

causing further devastation, especially in rural parts of Mobile, Washington, and Clark Counties.

That is right. I have had two hurricanes in one season in my district. These storms caused tens of millions of dollars in damage and left significant amounts of debris.

This would be difficult on a small town's budget in a normal year, but pandemic-related issues coupled with unexpected costs from severe storm damage will further stretch the already limited budgets of many of our communities.

Already, a local government in south Alabama has made the difficult decision not to purchase a much-needed new police vehicle due to the impacts of COVID-19 and Hurricane Sally on their budget.

The current 75–25 percent FEMA Federal-State cost share is simply unworkable in this challenging year.

This important legislation will raise the Federal cost share of pandemic-related disaster relief to 100 percent and all other relief for disasters this year, including the hurricanes that have devastated the Gulf Coast, to a minimum of 90 percent. Making this adjustment will help reduce the burden on our local communities and help strengthen the recovery process.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members from both sides will join me in supporting this critical legislation.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my good friend, who I understand has a little different viewpoint on this bill than some of us but definitely deserves the right to be heard.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), my friend, for yielding.

Look, I understand I am in the minority on this legislation in more ways than one.

Mr. Speaker, years ago, there was a movie called “Brewster’s Millions.” “Brewster’s Millions” featured Richard Pryor, John Candy, and others. In that movie, Richard Pryor was tasked with spending \$30 million in 30 days in order to get access to \$300 million in inheritance. So what he did in that movie is he just went out there and carelessly spent money hand over fist, just spending it irresponsibly and recklessly because it wasn’t his money. He didn’t have to really care about if it was spent in a wise or principled manner.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that perhaps we are doing a little bit of that here.

I want to be clear: I agree that our local governments and our State governments deserve relief, but, Mr. Speaker, in 2018, just 2 years ago, we actually passed, we enacted, section 1232 of the Disaster Recovery Relief Act that requires that FEMA look at the cumulative impact of disasters in a region to determine what the cost share should be. So, the law already

provides a mechanism to reduce the cost share.

I agree that they have not done a good job implementing it, but I do believe it is important for us to ensure that local and State governments have some concern with the dollars that are being spent, some skin in the game.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, look, whether it is a State or local or Federal Government, you have three options: you can reduce spending; you can raise taxes; or, you can incur debt. All we are doing is we are probably going to incentivize this irresponsible spending, and we are going to increase the Federal debt. I think that the better way to address this would be forcing FEMA to implement section 1232 of the DRRRA law of 2018 the way that we intended, therefore achieving a similar objective.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we revisit this legislation.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the chairman, to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I thought we just had that one additional speaker, or I wouldn’t have yielded back all my time.

I would like to point out that after Katrina, the gentleman’s home State got 100 percent.

In this case, when we are talking about COVID, there were unprecedented invocations of the Stafford Act for every State and every territory of the United States of America, and I believe that warrants the 100 percent for COVID, which has already occurred and is past tense.

In addition, COVID has devastated local revenue sources for States that have sales taxes. Mine doesn’t. You know, their revenues are down phenomenally, and for other reasons.

I don’t really want to belabor this. We are going to win overwhelmingly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding his time.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my friend.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly make note for the record that Hurricane Katrina was largely the result of the Federal Government’s actions, the devastation that was caused, the loss of life. The Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers acknowledged their fault in that incident. Yes, it was unique.

I also want to make clear that I said that I don’t necessarily object to the outcome of the legislation, but I think the way of getting there is inappropriate. We need to have consistent standards on how to achieve the right cost share for different disasters.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8266 will help communities recovering from recent disasters and support the nationwide effort to respond to the COVID pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8266, the FEMA Assistance Relief Act which will provide additional funding to state and local governments to help victims of disasters rebuild and will make an important difference in the lives of my constituents who are victims of the CZU Lightning Complex Fire.

2020 has been a difficult year for so many Americans. As our nation grappled with the COVID–19 pandemic, California endured a record-breaking wildfire season. In my Congressional District, the CZU Lightning Complex Fire burned for 37 straight days this summer, destroying nearly a thousand homes and forcing 77,000 of my constituents to evacuate.

The fires could not have come at a worse time for local governments who are facing major budget cuts due to the pandemic. Santa Cruz County projected a \$23 million decrease in revenue, and the cost of the fires has placed further strain on its ability to help residents affected by the fires. The President declared the fires to be a major disaster, providing much-needed federal funding, but FEMA only covers 75 percent of the cost of disaster relief, with state and local governments having to pick up the rest of the costs. The FEMA Assistance Relief Act increases the federal government’s share of the costs to 90 percent, alleviating the financial burden on local governments and allowing them to focus on rebuilding their communities.

I am deeply grateful for the extraordinary work of thousands of first responders who helped fight these terrible fires. Thanks to them and their work, the fires have long since been contained, but much work remains to be done to provide relief to my constituents. I’m proud to be an original cosponsor of the FEMA Assistance Relief Act to provide critical resources to communities around the country affected by natural disasters this year, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8266, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OCEAN POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT II

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4611) to modify permitting requirements with respect to the discharge of any pollutant from the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant in certain circumstances, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4611

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II”.

SEC. 2. SAN DIEGO POINT LOMA PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Administrator may issue a permit under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) for a discharge from the Point Loma Plant into marine waters that requires compliance with the requirements described in subsection (b).

(b) CONDITIONS.—A permit issued under this section shall require—

(1) maintenance of the currently designed deep ocean outfall from the Point Loma Plant with a discharge depth of not less than 300 feet and distance from the shore of not less than 4 miles;

(2) as applicable to the term of the permit, discharge of not more than 12,000 metric tons of total suspended solids per year commencing on the date of enactment of this section, not more than 11,500 metric tons of total suspended solids per year commencing on December 31, 2025, and not more than 9,942 metric tons of total suspended solids per year commencing on December 31, 2027;

(3) discharge of not more than 60 milligrams per liter of total suspended solids, calculated as a 30-day average;

(4) removal of not less than 80 percent of total suspended solids on a monthly average and not less than 58 percent of biochemical oxygen demand on an annual average, taking into account removal occurring at all treatment processes for wastewater upstream from and at the Point Loma Plant;

(5) attainment of all other effluent limitations of secondary treatment as determined by the Administrator pursuant to section 304(d)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(d)(1)), other than any requirements otherwise applicable to the discharge of biochemical oxygen demand and total suspended solids;

(6) compliance with the requirements applicable to Federal issuance of a permit under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, including State concurrence consistent with section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341) and ocean discharge criteria evaluation pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1343);

(7) implementation of the pretreatment program requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 301(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1311(h)) in addition to the requirements of section 402(b)(8) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(b)(8));

(8) that the applicant provide 10 consecutive years of ocean monitoring data and analysis for the period immediately preceding the date of each application for a permit under this section sufficient to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the discharge of pollutants pursuant to a permit issued under this section will meet the requirements of section 301(h)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1311(h)(2)) and that the applicant has established and will maintain throughout the permit term an ocean monitoring program that meets or exceeds the requirements of section 301(h)(3) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1311(h)(3)); and

(9) to the extent potable reuse is permitted by Federal and State regulatory agencies, that the applicant demonstrate that at least 83,000,000 gallons per day on an annual average of water suitable for potable reuse will be produced by December 31, 2035, taking into account production of water suitable for potable reuse occurring at all treatment processes for wastewater upstream from and at the Point Loma Plant.

(c) MILESTONES.—The Administrator shall determine development milestones necessary

to ensure compliance with this section and include such milestones as conditions in each permit issued under this section before December 31, 2035.

(d) SECONDARY TREATMENT.—Nothing in this section prevents the applicant from alternatively submitting an application for the Point Loma Plant that complies with secondary treatment pursuant to section 301(b)(1)(B) and section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1311(b)(1)(B)); 33 U.S.C. 1342).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) BIOCHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND.—The term “biochemical oxygen demand” means biological oxygen demand, as such term is used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(3) POINT LOMA PLANT.—The term “Point Loma Plant” means the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant owned by the City of San Diego on the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4611, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4611. The legislation introduced by Representative SCOTT PETERS clarifies that the city of San Diego, California, can utilize the standard Clean Water and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit process to continue operation of the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant with alternative standards.

The legislation provides regulatory accountability and consistency to the city and has the support of surrounding localities, local public work departments, and water districts, as well as nongovernmental and environmental organizations.

I am unaware of any opposition to this legislation currently. The Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant applies for and receives a waiver under the Clean Water Act to discharge wastewater with less than full secondary treatment—the baseline requirement of the Clean Water Act. The facility qualifies for the waiver by meeting certain criteria and renews its application every 5 years.

As part of a long-term effort, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment

Plant is working to reduce its discharge into coastal waters. This effort involves water recycling and will direct a portion of the facility's discharge. However, the facility's discharges into coastal waters will never be eliminated.

To be clear, this legislation is not a waiver of all the requirements of the Clean Water Act, and the facility will need to comply with the other requirements of the act.

I thank Representative PETERS and the city of San Diego for continuing to work with us on this legislation. I support this legislation and ask my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2020.

Hon. PETER A. DEFazio,
Chair, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR DEFazio: In recognition of the goal of expediting consideration of H.R. 4611 the “Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II,” the Committee on Natural Resources agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The Committee on Natural Resources takes this action with the mutual understanding that, in doing so, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chair, House Natural Resources Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2020.

Hon. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA,
Chair, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR GRIJALVA: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4611, the Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II. I appreciate your decision to waive formal consideration of the bill.

I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I further agree that by forgoing formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving any jurisdiction over any relevant subject matter. Additionally, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources should a House-Senate conference be convened on this legislation. Finally, this exchange of letters will be included in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered on the floor.

Thank you again, and I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the

Committee on Natural Resources on this important issue.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFazio
Chair.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4611, the Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II. This bill would modify and simplify the city of San Diego's required permitting process under the Clean Water Act to operate the city's Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The bill would make permanent a regulatory exemption under the Clean Water Act, and, in exchange, the city would promote water recycling and conservation efforts at its facility. This would result in increased water supply for the region and reduce treated wastewater discharges to the ocean.

The bill will help ensure that San Diego has long-term certainty for its water supply, all while saving the city and regional ratepayers millions of dollars by simplifying our permitting process.

I urge support of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS). This is his legislation.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

For 40 years, the city of San Diego has treated the region's sewage through the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. It is a chemically enhanced primary treatment facility that treats wastewater to a level that can be discharged into the ocean without harming the environment.

The Clean Water Act generally requires sewer systems to implement a secondary level of treatment. However, scientists at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography have consistently said that forcing San Diego ratepayers to pay billions of dollars to upgrade the Point Loma facility to secondary treatment would be a waste of money because the enhanced advanced treatment the plant currently provides, combined with its 4-mile-long outfall, causes no harm to the ocean environment. In fact, the construction of a new facility along the coastline could do more harm than good. For these reasons, San Diego has been allowed to avoid building a new facility through a Federal waiver process at a cost of millions of dollars every 5 years.

Water has always been in short supply in southern California, yet, during my first years on the San Diego City Council in the early 2000s, I was one of only three council members to support blackwater recycling to improve the reliability of our regional water supply.

Even though all water is recycled, our opponents at the time dubbed it "toilet to tap." Now, however, we recognize that historic droughts, combined with the shortage of melting snow, have made our water supply

shortage a permanent challenge for the West. And today, San Diego's proposed water recycling plan with the more accurate moniker, the "pure water program," has widespread support from among local elected leaders, environmental advocates, and State regulators.

In 2019, I introduced the Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II, or OPRA II, to support the dual goals of increasing fresh water supply and reducing pollution output to the ocean.

Under OPRA II, the city of San Diego must demonstrate that the pure water program can produce 83 million gallons a day of water by 2036. This is an estimated one-third of the entire city's drinking water needs. Over the same period, the program is expected to reduce pollution discharge from the Point Loma plant by over 100 million gallons.

Pure water will still require substantial investment from San Diego ratepayers; however, this bill replaces the complex and expensive secondary treatment waiver application with a simpler and more environmentally effective process if the city meets stringent water recycling milestones.

OPRA II has been a decades-long labor of love among the city of San Diego, its regional partners, and State and Federal Government. It will deploy cost-effective technology and will protect our region's water sources, technology that could one day be deployed by other vulnerable communities to help address water shortage issues.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank my colleagues.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the simplified permitting process under H.R. 4611 will provide more certainty to communities in the San Diego area, will increase water recycling and conservation efforts there, as well as reduce treated wastewater discharges into the Pacific Ocean.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4611, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CHILD CARE IS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2020

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 8326) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to require eligible recipients of certain grants to develop a comprehensive economic development strategy that directly or indirectly increases the accessibility of affordable, quality child care, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8326

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Care is Economic Development Act of 2020" or the "CED Act".

SEC. 2. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(a)(3)(A) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162(a)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" before "balances resources"; and

(2) by inserting ", and directly or indirectly increases the accessibility of affordable, quality child care" after "sound management of development".

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall issue guidance on implementing the amendments made by subsection (a) to include the accessibility of affordable, quality child care in a comprehensive economic development strategy developed under section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 8326.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8326, the Child Care is Economic Development Act, or the CED Act.

Access to childcare is essential to economic development but it is often ignored in planning. This legislation changes that by making sure that local Economic Development Districts consider the availability and accessibility of affordable, quality childcare when creating their Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy.

Job creation is an important part of economic development. But doing so without considering childcare leaves an enormous blind spot. For many communities large and small, access to affordable childcare remains one of the