders with expertise in working waterfront planning.

“(C) Coastal States may allocate grants to local governments, agencies, or nongovernmental organizations eligible for assistance under this section.

“(3) In awarding a grant to a coastal State, the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the economic, cultural, and historical significance of working waterfront to the coastal State;

“(B) the demonstrated working waterfront needs of the coastal State as outlined by a working waterfront plan approved for the coastal

State under subsection (c), and the value of the proposed project for the implementation of such plan;

“(C) the ability to successfully leverage funds among participating entities, including Federal programs, regional organizations, State and other government units, landowners, corporations, or private organizations;

“(D) the potential for rapid turnover in the ownership of working waterfront in the coastal State, and where applicable the need for coastal States to respond quickly when properties in existing or potential working waterfront areas or public access areas as identified in the working waterfront plan submitted by the coastal State come under threat or become available; and

“(E) the impact of the working waterfront plan approved for the coastal State under subsection (c) on the coastal ecosystem and the users of the coastal ecosystem.

“(4) The Secretary shall approve or reject an application for such a grant within 60 days after receiving an application for the grant.

“(c) WORKING WATERFRONT PLANS.—

“(1) To be eligible for a grant under subsection (b), a coastal State must submit and have approved by the Secretary a comprehensive working waterfront plan in accordance with this subsection, or be in the process of developing such a plan and have an established working waterfront program at the State or local level, or the Secretary determines that an existing coastal land use plan for that State is in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) Such plan—

“(A) must provide for preservation and expansion of access to coastal waters to persons engaged in commercial fishing, recreational fishing and boating businesses, aquaculture, boatbuilding, or other water-dependent, coastal-related business;

“(B) shall include one or more of—

“(i) an assessment of the economic, social, cultural, and historic value of working waterfront to the coastal State;

“(ii) a description of relevant State and local laws and regulations affecting working waterfront in the geographic areas identified in the working waterfront plan;

“(iii) identification of geographic areas where working waterfronts are currently under threat of conversion to uses incompatible with commercial and recreational fishing, recreational fishing and boating businesses, aquaculture, boatbuilding, or other water-dependent, coastal-related business, and the level of that threat;

“(iv) identification of geographic areas with a historic connection to working waterfronts where working waterfronts are not currently available, and, where appropriate, an assessment of the environmental impacts of any expansion or new development of working waterfronts on the coastal ecosystem;

“(v) identification of other working waterfront needs including improvements to existing working waterfronts and working waterfront areas;

“(vi) a strategic and prioritized plan for the preservation, expansion, and improvement of working waterfronts in the coastal State;

“(vii) for areas identified under clauses (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi), identification of current availability and potential for expansion of public access to coastal waters;

“(viii) a description of the degree of community support for such strategic plan; and

“(ix) a contingency plan for properties that revert to the coastal State pursuant to determinations made by the coastal State under subsection (g)(4)(C);

“(C) may include detailed environmental impacts on working waterfronts, including hazards, sea level rise, inundation exposure, and other resiliency issues;

“(D) may be part of the management program approved under section 306;

“(E) shall utilize to the maximum extent practicable existing information contained in rel-

evant surveys, plans, or other strategies to fulfill the information requirements under this paragraph; and

“(F) shall incorporate the policies and regulations adopted by communities under local working waterfront plans or strategies in existence before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(3) A working waterfront plan—

“(A) shall be effective for purposes of this section for the 5-year period beginning on the date it is approved by the Secretary;

“(B) must be updated and re-approved by the Secretary before the end of such period; and

“(C) shall be complimentary to and incorporate the policies and objectives of regional or local working waterfront plans as in effect before the date of enactment of this section or as subsequently revised.

“(4) The Secretary may—

“(A) award planning grants to coastal States for the purpose of developing or revising comprehensive working waterfront plans; and

“(B) award grants consistent with the purposes of this section to States undertaking the working waterfront planning process under this section, for the purpose of preserving and protecting working waterfronts during such process.

“(5) Any coastal State applying for a working waterfront grant under this title shall—

“(A) develop a working waterfront plan, using a process that involves the public and those with an interest in the coastal zone;

“(B) coordinate development and implementation of such a plan with other coastal management programs, regulations, and activities of the coastal State; and

“(C) if the coastal State allows qualified holders (other than the coastal State) to enter into working waterfront covenants, provide as part of the working waterfront plan under this subsection a mechanism or procedure to ensure that the qualified holders are complying their duties to enforce the working waterfront covenant.

“(d) USES, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS.—

“(1) Each grant made by the Secretary under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be appropriate to ensure that the grant is used for purposes consistent with this section.

“(2) A grant under this section may be used—

“(A) to acquire a working waterfront, or an interest in a working waterfront;

“(B) to make improvements to a working waterfront, including the construction or repair of wharfs, boat ramps, or related facilities; or

“(C) for necessary climate adaptation mitigation.

“(e) PUBLIC ACCESS REQUIREMENT.—A working waterfront project funded by grants made under this section must provide for expansion, improvement, or preservation of reasonable and appropriate public access to coastal waters at or in the vicinity of a working waterfront, except for commercial fishing or other industrial access points where the coastal State determines that public access would be unsafe.

“(f) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a grant awarded under this section may be used to purchase working waterfront or an interest in working waterfront, including an easement, only from a willing seller and at fair market value.

“(2) A grant awarded under this section may be used to acquire working waterfront or an interest in working waterfront at less than fair market value only if the owner certifies to the Secretary that the sale is being entered into willingly and without coercion.

“(3) No Federal, State, or local entity may exercise the power of eminent domain to secure title to any property or facilities in connection with a project carried out under this section.

“(g) ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND OTHER ENTITIES.—

“(1) The Secretary shall encourage coastal States to broadly allocate amounts received as

grants under this section among working waterfronts identified in working waterfront plans approved under subsection (c).

“(2) Subject to the approval of the Secretary, a coastal State may, as part of an approved working waterfront plan, designate as a qualified holder any unit of State or local government or nongovernmental organization, if the coastal State is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the property will be managed in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which the land entered into the program.

“(3) A coastal State or a qualified holder designated by a coastal State may allocate to a unit of local government, nongovernmental organization, fishing cooperative, or other entity, a portion of any grant made under this section for the purpose of carrying out this section, except that such an allocation shall not relieve the coastal State of the responsibility for ensuring that any funds so allocated are applied in furtherance of the coastal State's approved working waterfront plan.

“(4) A qualified holder may hold title to or interest in property acquired under this section, except that—

“(A) all persons holding title to or interest in working waterfront affected by a grant under this section, including a qualified holder, private citizen, private business, nonprofit organization, fishing cooperative, or other entity, shall enter into a working waterfront covenant;

“(B) such covenant shall be held by the coastal State or a qualified holder designated under paragraph (2);

“(C) if the coastal State determines, on the record after an opportunity for a hearing, that the working waterfront covenant has been violated—

“(i) all right, title, and interest in and to the working waterfront covered by such covenant shall, except as provided in subparagraph (D), revert to the coastal State; and

“(ii) the coastal State shall have the right of immediate entry onto the working waterfront;

“(D) if a coastal State makes a determination under subparagraph (C), the coastal State may convey or authorize the qualified holder to convey the working waterfront or interest in working waterfront to another qualified holder; and

“(E) nothing in this subsection waives any legal requirement under any Federal or State law.

“(h) MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall require that each coastal State that receives a grant under this section, or a qualified holder designated by that coastal State under subsection (g), shall provide matching funds in an amount equal to at least 25 percent of the total cost of the project carried out with the grant.

“(2) The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (1) for any qualified holder that is an underserved community, a community that has an inability to draw on other sources of funding because of the small population or low income of the community, or for other reasons the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(3) A local community designated as a qualified holder under subsection (g) may utilize funds or other in-kind contributions donated by a nongovernmental partner to satisfy the matching funds requirement under this subsection.

“(4) As a condition of receipt of a grant under this section, the Secretary shall require that a coastal State provide to the Secretary such assurances as the Secretary determines are sufficient to demonstrate that the share of the cost of each eligible project that is not funded by the grant awarded under this section has been secured.

“(5) If financial assistance under this section represents only a portion of the total cost of a project, funding from other Federal sources may be applied to the cost of the project. Each portion shall be subject to match requirements under the applicable provision of law.

“(6) The Secretary shall treat as non-Federal match the value of a working waterfront or interest in a working waterfront, including conservation and other easements, that is held in perpetuity by a qualified holder, if the working waterfront or interest is identified in the application for the grant and acquired by the qualified holder within 3 years of the grant award date, or within 3 years after the submission of the application and before the end of the grant award period. Such value shall be determined by an appraisal performed at such time before the award of the grant as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(7) The Secretary shall treat as non-Federal match the costs associated with acquisition of a working waterfront or an interest in a working waterfront, and the costs of restoration, enhancement, or other improvement to a working waterfront, if the activities are identified in the project application and the costs are incurred within the period of the grant award, or, for working waterfront described in paragraph (6), within the same time limits described in that paragraph. These costs may include either cash or in-kind contributions.

“(i) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No more than 5 percent of the funds made available to the Secretary under this section may be used by the Secretary for planning or administration of the program under this section.

“(j) OTHER TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) Up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated under this section may be used by the Secretary for purposes of providing technical assistance as described in this subsection.

“(2) The Secretary shall—

“(A) provide technical assistance to coastal States and local governments in identifying and obtaining other sources of available Federal technical and financial assistance for the development and revision of a working waterfront plan and the implementation of an approved working waterfront plan;

“(B) provide technical assistance to States and local governments for the development, implementation, and revision of comprehensive working waterfront plans, which may include, subject to the availability of appropriations, planning grants and assistance, pilot projects, feasibility studies, research, and other projects necessary to further the purposes of this section;

“(C) assist States in developing other tools to protect working waterfronts;

“(D) collect and disseminate to States guidance for best storm water management practices in regards to working waterfronts;

“(E) provide technical assistance to States and local governments on integrating resilience planning into working waterfront preservation efforts; and

“(F) collect and disseminate best practices on working waterfronts and resilience planning.

“(k) REPORTS.—

“(1) The Secretary shall—

“(A) develop performance measures to evaluate and report on the effectiveness of the program under this section in accomplishing the purpose of this section; and

“(B) submit to Congress a biennial report that includes such evaluations, an account of all expenditures, and descriptions of all projects carried out using grants awarded under this section.

“(2) The Secretary may submit the biennial report under paragraph (1)(B) by including it in the biennial report required under section 316.

“(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘qualified holder’ means a coastal State or a unit of local or coastal State government or a non-State organization designated by a coastal State under subsection (g).

“(2) The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary, acting through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

“(3) The term ‘working waterfront’ means real property (including support structures over

water and other facilities) that provides access to coastal waters to persons engaged in commercial and recreational fishing, recreational fishing and boating businesses, boatbuilding, aquaculture, or other water-dependent, coastal-related business and is used for, or that supports, commercial and recreational fishing, recreational fishing and boating businesses, boatbuilding, aquaculture, or other water-dependent, coastal-related business.

“(4) The term ‘working waterfront covenant’ means an agreement in recordable form between the owner of working waterfront and one or more qualified holders, that provides such assurances as the Secretary may require that—

“(A) the title to or interest in the working waterfront will be held by a grant recipient or qualified holder in perpetuity, except as provided in subparagraph (C);

“(B) the working waterfront will be managed in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which the property is acquired pursuant to this section, and the property will not be converted to any use that is inconsistent with the purpose of this section;

“(C) if the title to or interest in the working waterfront is sold or otherwise exchanged—

“(i) all working waterfront owners and qualified holders involved in such sale or exchange shall accede to such agreement; and

“(ii) funds equal to the fair market value of the working waterfront or interest in working waterfront shall be paid to the Secretary by parties to the sale or exchange, and such funds shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, be paid to the coastal State in which the working waterfront is located for use in the implementation of the working waterfront plan of the State approved by the Secretary under this section; and

“(D) such covenant is subject to enforcement and oversight by the coastal State or by another person as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Grant Program \$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

SEC. 104. WORKING WATERFRONTS PRESERVATION FUND; GRANTS.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 322. WORKING WATERFRONTS PRESERVATION LOAN FUND.

“(a) FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a separate account that shall be known as the ‘Working Waterfronts Preservation Loan Fund’ (in this section referred to as the ‘Fund’).
“(b) USE.—
“(1) Subject to the availability of appropriations, amounts in the Fund may be used by the Secretary to make loans to coastal States for the purpose of implementing a working waterfront plan approved by the Secretary under section 321(c) through preservation, improvement, restoration, rehabilitation, acquisition of working waterfront properties under criteria established by the Secretary.

“(2) Upon enactment of this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a feasibility study on the administration of the development and management of a Working Waterfronts Preservation Loan Fund.

“(3) Upon the completion of the study under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall establish a fund in accordance with the results of that study, and establish such criteria as referenced in subsection (c) in consultation with States that have a management program approved by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 306 and local government coastal management programs.

“(c) AWARD CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall award loans under this section through a regionally equitable, competitive funding process, and in accordance with the following:

“(1) The Governor, or the lead agency designated by the Governor for coordinating the

implementation of this section, where appropriate in consultation with the appropriate local government, shall determine that an application for a loan is consistent with the State’s approved coastal zone plan, program, and policies prior to submission to the Secretary.

“(2) In developing guidelines under this section, the Secretary shall consult with coastal States, other Federal agencies, and other interested stakeholders with expertise in working waterfront planning.

“(3) Coastal States may allocate amounts loaned under this section to local governments, agencies, or nongovernmental organizations eligible for loans under this section.

“(4) In awarding a loan for activities in a coastal State, the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the economic and cultural significance of working waterfront to the coastal State;

“(B) the demonstrated working waterfront needs of the coastal State as outlined by a working waterfront plan approved for the coastal State under section 321(c), and the value of the proposed loan for the implementation of such plan;

“(C) the ability to successfully leverage loan funds among participating entities, including Federal programs, regional organizations, State and other government units, landowners, corporations, or private organizations;

“(D) the potential for rapid turnover in the ownership of working waterfront in the coastal State, and where applicable the need for coastal States to respond quickly when properties in existing or potential working waterfront areas or public access areas as identified in the working waterfront plan submitted by the coastal State come under threat or become available;

“(E) the impact of the loan on the coastal ecosystem and the users of the coastal ecosystem; and

“(F) the extent of the historic connection between working waterfronts for which the loan will be used and the local communities within the coastal State.

“(d) LOAN AMOUNT AND TERMS.—

“(1) The amount of a loan under this section—

“(A) shall be not less than \$100,000; and

“(B) shall not exceed 15 percent of the amount in the Fund as of July 1 of the fiscal year in which the loan is made.

“(2) The interest rate for a loan under this section shall not exceed 4 percent.

“(3) The repayment term for a loan under this section shall not exceed 20 years.

“(e) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve or reject an application for a loan under this section within 60 days after receiving an application for the loan.

“(f) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No more than 5 percent of the funds made available to the Secretary under this section may be used by the Secretary for planning or administration of the program under this section.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—The definitions in section 321(l) shall apply to this section.

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund \$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

SEC. 105. ELIGIBILITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR FEDERAL FUNDING UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1972.

Section 304(4) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453(4)) is amended by inserting “the District of Columbia,” after “the term also includes”.

SEC. 106. CLIMATE CHANGE PREPAREDNESS IN THE COASTAL ZONE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 323. CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish, consistent with the national policies set

forth in section 303, a coastal climate change adaptation preparedness and response program to—

“(1) provide assistance to coastal States to voluntarily develop coastal climate change adaptation plans, pursuant to approved management programs approved under section 306, to minimize contributions to climate change and to prepare for and reduce the negative consequences that may result from climate change in the coastal zone; and

“(2) provide financial and technical assistance and training to enable coastal States to implement plans developed pursuant to this section through coastal States’ enforceable policies.

“(b) COASTAL CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PLANNING AND PREPAREDNESS GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may make a grant to any coastal State for the purpose of developing climate change adaptation plans pursuant to guidelines issued by the Secretary under paragraph (8).

“(2) PLAN CONTENT.—A plan developed with a grant under this subsection shall include the following:

“(A) Identification of public facilities and public services, working waterfronts, coastal resources of national significance, coastal waters, energy facilities, or other land and water uses located in the coastal zone that are likely to be impacted by climate change.

“(B) Adaptive management strategies for land use to respond or adapt to changing environmental conditions, including strategies to protect biodiversity, protect water quality, and establish habitat buffer zones, migration corridors, and climate refugia.

“(C) Adaptive management strategies for ocean-based ecosystems and resources, including strategies to plan for and respond to geographic or temporal shifts in marine resources, to create protected areas that will provide climate refugia, and to maintain and restore ocean ecosystem function.

“(D) Requirements to initiate and maintain long-term monitoring of environmental change to assess coastal zone adaptation and to adjust when necessary adaptive management strategies and new planning guidelines to attain the policies under section 303.

“(E) Other information considered necessary by the Secretary to identify the full range of climate change impacts affecting coastal communities.

“(3) STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLANS.—Plans developed with a grant under this subsection shall be consistent with State hazard mitigation plans and natural disaster response and recovery programs developed under State or Federal law.

“(4) ALLOCATION.—Grants under this subsection shall be available only to coastal States with management programs approved by the Secretary under section 306 and shall be allocated among such coastal States in a manner consistent with regulations promulgated pursuant to section 306(c).

“(5) PRIORITY.—In the awarding of grants under this subsection, the Secretary may give priority to any coastal State that has received grant funding to develop program changes pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of section 309(a).

“(6) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to a coastal State consistent with section 310 to ensure the timely development of plans supported by grants awarded under this subsection.

“(7) FEDERAL APPROVAL.—In order to be eligible for a grant under subsection (c), a coastal State must have its plan developed under this subsection approved by the Secretary.

“(8) GUIDELINES.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the coastal States, shall issue guidelines for the implementation of the grant program established under this subsection.

“(c) COASTAL CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may make grants to any coastal State that has a climate change adaptation plan approved under subsection (b)(7), in order to support projects that implement strategies contained within such plans.

“(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary, within 90 days after approval of the first plan approved under subsection (b)(7), shall publish in the Federal Register requirements regarding applications, allocations, eligible activities, and all terms and conditions for grants awarded under this subsection. No less than 30 percent, and no more than 50 percent, of the funds appropriated in any fiscal year for grants under this subsection shall be awarded through a merit-based competitive process.

“(3) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may award grants to coastal States to implement projects in the coastal zone to address stress factors in order to improve coastal climate change adaptation, including the following:

“(A) Activities to address physical disturbances within the coastal zone, especially activities related to public facilities and public services, tourism, sedimentation, ocean acidification, and other factors negatively impacting coastal waters.

“(B) Monitoring, control, or eradication of disease organisms and invasive species.

“(C) Activities to address the loss, degradation, or fragmentation of wildlife habitat through projects to establish or protect marine and terrestrial habitat buffers, wildlife refugia, other wildlife refuges, or networks thereof, preservation of migratory wildlife corridors and other transition zones, and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat.

“(D) Projects to reduce, mitigate, or otherwise address likely impacts caused by natural hazards in the coastal zone, including sea level rise, coastal inundation, storm water management, coastal erosion and subsidence, severe weather events such as cyclonic storms, tsunamis and other seismic threats, and fluctuating Great Lakes water levels. The Secretary shall give priority to projects that utilize green infrastructure solutions.

“(E) Projects to adapt existing infrastructure, including enhancements to both built and natural environments.

“(F) Provision of technical training and assistance to local coastal policy makers to increase awareness of science, management, and technology information related to climate change and adaptation strategies.

“(4) PROMOTION AND USE OF NATIONAL ESTUARINE RESEARCH RESERVES.—The Secretary shall promote and encourage the use of National Estuarine Research Reserves as sites for pilot or demonstration projects carried out with grants awarded under this section.”.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 318(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1464(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) for grants under section 323, such sums as are necessary.”.

“(c) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any coastal State to amend or modify its approved management program pursuant to section 306(e) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1455(e)) or to extend the enforceable policies of a coastal State beyond the coastal zone as identified in the coastal State’s approved management program.

TITLE II—FISHERY RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—National Fish Habitat Conservation Through Partnerships

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to encourage partnerships among public agencies and other interested persons to promote fish conservation—

(1) to achieve measurable habitat conservation results through strategic actions of Fish Habitat Partnerships that lead to better fish habitat conditions and increased fishing opportunities by—

(A) improving ecological conditions;

(B) restoring natural processes; or

(C) preventing the decline of intact and healthy systems;

(2) to establish a consensus set of national conservation strategies as a framework to guide future actions and investment by Fish Habitat Partnerships;

(3) to broaden the community of support for fish habitat conservation by—

(A) increasing fishing opportunities;

(B) fostering the participation of local communities, especially young people in local communities, in conservation activities; and

(C) raising public awareness of the role healthy fish habitat play in the quality of life and economic well-being of local communities;

(4) to fill gaps in the National Fish Habitat Assessment and the associated database of the National Fish Habitat Assessment—

(A) to empower strategic conservation actions supported by broadly available scientific information; and

(B) to integrate socioeconomic data in the analysis to improve the lives of humans in a manner consistent with fish habitat conservation goals; and

(5) to communicate to the public and conservation partners—

(A) the conservation outcomes produced collectively by Fish Habitat Partnerships; and

(B) new opportunities and voluntary approaches for conserving fish habitat.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) BOARD.—The term “Board” means the National Fish Habitat Board established by section 203.

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Environmental Protection Agency Assistant Administrator” means the Assistant Administrator for Water of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given to the term “Indian tribe” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(6) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator” means the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(7) PARTNERSHIP.—The term “Partnership” means an entity designated by Congress as a Fish Habitat Partnership under section 204.

(8) REAL PROPERTY INTEREST.—The term “real property interest” means an ownership interest in—

(A) land; or

(B) water (including water rights).

(9) MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSIONS.—The term “Marine Fisheries Commissions” means—

(A) The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

(B) the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; and

(C) the Pacific States Marine Commission.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

(12) STATE AGENCY.—The term “State agency” means—

(A) the fish and wildlife agency of a State; and

(B) any department or division of a department or agency of a State that manages in the public trust the inland or marine fishery resources of the State or sustains the habitat for those fishery resources pursuant to State law or the constitution of the State.

SEC. 203. NATIONAL FISH HABITAT BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) FISH HABITAT BOARD.—There is established a board, to be known as the “National Fish Habitat Board”, whose duties are—

(A) to promote, oversee, and coordinate the implementation of this subtitle;

(B) to establish national goals and priorities for fish habitat conservation;

(C) to recommend to Congress entities for designation as Partnerships; and

(D) to review and make recommendations regarding fish habitat conservation projects.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall be composed of 25 members, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a representative of the Department of the Interior;

(B) 1 shall be a representative of the United States Geological Survey;

(C) 1 shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce;

(D) 1 shall be a representative of the Department of Agriculture;

(E) 1 shall be a representative of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies;

(F) 4 shall be representatives of State agencies, 1 of whom shall be nominated by a regional association of fish and wildlife agencies from each of the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, and Western regions of the United States;

(G) 1 shall be a representative of either—

(i) Indian Tribes in the State of Alaska; or

(ii) Indian Tribes in States other than the State of Alaska;

(H) 1 shall be a representative of either—

(i) the Regional Fishery Management Councils established under section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852); or

(ii) a representative of the Marine Fisheries Commissions;

(I) 1 shall be a representative of the Sportfishing and Boating Partnership Council;

(J) 7 shall be representatives selected from at least one from each of the following:

(i) the recreational sportfishing industry;

(ii) the commercial fishing industry;

(iii) marine recreational anglers;

(iv) freshwater recreational anglers;

(v) habitat conservation organizations; and

(vi) science-based fishery organizations;

(K) 1 shall be a representative of a national private landowner organization;

(L) 1 shall be a representative of an agricultural production organization;

(M) 1 shall be a representative of local government interests involved in fish habitat restoration;

(N) 2 shall be representatives from different sectors of corporate industries, which may include—

(i) natural resource commodity interests, such as petroleum or mineral extraction;

(ii) natural resource user industries; and

(iii) industries with an interest in fish and fish habitat conservation; and

(O) 1 shall be a leadership private sector or landowner representative of an active partnership.

(3) COMPENSATION.—A member of the Board shall serve without compensation.

(4) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Board may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Board.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, a member of the Board described in any of subparagraphs (F) through (O) of subsection (a)(2) shall serve for a term of 3 years.

(2) INITIAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The initial Board shall consist of representatives as described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of subsection (a)(2).

(B) REMAINING MEMBERS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the representatives of the initial Board under subparagraph (A) shall appoint the remaining members of the Board described in subparagraphs (H) through (O) of subsection (a)(2).

(C) TRIBAL REPRESENTATIVES.—Not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Board a recommendation of not fewer than 3 Tribal representatives, from which the Board shall appoint 1 representative pursuant to subparagraph (G) of subsection (a)(2).

(3) STAGGERED TERMS.—Of the members described in subsection (a)(2)(J) initially appointed to the Board—

(A) 2 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year;

(B) 2 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(C) 3 shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(4) VACANCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy of a member of the Board described in subparagraph (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), (M), (N), or (O) of subsection (a)(2) shall be filled by an appointment made by the remaining members of the Board.

(B) TRIBAL REPRESENTATIVES.—Following a vacancy of a member of the Board described in subparagraph (G) of subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall recommend to the Board a list of not fewer than 3 Tribal representatives, from which the remaining members of the Board shall appoint a representative to fill the vacancy.

(5) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—An individual whose term of service as a member of the Board expires may continue to serve on the Board until a successor is appointed.

(6) REMOVAL.—If a member of the Board described in any of subparagraphs (H) through (O) of subparagraph (a)(2) misses 3 consecutive regularly scheduled Board meetings, the members of the Board may—

(A) vote to remove that member; and

(B) appoint another individual in accordance with paragraph (4).

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The representative of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies appointed under subsection (a)(2)(E) shall serve as Chairperson of the Board.

(2) TERM.—The Chairperson of the Board shall serve for a term of 3 years.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

(A) at the call of the Chairperson; but

(B) not less frequently than twice each calendar year.

(2) PUBLIC ACCESS.—All meetings of the Board shall be open to the public.

(e) PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall establish procedures to carry out the business of the Board, including—

(A) a requirement that a quorum of the members of the Board be present to transact business;

(B) a requirement that no recommendations may be adopted by the Board, except by the vote of $\frac{2}{3}$ of all members;

(C) procedures for establishing national goals and priorities for fish habitat conservation for the purposes of this subtitle;

(D) procedures for designating Partnerships under section 204; and

(E) procedures for reviewing, evaluating, and making recommendations regarding fish habitat conservation projects.

(2) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 204. FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO RECOMMEND.—The Board may recommend to Congress the designation of Fish Habitat Partnerships in accordance with this section.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of a Partnership shall be—

(1) to work with other regional habitat conservation programs to promote cooperation and coordination to enhance fish populations and fish habitats;

(2) to engage local and regional communities to build support for fish habitat conservation;

(3) to involve diverse groups of public and private partners;

(4) to develop collaboratively a strategic vision and achievable implementation plan that is scientifically sound;

(5) to leverage funding from sources that support local and regional partnerships;

(6) to use adaptive management principles, including evaluation of project success and functionality;

(7) to develop appropriate local or regional habitat evaluation and assessment measures and criteria that are compatible with national habitat condition measures; and

(8) to implement local and regional priority projects that improve conditions for fish and fish habitat.

(c) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—An entity seeking to be designated by Congress as a Partnership shall—

(1) submit to the Board an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Board may reasonably require; and

(2) demonstrate to the Board that the entity has—

(A) a focus on promoting the health of important fish and fish habitats;

(B) an ability to coordinate the implementation of priority projects that support the goals and national priorities set by the Board that are within the Partnership boundary;

(C) a self-governance structure that supports the implementation of strategic priorities for fish habitat;

(D) the ability to develop local and regional relationships with a broad range of entities to further strategic priorities for fish and fish habitat;

(E) a strategic plan that details required investments for fish habitat conservation that addresses the strategic fish habitat priorities of the Partnership and supports and meets the strategic priorities of the Board;

(F) the ability to develop and implement fish habitat conservation projects that address strategic priorities of the Partnership and the Board; and

(G) the ability to develop fish habitat conservation priorities based on sound science and data, the ability to measure the effectiveness of fish habitat projects of the Partnership, and a clear plan as to how Partnership science and data components will be integrated with the overall Board science and data effort.

(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CONGRESS.—The Board may recommend to Congress for designation an application for a Partnership submitted under subsection (c) if the Board determines that the applicant—

(1) meets the criteria described in subsection (c)(2);

(2) identifies representatives to provide support and technical assistance to the Partnership from a diverse group of public and private partners, which may include State or local governments, nonprofit entities, Indian Tribes, and private individuals, that are focused on conservation of fish habitats to achieve results across jurisdictional boundaries on public and private land;

(3) is organized to promote the health of important fish species and important fish habitats, including reservoirs, natural lakes, coastal and marine environments, and estuaries;

(4) identifies strategic fish and fish habitat priorities for the Partnership area in the form of geographical focus areas or key stressors or impairments to facilitate strategic planning and decision making;

(5) is able to address issues and priorities on a nationally significant scale;

(6) includes a governance structure that—

(A) reflects the range of all partners; and

(B) promotes joint strategic planning and decision making by the applicant;

(7) demonstrates completion of, or significant progress toward the development of, a strategic plan to address declines in fish populations, rather than simply treating symptoms, in accordance with the goals and national priorities established by the Board; and

(8) promotes collaboration in developing a strategic vision and implementation program that is scientifically sound and achievable.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act and each February 1 thereafter, the Board shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report, to be entitled “Report to Congress on Future Fish Habitat Partnerships and Modifications”, that—

(A) identifies each entity that—

(i) meets the requirements described in subsection (d); and

(ii) the Board recommends to Congress for designation as a Partnership;

(B) describes any proposed modifications to a Partnership previously designated by Congress under subsection (f);

(C) with respect to each entity recommended for designation as a Partnership, describes, to the maximum extent practicable—

(i) the purpose of the recommended Partnership; and

(ii) how the recommended Partnership fulfills the requirements described in subsection (d).

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY; NOTIFICATION.—The Board shall—

(A) make the report publicly available, including on the internet; and

(B) provide to the appropriate congressional committees and the State agency of any State included in a recommended Partnership area written notification of the public availability of the report.

(f) DESIGNATION OR MODIFICATION OF PARTNERSHIP.—Congress shall have the exclusive authority to designate or modify a Partnership.

(g) EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) DESIGNATION REVIEW.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any partnership receiving Federal funds as of the date of enactment of this Act shall be subject to a designation review by Congress in which Congress shall have the opportunity to designate the partnership under subsection (f).

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.—A partnership referred to in paragraph (1) that Congress does not designate as described in that paragraph shall be ineligible to receive Federal funds under this subtitle.

SEC. 205. FISH HABITAT CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

(a) SUBMISSION TO BOARD.—Not later than March 31 of each year, each Partnership shall submit to the Board a list of priority fish habitat conservation projects recommended by the Partnership for annual funding under this subtitle.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS BY BOARD.—Not later than July 1 of each year, the Board shall submit to the Secretary a priority list of fish habitat conservation projects that includes a description, including estimated costs, of each project that the Board recommends that the Secretary approve and fund under this subtitle for the following fiscal year.

(c) CRITERIA FOR PROJECT SELECTION.—The Board shall select each fish habitat conservation project recommended to the Secretary under subsection (b) after taking into consideration, at a minimum, the following information:

(1) A recommendation of the Partnership that is, or will be, participating actively in implementing the fish habitat conservation project.

(2) The capabilities and experience of project proponents to implement successfully the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the fish habitat conservation project—

(A) fulfills a local or regional priority that is directly linked to the strategic plan of the Partnership and is consistent with the purpose of this subtitle;

(B) addresses the national priorities established by the Board;

(C) is supported by the findings of the habitat assessment of the Partnership or the Board, and aligns or is compatible with other conservation plans;

(D) identifies appropriate monitoring and evaluation measures and criteria that are compatible with national measures;

(E) provides a well-defined budget linked to deliverables and outcomes;

(F) leverages other funds to implement the project;

(G) addresses the causes and processes behind the decline of fish or fish habitats; and

(H) includes an outreach or education component that includes the local or regional community.

(4) The availability of sufficient non-Federal funds to match Federal contributions for the fish habitat conservation project, as required by subsection (e).

(5) The extent to which the fish habitat conservation project—

(A) will increase fish populations in a manner that leads to recreational fishing opportunities for the public;

(B) will be carried out through a cooperative agreement among Federal, State, and local governments, Indian Tribes, and private entities;

(C) increases public access to land or water for fish and wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities;

(D) advances the conservation of fish and wildlife species that have been identified by a State agency as species of greatest conservation need;

(E) where appropriate, advances the conservation of fish and fish habitats under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) and other relevant Federal law and State wildlife action plans; and

(F) promotes strong and healthy fish habitats so that desired biological communities are able to persist and adapt.

(6) The substantiality of the character and design of the fish habitat conservation project.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR EVALUATION.—No fish habitat conservation project may be recommended by the Board under subsection (b) or provided financial assistance under this subtitle unless the fish habitat conservation project includes an evaluation plan designed using applicable Board guidance—

(A) to appropriately assess the biological, ecological, or other results of the habitat protection, restoration, or enhancement activities carried out using the assistance;

(B) to reflect appropriate changes to the fish habitat conservation project if the assessment substantiates that the fish habitat conservation project objectives are not being met;

(C) to identify improvements to existing fish populations, recreational fishing opportunities, and the overall economic benefits for the local community of the fish habitat conservation project; and

(D) to require the submission to the Board of a report describing the findings of the assessment.

(2) ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State, local government, or other non-Federal entity is eligible to receive funds for the acquisition of real property from willing sellers under this subtitle if the acquisition ensures—

(i) public access for fish and wildlife-dependent recreation; or

(ii) a scientifically based, direct enhancement to the health of fish and fish populations, as determined by the Board.

(B) STATE AGENCY APPROVAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—All real property interest acquisition projects funded under this subtitle must be approved by the State agency in the State in which the project is occurring.

(ii) PROHIBITION.—The Board may not recommend, and the Secretary may not provide any funding for, any real property interest acquisition that has not been approved by the State agency.

(C) ASSESSMENT OF OTHER AUTHORITIES.—The Board may not recommend, and the Secretary may not provide any funding under this subtitle for, any real property interest acquisition unless the Partnership that recommended the project has conducted a project assessment, submitted with the funding request and approved by the Board, to demonstrate all other Federal, State, and local authorities for the acquisition of real property have been exhausted.

(D) RESTRICTIONS.—A real property interest may not be acquired pursuant to a fish habitat conservation project by a State, local government, or other non-Federal entity conducted with funds provided under this subtitle, unless—

(i) the owner of the real property authorizes the State, local government, or other non-Federal entity to acquire the real property; and

(ii) the Secretary and the Board determine that the State, local government, or other non-Federal entity would benefit from undertaking the management of the real property being acquired because that is in accordance with the goals of a Partnership.

(e) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no fish habitat conservation project may be recommended by the Board under subsection (b) or provided financial assistance under this subtitle unless at least 50 percent of the cost of the fish habitat conservation project will be funded with non-Federal funds.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Such non-Federal share of the cost of a fish habitat conservation project—

(A) may not be derived from another Federal grant program; and

(B) may include in-kind contributions and cash.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or any other provision of law, any funds made available to an Indian Tribe pursuant to this subtitle may be considered to be non-Federal funds for the purpose of paragraph (1).

(f) APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of the recommended priority list of fish habitat conservation projects under subsection (b), and subject to subsection (d) and based, to the maximum extent practicable, on the criteria described in subsection (c), the Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce on marine or estuarine projects, shall

approve or reject any fish habitat conservation project recommended by the Board.

(2) **FUNDING.**—If the Secretary approves a fish habitat conservation project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use amounts made available to carry out this subtitle to provide funds to carry out the fish habitat conservation project.

(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—If the Secretary rejects under paragraph (1) any fish habitat conservation project recommended by the Board, not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of the recommendation, the Secretary shall provide to the Board, the appropriate Partnership, and the appropriate congressional committees a written statement of the reasons that the Secretary rejected the fish habitat conservation project.

SEC. 206. TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator, the Environmental Protection Agency Assistant Administrator, and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in coordination with the Forest Service and other appropriate Federal departments and agencies, may provide scientific and technical assistance to Partnerships, participants in fish habitat conservation projects, and the Board.

(b) **INCLUSIONS.**—Scientific and technical assistance provided under subsection (a) may include—

(1) providing technical and scientific assistance to States, Indian Tribes, regions, local communities, and nongovernmental organizations in the development and implementation of Partnerships;

(2) providing technical and scientific assistance to Partnerships for habitat assessment, strategic planning, and prioritization;

(3) supporting the development and implementation of fish habitat conservation projects that are identified as high priorities by Partnerships and the Board;

(4) supporting and providing recommendations regarding the development of science-based monitoring and assessment approaches for implementation through Partnerships;

(5) supporting and providing recommendations for a national fish habitat assessment;

(6) ensuring the availability of experts to assist in conducting scientifically based evaluation and reporting of the results of fish habitat conservation projects; and

(7) providing resources to secure State agency scientific and technical assistance to support Partnerships, participants in fish habitat conservation projects, and the Board.

SEC. 207. COORDINATION WITH STATES AND INDIAN TRIBES.

The Secretary shall provide a notice to, and cooperate with, the appropriate State agency or Tribal agency, as applicable, of each State and Indian Tribe within the boundaries of which an activity is planned to be carried out pursuant to this subtitle, including notification, by not later than 30 days before the date on which the activity is implemented.

SEC. 208. INTERAGENCY OPERATIONAL PLAN.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Director, in cooperation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator, the Environmental Protection Agency Assistant Administrator, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, and the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies (including, at a minimum, those agencies represented on the Board) shall develop an interagency operational plan that describes—

(1) the functional, operational, technical, scientific, and general staff, administrative, and material needs for the implementation of this subtitle; and

(2) any interagency agreements between or among Federal departments and agencies to address those needs.

SEC. 209. ACCOUNTABILITY AND REPORTING.

(a) REPORTING.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Board shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the progress of this subtitle.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an estimate of the number of acres, stream miles, or acre-feet, or other suitable measures of fish habitat, that was maintained or improved by Partnerships under this subtitle during the 5-year period ending on the date of submission of the report;

(B) a description of the public access to fish habitats established or improved under this subtitle during that 5-year period;

(C) a description of the improved opportunities for public recreational fishing achieved under this subtitle; and

(D) an assessment of the status of fish habitat conservation projects carried out with funds provided under this subtitle during that period, disaggregated by year, including—

(i) a description of the fish habitat conservation projects recommended by the Board under section 205(b);

(ii) a description of each fish habitat conservation project approved by the Secretary under section 205(f), in order of priority for funding;

(iii) a justification for—

(I) the approval of each fish habitat conservation project; and

(II) the order of priority for funding of each fish habitat conservation project;

(iv) a justification for any rejection of a fish habitat conservation project recommended by the Board under section 205(b) that was based on a factor other than the criteria described in section 205(c); and

(v) an accounting of expenditures by Federal, State, or local governments, Indian Tribes, or other entities to carry out fish habitat conservation projects under this subtitle.

(b) **STATUS AND TRENDS REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2020, and every 5 years thereafter, the Board shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(1) a status of all Partnerships designated under this subtitle;

(2) a description of the status of fish habitats in the United States as identified by designated Partnerships; and

(3) enhancements or reductions in public access as a result of—

(A) the activities of the Partnerships; or

(B) any other activities carried out pursuant to this subtitle.

SEC. 210. EFFECT OF THIS SUBTITLE.

(a) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subtitle—

(1) establishes any express or implied reserved water right in the United States for any purpose;

(2) affects any water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) preempts or affects any State water law or interstate compact governing water; or

(4) affects any Federal or State law in existence on the date of enactment of the Act regarding water quality or water quantity.

(b) **AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE WATER RIGHTS OR RIGHTS TO PROPERTY.**—Only a State, local government, or other non-Federal entity may acquire, under State law, water rights or rights to property with funds made available through section 212.

(c) **STATE AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this subtitle—

(1) affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under the laws and regulations of the State; or

(2) authorizes the Secretary to control or regulate within a State the fishing or hunting of fish and wildlife.

(d) **EFFECT ON INDIAN TRIBES.**—Nothing in this subtitle abrogates, abridges, affects, modifies, supersedes, or alters any right of an Indian Tribe recognized by treaty or any other means, including—

(1) an agreement between the Indian Tribe and the United States;

(2) Federal law (including regulations);

(3) an Executive order; or

(4) a judicial decree.

(e) **ADJUDICATION OF WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subtitle diminishes or affects the ability of the Secretary to join an adjudication of rights to the use of water pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 208 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and The Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1953 (43 U.S.C. 666).

(f) **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this subtitle affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the Department of Commerce to manage, control, or regulate fish or fish habitats under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(g) **EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.**—Nothing in this subtitle permits the use of funds made available to carry out this subtitle to acquire real property or a real property interest without the written consent of each owner of the real property or real property interest, respectively.

(2) **MITIGATION.**—Nothing in this subtitle authorizes the use of funds made available to carry out this subtitle for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes under—

(A) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(B) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(C) the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4082); or

(D) any other Federal law or court settlement.

(3) **CLEAN WATER ACT.**—Nothing in this subtitle affects any provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), including any definition in that Act.

SEC. 211. NONAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to—

(1) the Board; or

(2) any Partnership.

SEC. 212. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) **FISH HABITAT CONSERVATION PROJECTS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$7,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to provide funds for fish habitat conservation projects approved under section 205(f), of which 5 percent is authorized only for projects carried out by Indian Tribes.

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE AND PLANNING EXPENSES.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023 an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount appropriated for the applicable fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) for administrative and planning expenses under this subtitle; and

(B) to carry out section 209.

(3) **TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC ASSISTANCE.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024 to carry out, and provide technical and scientific assistance under, section 206—

(A) \$400,000 to the Secretary for use by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(B) \$400,000 to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Assistant Administrator for use by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(C) \$400,000 to the Environmental Protection Agency Assistant Administrator for use by the Environmental Protection Agency;

(D) \$400,000 to the Secretary for use by the United States Geological Survey; and

(E) \$400,000 to the Chief of the Forest Service for use by the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service.

(b) AGREEMENTS AND GRANTS.—The Secretary may—

(1) on the recommendation of the Board, and notwithstanding sections 6304 and 6305 of title 31, United States Code, and the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note; Public Law 106–107), enter into a grant agreement, cooperative agreement, or contract with a Partnership or other entity to provide funds authorized by this subtitle for a fish habitat conservation project or restoration or enhancement project;

(2) apply for, accept, and, subject to the availability of appropriations, use a grant from any individual or entity to carry out the purposes of this subtitle; and

(3) subject to the availability of appropriations, make funds authorized by this Act available to any Federal department or agency for use by that department or agency to provide grants for any fish habitat protection project, restoration project, or enhancement project that the Secretary determines to be consistent with this subtitle.

(c) DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may—

(A) enter into an agreement with any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code to solicit private donations to carry out the purposes of this subtitle; and

(B) accept donations of funds, property, and services to carry out the purposes of this subtitle.

(2) TREATMENT.—A donation accepted under this subtitle—

(A) shall be considered to be a gift or bequest to, or otherwise for the use of, the United States; and

(B) may be—

(i) used directly by the Secretary; or

(ii) provided to another Federal department or agency through an interagency agreement.

SEC. 213. PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATORY AUTHORITY BY FEDERAL AGENCIES THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS.

Any Partnership designated under this subtitle—

(1) shall be for the sole purpose of promoting fish conservation; and

(2) shall not be used to implement any regulatory authority of any Federal agency.

Subtitle B—Great Lakes Fishery Research Authorization

SEC. 214. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(2) GREAT LAKES BASIN.—The term “Great Lakes Basin” means the air, land, water, and living organisms in the United States within the drainage basin of the Saint Lawrence River at and upstream from the point at which such river and the Great Lakes become the international boundary between Canada and the United States.

SEC. 215. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Great Lakes support a diverse ecosystem, on which the vibrant and economically valuable Great Lakes fisheries depend.

(2) To continue successful fisheries management and coordination, as has occurred since signing of the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between the United States and Canada on September 10, 1954, management of the ecosystem and its fisheries require sound, reliable science, and the use of modern scientific technologies.

(3) Fisheries research is necessary to support multi-jurisdictional fishery management decisions and actions regarding recreational and sport fishing, commercial fisheries, tribal harvest, allocation decisions, and fish stocking activities.

(4) President Richard Nixon submitted, and the Congress approved, Reorganization Plan No. 4 (84 Stat. 2090), conferring science activities and management of marine fisheries to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(5) Reorganization Plan No. 4 expressly excluded fishery research activities within the Great Lakes from the transfer, retaining management and scientific research duties within the already established jurisdictions under the 1954 Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries, including those of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission and the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 216. GREAT LAKES MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, SCIENCE, AND RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director may conduct monitoring, assessment, science, and research, in support of the binational fisheries within the Great Lakes Basin.

(b) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—The Director shall, under subsection (a)—

(1) execute a comprehensive, multi-lake, freshwater fisheries science program;

(2) coordinate with and work cooperatively with regional, State, tribal, and local governments; and

(3) consult with other interested entities groups, including academia and relevant Canadian agencies.

(c) INCLUDED RESEARCH.—To properly serve the needs of fisheries managers, monitoring, assessment, science, and research under this section may include—

(1) deepwater ecosystem sciences;

(2) biological and food-web components;

(3) fish movement and behavior investigations;

(4) fish population structures;

(5) fish habitat investigations;

(6) invasive species science;

(7) use of existing, new, and experimental biological assessment tools, equipment, vessels, other scientific instrumentation and laboratory capabilities necessary to support fishery management decisions; and

(8) studies to assess impacts on Great Lakes fishery resources.

(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subtitle is intended or shall be construed to impede, supersede, or alter the authority of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, States, and Indian tribes under the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between the United States of America and Canada on September 10, 1954, and the Great Lakes Fishery Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 931 et seq.).

SEC. 217. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For each of fiscal years 2020 through 2029, there is authorized to be appropriated \$17,500,000 to carry out this subtitle.

TITLE III—MEETING 21ST CENTURY OCEAN AND COASTAL DATA NEEDS

Subtitle A—Digital Coast

SEC. 301. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Digital Coast is a model approach for effective Federal partnerships with State and local government, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector.

(2) Access to current, accurate, uniform, and standards-based geospatial information, tools, and training to characterize the United States coastal region is critical for public safety and for the environment, infrastructure, and economy of the United States.

(3) More than half of all people of the United States (153,000,000) currently live on or near a coast and an additional 12,000,000 are expected in the next decade.

(4) Coastal counties in the United States average 300 persons per square mile, compared with the national average of 98.

(5) On a typical day, more than 1,540 permits for construction of single-family homes are issued in coastal counties, combined with other commercial, retail, and institutional construction to support this population.

(6) Over half of the economic productivity of the United States is located within coastal regions.

(7) Highly accurate, high-resolution remote sensing and other geospatial data play an increasingly important role in decision making and management of the coastal zone and economy, including for—

(A) flood and coastal storm surge prediction;

(B) hazard risk and vulnerability assessment;

(C) emergency response and recovery planning;

(D) community resilience to longer range coastal change;

(E) local planning and permitting;

(F) habitat and ecosystem health assessments; and

(G) landscape change detection.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COASTAL REGION.—The term “coastal region” means the area of United States waters extending inland from the shoreline to include coastal watersheds and seaward to the territorial sea.

(2) COASTAL STATE.—The term “coastal State” has the meaning given the term “coastal state” in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453).

(3) FEDERAL GEOGRAPHIC DATA COMMITTEE.—The term “Federal Geographic Data Committee” means the interagency committee that promotes the coordinated development, use, sharing, and dissemination of geospatial data on a national basis.

(4) REMOTE SENSING AND OTHER GEOSPATIAL.—The term “remote sensing and other geospatial” means collecting, storing, retrieving, or disseminating graphical or digital data depicting natural or manmade physical features, phenomena, or boundaries of the Earth and any information related thereto, including surveys, maps, charts, satellite and airborne remote sensing data, images, LiDAR, and services performed by professionals such as surveyors, photogrammetrists, hydrographers, geodesists, cartographers, and other such services.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

SEC. 303. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DIGITAL COAST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program for the provision of an enabling platform that integrates geospatial data, decision-support tools, training, and best practices to address coastal management issues and needs. Under the program, the Secretary shall strive to enhance resilient communities, ecosystem values, and coastal economic growth and development by helping communities address their issues, needs, and challenges through cost-effective and participatory solutions.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The program established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the “Digital Coast” (in this section referred to as the “program”).

(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall ensure that the program provides data integration, tool development, training, documentation, dissemination, and archiving by—

(1) making data and resulting integrated products developed under this section readily accessible via the Digital Coast Internet website of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the GeoPlatform.gov and data.gov Internet websites, and such other information distribution technologies as the Secretary considers appropriate;

(2) developing decision-support tools that use and display resulting integrated data and provide training on use of such tools;

(3) documenting such data to Federal Geographic Data Committee standards; and

(4) archiving all raw data acquired under this title at the appropriate National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration data center or such other Federal data center as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the activities carried out under the program to optimize data collection, sharing and integration, and to minimize duplication by—

(1) consulting with coastal managers and decision makers concerning coastal issues, and sharing information and best practices, as the Secretary considers appropriate, with—

(A) coastal States;

(B) local governments; and

(C) representatives of academia, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) consulting with other Federal agencies, including interagency committees, on relevant Federal activities, including activities carried out under the Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act (33 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), and the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 (33 U.S.C. 892 et seq.);

(3) participating, pursuant to section 216 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note), in the establishment of such standards and common protocols as the Secretary considers necessary to assure the interoperability of remote sensing and other geospatial data with all users of such information within—

(A) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(B) other Federal agencies;

(C) State and local government; and

(D) the private sector;

(4) coordinating with, seeking assistance and cooperation of, and providing liaison to the Federal Geographic Data Committee pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-16 and Executive Order 12906 of April 11, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 17671), as amended by Executive Order 13286 of February 28, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 10619); and

(5) developing and maintaining a best practices document that sets out the best practices used by the Secretary in carrying out the program and providing such document to the United States Geological Survey, the Corps of Engineers, and other relevant Federal agencies.

(d) FILLING NEEDS AND GAPS.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall—

(1) maximize the use of remote sensing and other geospatial data collection activities conducted for other purposes and under other authorities;

(2) focus on filling data needs and gaps for coastal management issues, including with respect to areas that, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, were underserved by coastal data and the areas of the Arctic that are under the jurisdiction of the United States;

(3) pursuant to the Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act (33 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), support continue improvement in existing efforts to coordinate the acquisition and integration of key data sets needed for coastal management and other purposes, including—

(A) coastal elevation data;

(B) land use and land cover data;

(C) socioeconomic and human use data;

(D) critical infrastructure data;

(E) structures data;

(F) living resources and habitat data;

(G) cadastral data; and

(H) aerial imagery; and

(4) integrate the priority supporting data set forth under paragraph (3) with other available data for the benefit of the broadest measure of coastal resource management constituents and applications.

(e) FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary—

(A) may enter into financial agreements to carry out the program, including—

(i) support to non-Federal entities that participate in implementing the program; and

(ii) grants, cooperative agreements, interagency agreements, contracts, or any other agreement on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis, with other Federal, tribal, State, and local governmental and nongovernmental entities; and

(B) may, to the maximum extent practicable, enter into such contracts with private sector entities for such products and services as the Secretary determines may be necessary to collect, process, and provide remote sensing and other geospatial data and products for purposes of the program.

(2) FEES.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—The Secretary may assess and collect fees to conduct any planned training, workshop, or conference that advances the purposes of the program.

(B) AMOUNTS.—The amount of a fee under this paragraph may not exceed the sum of costs incurred, or expected to be incurred, by the Secretary as a direct result of the conduct of the training, workshop, or conference, including for subsistence expenses incidental to the training, workshop, or conference, as applicable.

(C) USE OF FEES.—Amounts collected by the Secretary in the form of fees under this paragraph may be used to pay for—

(i) the costs incurred for conducting an activity described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the expenses described in subparagraph (B).

(3) SURVEY AND MAPPING.—Contracts entered into under paragraph (1)(B) shall be considered “surveying and mapping” services as such term is used in and as such contracts are awarded by the Secretary in accordance with the selection procedures in chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

(f) OCEAN ECONOMY.—The Secretary may establish publicly available tools that track ocean and Great Lakes economy data for each coastal State.

Subtitle B—Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System

SEC. 304. STAGGERED TERMS FOR NATIONAL INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 12304(d)(3)(B) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3603(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

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

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), members”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) STAGGERED TERMS.—The Administrator may appoint or reappoint a member for a partial term of 1 or 2 years in order to establish a system of staggered terms. The Administrator may appoint or reappoint a member under this clause only once. A member appointed or reappointed to a partial term under this clause may not serve more than one full term.”.

SEC. 305. INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 12305(a) of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3604(a)) is amended by inserting “disburse appropriated funds to,” after “agreements, with,”.

SEC. 306. REAUTHORIZATION OF INTEGRATED COASTAL AND OCEAN OBSERVATION SYSTEM ACT OF 2009.

Section 12311 of the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3610) is amended by striking “for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 such sums as are necessary” and inserting “\$47,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024”.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

SEC. 401. REFERENCES TO THE NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.).

SEC. 402. MODIFICATION OF DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 208(b) (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) is amended by striking “may” and inserting “shall”.

(b) PLACEMENTS IN CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (1) of this section, in the second sentence, by striking “A fellowship” and inserting the following:

“(2) PLACEMENT PRIORITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In each year in which the Secretary awards a legislative fellowship under this subsection, when considering the placement of fellows, the Secretary shall prioritize placement of fellows in the following:

“(i) Positions in offices of committees of Congress that have jurisdiction over the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

“(ii) Positions in offices of Members of Congress who are on such committees.

“(iii) Positions in offices of Members of Congress that have a demonstrated interest in ocean, coastal, or Great Lakes resources.

“(B) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—

“(i) FINDING AND RECOGNITION.—Congress—

“(I) finds that both host offices and fellows benefit when fellows have the opportunity to choose from a range of host offices from different States and regions, both chambers of Congress, and both political parties; and

“(II) recognizes the steps taken by the National Sea Grant College Program to facilitate an equitable distribution of fellows among the political parties.

“(ii) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that fellows have the opportunity to choose from offices that are described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) and that are equitably distributed among—

“(I) the political parties; and

“(II) the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(iii) POLITICAL AND CAMERAL EQUITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that placements are equitably distributed between—

“(I) the political parties; and

“(II) the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(3) DURATION.—A fellowship”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING FEDERAL HIRING OF FORMER FELLOWS.—It is the sense of Congress that in recognition of the competitive nature of the fellowship under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), and of the exceptional qualifications of fellowship awardees—

(1) the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, should encourage participating Federal agencies to consider opportunities for fellowship awardees at the conclusion of their fellowships for workforce positions appropriate for their education and experience; and

(2) Members and committees of Congress should consider opportunities for such awardees for such positions.

SEC. 403. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 204(c)(4)(E) (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)) is amended to read as follows:

“(E) accept donations of money and, notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, of voluntary and uncompensated services.”.

(b) **PRIORITIES.**—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, shall establish priorities for the use of donations accepted under section 204(c)(4)(E) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)), and shall consider among those priorities the possibility of expanding the Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship’s placement of additional fellows in relevant legislative offices under section 208(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), in accordance with the recommendations under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Sea Grant College Program, in consultation with the National Sea Grant Advisory Board and the Sea Grant Association, shall—

(1) develop recommendations for the optimal use of any donations accepted under section 204(c)(4)(E) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(E)); and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the recommendations developed under paragraph (1).

(d) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect any other amounts available for marine policy fellowships under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)), including amounts—

(1) accepted under section 204(c)(4)(F) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(F)); or

(2) appropriated under section 212 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1131).

SEC. 404. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT ON COORDINATION OF OCEANS AND COASTAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.

Section 9 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 857-20) is repealed.

SEC. 405. REDUCTION IN FREQUENCY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT ADVISORY BOARD REPORT.

Section 209(b)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “BIENNIAL” and inserting “PERIODIC”; and

(2) in the first sentence, by striking “The Board shall report to the Congress every two years” and inserting “Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Board shall submit to Congress a report”.

SEC. 406. MODIFICATION OF ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

Section 204(b) (33 U.S.C. 1123(b)) is amended by inserting “for research, education, extension, training, technology transfer, public service, after “financial assistance”.

SEC. 407. DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY; DEAN JOHN A. KNAUSS MARINE POLICY FELLOWSHIP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—During fiscal year 2019 and any fiscal year thereafter, the head of any Federal agency may appoint, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, other than sections 3303 and 3328 of such title, a qualified candidate described in subsection (b) directly to a position with the Federal agency for which the candidate meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards.

(b) **QUALIFIED CANDIDATE.**—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a former recipient of a Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship

under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) who—

(1) earned a graduate or post-graduate degree in a field related to ocean, coastal, or Great Lakes resources or policy from an institution of higher education accredited by an agency or association recognized by the Secretary of Education pursuant to section 496(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1099b(a));

(2) received a Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship under section 208(b) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(b)) within 5 years before the date the individual is appointed under this section; and

(3) successfully fulfilled the requirements of the fellowship within the executive or legislative branch of the United States Government.

SEC. 408. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 212(a) (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title—

“(A) \$87,520,000 for fiscal year 2020;

“(B) \$91,900,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(C) \$96,500,000 for fiscal year 2022;

“(D) \$101,325,000 for fiscal year 2023;

“(E) \$106,380,000 for fiscal year 2024; and

“(F) \$111,710,813 for fiscal year 2025.”; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) **PRIORITY ACTIVITIES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2020 THROUGH 2025.**—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025 for competitive grants for the following:

“(A) University research on the biology, prevention, and control of aquatic nonnative species.

“(B) University research on oyster diseases, oyster restoration, and oyster-related human health risks.

“(C) University research on the biology, prevention, and forecasting of harmful algal blooms.

“(D) University research, education, training, and extension services and activities focused on coastal resilience and United States working waterfronts and other regional or national priority issues identified in the strategic plan under section 204(c)(1).

“(E) University research and extension on sustainable aquaculture techniques and technologies.

“(F) Fishery research and extension activities conducted by sea grant colleges or sea grant institutes to enhance, and not supplant, existing core program funding.”.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.**—Paragraph (1) of section 212(b) (33 U.S.C. 1131(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There may not be used for administration of programs under this title in a fiscal year more than 5.5 percent of the lesser of—

“(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under this title for the fiscal year; or

“(ii) the amount appropriated under this title for the fiscal year.

“(B) **CRITICAL STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall use the authority under subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, to meet any critical staffing requirement while carrying out the activities authorized under this title.

“(ii) **EXCEPTION FROM CAP.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), any costs incurred as a result of an exercise of authority described in clause (i) shall not be considered an amount used for administration of programs under this title in a fiscal year.”.

(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 204(d)(3) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking “With respect to sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes” and inserting “With respect to sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, sea grant programs, and sea grant projects”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “funding among sea grant colleges and sea grant institutes” and inserting “funding among sea grant colleges, sea grant institutes, sea grant programs, and sea grant projects”.

(2) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING DISTRIBUTION OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.—Section 212 (33 U.S.C. 1131) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 409. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) Section 204(d)(3)(B) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)(B)) is amended by moving clause (vi) 2 ems to the right.

(b) Section 209(b) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “The Secretary shall” and all that follows; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.**—The Secretary shall”.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-330 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 748.

Each further amendment printed in House Report 116-330, shall be considered in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in House Report 116-330 not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CASE OF HAWAII

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 748, I offer amendments en bloc under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, and 28 printed in House Report 116-330, offered by Mr. CASE of Hawaii:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Page 49, after line 24, insert the following:

(G) Activities or projects to address the immediate and long-term degradation or loss

of coral and coral reefs in response to bacteria, fungi, viruses, increased sea surface temperatures, ultraviolet radiation, and pollutants.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Page 66, line 4, insert “coral reefs,” after “environments.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MORELLE OF NEW YORK

Page 35, line 4, strike “may” and insert “shall”.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN OF VIRGINIA

Page 10, line 5, strike “or”.

page 10, line 8, strike the period and insert “; or”.

(C) which include communities that may not have adequate resources to prepare for or respond to coastal hazards, including low-income communities, communities of color, Tribal communities, and rural communities.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 45, line 25, insert after subparagraph (C) the following:

(C) Adaptive management strategies for Great Lakes ecosystems and resources, including strategies to support freshwater fisheries, monitor ice cover, manage phosphorous and nitrogen chemical loads, minimize invasive species and harmful blooms of algae, and create protected areas to maintain Great Lakes ecosystems.

Page 46, lines 1 and 7, redesignate subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 45, line 15, insert “combat invasive species,” after “strategies to”.

Page 46, after line 6, insert the following:

(E) A description of how the plan will address the impact of climate change affecting coastal communities will have on nearby Tribes, Tribal communities, and low-income or low-resource communities and how those stakeholders will be included in and informed about the development of the plan.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 7, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 7, line 23, strike the period and insert “; and”.

(3) include an outreach or education component that seeks and solicits feedback from the local or regional community most directly affected by the proposal.

Page 11, after line 6, insert the following:

(II) Tribes and Tribal organizations;

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 91, after line 14, insert the following: (7) research on the impacts of harmful algal blooms, nutrient pollution, and dead zones on Great Lakes fisheries;

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 48, line 19, insert “, such as sea walls and living shorelines” after “environment”.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 307. ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—OCEANS.

(a) AGREEMENT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Acad-

emy of Sciences to conduct the comprehensive assessment under subsection (b).

(b) COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under an agreement between the Administrator and the National Academy of Sciences under this section, the National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a comprehensive assessment of the need for and feasibility of establishing an Advanced Research Projects Agency—Oceans (ARPA—O).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The comprehensive assessment carried out pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of how an ARPA—O could help overcome the long-term and high-risk technological barriers in the development of ocean technologies, with the goal of enhancing the economic, ecological, and national security of the United States through the rapid development of technologies that result in—

(i) improved data collection, monitoring, and prediction of the ocean environment, including sea ice conditions;

(ii) overcoming barriers to the application of new and improved technologies, such as high costs and scale of operational missions;

(iii) improved management practices for protecting ecological sustainability;

(iv) improved national security capacity;

(v) improved technology for fishery population assessments;

(vi) expedited processes between and among Federal agencies to successfully identify, transition, and coordinate research and development output to operations, applications, commercialization, and other uses; and

(vii) ensuring that the United States maintains a technological lead in developing and deploying advanced ocean technologies;

(B) an evaluation of the organizational structures under which an ARPA—O could be organized, which takes into account—

(i) best practices for new research programs;

(ii) metrics and approaches for periodic program evaluation;

(iii) capacity to fund and manage external research awards; and

(iv) options for oversight of the activity through a Federal agency, an interagency organization, nongovernmental organization, or other institutional arrangement; and

(C) an estimation of the scale of investment necessary to pursue high priority ocean technology projects.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the comprehensive assessment conducted under subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term “Administrator” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere in the Under Secretary’s capacity as Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 108. UPDATE TO ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY INDEX PRODUCTS OF NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION FOR GREAT LAKES.

(a) UPDATE REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY INDEX PRODUCTS FOR GREAT LAKES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere shall commence updating the environmental sensitivity index products of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for each coastal area of the Great Lakes.

(b) PERIODIC UPDATES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY INDEX PRODUCTS GENERALLY.—

Subject to the availability of appropriations and the priorities set forth in subsection (c), the Under Secretary shall—

(1) periodically update the environmental sensitivity index products of the Administration; and

(2) endeavor to do so not less frequently than once every 7 years.

(c) PRIORITIES.—When prioritizing geographic areas to update environmental sensitivity index products, the Under Secretary shall consider—

(1) the age of existing environmental sensitivity index products for the areas;

(2) the occurrence of extreme events, be it natural or man-made, which have significantly altered the shoreline or ecosystem since the last update;

(3) the natural variability of shoreline and coastal environment; and

(4) the volume of vessel traffic and general vulnerability to spilled pollutants.

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY INDEX PRODUCT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “environmental sensitivity index product” means a map or similar tool that is utilized to identify sensitive shoreline, coastal or offshore, resources prior to an oil spill event in order to set baseline priorities for protection and plan cleanup strategies, typically including information relating to shoreline type, biological resources, and human use resources.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Under Secretary \$7,500,000 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be available to the Under Secretary for the purposes set forth in such paragraph until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 75, lines 7-8, strike “paragraph (2)” and insert “paragraphs (2) and (4)”.

Page 75, after line 25, insert the following:

(4) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce with respect to marine or estuarine projects, may waive the application of paragraph (2)(A) with respect to a State or an Indian Tribe, or otherwise reduce the portion of the non-Federal share of the cost of an activity required to be paid by a State or an Indian Tribe under paragraph (1), if the Secretary determines that the State or Indian Tribe does not have sufficient funds not derived from another Federal grant program to pay such non-Federal share, or portion of the non-Federal share, without the use of loans.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 55, line 25, strike “25” and insert “26”.

Page 56, line 16, strike “1 shall be a representative” and insert “2 shall be representatives”.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 11, line 16, strike “and”.

Page 11, line 20, strike the period and insert “; and”.

(3) to incentivize landowners to engage in living shoreline projects.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 10, line 15, strike “and”.

Page 10, line 18, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 10, after line 19, insert the following:

(iii) the consideration of an established eligible entity program with systems to disburse funding from a single grant to support multiple small-scale projects.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 49, line 1, insert “, avian,” after “marine”.

Page 49, line 5, insert “, avian,” after “fish”.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 91, after line 14, insert the following:

(7) research into the affects of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, mercury, and other contaminants on fisheries and fishery ecosystems;

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 50, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 107. PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a program to award prizes competitively under section 24 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3719), for the purpose described in subsection (b).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose described in this subsection is to stimulate innovation to advance the following coastal risk reduction and resilience measures:

(1) Natural features, including dunes, reefs, and wetlands.

(2) Nature-based features, including beach nourishment, dune restoration, wetland and other coastal habitat restoration, and living shoreline construction.

(3) Nonstructural measures, including flood proofing of structures, flood warning systems, and elevated development.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 50, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 107. CATALOG OF RESEARCH ON APPLICABLE COASTAL RISK REDUCTION AND RESILIENCE MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator, shall—

(1) identify all Department of Commerce research activities regarding applicable coastal risk reduction and resilience measures;

(2) consult with the heads of other Federal agencies to identify what activities, if any, those Federal agencies are conducting regarding applicable coastal risk reduction and resilience measures;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of the activities identified under paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(4) appoint one or more officers or employees of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to liaise with non-Federal entities conducting research related to applicable coastal risk reduction and resilience measures in order to eliminate redundancies, cooperate for common climate research goals, and to make research findings readily available to the public.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE COASTAL RISK REDUCTION AND RESILIENCE MEASURES.—In this section, the term “applicable coastal risk reduction and resilience measures” means natural features, nature-based features, or nonstructural measures.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, again, in the interests of an incredibly good bipartisan bill

and moving this bill forward, I offer this en bloc amendment, which is a package of a number of amendments offered by colleagues that all seek to further improve the resilience of our coastlines and of our Great Lakes.

I applaud the sponsors of these amendments for their thoughtful engagement on this issue and for acting to ensure that families in their districts are safe and healthy, with productive jobs and clean environments.

We are working to create a more sustainable, healthy planet, and this package of bills and these amendments will move us in the right direction.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I first want to thank the Democrats for at least not wasting our time by debating all of these amendments individually. But, once again, within the pockets you will find some good things and some not so good things that are part of what is going on here.

For example, there will be within that list some blanket waivers for Federal cost-sharing requirements. It is not a good idea to do it.

There are some stand-alone bills that are in there that have no regular order consideration in this House. It is also not a good process to go through.

But if we are going to throw regular order out the window and address 20 amendments all at once that don't really have that significant of a change or an impact, at least we are doing this in the most efficient and effective way that we possibly could. It is not necessarily making a bill, it is not really going anywhere better, but at least we are getting stuff done so we can say we have the illusion of activity on the floor.

Madam Chair, I urge rejection of the en bloc, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), my colleague.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding and for his work on this bill.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to ensure that Great Lakes States have access to the resources in this bill, so they can address climate change threats specific to our region.

Increased rain has already led to more agricultural runoff into the Great Lakes, resulting in higher bacterial counts and larger algal blooms. This has put our drinking water supplies at risk. Lake Michigan alone provides drinking water for 10 million people.

Climate change increasingly threatens Great Lakes wildlife, including fisheries important to our economy, by changing temperatures, precipitation patterns, and ice cover.

These are some of the reasons that America's “third coast,” our Great

Lakes States, need access to the resources in this bill.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his support, including my amendment in this en bloc, and I ask my colleagues to join me and support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), my colleague.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment.

The ocean covers more than 70 percent of the planet. It supplies much of the oxygen that we breathe, it regulates our climate, it is linked to the water we drink, and it is home to more than half of all life on Earth. But despite our intrinsic connection to our ocean, we know very little about what is beneath its surface.

As co-chair of the House Oceans Caucus, I have worked with my fellow co-chair for the caucus, Congressman DON YOUNG from Alaska, to improve ocean data and monitoring efforts through the introduction of our BLUE GLOBE Act. My amendment parallels those efforts and would direct the NOAA administrator to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to assess the potential for, and feasibility of, an Advanced Research Project Agency-Oceans, or ARPA-O.

Coastal communities, like those I represent in northwest Oregon, rely on accurate ocean data and monitoring for information on ocean acidification, forecasting of harmful algal blooms and hypoxia, tsunami preparedness, navigation, and port security. And after the stark findings in the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report on “The Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate,” we know that ocean data and monitoring are more important than ever in adapting to the climate crisis.

My other amendment would add and expand a new grant program established in the underlying bill to strengthen research opportunities on coastal acidification and hypoxia. The basic chemistry of our oceans is changing at an unprecedented rate, and additional research efforts like those established in this bill will help communities respond.

I thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Mr. CRIST for their support of these amendments and for their leadership.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, again, these en bloc amendments are critical additions and positive additions to a critical bill. These amendments address major issues related to the harmful impacts of climate change and

other man-made effects on our oceans, our coastlines, and our lakes.

For example, they single out the destruction that is being wrought, as we speak, on our coral reefs throughout our entire country, our coral reefs throughout the Gulf Coast, throughout Florida, and throughout the West Coast, in Hawaii and beyond: the acidification that has led to bleaching of these coral reefs. And as we all know, or at least I hope we all know, as go the coral reefs, so go our oceans.

These amendments would strengthen Federal programs that address the health of our coral reefs. These amendments go to harmful algal blooms, which are a problem throughout our country, as well.

What can we and should we do about it as a Federal coordinated effort? Of course, we should do something about that.

These amendments would strengthen this bill. These amendments would forward a Federal-State partnership, a community partnership, to address another harmful consequence which is killing our oceans.

These amendments would address coastal resiliency. How do we prevent our coastlines from eroding? In my own home State of Hawaii, we have seen significant erosion. And that is true of all of the other coasts: significant increases in sea level over a very, very recent period of time that has caused major erosion.

How can we adopt better overall programs that adapt to a changing ocean and do not worsen the problem of coastal erosion? How do we do that?

These amendments get at these issues. These are good, solid, and positive additions that our colleagues have come up with to strengthen a good, solid, and positive bipartisan bill.

Madam Chair, I support these amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, I appreciate especially the ability of putting all these amendments into en bloc to help move this process along. I am just looking at some of the issues that have been brought up already, and I am looking at the list of the Federal grants and the agencies that are already spending their money on these approaches.

If the issue is, obviously, you want more money spent on those programs, that is not an authorization that we are doing here. That is an appropriations issue. Go to the Appropriations Committee and talk about how that fits into the overall budget.

This does not necessarily move us forward, but at least we are not spending as much time as we would if we addressed each of these individually.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendments which are included in en bloc No. 1.

My amendments are simply. I will sum them up in six words: Community Engagement, Education, Outreach, and Consultation.

The impacts of climate change and environmental degradation affect us all. But the fact is climate change has a disparate impact on low-income and minority communities. Indeed, these communities are also disproportionately impacted by other environmental hazards. It is also worth mentioning that these communities, which suffer resource deficits, cannot simply relocate out of flood zones or pay for expensive mitigation efforts.

Similarly, my Native brothers and sisters have unique cultures that are highly vulnerable to climate change impacts which threatens their ways of life, subsistence, lands and water rights, and survival. For example, the Great Lakes have been an integral part of the history of many of the region’s tribes.

However, too often, the most vulnerable communities are left out when it comes to the great ideas and projects like those we are authorizing in this bill. Tribal communities and low-income communities have a great stake in this debate. My amendment makes sure that they are included and active participants in the efforts authorized by this bill. My amendments would amend two of the grant programs in the bill to make clear that you must consult with, reach out, and meaningfully engage with tribal and low-income communities located where these projects are planned.

My amendments affect two programs created in this bill: the Living Shorelines Grant Program and the Climate Change Adaption Preparedness and Response Program.

The Living Shorelines Grant program is intended to fund the design, implementation, and monitoring of climate resilient living shoreline projects intended to protect coastal communities and ecosystem functions from environmental conditions, particularly those impacted by climate change.

The Climate Program is intended to help develop and fund comprehensive adaptation plans to help states better understand the scope of the threat of climate change, identify state-wide costs, and develop local strategies to ensure safety for their residents.

We get better policy making and outcomes when we ensure that all segments of our communities are engaged and meaningfully involved in the process.

I thank the chairman for his support of these commonsense amendments.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HECK). The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Hawaii will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-330.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. 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 92, after line 7, insert the following:

Subtitle C—Chesapeake Bay Oyster Research
SEC. 218. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall be the primary representative of the Administration in the Chesapeake Bay.

SEC. 219. GRANTS FOR RESEARCHING OYSTERS IN THE CHESAPEAKE BAY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall establish a grant program (in this section referred to as the “Program”) under which the Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities for the purpose of conducting research on the conservation, restoration, or management of oysters in the Chesapeake Bay.

(b) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(c) ALLOCATION OF GRANT FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award a grant under the Program to eligible entities that submit an application under subsection (b).

(2) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the total amount of Federal funding received under the Program by an eligible entity may not exceed 85 percent of the total cost of the research project for which the funding was awarded. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the non-Federal share of project costs may be provided by in-kind contributions and other noncash support.

(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive all or part of the requirement in subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that no reasonable means are available through which an eligible entity applying for a grant under this section can meet such requirement and the probable benefit of such research project outweighs the public interest in such requirement.

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

(1) ACADEMIC COMMUNITY.—The term “academic community” means faculty, researchers, professors, and representatives of State-accredited colleges and universities.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means a member of the academic community, the seafood industry, a relevant nonprofit organization, or a relevant State agency, that is proposing or conducting a research project on the conservation, restoration, or management of oysters in the Chesapeake Bay developed through consultation with a member of the academic community, a member of the seafood industry, a relevant nonprofit organization, or a relevant State agency.

(3) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term “nonprofit organization” means an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(4) SEAFOOD INDUSTRY.—The term “seafood industry” means shellfish growers, shellfish harvesters, commercial fishermen, and recreational fishermen.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2025 to carry out this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first recognize the hard work of Chairman GRIJALVA and the sponsors of the underlying pieces of legislation. This package reflects a bipartisan collaboration between Members dedicated to conserving our natural resources.

In the face of changing climate, extreme weather patterns and events, rising tides, disappearing species, and habitat destruction, it is critical we act now to preserve and protect our coastlines, and the communities and local economies that depend on the continued health of our water resources.

This includes the Chesapeake Bay, the largest estuary in the country, in my State of Maryland. The bay is critically important as an economic engine that attracts millions of tourists and supports thousands of jobs.

For decades, oyster harvesting was one of the bay's most important industries. Yet today, we are seeing an alarming decline in the bay's oyster population, a decline caused by climate change, years of overharvesting, ocean acidification, nutrient reduction, denitrification, habitat destruction, and oyster-debilitating disease. However, there is still much we don't know as to why the depletion is occurring and how best to conserve oysters.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment strengthens the underlying bill by providing research grants to those working to reverse the depletion and decline of oysters in the Chesapeake Bay. These grants support collaborative partnerships to research the long-term conservation, restoration, and management of oysters in the Chesapeake Bay.

This program will encourage collaborations between the academic community, the seafood industry, nonprofit organizations, and State agencies to develop new innovative solutions.

These grants will help us better understand why oyster hatcheries are crashing and to develop best practices in mitigating habitat destruction.

My amendment will provide us more tools to strengthen the oyster population and the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I actually don't have great pleasure in doing that because Mr. BROWN is a vital member of our committee, does a great

job, and defends his State brilliantly. I appreciate him doing that.

But, once again, the process we are doing is adding another new taxpayer program that already has existing programs in effect, and is actually a stand-alone bill that has not received a hearing, a markup, or a CBO score, and adding that to this, because this is, once again, the only train in town and we are not taking time to do these things individually as we ought to.

But when it comes to oyster research, which is extremely important, I recognize fully, as you see by the chart the total numbers in each of these years, starting in fiscal year 2014, are how much had been given to this particular program.

In 2018, it was \$617 million in funds from all of the different government agencies that actually participate. That includes Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Homeland Security, Interior, and EPA for watershed restoration.

NOAA does have a Chesapeake Bay office. They provide research. They provide grants to both Maryland and Virginia. Last year, they also provided a grant to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation to add these programs in there.

What we are trying to say here is, it is already being done.

Now, if this is a problem of not enough money going into there, as some of the other speakers have said, well, that is not an issue of authorization. The authorization authority exists. That is a question of how much we are actually appropriating, which is an entirely different issue, which you should go to the Appropriations Committee to see if you actually want that number higher.

But, actually, the Federal Government does do this, and they are increasing with it. There is not a problem that needs authorization. If you need more money, that is an appropriations issue. This, unfortunately, is not about appropriations. This is about authorization.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate his interest. I appreciate this issue. But it is already being done by other agencies. There is no need for another entity to enter into this particular market.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116-330.

Mr. HUIZENGA. 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 16, after line 2, insert the following:
(h) MINIMUM REQUIRED FUNDS FOR SHORELINE PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN THE GREAT LAKES.—The Secretary shall make not less than 10 percent of the funds awarded under this section to projects located in the Great Lakes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, while I stand here today as I offer my amendment, residents across the Great Lakes are facing imminent threats to their property, their infrastructure, and the shorelines themselves due to historically high water levels.

Great Lakes communities, including many in my own district along the shores of Lake Michigan, are in critical need of shoreline projects to protect against devastating erosion.

For those of us who call the region home, the Great Lakes forever shape our way of life. It is where we recreate. It is where we do business. It is where we pass along the heritage of our region.

The Great Lakes form the largest fresh surface water system on the Earth, holding nearly 20 percent of the world's freshwater supply.

They directly generate more than 1.5 million jobs, provide the backbone of a \$5 trillion regional economy, and are the home for more than 3,500 different plants and species.

As I often say, we can and should protect and promote both the economy and the ecology of the Great Lakes. However, our communities are facing devastating consequences if we don't act to protect our shorelines now. The high water levels, combined with the effect of recent storms that brought even higher waves and strong winds, are threatening our communities.

Public infrastructure, including roads, bridges, and docks, have been battered and, in some cases, actually lost. Recreational beaches have disappeared, and others are covered with dangerous debris now. Habitats have been destroyed. Numerous homes are teetering on the edge of dune cliffs or are threatened by the rising water level.

This amendment, which would set aside just 10 percent of the spending in these particular projects, would ensure that communities within the Great Lakes system receive necessary funding through the living shoreline grant program to protect and preserve our shorelines.

It is imperative that resources are provided through all available options to enhance the shorelines of the Great Lakes and to protect our homes and our communities.

I understand the ranking member's position on this particular package of bills and Senate activity, or maybe lack thereof on this. Yet, I do have a responsibility to not only highlight this issue but to advocate for those who are in desperate need and in desperate situations.

That is one of the reasons I will be supporting this package. I ask for consideration of my colleagues to help adopt this amendment.

Whether it is going together as a package or whether it gets dealt with separately in the Senate, I know that this is something that we need to look at as a legislative body, and we need to act now.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, for our majority colleagues, I deeply appreciate my colleague's comments in support of his amendment and his appreciation and understanding of the communities that he represents, in terms of the impacts of climate change and other man-made causes not only on our oceans, because we tend to focus on our oceans, but on our lakes, to include our Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are currently experiencing nearly record high water levels, causing widespread erosion of beaches and property and costing people their lives. In fact, there have been over 50 percent more deaths in the Great Lakes in 2019 because of these dangerous conditions compared to 2018.

These high lake levels are forecast to continue for 2020 and, in all likelihood, beyond. Just this month, 12 Michigan State lawmakers asked Governor Whitmer to declare a state of emergency for the Lake Michigan shoreline because of water levels.

Resilient, living shorelines are one of the best options for the Great Lakes communities dealing with the impacts of high lake levels, as they are for other communities in the body of this bill.

Our majority does support my colleague's amendment to be sure that this money does find its way to where it is most needed. I support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman from Hawaii and his acknowledgment of what is going on in the Great Lakes.

In fact, it was my own State representative who led that letter of State legislators requesting Governor Whitmer to declare this emergency declaration so that the Federal Government can look at that.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate that support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. KATKO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 116-330.

Mr. KATKO. 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 91, after line 14, insert the following:

(7) harmful algal bloom development research;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 729, which I am proud to offer with my colleagues from New York, Representatives MORELLE, BRINDISI, and STEFANIK.

This amendment would explicitly authorize the U.S. Geological Survey to conduct research on harmful algal bloom, or HAB, development within the Great Lakes Basin system. This research would help to address significant risks that algal blooms pose to freshwater ecosystems, including the production of toxins that endanger humans and animal life.

These hazards are all too familiar to the community that I represent in central New York, which has faced a rising number of outbreaks in recent years. In these instances, outbreaks have jeopardized the availability of clean drinking water for my constituents and directly impacted the health of our lakefront communities.

Unfortunately, this issue extends beyond my district and even further beyond the Great Lakes. These algal blooms have been recorded in all 50 States, necessitating increased Federal support for research and mitigation efforts nationwide.

Research conducted in the Great Lakes under this amendment would help to stem the increasing spread of this toxic threat and provide peace of mind to at-risk communities.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague's efforts on this particular amendment, which, as he points out, is a truly bipartisan amendment joined in by Members from the New York delegation on a bipartisan basis. I think this illustrates a couple of different things.

First of all, this bill and these amendments need not be partisan. In fact, they offer one of the best avenues forward for true bipartisanship as we confront the crisis of climate change.

Second, they illustrate that when we talk about our marine resources and climate change, and in this bill, we focus on our oceans and tend to think that our coastal States are those that are affected. Clearly, it is not only our coastal States that are affected.

Many States throughout our country are directly affected by the impacts of climate change, including New York State, in conjunction with the Great Lakes. So this is an amendment that we can support. Every year, we seem to hear about another toxic algal bloom in the Great Lakes closing beaches or fisheries.

It is important that the fishery research reauthorization in this bill include researching the impacts of harmful algal blooms because there is a lot that is unknown about the causes of these toxic blooms and the long-term effects in fish populations.

When we speak of fish populations in the Great Lakes, we speak not only of the benefits of the fish populations through our natural ecosystems in the Great Lakes and not only of recreational fisheries, but we speak in the range of some 75,000 jobs that can be directly attributed to the health of our fisheries in our Great Lakes. So I am pleased to urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Hawaii. I urge adoption 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 New York (Mr. KATKO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. KATKO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 116-330.

Mr. KATKO. 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 49, after line 24, insert the following:

(G) Projects to assess the impact on coastal resiliency of water level regulating practices on the Great Lakes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act. This amendment would extend the eligibility for grant funding under H.R. 729 to projects that assess the impact of Great Lakes water level management practices on coastal resiliency.

My constituents on Lake Ontario's southern shore have faced record high and oftentimes catastrophic water levels in 2 of the last 3 years. These rising levels have resulted in catastrophic flood damage and coastal erosion, threatening the physical well-being of our communities and posing an existential threat to the local economy.

As water levels continue to rise across the Great Lakes, it is important that we thoroughly evaluate all the factors that contribute to the health of our coastal communities, including the water level management procedures that are supposed to mitigate those threats to our coasts.

My amendment will provide necessary support to projects that include a thorough evaluation of these procedures as a part of the broader effort to improve coastal resiliency across the Great Lakes.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, again, this is a very positive, bipartisan amendment by the Members from New York and indicates that we can, in fact, proceed in a bipartisan way on these critical issues.

As already noted earlier in my remarks, the Great Lakes have experienced record or near-record high levels of water this year and are projected to continue to have high levels next year and well beyond.

Many coastal communities and property owners in the Great Lakes are suffering from accelerated land loss and erosion. This amendment rightfully ensures that water level regulating practices can be a part of coastal resilience planning.

I only regret that when it comes to our world's oceans, we don't have the luxury of regulating sea levels in accordance with water level regulating practices.

We support this amendment and the intent of this amendment, but I must indicate a caution for the RECORD, and that is that if this amendment leads to the uncontrolled, indiscriminate construction of dams throughout our country, we need to be careful because dams are double-edged swords. They can be a tremendous boon to water reg-

ulating practices and electricity, energy, sports and fishing, and many other concerns, but they can have unintended environmental consequences.

I would simply caution that as we go forward with the implementation of this amendment, I hope that we pay very close attention to the sound science behind water level regulating practices.

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, but I will note that my colleague from Hawaii is right in that this needs to be properly administered if it is, in fact, made into law.

One of the problems we have in the Great Lakes in general is the high water levels. What we have on Lake Ontario is something called the International Joint Commission, which I would argue is not properly administering the water levels and is contributing greatly to the problem.

This amendment is meant, in part, to address that and to have more uniformity with respect to the application of water levels and considering more the impact on the coastal shorelines from those regulations.

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. KATKO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CRIST

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 116-330.

Mr. CRIST. 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 48, lines 19-20, insert "harmful algal blooms," after "ocean acidification."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chair, my amendment today is simple. It clarifies that projects to address harmful algal blooms are eligible for priority funding under the climate change adaptation, preparedness, and response program created by the underlying bill.

□ 1615

Last year, the State of Florida was ravaged by simultaneous outbreaks of red tide and blue-green algae. Floridians across the State were forced to endure threats to their health. Dead fish, dolphins, and Florida's iconic manatees washed up on our beaches in droves, and an awful and inescapable stench drifted inland for miles.

In Florida, our waterways and natural resources are our livelihoods, but these harmful algae blooms threaten that. According to a damage assessment from the Tampa Bay Regional

Planning Council, businesses in the 12 most impacted counties lost over \$130 million in 4 short months, and at least 300 hardworking Floridians lost their jobs as a direct result of these outbreaks.

This is not just a seasonal nuisance. These outbreaks are a threat to Florida's environment and to our very way of life. As our State still struggles to recover from last year's disaster, another red tide outbreak is happening right now.

The reality is that these outbreaks will only get worse as our climate changes and our oceans warm. It is imperative that any program to help prepare our communities for the impacts of climate change also includes initiatives to address harmful algae blooms such as red tides.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the bipartisan sponsors of my amendment: the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY); the gentlewoman from Oregon, Chairwoman BONAMICI; the gentlewoman from Ohio, Chairwoman KAPTUR; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). I would also like to thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment as well as the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this is, once again, where we have the same situation that the issue and the problem of which the gentleman from Florida speaks is real and it is there. The concept is it is already also being addressed. These are the kinds of programs that already exist to do exactly what the gentleman wishes to do.

Nonetheless, this amendment would authorize a duplicative program that would cost \$114 million if it were actually implemented. But just because we pass the amendment doesn't mean the money is there to implement the program.

So much of the opposition and so many of the complaints that we have been hearing are that there is not enough money appropriated to do it. The \$114 million doesn't exist until there is an appropriation to actually go about that concept.

Here is where the problem lies for all of these amendments that we are going to be hearing for this entire process. The bill is the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act, passed in 1998, which already provides the legal authority and the funding level—not necessarily the appropriation but the legal, authorized funding level—for algae bloom prevention and control.

In addition—in addition to these activities—and they are being conducted by NOAA, USGS, NASA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and EPA—it is the

concept we have been saying all along, this entire concept of this package that we are bringing in here is stuff that is trying to highlight another issue and another problem which may be, in this case, a legitimate issue and problem, but fails to realize it is already covered.

Mr. Chairman, you don't need a duplicative program to do what we are already doing. If you want more money for it, that is another issue, and that doesn't take place in these authorizations. That takes place in appropriations. But we are already doing 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 Florida (Mr. CRIST).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NUMBER 14 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed House Report 116-330.

Mr. PANETTA. 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 92, after line 23, insert the following:

(3) Collaborations and partnerships between institutions of higher education and Federal agencies help ensure digital data focused on coastal management issues are communicated effectively between such entities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act.

As we have heard today, this bill helps communities like mine on the central coast of California prepare for and respond to climate change, and it does this with scientific data to address coastal and ocean management.

More importantly, this bill establishes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Digital Coast program, a web-based collection of tools, training resources, and data that informs coastal managers on their climate-related decisions.

Now, my amendment will expand that data set, and it will do that by encouraging collaborations and partnerships between higher educational institutions and Federal agencies.

Now, in my district, there are coastal colleges and universities that are pur-

suing cutting-edge research focused on coastal resilience. At the same time, there are Federal agencies like NOAA that are doing innovative work on this very same topic.

My amendment will ensure that there is communication, coordination, and collaboration between academic scholars and the policymakers when it comes to digital data focused on coastal management issues. This will not only improve the relevance and applicability of our Nation's efforts to protect coastal communities, but it will help our Nation gather the evidence it needs and continue being the leader it needs to be when it comes to mitigation and adaptation in dealing with climate change.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although, in all fairness, I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this adds a finding to it. It doesn't have any cost. This is not a duplicative program because it is a finding, so I support this 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 California (Mr. PANETTA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. MUCARSEL-POWELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 116-330.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. 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 17, line 6, insert "corals," after "submerged aquatic plants."

Page 17, line 18, insert "corals," after "submerged aquatic vegetation,"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which would ensure that corals are included in projects eligible for grants provided for by section 102 of the underlying bill, the Living Shorelines grant program.

Living shorelines are essential for protecting our coastlines from rising sea levels and stronger wave action from intensifying storms.

My district in south Florida benefits greatly from many elements of living shorelines. Mangroves absorb the power of strong waves, protect our coasts from erosion, and store carbon. Our beautiful Everglades provide tremendous flood protection, clean our water, and provide habitats for so many types of wildlife.

Another crucial tool in our natural toolbox is coral reefs, and we must ensure that projects to protect and restore our reefs are eligible for grants.

My district is home to the third largest barrier reef in the world and the only barrier reef in the continental United States. Healthy corals dissipate the force of waves and protect coastlines from damage and erosion. In fact, according to NOAA, healthy coral reefs absorb 97 percent of a wave's energy, providing significant shoreline protection.

Unlike concrete and stone seawalls and breakwaters, coral reefs have a tremendous amount of biodiversity that is unparalleled under the surface. They are the rain forest of the ocean. They are essential for our tourism industry and for our fishing industry, both recreational and commercial.

Our coral reefs are suffering right now under the stressors of today's environment and human activity. We need to take steps wherever we can to protect and restore our reefs.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, again, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, we, once again, are in the same situation. This is not a bad idea, and it is not a bad concept. In fact, it is such a good concept, we are already doing it.

So, if I quote NOAA in their testimony in our committee, the agency currently provides financial and technical assistance to coastal communities for the use of living shorelines through existing programs. The program already has \$300 million that is going in there, and it is going through those areas, including the Interior, NOAA, Fish and Wildlife, EPA, Science Foundation, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Department of Agriculture.

All of those are providing funds for this very thing, which means it is happening. You don't need to add this language to have it happen, Mr. Chairman, because it already is happening.

By adding the language, I guess, well, you get to add another line in the code, and you can say you passed something. But the bottom line is it still is an unnecessary amendment to an unnecessary bill because the authority and the authorization is already there.

The only thing that might not be there is, once again, you don't think it

is spending enough money, in which case that is an appropriations issue, not an authorization issue.

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

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of my fellow colleague from the other side, but you know the technicalities that we have to deal with when dealing with bureaucratic agencies and governments. So we just need to make sure that we do not exclude such a crucial part of what we are talking about, which is protection for our shorelines.

I just want to mention one more thing, that the annual benefits of coral reefs, including a flood protection barrier for more than 18,000 coastal citizens, actually provide \$1.8 billion worth of coastal infrastructure in the United States in terms of benefits. So, whatever we are going to spend in providing grants to protect our coral reefs, we are going to receive back in benefits.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MRS. LURIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed House Report 116-330.

Mrs. LURIA. 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 24, strike "and".

Page 9, line 18, strike the period and insert ";" and".

Page 9, line 19, insert "(E) the potential of the project to support resiliency at a military installation or community infrastructure supportive of a military installation (as such terms are defined in section 2391 of title 10, United States Code.)"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act.

My amendment directs NOAA to consider the potential of proposed living shoreline projects to enhance the resiliency of military installations and the communities that surround them.

Earlier this year, the Department of Defense found that well over half of the highest priority military installations

are or will be at risk of recurrent flooding. The report found that greater Hampton Roads is one of the areas "most vulnerable to flooding" in the entire United States.

Hampton Roads is home to the largest Navy base in the world and installations from every branch of the service. When it floods in coastal Virginia, it is both a local nuisance as well as a threat to our national security.

Coastal Virginians are stepping up to meet this challenge. The cities of Norfolk and Virginia Beach have proposed almost \$1.5 billion in coastal resiliency infrastructure, but Hampton Roads and other coastal localities with military presence cannot bear the cost of sea level rise, severe storms, and recurrent flooding alone.

My amendment will strengthen H.R. 729 by ensuring that NOAA takes into account the crucial role resiliency projects can play in bolstering our national security and our local communities.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I would actually ask to claim the time in opposition, though, once again, I am not really opposed to this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those elements which, once again, the gentlewoman raises an issue that I think is right, it is good, and it is appropriate; and the idea that we should make sure these considerations take effect is an appropriate thing.

The concept, once again, but the problem is there is nothing that prohibits that from being done, and, indeed, it is being done even as we speak, but you want to reemphasize it.

Once again, we should be taking military consideration into everything we are doing, not just this particular amendment. But it is the right concept there. It is why I am not really opposed to this. It is the right thing to do.

Actually, it is such a right thing to do, we should have been spending our time doing the NDAA, which is much more successful and much more important to the military. That should have been passed months ago. That is how important this particular topic is.

I am not really opposed to it. It is, once again, redundant, and we are already doing that. There is nothing that stops us from doing that.

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

□ 1630

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I applaud the sponsor of this amendment, my colleague from the beautiful and critical Virginia coast.

Everything she said in her remarks could easily have applied to many, many of our military installations across the country.

Of course, Hampton Roads is critical to our Nation's defense, and so is Joint Base Pearl Harbor, the home of our Air Force and our Navy in the Indo-Pacific, as is Marine Corps Base Kaneohe, the home of our marines in the Indo-Pacific.

My colleague, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, knows full well that our military has actually taken the lead in assessing the realistic consequences of climate change on our military installations across the country. They deserve credit for that. They also need help with that. My colleagues' amendment would provide them that help and will create the partnership that we need to guarantee the continued security and operation of our Nation's key military installations and the family communities that depend on them.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Chair, coastal resiliency projects, such as the Living Shoreline Program, can strengthen our military and the local communities that support them. My amendment will improve H.R. 729 by ensuring that NOAA considers the national security benefits of these projects.

Let me be clear: A vote against this amendment is a vote to turn our backs on our servicemembers and military families, as well as disregard the future of military readiness in our coastal communities.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment in the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, let's just say this: In concept once again, regardless of how one votes on this amendment, the issue is still significant. The issue is still being covered. The issue is already being done. There is a redundancy in some elements to it, but it is a redundancy for a good cause.

Mr. Chair, I am not going to vote against it, but, once again, we are doing it. We are doing it already, that is what we are doing with the entire package that we are debating. We are doing it already.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed House Report 116-330.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. 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 the following:

TITLE V—STREAMLINING ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVALS

SEC. 501. ADDRESSING PERMITS FOR TAKING OF MARINE MAMMALS.

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(5)(D)) is amended as follows:

(1) In clause (i)—

(A) by striking “citizens of the United States” and inserting “persons”;

(B) by striking “within a specific geographic region”;

(C) by striking “of small numbers”;

(D) by striking “such citizens” and inserting “such persons”; and

(E) by striking “within that region”.

(2) In clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “, and other means of effecting the least practicable impact on such species or stock and its habitat”;

(B) in subclause (III), by striking “requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking by harassment, including” and inserting “efficient and practical requirements pertaining to the monitoring of such taking by harassment while the activity is being conducted and the reporting of such taking, including, as the Secretary determines necessary,”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“Any condition imposed pursuant to subclause (I), (II), or (III) may not result in more than a minor change to the specified activity and may not alter the basic design, location, scope, duration, or timing of the specified activity.”.

(3) In clause (iii), by striking “receiving an application under this subparagraph” and inserting “an application is accepted or required to be considered complete under subclause (I)(aa), (II)(aa), or (IV) of clause (viii), as applicable.”.

(4) In clause (vi), by striking “a determination of ‘least practicable adverse impact on such species or stock’ under clause (i)(I)” and inserting “conditions imposed under subclause (I), (II), or (III) of clause (ii)”.

(5) By adding at the end the following:

“(viii)(I) The Secretary shall—

“(aa) accept as complete a written request for authorization under this subparagraph for incidental taking described in clause (i), by not later than 45 days after the date of submission of the request; or

“(bb) provide to the requester, by not later than 15 days after the date of submission of the request, a written notice describing any additional information required to complete the request.

“(II) If the Secretary provides notice under subclause (I)(bb), the Secretary shall, by not later than 30 days after the date of submission of the additional information described in the notice—

“(aa) accept the written request for authorization under this subparagraph for incidental taking described in clause (i); or

“(bb) deny the request and provide the requester a written explanation of the reasons for the denial.

“(III) The Secretary may not make a second request for information, request that the requester withdraw and resubmit the request, or otherwise delay a decision on the request.

“(IV) If the Secretary fails to respond to a request for authorization under this subpara-

graph in the manner provided in subclause (I) or (II), the request shall be considered to be complete.

“(ix)(I) At least 90 days before the expiration of any authorization issued under this subparagraph, the holder of such authorization may apply for a one-year extension of such authorization. The Secretary shall grant such extension within 14 days after the date of such request on the same terms and without further review if there has been no substantial change in the activity carried out under such authorization nor in the status of the marine mammal species or stock, as applicable, as reported in the final annual stock assessment reports for such species or stock.

“(II) In subclause (I) the term ‘substantial change’ means a change that prevents the Secretary from making the required findings to issue an authorization under clause (i) with respect to such species or stock.

“(III) The Secretary shall notify the applicant of such substantial changes with specificity and in writing within 14 days after the applicant’s submittal of the extension request.

“(x) If the Secretary fails to make the required findings and, as appropriate, issue the authorization within 120 days after the application is accepted or required to be considered complete under subclause (I)(aa), (II)(aa), or (III) of clause (viii), as applicable, the authorization is deemed to have been issued on the terms stated in the application and without further process or restrictions under this Act.”.

SEC. 502. REMOVING DUPLICATIONS.

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(5)(D)), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(xi) Any taking of a marine mammal in compliance with an authorization under this subparagraph is exempt from the prohibition on taking in section 9 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1368). Any Federal agency authorizing, funding, or carrying out an action that results in such taking, and any agency action authorizing such taking, is exempt from the requirement to consult regarding potential impacts to marine mammal species or designated critical habitat under section 7(a)(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1366(a)(2)).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to the underlying legislation, H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act.

My amendment seeks to provide critical reforms to duplicative, burdensome, and outdated policies that hamper energy exploration and critical coastal restoration. To be clear, coastal restoration is vital to deterring ecosystem degradation and fueling economic sustainability for communities who call this southernmost part of Louisiana home.

The loss of our coastal areas presents an increased threat to safety within residential communities, and it negatively impacts business investments due to the difficulty in obtaining insurance.

Since the 1930s, Louisiana has suffered nearly 1,900 square miles of land

loss, and it is anticipated to lose an additional 4,000-plus, unless Congress acts to loosen the regulations that have delayed critical projects that bolster vulnerable habitats and communities.

Take my home State of Louisiana, for example, which has greatly suffered from overreaching government regulation.

In March of 2017, the Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana announced the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project was going to be delayed an additional 2 years due to permitting issues. This project is considered the very cornerstone of the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority’s 2017 Coastal Master Plan to mitigate flood risks, restore and protect critical habitats, and ensure Congress is not debating the issue 15 years after the region has been irreparably lost and sunk into the Gulf of Mexico.

In addition, this amendment supports the national security interest of the United States to ensure our men and women in uniform are able to properly train for future missions.

In 2016, a Federal court of appeals revoked the U.S. Navy’s authorization to use sonar for critical national security training because it conflicted with the rules and regulations under the MMPA. To address these delays directly, my amendment simply makes common-sense updates to the MMPA that help increase regulatory efficiency and remove duplicative permitting requirements under Federal law.

For anyone to insinuate that this amendment will destroy protections and result in wetland and species decline is simply untrue. In fact, the reforms made by my amendment would further support coastal habitats and species restoration, U.S. national security interest, and American energy independence.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, this amendment is not a coastal resilience amendment. This amendment has nothing to do with the underlying bill; in fact, it was a miracle that it was ruled germane. This amendment instead is simply an unneeded handout to oil and gas companies that takes us in exactly the wrong direction, not only on climate change, but on the very survival of our oceans.

We all know, and I remind everybody, that this language is the exact language that in past Congresses was included in the other side’s ocean drilling package that would have paved the way for faster permitting of seismic testing and ocean drilling.

Why? Because our oceans marine mammals get in the way of that.

Congress first enacted the Marine Mammal Protection Act over 40 years

ago to protect all marine mammals in response to declines caused by human activities, and it has worked successfully for almost all of those years. The Marine Mammal Protection Act ensures that activities that may result in incidental harm or take of marine mammals are thoroughly reviewed, rather than permitted through the expedited and inadequate process proposed by this bill.

Activities such as seismic air gun testing used for oil and gas exploration, offshore drilling, sonar, and geophysical surveys can all affect marine mammals. And while I sometimes hear the other side falsely claim that these activities have not killed any marine mammals, the best available science for decades has demonstrated that, in fact, there are significant long-term negative impacts on several marine mammal species that do, in fact, cause their death.

This amendment would undermine critical protections under the Marine Mammal Protection Act by striking the conditions required for permitted activities. It would allow for unmitigated incidental harm, that is without the current safeguards that would allow for the, “least practicable impact on such species or stocks,” among other things. Is it too much to ask that we require the least practicable impact on such species or stock?

It would further limit mitigation for any incidental losses and requirements for monitoring. These legislative changes would allow industry to continue their activities with oversight of their impacts only if it was, “efficient and practical.” Efficient and practical? Let’s just give them carte blanche to gut this bill, literally and figuratively.

Lastly, this amendment would waive requirements for take and consultation under the Endangered Species Act, another decades-long cornerstone of our protection of our natural species for any threatened or endangered marine mammals. The ESA has been critical to the recovery of several populations of marine mammals and is needed to protect other species from extinction.

Let’s keep the focus where we can focus on a bipartisan solution to climate change as it affects our oceans, our coastlines and our lakes. Let’s keep the focus on coastal resilience, on assisting communities, on fostering Federal-State organization partnerships, on living in the present and the future and not in the past on the effects of climate change.

Let’s keep that focus there, rather than use this bill, this amendment, to provide a desired handout to an industry that does not or has not demonstrated a true understanding of its impacts on our oceans, an industry that does need to continue to be regulated through strong positive time-tested legislation, such as the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I really appreciate the gentle-

man’s zeal, but I want him to know the focus is on the right thing. We are focused here on solving problems.

This is not the first time this legislation has been misunderstood or even mischaracterized. As I stated previously, those who say that this amendment would weaken the effectiveness of certain elements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act resulting in industries involved with offshore areas having unfettered access to conduct activities that are detrimental to marine life is just absolutely not the case.

This amendment would roll back burdensome regulations on companies seeking to do business in offshore areas, but it does it in a very safe and responsible way. The current process is just too burdensome; it is too time-consuming.

Though the MMPA includes statutory deadlines for Federal agencies processing Incidental Harassment Authorization applications, industries operating in offshore areas cite delays that lasts hundreds of days, and that is just simply not acceptable.

Previously, the Government Accountability Office reported on this exact issue. The GAO discovered that the National Marine Fishery Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service failed to meet basic tasks, which included accurately recording application dates and timelines. In addition, the GAO found that some IHA applications sat within these agencies for years. In addition, ESA’s list of species recovery efforts have also been hampered or delayed by the current IHA process.

During a previous Water, Power and Ocean Subcommittee hearing on marine mammal predation of ESA-listed salmon species in the Pacific Northwest, the then-regional director of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife testified that, “the conditions associated with the current requirements of Section 120 of the MMPA are challenging and expensive to implement, limited in scope and legal challenges have slowed the progress in reducing impacts to salmon.” That is just one species, as an example, but it illustrates the need for this amendment to be adopted to H.R. 721.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close after the gentleman closes, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), our distinguished ranking member.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of UTAH. Mr. Chair, unlike the other amendments that we have had, this is the only one that is added here that actually has had a hearing. It has had a markup, it has

gone through regular order, and it is the only one that is not doing something that is duplicative.

This is a problem that does exist and trying to make it to actually happen. Everything else we have talked about is stuff that is nice, but it is duplicative. It doesn’t actually do anything. This is the only one that does something, and it does something in a positive way.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, we understand that for some industries interested in the exploitation of our oceans that the Marine Mammal Protection Act is inconvenient. We understand that we ask for limitations on the activities of those industries, which would otherwise not demonstrate any discernible concern for our oceans. And we reject the basic premise that that regulation is not necessary for our oceans.

Our marine mammals deserve our protection, and we have protected them, and we have worked through the give-and-take of legitimate activities in the oceans where they can and should be balanced with impacts on our marine mammals.

So, again, I respectfully submit that this particular proposal, which has been—as the ranking member points out—thoroughly vetted in prior Congresses, although not brought to the floor, can in fact yield a good, solid debate. But we simply reject the position taken.

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

□ 1645

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 116-330 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendments en bloc by Mr. CASE of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. CRIST of Florida.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. PANETTA of California.

Amendment No. 23 by Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL of Florida.

Amendment No. 26 by Mrs. LURIA of Virginia.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 259, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 666]

AYES—160

Abraham	González-Colón	Nunes
Allen	(PR)	Olson
Amodei	Gosar	Palazzo
Armstrong	Granger	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Baird	Green (TN)	Reed
Balderson	Griffith	Reschenthaler
Banks	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Barr	Guest	Riggleman
Bergman	Guthrie	Roby
Biggs	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Hice (GA)	Rouzer
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Bucshon	Hill (AR)	Scalise
Budd	Holding	Schweikert
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Hudson	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Huizenga	Shimkus
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Simpson
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Johnson (SD)	Spano
Cline	Jordan	Stauber
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Steil
Cole	King (IA)	Steube
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Stewart
Comer	Kustof (TN)	Stivers
Conaway	LaHood	Taylor
Cook	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Crawford	Lamborn	Tipton
Crenshaw	Latta	Haaland
Curtis	Lesko	Walberg
Davidson (OH)	Long	Walden
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Walker
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walorski
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Watkins
Dunn	Marchant	Weber (TX)
Emmer	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Estes	McClintock	Westerman
Ferguson	McHenry	Williams
Fleischmann	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meadows	Wittman
Foxx (NC)	Miller	Womack
Gallagher	Mitchell	Woodall
Gianforте	Moolenaar	Wright
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gohmert	Mullin	Young
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Zeldin

NOES—259

Adams	Bera	Brindisi
Aguilar	Beyer	Brooks (IN)
Allred	Bilirakis	Brown (MD)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Axne	Blumenauer	Buchanan
Bacon	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Barragán	Bonamici	Butterfield
Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Carbajal
Beatty	F.	Cárdenas

Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Peters
Carter (GA)	Huffman	Peterson
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Case	Jayapal	Pingree
Casten (IL)	Jeffries	Plaskett
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Castro (TX)	Johnson (TX)	Porter
Chu, Judy	Joyce (OH)	Posey
Cicilline	Kaptur	Pressley
Cisneros	Katko	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Clay	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Khanna	Richmond
Clyburn	Kildee	Rose (NY)
Cohen	Kilmer	Rouda
Connolly	Kim	Royal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruiz
Correa	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Rutherford
Cox (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Ryan
Craig	Lamb	Sablan
Crist	Langevin	Sánchez
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Cunningham	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Davids (KS)	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (NV)	Schrader
Dean	Levin (CA)	Levin (MI)
DeFazio	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lewis	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Loebbecke	Shalala
Delgado	Lofgren	Sherman
Demings	Lowenthal	Sherrill
DeSaulnier	Deutch	Sires
Deutch	Luján	Slotkin
Diaz-Balart	Luria	Smith (NJ)
Dingell	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Malinowski	Soto
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, F.	Spanberger
F.	Carolyn B.	Speier
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Stanton
Escobar	Marshall	Stefanik
Eshoo	Mast	Stevens
Espauillat	Matsui	Suozzi
Fitzpatrick	McAdams	Swalwell (CA)
Fletcher	McBath	Takano
Fortenberry	McCaul	Thompson (CA)
Foster	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Frankel	McEachin	Timmons
Fudge	McGovern	Titus
Fulcher	McNerney	Titus
Gaetz	Meeks	Tlaib
Gallego	Meng	Tonko
Garamendi	Moore	Torres (CA)
Garcia (IL)	Morelle	Torres Small
Garcia (TX)	Moulton	(NM)
Golden	Mucarsel-Powell	Trahan
Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Trone
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (NC)	Turner
Gordon	Nadal	Underwood
Gómez	Napolitano	Upton
Gottheimer	Ocasio-Cortez	Waltz
Graves (GA)	Omar	Waterson
Graves, Al (TX)	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Grijalva	Panetta	Velázquez
Haaland	Himes	Visclosky
Harder (CA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Waltz
Hastings	Horsford	Watson (FL)
Hayes	Houlihan	Yarmuth
Heck	Perlmuter	
Higgins (NY)		
Himes		
Horn, Kendra S.		
Horsford		
Houlihan		

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Kelly (PA)	San Nicolas
Gabbard	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
Gooden	Meuser	Smucker
Hunter	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Joyce (PA)	Radewagen	Wasserman
Keller	Rooney (FL)	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAYNE) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1737

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HECK) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, 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. 729) to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 748, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 151, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 667]

YEAS—262

Adams	Cisneros	Doggett
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Allred	Clarke (NY)	F.
Axne	Cleaver	Engel
Bergman	Espauillat	Escobar
Bera	Foster	Eshoo
Bergman	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Cooper	Fletcher
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Fortenberry
Blumenauer	Costa	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Garcia (CA)
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Frankel
Boyle, Brendan	Craig	Fudge
F.	Crist	Gaetz
Brindisi	Crow	Gallego
Brooks (IN)	Cuellar	Garamendi
Brown (MD)	Cunningham	Garcia (IL)
Brownley (CA)	Davids (KS)	Garcia (TX)
Buchanan	Davis (CA)	Golden
Bustos	Davis, Danny K.	Gomez
Butterfield	Dean	Gonzalez (OH)
Carbajal	DeFazio	Gonzalez (TX)
Cárdenas	DeGette	Gottheimer
Carson (IN)	DeLauro	Green, Al (TX)
Cartwright	DelBene	Grijalva
Case	Delgado	Haaland
Casten (IL)	Demings	Harder (CA)
Castor (FL)	DeSaulnier	Harris
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Hastings
Chu, Judy	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Cicilline	Dingell	Heck

Herrera Beutler McBath Schrier Schweikert Taylor Wenstrup
 Higgins (NY) McCollum Scott (VA) Scott, Austin Thornberry Westerman
 Himes McEachin Scott, David Sensenbrenner Timmons Williams
 Horn, Kendra S. McGovern Sewell (AL) Shimkus Tipton Wilson (SC)
 Horsford McNearney Shalala Simpson Wagner Womack
 Houlahan Meeks Sherman Smith (MO) Walden Woodall
 Hoyer Meng Sherrill Smith (NE) Walker Wright
 Huffman Mitchell Sires Spano Watkins Yoho
 Huizenga Moolenaar Slotkin Steil Webster (TX)
 Hurd (TX) Moore Smith (NJ) Stewart Webster (FL)
 Jackson Lee Morelle Smith (WA)
 Jayapal Moulton Soto
 Jeffries Mucarsel-Powell Spanberger Aderholt Keller Roy
 Johnson (GA) Murphy (FL) Speier Allen Kelly (PA) Serrano
 Johnson (TX) Nadler Stanton Gabbard Lieu, Ted Smucker
 Joyce (OH) Napolitano Neal Stauber Gooden Meuser Thompson (PA)
 Kaptur Neal Stefanik Hunter Perry Wasserman
 Katko Neguse Steube Joyce (PA) Rooney (FL) Schultz
 Keating Norcross Stevens
 Kelly (IL) O'Halleran Stivers Suozzi
 Kennedy Ocasio-Cortez Omar Pallone Swalwell (CA)
 Khanna Pallone Panetta Takano
 Kildee Kilmer Peters Thompson (CA)
 Kilmer Kim Pappas Thompson (MS)
 Kind King (NY) Pascrell Payne Titus
 Kirkpatrick Perlmutter Peters Tonko Torres (CA)
 Krishnamoorthi Kuster (NH) Peterson Phillips Torres Small
 Lamb Phillips Pingree Pocan Trahan Underwood
 Langevin Larson (WA) Porter Pressley Turner Upton
 Larson (CT) Larson (FL) Price (NC) Quigley Van Drew
 Lawrence Lawson (FL) Reed Rice (NY) Vargas
 Lee (CA) Lee (NV) Richmond Rose (NY) Veasey
 Levin (CA) Levin (MI) Lipinski Rouda Velázquez
 Lewis Loebssack Roybal-Allard Ruiz Walberg
 Lofgren Lowenthal Ruppersberger Ruppersberger Waltz
 Lowey Luján Rush Rutherford Waters
 Luria Lynch Watson Coleman Ryan Welch
 Malinowski Maloney, Carolyn B. Sarbanes Scanlon Wild
 Maloney, Sean Mast Schiff Wilson (FL) Wittman
 Matsui Schneider Young Zeldin Yarmuth
 McAdams Schrader

NAYS—151

Abraham Duncan LaMalfa
 Amash Dunn Lamborn
 Amodei Emmer Latta
 Armstrong Ferguson Lesko
 Arrington Fleischmann Long
 Babin Flores Loudermilk
 Bacon Foxx (NC) Lucas Luetkemeyer
 Baird Fulcher Merchant
 Balderson Gallagher Marshall
 Banks Gianforte Massie
 Barr Biggs Gibbs McCarthy
 Bilirakis Gohmert McCaul
 Bishop (NC) Gosar McClintock
 Bishop (UT) Granger McHenry
 Bost Graves (GA) McKinley
 Brady Graves (LA) Meadows
 Brooks (AL) Graves (MO) Miller
 Buck Green (TN) Mooney (WV)
 Bucshon Griffith Mullin
 Budd Grothman Murphy (NC)
 Burchett Guest Newhouse
 Burgess Guthrie Norman
 Byrne Hagedorn Nunes
 Calvert Hartzler Olson
 Carter (GA) Hern, Kevin Palazzo
 Carter (TX) Hice (GA) Palmer
 Chabot Higgins (LA) Pence
 Cheney Hill (AR) Posey
 Cline Holding Ratcliffe
 Cloud Hollingsworth Reschenthaler
 Collins (GA) Hudson Rice (SC)
 Comer Johnson (LA) Riggleman
 Conaway Johnson (OH) Roby
 Cook Johnson (SD) Rodgers (WA)
 Crawford Jordan Roe, David P.
 Crenshaw Kelly (MS) Rogers (AL)
 Curtis King (IA) Rogers (KY)
 Davidson (OH) Kinzinger Rose, John W.
 Davis, Rodney Kustoff (TN) Rouzer
 DesJarlais LaHood Scalise

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Keller	Roy
Allen	Kelly (PA)	Serrano
Gabbard	Lieu, Ted	Smucker
Gooden	Meuser	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Perry	Wasserman
Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Schultz

□ 1747

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the motion to lay on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Himes moves to reconsider the vote on passage of H.R. 729.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. McCollum moves to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HARRIS. 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.

CELEBRATING HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Human Rights Day.

More than 70 years ago today, the United Nations established the fundamental human rights to be protected for every person in every nation, such as the right to liberty, freedom from slavery, and freedom of opinion.

But there were rights added in 1976 that bear repeating here today: the right to work in just and under favorable conditions, the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to an education.

In the last few decades, we have failed to live up to these rights. We

have allowed unions to lose their power and protect worker conditions. We have failed to increase the Federal minimum wage. We have failed to provide funding for higher education.

We need to get these rights back for all Americans. We can regain the high ground in our struggle for human rights.

RECOGNIZING STAFF MEMBER BETTY FORD

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a member of my staff and a true servant of Oklahoma, Betty Ford.

Betty has served southeast Oklahoma, working as a congressional field rep for 29 years. She has worked for five different Members of Congress, including myself. At the end of the year, Betty is going to retire.

I know she is looking forward to spending more time with her grandkids and with her kids. While we will definitely miss her, we wish her nothing but the best in her next chapter.

I thank Betty for serving with a servant's heart, and I thank her for all she has done for all of us in Oklahoma.

May God bless her.

END THE USE OF HARMFUL BURN PITS

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, many servicemembers and veterans across the country who have been exposed to military burn pits are becoming ill. Many are dying due to cancers and suffering from severe pulmonary and autoimmune diseases.

We have the chance to end the use of harmful burn pits this week with my two amendments in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

Our military uses burn pits to eliminate dangerous waste, including chemicals, jet fuels, and batteries, which can emit toxic smoke containing carcinogens and particulate matter.

In my district, we tragically lost to pancreatic cancer Jennifer Kepner, a 39-year-old Air Force veteran exposed to burn pits who left behind her husband and two young children.

We must act now for veterans like Jennifer, for their families, and for everyone affected by burn pit exposure.

My provisions in the NDAA require the Department of Defense to submit to Congress an implementation plan to end the use of burn pits and to inform Congress on all locations where burn pits were used.

These amendments are an important step in the comprehensive plan to end the use of burn pits. We must do it now.