

Of all federally funded coastal programs, only NEPs implement a community-based decision framework to address local and national priorities. NEPs and their partners address:

- Stormwater and infrastructure projects;
- Eelgrass and shellfish restoration, supporting aquaculture, fishing, and tourist industries;

- Land and wildlife conservation;
- Science and monitoring to guide decision-making; and

- Innovative education programs designed for the next generation of Americans.

The NEP consists of 28 unique, voluntary programs established by the Clean Water Act to protect and improve estuaries of national significance. Each NEP engages its local community in a non-regulatory, consensus-driven, and science-based process. For every federal dollar, NEPs collectively leverage \$19 in local funds to protect and improve coastal environments, communities, and economies. This investment in our national estuaries strengthens America's economy and supports thousands of jobs and secures the future of our coastal communities.

NEPs engage local industries, businesses, and other community members to develop—and implement—solutions for tough problems. NEP's public-private partnerships stretch federal dollars to provide on-the-ground results driven by diverse stakeholders. NEP partners include commercial agriculture and fisheries, energy and water utilities, local businesses, construction and landscaping professionals, state and local governments, academic institutions, teachers, students, and community groups.

The value of our oceans, estuaries and coasts to our nation is immense. Over half the U.S. population lives in coastal watershed counties. Roughly half the nation's gross domestic product is generated in those counties and adjacent ocean waters. In 2019 alone, ocean industries contributed \$320 billion to U.S. economy.

RESULTS ON THE GROUND

NEPs are focused on results on the ground and have had great success in protecting and restoring estuaries and coastal communities:

- In the lower Columbia River since 2000, we have:

- Restored 28,387 acres of habitat with 100 partners to help recover threatened and endangered fish.

- Provided 81,485 students with over 407,704 hours of outdoor science learning, helping teachers meet benchmarks, and fill in gaps in science education.

- Planted 144,721 native trees along riparian corridors with students and volunteers of all ages.

- Raised more than \$76 million—100% of those funds stay in Oregon and Washington addressing local priorities. These are monies local entities cannot access on their own and we can't raise without the NEP funds.

- Leverage \$11.5 million in federal NEP funds to bring a total of \$76 million to our region, 100% spent in Oregon and Washington.

- Generated 1,524 family wage jobs, mostly in construction, restoring habitat, that cannot be exported.

These results are repeated around the nation in each of the 28 national estuary programs:

- Morro Bay National Estuary Program is restoring underwater eelgrass meadows after a precipitous decline in the last decade. Promising restoration results show that collaborative research, community outreach, and adaptive management make a difference for healthy estuary habitats on the California's Central Coast.

All three California National Estuary Programs are partnering to improve the status

and use of resources for boaters to pump out waste from their boats. These stations are critical to keeping bacteria and other pollution from entering sensitive coastal waters.

The NY-NJ Harbor & Estuary Program is working with the Bronx River Alliance and other community groups to track down sources of floatable trash in the River.

The Center of the Inland Bays in Delaware is bringing the oyster back, using living shorelines to stop erosion, protect property and restore habitat.

NEPs have collectively restored and protected more than 2,000,000 acres of vital habitats since 2000 alone.

Important reforms were made to the National Estuary Program in the reauthorization during the 114th Congress, including the creation of a competitive program to address urgent challenges and the streamlining of administrative costs. HR 4044 amplifies and improves on these reforms.

Despite these great outcomes, threats to our waters and our communities remain. Toxics from stormwater contaminate clean water and habitat and cause cancer and neurological damage to humans and river species. Changes in precipitation, temperature, and storminess increase sea levels, increase erosion, and intensify flood events, leaving many of our rural communities and much of our local infrastructure vulnerable to these variabilities. Micro plastics are pervasive in our rivers and streams; they are filling the bellies of ocean species and impair human immune systems, disrupt hormones, and cause cancer. Disparities in education and lack of opportunities for hands-on outdoor learning exist for too many in our communities.

We thank you again for your efforts to advance this legislation and look forward to working with you to reauthorize this successful program.

Sincerely yours,

DEBRAH MARRIOTT,
Executive Director.

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

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4044. I want to thank Mr. MALINOWSKI and Chairwoman NAPOLITANO for their leadership in crafting this legislation and bringing it to the floor today for consideration by the full House of Representatives. It is vital that we, as a nation, focus on preserving and restoring our estuaries.

I am especially pleased that the bill almost doubles the amount of funding available to support national estuaries. This should finally allow the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to move forward with adding more of these critical ecosystems to the National Estuary Program.

As one of only five or six hypersaline lagoons in the world and the only one in the nation, the Laguna Madre has unique conservation requirements. Adjacent to the longest barrier island in the world, Padre Island, the Laguna Madre is home to five species of endangered sea turtle and a critical migratory bird habitat for dozens of endangered or threatened bird species. The EPA previously designated the Upper Laguna Madre as a national estuary, and with this additional funding, we can now move forward with adding the Lower Laguna Madre to the existing designation.

Having grown up in Brownsville, Texas, Chairwoman Napolitano knows the beauty and importance of this national treasure. On behalf of my constituents, I want to express the grati-

tude of South Texas for the hard work and dedication of the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee Members and staff to conserving the Lower Laguna Madre for future generations.

I look forward to working with our Senators to help pass this legislation, and with our local officials, especially Cameron County Commissioner David Garza, and our governor, so we can finally secure a National Estuary Program designation for the Lower Laguna Madre. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4044.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4044, the Protect and Restore America's Estuaries Act. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Estuary Caucus, I am pleased to support this bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Program through Fiscal Year 2026. The Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership, in my home state of Oregon, is one of the twenty-eight National Estuary Programs across the country. The Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership is leading outstanding resiliency efforts in the Pacific Northwest to restore and protect habitat, improve water quality, restore flood plains, and address marine debris. This bill will help the National Estuary Programs consider the effects of extreme weather events that are increasingly common in the climate crisis, and implement appropriate adaptation strategies in their management plans. Additionally, this bill takes important steps to allow the NEPs to better address storm water runoff, coastal resiliency, and accelerate land loss mitigation efforts. This past weekend, we celebrated World Wetlands Day. Our coastal wetlands and estuaries are often overlooked and undervalued, but they are on the frontlines of the climate crisis. We can help support and safeguard our National Estuary Programs by passing the Protect and Restore America's Estuaries Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4044, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. 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 motion will be postponed.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION ACT

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1132) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1132

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 "San Francisco Bay Restoration Act".

SEC. 2. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Title I of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 124. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘Estuary Partnership’ means the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, designated as the management conference for the San Francisco Bay under section 320.

“(2) SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN.—The term ‘San Francisco Bay Plan’ means—

“(A) until the date of the completion of the plan developed by the Director under subsection (d), the comprehensive conservation and management plan approved under section 320 for the San Francisco Bay estuary; and

“(B) on and after the date of the completion of the plan developed by the Director under subsection (d), the plan developed by the Director under subsection (d).

“(b) PROGRAM OFFICE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall establish in the Environmental Protection Agency a San Francisco Bay Program Office. The Office shall be located at the headquarters of Region 9 of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(2) APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR.—The Administrator shall appoint a Director of the Office, who shall have management experience and technical expertise relating to the San Francisco Bay and be highly qualified to direct the development and implementation of projects, activities, and studies necessary to implement the San Francisco Bay Plan.

“(3) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; STAFFING.—The Administrator shall delegate to the Director such authority and provide such staff as may be necessary to carry out this section.

“(c) ANNUAL PRIORITY LIST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing public notice, the Director shall annually compile a priority list, consistent with the San Francisco Bay Plan, identifying and prioritizing the projects, activities, and studies to be carried out with amounts made available under subsection (e).

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—The annual priority list compiled under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) Projects, activities, and studies, including restoration projects and habitat improvement for fish, waterfowl, and wildlife, that advance the goals and objectives of the San Francisco Bay Plan, for—

“(i) water quality improvement, including the reduction of marine litter;

“(ii) wetland, riverine, and estuary restoration and protection;

“(iii) nearshore and endangered species recovery; and

“(iv) adaptation to climate change.

“(B) Information on the projects, activities, and studies specified under subparagraph (A), including—

“(i) the identity of each entity receiving assistance pursuant to subsection (e); and

“(ii) a description of the communities to be served.

“(C) The criteria and methods established by the Director for identification of projects, activities, and studies to be included on the annual priority list.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—In compiling the annual priority list under paragraph (1), the Director shall consult with, and consider the recommendations of—

“(A) the Estuary Partnership;

“(B) the State of California and affected local governments in the San Francisco Bay estuary watershed;

“(C) the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority; and

“(D) any other relevant stakeholder involved with the protection and restoration of the San Francisco Bay estuary that the Director determines to be appropriate.

“(d) SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Director, in conjunction with the Estuary Partnership, shall review and revise the comprehensive conservation and management plan approved under section 320 for the San Francisco Bay estuary to develop a plan to guide the projects, activities, and studies of the Office to address the restoration and protection of the San Francisco Bay.

“(2) REVISION OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN.—Not less often than once every 5 years after the date of the completion of the plan described in paragraph (1), the Director shall review, and revise as appropriate, the San Francisco Bay Plan.

“(3) OUTREACH.—In carrying out this subsection, the Director shall consult with the Estuary Partnership and Indian tribes and solicit input from other non-Federal stakeholders.

“(e) GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may provide funding through cooperative agreements, grants, or other means to State and local agencies, special districts, and public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, including the Estuary Partnership, for projects, activities, and studies identified on the annual priority list compiled under subsection (c).

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS; NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(A) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—Amounts provided to any entity under this section for a fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 75 percent of the total cost of any projects, activities, and studies that are to be carried out using those amounts.

“(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Not less than 25 percent of the cost of any project, activity, or study carried out using amounts provided under this section shall be provided from non-Federal sources.

“(f) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Director may not use more than 5 percent to pay administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this section.

“(3) PROHIBITION.—No amounts made available under this section may be used for the administration of a management conference under section 320.

“(g) ANNUAL BUDGET PLAN.—In each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, the President, as part of the annual budget submission of the President to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall submit information regarding each Federal department and agency involved in San Francisco Bay protection and restoration, including—

“(1) a report that displays for each Federal agency—

“(A) the amounts obligated in the preceding fiscal year for protection and restoration projects, activities, and studies relating to the San Francisco Bay; and

“(B) the proposed budget for protection and restoration projects, activities, and studies relating to the San Francisco Bay; and

“(2) a description and assessment of the Federal role in the implementation of the San Francisco Bay Plan and the specific role of each Federal department and agency in-

involved in San Francisco Bay protection and restoration, including specific projects, activities, and studies conducted or planned to achieve the identified goals and objectives of the San Francisco Bay Plan.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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. 1132, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1132. Introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), H.R. 1132 builds off existing bay restoration work under EPA's National Estuary Program.

In my home State of California, the importance of a healthy watershed and improved water quality has never been more apparent. In fact, the San Francisco Bay estuary drains more than 40 percent of our State's waters.

That is why I am thankful to see several of my colleagues from California as original cosponsors, including members of this committee: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

At our June hearing, the subcommittee learned about the ongoing sources of pollution to this 1,600-square-mile estuary. Simultaneously, habitat destruction has forever changed the geography of the bay area. More than 90 percent of shoreline wetlands and 40 percent of the total aquatic ecosystem have been lost.

This new EPA program office will concentrate Federal efforts to address water quality challenges and ecosystem health in the bay. This will improve the environment and economy for the bay area region that is home to 8 million people and an annual GDP of \$775 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1132, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of H.R. 1132, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act, from the National Audubon Society and Save the Bay.

AUDUBON,
September 18, 2019.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Water Resources
and Environment, Washington, DC.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Re-
sources and Environment, Washington, DC.

On behalf of the National Audubon Soci-
ety's more than 1 million members, our mis-
sion is to protect birds and the places they
need for today and tomorrow. We write to
offer our support for the following bills re-
lated to important coastal and water con-
servation issues that will be the subject of
the September 19, 2019 Markup before the
Committee on Transportation and Infra-
structure Committee.

HR 4031—GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE
ACT OF 2019

The Great Lakes are home to 30 million
people and 350 species of birds, but increasing
challenges are on the horizon for the world's
largest body of freshwater. Fluctuating
water levels exacerbated by climate change,
invasive exotic species and excess nutrients
are putting even more stress on this eco-
system that is so important for birds and
people. The Great Lakes Restoration Initia-
tive has helped clean up toxic pollutants,
protect wildlife by restoring critical habitat,
and help combat devastating invasive spe-
cies.

HR 4031 would increase funding for con-
servation projects to \$475 million over five
years, by increasing the Great Lakes Res-
toration Initiative's authorization incremen-
tally from \$300 million per year to \$475 mil-
lion per year.

HR 1132—SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION ACT

The San Francisco Bay Area, home to the
Pacific Coast's largest estuary, is also home
to a rapidly growing population of 8 million
people, and provides for a host of social and
economic values through ports and industry,
agriculture, fisheries, archaeological and
cultural sites, recreation, and research. How-
ever, San Francisco Bay has lost 90% of its
tidal wetlands and more than 50% of its
eelgrass and mudflat habitat. Climate
change exacerbates these conditions through
drought that alters the salinity balance,
ocean acidification that reduces species
abundance and diversity, increasing water
temperatures, and rising seas causing flood-
ing that eliminates living shorelines and
puts communities at risk. Many species of
waterbirds forage in the San Francisco Bay,
including Brant Geese and Surf Scoters, un-
derscoring the value of this ecosystem.

HR 1132 would authorize a San Francisco
Bay Restoration Grant Program in EPA and
funding of up to \$25m per year to support the
restoration of this estuary.

HR 1620—CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Salt marshes are special places to birds
and other wildlife, but sea level rise has ele-
vated the waters in the Chesapeake Bay by
one foot during the 20th century and is accel-
erating due to climate change. Salt marshes
provide valuable "ecosystem services", in-
cluding nurseries for the Chesapeake Bay's
commercially important fish, a buffer pro-
tecting coastal communities against storm
surge, a filter that stops nutrient and sedi-
ment pollution from entering the Bay, and a
recreational resource attracting visitors who
contribute millions of dollars to local econo-
mies. Chesapeake Bay's salt marshes host

globally significant populations of both
Saltmarsh Sparrow and Black Rail.

HR 1620 would increase the authorization
of appropriations for the Chesapeake Bay
Program to more than \$90m per year.

HR 2247—PROMOTING UNITED GOVERNMENT
EFFORTS TO SAVE OUR SOUND ACT

Despite significant investments in Puget
Sound ecosystem health by state, federal,
tribal and local governments, concerned
members of the public, and conservation or-
ganizations, progress towards ecosystem re-
covery targets remains slow. The number of
marine birds wintering in Puget Sound has
declined significantly in the last 30 years and
migratory, fish-eating birds appear to be at
the greatest risk.

HR 2247 would authorize up to \$50 million
in funding for Puget Sound recovery. The
PUGET SOS Act also aligns federal agency
expertise and resources, ensuring that fed-
eral agencies are coordinated, setting goals,
and holding each other accountable will help
increase their effectiveness and provide a
boost to Puget Sound recovery.

HR 3779—RESILIENCE REVOLVING LOAN FUND ACT
OF 2019

Pre-disaster planning can help commu-
nities adapt to the changing flood patterns
that threaten people and birds species de-
pendent on shoreline and riverine areas.
These changes have led to more frequent in-
stances of "nuisance flooding," as well as
catastrophic events. NOAA has found that
"nuisance" or "sunny day" flooding is up
300% to 900% than it was 50 years ago. In ad-
dition, catastrophic flooding events have in-
creased in both frequency and intensity.
These trends have been particularly pro-
nounced in the Northeast, Midwest and
upper Great Plains, where the amount of pre-
cipitation in large rainfall events has in-
creased more than 30 percent above the aver-
age observed from 1901-1960. As sea level rise
accelerates, it only exacerbates these im-
pacts, which further compounds vulner-
ability in flood-prone communities.

HR 3779 would amend the 1988 Stafford Act
to offer low-interest loans to states for "dis-
aster mitigation projects", including invest-
ments in natural infrastructure projects,
which would help communities prepare and
recover from natural disasters.

We urge you to support and advance the
bills listed above. Please feel free to contact
us with any questions.

Sincerely,

JULIE HILL-GABRIEL,
Vice President, Water Conservation,
National Audubon Society.

SAVE THE BAY,
February 3, 2020.

Hon. JACKIE SPEIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

HR 1132: SUPPORT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPEIER: Save The
Bay applauds your introduction of HR 1132,
the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act, and
encourages all Members of Congress to vote
for its passage on the House Floor this week.
This initiative will enhance the U.S. Envi-
ronmental Protection Agency's efforts ca-
pacity to improve the health of San Fran-
cisco Bay, with resources that are des-
perately needed at a time of accelerating cli-
mate change.

Save The Bay is the oldest and largest
membership organization working exclu-
sively to protect and restore San Francisco
Bay, with 50,000 members and supporters. As
the Bay's leading champion since 1961, Save
The Bay is committed to making the Bay
cleaner and healthier for people and wildlife,
and HR 1132 would significantly advance that
goal.

Over the last 150 years, the water quality
and health of the San Francisco Bay estuary
have been diminished by pollution, invasive
species, loss of wetland habitat and other
factors. Improving bay water quality, restor-
ing critical habitat, and adapting to climate
change in San Francisco Bay, are urgent fed-
eral, state and regional priorities that re-
quire additional funding. The Bay region is
fortunate to have in place well-developed
science-based plans, agencies, and collabo-
rative structures to improve the Bay's
health, but more resources for implementa-
tion are essential in the crucial decade
ahead. The San Francisco Bay Restoration
Act would provide significant additional ca-
pacity to improve the Bay, building effi-
ciently on elements already in place to im-
prove our economy and the region's quality
of life.

In 2016, San Francisco Bay Area voters
agreed to make an unprecedented invest-
ment in San Francisco Bay Restoration, ap-
proving a nine-county parcel tax specifically
to accelerate Bay tidal marsh restoration.
Measure AA was approved by more than 70
percent of the region's voters, and is raising
\$500 million over 20 years for grants to res-
toration projects, most of which are occur-
ring on federal property with the San Fran-
cisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Match-
ing federal investment for this and other res-
toration work is overdue, and HR 1132 would
begin to address that need by authorizing \$25
million annually for those purposes.

HR 1132 also would address the inequity in
funding for U.S. EPA Geographic Programs,
which are annually providing orders of mag-
nitude higher funding to other national estu-
aries under strong statutory authority with-
in the Clean Water Act. San Francisco Bay
deserves similar support and commitment as
the federal government currently provides to
Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound and other lo-
cations, and HR 1132 begins to rectify that
disparity.

Each month provides evidence of added ur-
gency and need for the San Francisco Bay
Program and resources that HR 1132 creates.
Tidal marsh restoration is essential to pro-
tect Bay wildlife habitat, and adjacent
shoreline communities and infrastructure
from sea level rise. The recent Baylands
Habitat Goals Update underscored that tidal
marsh revegetation must be initiated wher-
ever possible within the next decade to stay
ahead of rising seas, and the recent Cali-
fornia Legislative Analyst's Office report
further underscores the urgency of adapta-
tion and resilience actions. And as California
Governor Gavin Newsom stated in January,
"We are experiencing a global climate crisis.
One that has irreversible impacts and is hap-
pening right now. This is not something to
deal with 10 years from now. Or 5 years from
now. Or 2 years from now. We need action.
Now."

We deeply appreciate the strong support
from Speaker Pelosi and the entire San
Francisco Bay delegation for HR 1132. We en-
courage the House of Representatives pass
this bill swiftly, and we pledge our continued
assistance toward its enactment. Thank you
again for your leadership!

Sincerely,

DAVID LEWIS,
Executive Director.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of
H.R. 1132. It represents good govern-
ance by codifying the EPA's existing
work in the San Francisco Bay Area.
The bay area watershed provides a pri-
mary source of drinking water for over

25 million people and irrigation for 7,000 square miles of agriculture. It includes important economic resources, such as water supply infrastructure, ports, deepwater shipping channels, major highway and railway corridors, and energy lines.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, today, we are taking up the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act. This is legislation I have introduced every year since 2010. Since then, the environmental conditions of the bay have only grown worse.

The bay is the heart of the region, with a vibrant ecosystem that is home to the largest estuary on the West Coast. It generates more than \$370 billion in goods and services annually and is home to more than 3½ million jobs.

Forty percent of the land in California drains to the estuary, as my colleagues have mentioned. It also is home to more than 100 endangered and threatened species. The region's tidal and seasonal wetlands comprise a significant portion of America's coastal resources, yet over the past 200 years, 90 percent of the bay's wetlands have been destroyed by human activity.

Increased pollution from cars, homes, and communities in San Francisco have absorbed into various creeks, rivers, and streams that flow into the bay and the Pacific Ocean. By 2030, the expected sea-level rise in the bay area will exceed the rate at which the marshes can elevate and move, effectively drowning them.

Despite the impending threats, Federal efforts for bay restoration and pollution mitigation systems have failed to meet the enormous need. Between 2008 and 2016, EPA's geographic programs invested only \$45 million into the San Francisco Bay, while Puget Sound received over \$260 million and Chesapeake Bay \$490 million. That is 10 times as much, and the disparity becomes even more pronounced when you consider the populations served. A mere \$6 was spent on the bay for each resident of the bay area, while almost \$30 was spent for each resident living near Chesapeake Bay and almost \$60 per resident near Puget Sound.

In the most recent round of appropriations in early 2018, the San Francisco Bay's appropriations remained at \$4.8 million while smaller geographic programs received substantially more, including Lake Champlain with \$8.3 million and Long Island Sound with \$12 million.

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Act will authorize \$25 million annually for 5 years to fund water quality improvement efforts, wetland and estuary restoration, endangered species recovery, and adaption to climate change. We are just asking for our fair share of the dollars set aside for estuary restoration.

□ 1315

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I commend my colleague, JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on this issue. And thanks also to the ranking member for recognizing the importance, the critical national importance, of the San Francisco Bay Estuary.

I have the fortune of representing a beautiful district that starts at the Oregon border but goes all the way down to the Golden Gate Bridge. That means I represent a good portion of San Francisco Bay, the North Bay, where we understand all too well how much we have lost—90 percent of the Bay's wetlands have been destroyed.

Starting a century and-a-half ago, there has been incredible degradation of this vital estuary beginning with the Gold Rush, continuing to massive water diversions and pollution inputs, the diking of wetlands, and so on. But despite all of that degradation, San Francisco Bay continues to play a vital role ecologically in our region and an even greater role economically.

We have hundreds of billions of dollars in economic activity every year as a product of San Francisco Bay—outdoor recreation, commercial and recreational fishing, travel and tourism. And we also see the very real benefits in the San Francisco Bay area of coastal resiliency, using natural systems as a buffer against rising sea levels.

The citizens of the nine-county Bay area have stepped up. We recognize the national importance of this resource, and we have supported a ballot measure to support climate adaption and restoration funding. And now it is time for the Federal Government to do its part. That is why I am so pleased to support Congresswoman SPEIER's bill, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act, to provide the much-needed Federal partnership to help improve water quality in this important estuary to revive the Bay's wetlands and to protect our coastal communities and our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I do urge all my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1132, 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.

PROMOTING UNITED GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO SAVE OUR SOUND ACT

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2247) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of Puget Sound, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2247

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 "Promoting United Government Efforts to Save Our Sound Act" or the "PUGET SOS Act".

SEC. 2. PUGET SOUND COORDINATED RECOVERY.

Title I of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 124. PUGET SOUND.

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

"(1) COASTAL NONPOINT POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM.—The term 'Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program' means the State of Washington's Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program approved by the Secretary of Commerce as required under section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990.

"(2) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Program Office.

"(3) FEDERAL ACTION PLAN.—The term 'Federal Action Plan' means the plan developed under subsection (d)(2)(B).

"(4) INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION.—The term 'International Joint Commission' means the International Joint Commission established by the United States and Canada under the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 (36 Stat. 2448).

"(5) PACIFIC SALMON COMMISSION.—The term 'Pacific Salmon Commission' means the Pacific Salmon Commission established by the United States and Canada under the Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada Concerning Pacific Salmon, signed at Ottawa, January 28, 1985 (commonly known as the 'Pacific Salmon Treaty').

"(6) PROGRAM OFFICE.—The term 'Program Office' means the Puget Sound Recovery National Program Office established by subsection (c).

"(7) PUGET SOUND ACTION AGENDA; ACTION AGENDA.—The term 'Puget Sound Action Agenda' or 'Action Agenda' means the most recent plan developed by the Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference, in consultation with the Puget Sound Tribal Management Conference, and approved by the Administrator as the comprehensive conservation and management plan for Puget Sound under section 320.

"(8) PUGET SOUND FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TASK FORCE.—The term 'Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force' means the Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force established under subsection (d).

"(9) PUGET SOUND FEDERAL TASK FORCE.—The term 'Puget Sound Federal Task Force'