

to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 694

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 694 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 702

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 702 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 706

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 706 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 739

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 739 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 789

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 789 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 792

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 792 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 797

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 797 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1925. A bill to authorize State opioid response grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I am here to continue the important conversation we had on this floor about the ongoing addiction crisis we face in this country. Over the past 2 years, I have come to the floor 57 times to talk about addiction, and usually it has been about opioids and the impact opioids are having—tearing our families apart, devastating our communities. There is certainly an opioid epidemic in this country with prescription drugs, fentanyl, heroin—it is true—but we also have to focus on the fact that we have a broader problem. That is what I am going to talk about today, along with what we can do about it.

Congress has done a lot in the last several years. When looking at what was proposed and what was passed, we put new policies in place at the Federal level to promote better prevention, better treatment programs, and better long-term recovery. We passed legislation to stop some of these deadly drugs from coming into our country. That has helped somewhat. Those legislative initiatives, such as the CARA Act, the 21st Century Cures Act, and the STOP Act, are starting to work.

Over \$3 billion of additional funds has been appropriated by this Congress just in the last 3 years alone to ensure that we have the ability to push back against this epidemic. In my home State of Ohio—one of the States hardest hit by this epidemic—we received nearly \$140 million from the CARA and Cures grants. It is going toward stuff that is working—evidence-based pre-

vention, innovative approaches to treatment and getting people into treatment, and closing some of the gaps in the continuum of prevention, treatment, and recovery. A lot of people were falling between the cracks. Closing those gaps has made a big difference in my State. We also equipped our first responders with what they need and the training they need to help push back.

The good news is, these programs are starting to work. Drug overdose deaths are still way too high, but for the first time in 8 years—8 years of increased overdose deaths every year—we are seeing a reduction in overdose deaths.

In my own State of Ohio, we have seen significant progress. We have had a 21-percent drop in our overdose deaths finally after 8 years of increases. This was the biggest drop in the Nation from July 2017 to June of 2018, according to the Centers for Disease Control National Center of Health Statistics. Nationally, again after 8 years of annual increased deaths, we have seen a leveling out—in fact, a very modest downturn. Between 2017 and 2018, overdose deaths fell from 73,000 to 71,000. In all, the overdose rate dropped in 21 States. Overall, there has been only about a 1-percent drop, so it is very modest but a lot better than the alternative we have seen for 8 years, which is increased deaths.

As we begin to turn the tide on the opioid epidemic, I am convinced that we would be doing even better if not for the influx of fentanyl. About 4 or 5 years ago, fentanyl came to our country in a big way—almost entirely from China and almost always through our own U.S. Postal Service, believe it or not—and it has caused all kinds of havoc. It is the deadliest of all the drugs. When you look at overdose deaths, the primary cause now is fentanyl. It is a synthetic drug that is 50 times more powerful than heroin.

We are beginning to push back again, including with our STOP Act, which has now been passed, which requires the post office to begin screening and stopping some of these packages from coming in. We will do a better job in working with China. We have commitments from them, and we hope they will follow through on them.

Even as this limited progress is being made on the opioid front, we have a new, growing danger. I have heard this over the past few years from law enforcement and from providers—from people on the frontlines of the drug epidemic. They are seeing a resurgence of what are called psychostimulants. Mostly it is pure, powerful methamphetamine from Mexico—crystal meth.

In the last couple of months, I have heard about this from the people in the trenches all over Ohio. I have talked to community leaders in Knox County; treatment providers in Southeast Ohio; service providers in Columbus; the ADAMHS Board in Adams, Lawrence, and Scioto Counties; the leadership of

the Hamilton County Heroin Coalition; and community leaders and law enforcement in Butler County and the Dayton area just last week. From all over the State, they all tell me the same thing: We are making some progress now on heroin, and that is good. We are making limited progress on keeping the fentanyl out. But we are spinning our wheels on combating particularly crystal meth, and they are also seeing a resurgence of cocaine—both of which are stimulants, and both of which are causing havoc in these communities, in part because, as a psychostimulant, it leads to more violent behavior.

They are having a devastating impact in my State. According to a 2018 report from Ohio University, these psychostimulants—including meth—were found in just nine overdose deaths in 2010. That number rose to 556 overdose deaths in 2017, which is the most recent data we have. That is an increase of 6,000 percent. That same year, Ohio had more than 1,500 people die of cocaine overdose, which is an almost 140-percent increase from the year before.

This problem isn't isolated to Ohio. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, deaths involving cocaine, crystal meth, and other psychostimulants have increased nationwide. In the more than 70,000 drug overdose deaths in 2017, more than 23,000 or nearly one-third involved cocaine, meth, or both. Just from 2016 to 2017, in that 1 year, death rates involving cocaine and crystal meth increased by approximately 33 percent. Increases occurred across all demographic groups and in all ZIP Codes.

In the case of meth in particular, usage rates have gone up as opioid rates have gone down. I am told by experts that this is for a few reasons. Some meth users initially turned to this drug to manage the heavy crashes that followed prolonged usage of opioids—heroin, fentanyl, and other opioids—and then they became just as addicted to meth as they had been to opioids. Others turn to meth because the drug is stronger and cheaper than other options.

By the way, the days of home chemists and one-pot meth labs in America are largely gone. You probably can remember, 5, 10, 15 years ago, the meth labs in your community. You are not hearing about those now. That is the good thing, but the bad thing is that you are not hearing about them because the stuff coming from Mexico is more powerful and less expensive. The super-labs in Mexico run by the drug cartels are mass-producing this meth. It is powerful, deadly, and low cost. I am told by law enforcement in Columbus, OH, that crystal meth now costs less than marijuana on the streets of Columbus.

Most of this pure crystal meth enters the United States from Mexico in bulk at ports of entry along our southwest border, often hidden in cars and trucks.

Our Customs and Border Protection officers, who are already stretched thin by the ongoing migration crisis, don't have the resources to identify these smuggled shipments. The INTERDICTION Act, which we passed here, is beginning to help by providing some technology, but, frankly, we need research on better technology, and we need to provide more funding to ensure we can stop this deadly substance by identifying it at the border to keep it from coming in.

According to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the amount of methamphetamine at our ports of entry has soared from about 14,000 pounds in 2012 to 56,000 pounds in 2018. We have also seen a 38-percent increase in methamphetamine trafficking along the southern border just in the 1 year from 2017 to 2018. One troubling measurement is that the number of crystal meth submissions to the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation lab rose from 2,000 in 2015 to over 12,000 in 2018. That is a 500-percent increase in my home State. This is an indication of how much of this is being detained, being found by law enforcement and taken to these labs.

As I heard from folks all across Ohio, we are also seeing meth laced with other drugs, including fentanyl, heroin, and sometimes cocaine. I am told that sometimes the cartels mix these drugs into methamphetamine to lower the cost of the final product, meaning that the users may be consuming dangerous opioids without realizing it. Other traffickers do so because they know that fentanyl is incredibly addictive. You may think it is one thing, but it is really another. Any street drug you use is potentially deadly—remember that.

We still don't have the full picture of how these drugs are being mixed together and sold for consumption. Over the past 2 years, I have seen more reports of individuals in Ohio who used cocaine that, unknown to them, had been mixed with fentanyl. In the last month alone, at least 49 Ohioans in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, were killed by that deadly combination. It has been hitting our African-American communities particularly hard.

Again, this highlights how the drug cartels sometimes try to hook users by cutting stimulants with addictive, deadly fentanyl, often with lethal outcomes.

The bottom line is, we have to address the broader issue of addiction, not just the issue of individual drugs. We know that crystal meth and cocaine are increasing pretty dramatically. That is why we have to continue our fight against opioid use but also provide more flexibility to our communities. As a result, today I am introducing new legislation designed to address the resurgence of crystal meth and cocaine into our communities.

To date, the grants provided by the 21st Century Cures Act—these are grants that go directly back to the States, and the States determine how

they are used in local communities. These are called State opioid response grants. They have been used to increase access to naloxone—a miracle drug that reverses the overdose. They have also been used for longer term addiction treatment and support services for opioids.

For all the good they have done, these grants can't be used effectively to combat the drug crisis beyond opioids, which ignores the new on-the-ground reality of addiction in my State and many others. So the legislation I am introducing today will make a simple change to existing law. It will allow the State opioid response grants to be more flexible so they can be used for whatever the drug addiction problem is on the ground, which will be a little different for every State and, for that matter, every community. In particular, dollars would be able to be used in programs focused on methamphetamine and cocaine treatment and recovery.

We know these existing funds are making a difference. We have to be sure and keep this program going. That is why my legislation will also reauthorize the State opioid response grants program with this flexibility but reauthorize it for 5 years, providing \$500 million annually to ensure there is stable funding.

A stable funding stream to these States is absolutely essential to having the predictability and the certainty we need to continue to make progress and to avoid these new drugs coming in and creating more devastation in our communities. It is a simple, commonsense change that will allow State and local organizations the flexibility they need to fight what is quickly becoming a two-front war on addiction.

The fact that we are continuing to see these new types of drugs pop up in Ohio and around the country highlights the reality that this is a fight against addiction. Addiction is a disease. Again, this Congress has done an unprecedented amount of work in this area in the last few years, and I commend us for that, but we have to do more. We have to provide this flexibility. We have to be sure we are focusing on the fight against addiction, not just on individual drugs.

While I am encouraged by the welcomed progress in preventing opioid overdose deaths, we cannot rest on our laurels. The cartels continue to pump new combinations of opioids and stimulants into vulnerable communities, hooking individuals on yet another toxic drug and perpetrating this cycle of addiction. Let's keep our unprecedented bipartisan efforts going in this body. Let's continue to partner with allies, local government and State governments, and with our nonprofits. Let's make sure the resources are there to continue to save lives and restore communities.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself,  
Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MCSALLY,  
and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1932. A bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Drought Resiliency and Water Supply Improvement Act, which Senator CORY GARDNER (R-CO) introduced today. I am the lead Democratic sponsor on the bill, and Senators MARTHA MCSALLY (R-AZ) and KYRSTEN SINEMA (D-AZ) are also original cosponsors.

Drought—increasingly severe and prolonged drought—is a stark reality for California and the West. Climate change presents a triple threat to our water supply:

Higher temperatures causing a dwindling snowpack, increased evaporation and other effects that will reduce our natural storage and runoff. This could decrease flow in the Colorado River by 20% or more by mid-century and as much as 40% by the end of the century.

Longer and more severe droughts, including perhaps as much as an 80% chance of a megadrought of 20 to 50 years' duration in the Colorado Basin during this century.

Although this is more uncertain, the possibility of reduced overall precipitation, perhaps 10–15% less in California's Sierra Nevada mountains within the next 20–30 years.

We must respond to this challenge. The bill we are introducing today does so in three fundamental ways:

It significantly increases funding for an “all-of-the above” solution to improve our water supply, including surface and groundwater storage, conveyance, water recycling and desalination;

It reforms the Bureau of Reclamation's outdated project delivery system to more quickly approve and more cost-effectively fund new projects; and

It significantly invests not only in water supply projects, but also in environmental restoration to help imperiled species adapt to climate change as well.

Climate Change and Drought: I would like to say more about the effects of climate change on two critical areas for California: the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and the Colorado River Basin.

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory scientists project that climate change will cause a 54 percent drop in the Sierras' snowpack within the next 20 to 40 years and a 79 percent drop by the end of the century. This change alone could be devastating for California, because we absolutely depend on this snowpack. The Sierra snowpack provides 30% of our water supply and is our biggest reservoir. We need to start now to provide substitute ways for storing precipitation in the Sierras, whether through surface storage, groundwater storage, or improved infrastructure to transport floodwaters to the best recharge areas.

This enhanced storage in its many forms will be helpful not only for water users but also to maintain enough cold

water for salmon. Cold water reserves are critical to prevent salmon runs from being wiped out during years of devastating droughts.

The outlook for the Colorado Basin is perhaps even more challenging. The Colorado River provides a critical part of the water supply for 19 million people in southern California, but that water supply is diminishing. Already in 2019 the water demands on the Colorado River exceed average inflows to the river by 1.2 million to 1.5 million acre feet each year.

That is a huge gap, and the Drought Contingency Plan that was just negotiated among the 7 Colorado River Basin states represents just the beginning of efforts needed to close even the existing gap. With climate change, far more needs to be done, especially with warmer temperatures and greatly increased evaporation in the Basin and with the considerable odds of a megadrought of 20 to 50 years' duration.

The bill we are introducing today provides the Colorado River Basin States with the tools to begin investing in a wide range of water supply projects to meet this challenge. I believe this bill will be critical for helping reach agreement in the next round of negotiations for Colorado River drought contingency plans due to be completed by 2026.

Funding Authorizations in the Bill: In response to the water supply challenges presented by climate change, the bill we are introducing today significantly increases funding authorizations for a wide variety of water supply and environmental restoration projects.

The proposed legislation builds on and doubles the 5-year funding authorizations in the 2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Act. The bill authorizes the following funding over the next 5 years:

\$670 million for surface and groundwater storage projects, and supporting conveyance;

\$100 million for water recycling projects; and

\$60 million for desalination projects.

In addition, the bill authorizes \$140 million for environmental restoration and compliance projects. These projects include forest, meadow and watershed restoration projects with water benefits and projects to help restore threatened and endangered species affected by Bureau of Reclamation water projects.

Low-Interest Loans for Water Supply Projects: The bill creates a new loan program at 30-year Treasury rates (currently about 2.6%) for water supply projects known as the Reclamation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (RIFIA). The loans would use existing criteria under the successful WIFIA program (the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act).

The Office of Management and the Budget (OMB) has approved loans of \$2.3 billion for WIFIA in fiscal year 2018

backed by appropriations of just over 1% of that amount or \$25 million in budget authority. OMB was able to approve loans backed by just 1% of the loan amount because there is a virtually non-existent default rate for water projects. Only 4 in a thousand water infrastructure projects default, based on a study conducted by the Fitch credit rating agency.

Given OMB's experience that Federal outlays need only cover 1% of the loan cost for water projects, the \$125 million in authorized Federal spending in the draft bill likely could support \$12.5 billion in water project lending authority.

Needless to say, \$12.5 billion is a meaningful amount of Federal low-interest lending assistance for new water supply projects. And, because RIFIA is limited to no more than 49 percent of total project costs, that same \$125 million in RIFIA budget authority will support no less than \$25.5 billion in new water infrastructure investments throughout the west.

Need to Improve Reclamation's Project Delivery System: The bill not only increases funding for drought resiliency projects, it expedites their approvals and assists them more cost-effectively, stretching taxpayer dollars further.

The traditional Bureau of Reclamation model for approving and funding new water supply projects has involved the following:

Reclamation studies new projects in detail, which can take a decade or more for major projects:

Once Reclamation's studies are complete, Congress authorizes projects individually, which can take another 3–5 years or more in many cases; and

Congress then funds 100% of the project construction cost over many years of incremental appropriations, with project sponsors paying back the federal government over 50 years at little to no interest.

One can quickly see that this model can end up taking decades to construct significant new water supply projects. This is especially the case given the limitations of Federal budgets and the increasing cost of major projects in recent years. Given the tremendous challenge posed by climate change to Western water supply, we need a nimbler and more responsive model.

Mike Connor, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior during the Obama Administration, testified in support of a new model during an October 8, 2015 hearing before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Deputy Secretary Connor stated:

The traditional Reclamation business model, in which feasibility studies, consistent with the 1983 Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Development, are first authorized, funded, and submitted to Congress, and then construction is authorized and funded, does not always address the needs of project sponsors at the State and local levels. Moreover, given budget limitations and the availability of other available financing mechanisms, the

historic federal role in financing water storage projects through the Bureau of Reclamation must be revisited with a greater emphasis on non-federal financing.

**Changes to Traditional Model:** In response to the concerns articulated by Deputy Secretary Connor and others, the bill we are introducing today, building on the WIIN Act, makes five significant changes to the traditional Reclamation model. These changes expedite project approvals and make more cost-effective use of available federal funding.

1) Congressional authorization no longer required:

First, the bill eliminates the need for Congress to authorize individual projects. It can take 3–5 years for projects to get legislatively approved or longer. In fact, zero new water recycling projects have been authorized since 2009 due to the Federal earmark ban.

While Congressional authorizations are no longer required, Congress retains full veto authority over which projects get built through the appropriations process. Unless Congress approves funding for the study and construction of individual projects, Reclamation cannot proceed with them.

The advantage of the appropriations process as an alternative mechanism for Congressional approval is that it occurs every year. So rather than waiting 3–5 years or longer for Congressional approval under the traditional model, Congress decides each year whether or not to fund proposed projects.

2) Non-Federal funding is required upfront:

Second, the bill no longer requires 100% federal funding upfront as was necessary under the traditional Reclamation model. Instead, the bill allows a maximum of 50% Federal funding for Federally-owned projects, and a maximum of 25% federal funding for non-federal projects that are built by States, water districts, or Indian tribes.

Federal dollars can be stretched further by the partnerships with States and water districts that will be fostered under the bill. For example, the proposed expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir in California would be funded 50% by the State of California, which has already conditionally awarded funding, in addition to potentially 10–25% by the federal government and the remaining 25–40% by water users.

Multi-partner projects like the Los Vaqueros expansion will frequently have multiple benefits. For example, much of the State and Federal funding for the Los Vaqueros expansion would go to augment the water supply of wildlife refuges that provide essential water for migratory birds on the Pacific flyway. These benefits would complement the project's water supply benefits for many Bay Area water districts.

3) Feasibility studies are expedited:

Third, for the non-Federal projects authorized by the bill, the federal

study process would be significantly expedited, and it does so without waiving any environmental protection requirements. The bill makes clear that federal environmental laws must be fully and strictly followed.

Existing law, however, already addresses study procedures in parallel circumstances when the nonfederal entities are building a project and the federal government is only responsible for a minority of the project cost, no more than 25%. In these circumstances, the Federal government can and should expeditiously approve feasibility and other preliminary studies. There is existing precedent for such projects in the guidelines adopted by the Bureau of Reclamation for feasibility studies for water recycling projects under the Title XVI program. Like all the non-federal projects in this bill, these water recycling projects are built by non-federal entities with a maximum 25% federal cost-share.

The bill we are introducing today would direct Reclamation to model its feasibility study standards for all non-federal projects based on the Title XVI example. This will reduce delays in project approval and get these projects built faster.

4) The new loan program is cost-effective:

Fourth, the low-interest loan program created by the bill is an exceptionally cost-effective program. As I mentioned above, OMB has validated that low-interest water project loans need to be backed by Federal appropriations totaling only 1% of the project loan amount.

Federal funding of 1% of the loan amount will typically return 10–25% savings in the repayment cost of the loans for the water districts funding the projects. The total savings can be about 10% for AAA rated districts, and 20–25% for AA-rated districts.

For example, the water users who are supporting the proposed Sites Reservoir in northern California have estimated that the loans authorized by this bill would allow them to pay only \$512/acre-foot for water delivered by the project instead of \$682/acre-foot. This is a 25% reduction in their costs.

Thus, the Federal government can provide a loan at 1% of the loan amount and save the project sponsors 10–25% of the project cost. That is an exceptionally cost-effective federal investment.

There are at least three significant reasons that the loans are so beneficial for the project sponsors:

The sponsors pay about a 2.6% interest rate on their loans based on today's rates, versus 4% or greater rates for the alternative of municipal bond financing.

The districts would not need to start loan repayments until 5 years after substantial completion of the project, a substantial cost saver.

Loans are for 35 rather than 30 years, lowering annual debt service costs.

Significantly, the loans include all the taxpayer protections from the suc-

cessful WIFIA and TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act) programs. In particular, the RIFIA loans would be limited to 49% of the project cost, and the federal loans would have senior status in the event of any default. These provisions ensure the taxpayer won't be harmed in any default where the project retains at least 50% of its value, which is extremely likely for ratepayer backed water supply projects.

5) Federal grants and loans work together:

Fifth, the combination of low-interest loans and Federal grants of up to 25% of project costs for non-Federal projects can allow water users to make up the difference where the Federal government is no longer funding 100% of project costs up front. Many rural communities, and in particular agricultural communities, are not able to pay 100% of the cost of new water supply projects.

Under the bill we are introducing today, these communities will still have to provide a significant cost-share for improving their water supplies, and new water projects will have to be cost-effective enough to justify that investment. However, the Federal government can help build the best and most effective projects in increasing drought resiliency by providing assistance through both grants and loans.

**Environmental Benefits:** The longer and more severe droughts coming with climate change will adversely affect not just farms and cities, but also the natural environment. The bill includes provisions to improve species' drought resiliency as well.

The significant funding authorization of \$140 million for environmental restoration can be used to benefit many different species, including fish, migratory birds, and forest species. Some of the authorized uses of this funding include:

Improved habitat for salmon, Delta smelt and other fish species adversely affected by the Bureau of Reclamation's water projects;

Additional water for wildlife refuges hosting migratory birds along the Pacific flyway;

Improved stream gauges, monitoring and science to better understand how to restore species and to operate Reclamation water projects with reduced environmental impacts;

Assistance in implementing water-related settlements with State agencies and state water quality laws; and

Forest, meadow and watershed restoration efforts that improve the quality, timing, or other attributes of runoff to reservoirs or groundwater storage facilities.

I want to say a little more about the new authorization for forest, meadow and watershed restoration projects with water benefits. Wildfire and drought are two of our biggest challenges in California, and we need new tools to respond to them.

There are national forest lands and meadows upstream of many reservoirs

in California that are at serious risk of catastrophic fire.

If treatments of these lands restore healthier ecological conditions, it will improve water runoff into the downstream reservoirs and reduce the risk of large sedimentation dumps into the reservoirs from catastrophic fires.

Restoration of these lands may not be a top priority for the Forest Service because that agency's mission does not emphasize water benefits.

The bill being introduced today would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to contribute a portion of the cost of these projects. The new funding source will in turn make these multi-benefit projects more likely to be implemented.

I believe it is critical that we develop new tools like this one for reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires, and improving our drought resiliency.

I and the other cosponsors of today's bill are also looking for additional ways to increase the natural environment's resiliency to droughts in our states. We have circulated language for discussion and potential inclusion in the bill that would provide additional funding for "natural water storage projects."

These projects would help restore stream and river channels with natural materials like wetlands. Like many other projects prioritized by the bill, these projects could have multiple benefits, including increased groundwater recharge, improved flood protection, and increased floodplain habitat to benefit salmon and other species.

We look forward to receiving comments on ways to prioritize multi-benefit projects like natural water storage projects as we move forward with the bill.

In addition, the bill makes clear that it must be implemented consistently with all federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act and all other environmental laws. All applicable state laws must also be followed.

Offsets: Finally, the bill includes two provisions offsetting the new spending authorizations within it:

It extends the existing WIIN Act provisions allowing water districts to prepay their outstanding capital debts and convert to indefinite length water supply contracts. These provisions are expected to bring in additional revenue within the 10-year scoring window.

It sets up a process to deauthorize inactive water recycling project authorizations.

Conclusion: California is home to more than 40 million people, but our major state-wide water infrastructure hasn't significantly changed in the past 50 years, when we had only 16 million people.

We must modernize the system or we risk becoming a desert state.

I believe that this bill will place California on a long-term path to drought resiliency. Critically, this means put-

ting in place infrastructure to allow our cities, our farmers, and our natural communities to withstand the severe droughts that we are projected to face due to climate change.

I hope my Western colleagues will join me and the others who have introduced this bill, because drought is a serious threat for all of our states. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 254—COMMEMORATING JUNE 20, 2019, AS "WORLD REFUGEE DAY"

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

#### S. RES. 254

Whereas World Refugee Day is a global day to acknowledge the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children who are forced to flee their homes due to persecution;

Whereas, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this preamble as "UNHCR") and the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-212), a refugee is someone who—

(1) is outside of the country of his or her nationality; and

(2) is unable or unwilling to return because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) there are more than 70,800,000 displaced people worldwide, the worst displacement crisis in global history, including 25,900,000 refugees, more than 41,300,000 internally displaced people, and 3,500,000 asylum seekers;

(2) the refugee population under UNHCR's mandate has nearly doubled since 2012;

(3) 67 percent of the world's refugees come from just 5 countries: Syria, Afghanistan, South Sudan, Burma, and Somalia;

(4) children account for about ½ of the refugee population in the world, millions of whom are unable to access basic services including education;

(5) 13,600,000 individuals were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution in 2018, including 10,800,000 internally displaced persons and 2,800,000 refugees and asylum seekers, an average of 37,000 people per day;

(6) more than ½ of Syrians lived in displacement in 2018, either displaced across international borders or within their own country;

(7) for the fourth consecutive year, Lebanon hosted the largest number of refugees relative to its population, where 1 in 6 people are refugees;

(8) more than 1,400,000 refugees were in need of resettlement to a third country in 2018; and

(9) 25 countries admitted 92,400 refugees for resettlement in 2018;

Whereas refugee children are 5 times more likely to be out of school than nonrefugee children;

Whereas refugees who are women and children are often at greater risk of violence, human trafficking, exploitation, and gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States resettlement program is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which serves to strengthen global security, advance United States foreign policy goals, and support regional host countries, while assisting individuals and families in need;

Whereas, during the first 6 months of fiscal year 2019, the United States welcomed 12,155 refugees into the country, which is fewer than 50 percent of the administration's refugee admissions goal of 30,000 refugees;

Whereas, at this pace, the United States may not meet its fiscal year 2019 refugee admissions goal;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted traveler to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas refugees are major contributors to local economies, pay an average of \$21,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits, and revitalize cities and towns by offsetting population decline and boosting economic growth throughout the country by opening businesses, paying taxes, and buying homes; and

Whereas several industries rely heavily on refugee workers to support their economic stability, and low rates of arrivals of refugees, especially in towns that rely on refugee populations to revitalize their industries, has had serious impacts on economic growth: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) recognizes those individuals who have risked their lives working individually and for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as UNHCR, to provide life-saving assistance and protection for people displaced by conflicts around the world;

(3) underscores the importance of the United States refugee resettlement program as a critical tool for United States global leadership—

(A) to leverage foreign policy;

(B) to strengthen national and regional security; and

(C) to demonstrate international support of refugees;

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue providing robust funding for refugee protection overseas and resettlement in the United States;

(B) to uphold its international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance and protection of the most vulnerable populations;

(C) to work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(D) to alleviate the burden placed on frontline refugee host countries, such as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, that absorb the majority of the world's refugees