

for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2023.

President Emmerson Mnangagwa has not made the necessary political and economic reforms that would warrant terminating the existing targeted sanctions program. Throughout the last year, government security services routinely intimidated and violently repressed citizens, including members of opposition political parties, union members, and journalists. The absence of progress on the most fundamental reforms needed to ensure the rule of law, democratic governance, and the protection of human rights leaves Zimbabweans vulnerable to ongoing repression and presents a continuing threat to the peace and security in the region.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288, as amended, with respect to Zimbabwe and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 1, 2023.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO VENEZUELA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-13)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accord-

ance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2023.

The situation in Venezuela continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 with respect to the situation in Venezuela.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 1, 2023.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-14)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 13661, Executive Order 13662, and Executive Order 14065, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13685 and Executive Order 13849, is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2023.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, as well as the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 1, 2023.

#### KLAMATH RIVER BASIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time to stand before the House here this afternoon and talk about some issues that are not only important to my district in northern California to a couple of our key industries but really, they are important to all Americans because this is a life-sustaining topic we are talking about, and that is food, energy, and shelter.

We had that in abundance in California when we were allowed to produce the things that cause those to happen.

In my northern California district we have much agriculture. We have also an amazing natural water supply and the opportunities that come with that by harnessing that water supply for food for people, for agriculture, for hydroelectric power to make electricity and keep the lights on in places like this and all over America, and to mine the minerals that we need to produce all manner of things. These come from the natural resources we have in northern California, Minnesota, and all over this country.

So we have been successful in developing them and making them real since the founding of this country.

We have fallen on hard times more recently, though, with regulations that although may be well-founded and well-minded 50 years ago have been turned on their ear and work against good management of our forestlands, the extraction of minerals we need to sustain some of the ideals we have going forward for the future, for water supply, for agriculture, and for this country that has always known plenty.

These days we are actually seeing at some points empty shelves in our grocery stores in the United States.

It reminds me of a story about the time when former Russian President Boris Yeltsin was visiting this country with President Bush 41. They had gone to Houston, I believe, to the Space Center. They had left and were driving down the road. He saw a supermarket. He hadn't been in an American supermarket before. So he wanted to just pop in randomly with the President, the then-President of Russia, to see what it looked like.

President Yeltsin was amazed by the products that we have on the shelves in American stores. Not only that, but

that people were freely and casually purchasing them, not in a frenzy like oh, this is the day the food comes in and everybody has to rush in and stand in line and rush out before it is all gone. No. People were easily coming and going and taking what they needed. They were purchasing it at the register and walking out.

There was all variety of the same kind. All of it was fresh and of high quality.

That is what the United States has been able to bring itself to over all these years, and now that seems to be in peril.

A key part of that in my home State of California is that water supply. So I will touch about upon that here in a little bit.

We have in the northern California district that I represent and also on the Oregon side, which my colleague, Mr. BENTZ, represents, above this line here in Oregon is the Klamath Basin, the Klamath River.

Now, that is a natural lake that was formed at the beginning of the creation of this planet, but also it had been enhanced about 110 years ago through a Federal project. It yielded an additional 7 feet of elevation and approximately 400,000 new acre-feet of water supply that was intended when that Federal project was built to be agricultural water.

So back in 1906 when they created it, it made possible 1,400 farms and 200,000 acres of prime ag land. Under Federal law under the Reclamation Act and State law, all the stored water—the newly created water is called stored water—in the Upper Klamath Lake which was above the natural level of the existing lake was the stored water.

Again, there are 400,000 acre-feet of new water, but despite the clear law of the Federal Government, they have been taking advantage of the farmers year after year by mismanaging the lake and shifting that clear water right as adjudicated by Oregon courts to environmental purpose, to other purpose.

The water would not exist had not that project been built and paid for over the years by the farmers in that basin.

So what do we have, Madam Speaker?

In 2022, the Federal Government even cut off water that could have gone to finish the crop year. They eliminated 50,000 acre-feet of legal and available water to farmers. The really maddening thing is that at the end of the season, there was a surplus of water in the lake above what was needed to sustain what is known as a biological opinion to sustain the fish needs in the lake as well as what had been sent down the river for salmon needs.

There was extra water. We saw it ahead of time, yet they would not yield that additional water so we could finish the crop year on some of the needed crops that are planted up there. They plant all sorts of things up in that basin.

One of them would be the potatoes that they grow up there. They needed just a couple more weeks of water supply that was available, and instead they were allowed to die off. A normal, healthy potato ended up being the size of my pinky and obviously unharvestable and unusable all because they wouldn't listen to the projections that there would have been extra water. No. They wanted to start their new water year of 2023 in 2022 on the backs of a water supply that doesn't belong to the Federal Government. It is clearly for the farmers in the basin created after World War I and World War II for returning veterans to be able to set up shop and do that.

The Federal Government made this choice. They did this during a time when prices of food were skyrocketing around the country. Consumers are seeing these prices going up and shelves becoming more bare more often than we should ever see in this country.

So what else do we see?

They are depriving the farms of water. Here is another view of the basin here. It is a little more close-up of the various sumps and wildlife areas and the farmed land there. It is kind of hard to see from this distance, but indeed it is comprehensive, and it is rather complicated. But smart people have made that work over the years.

Indeed, when the farms thrive, also the refuges thrive. So negative effects have been such that when the farms don't get the water, the wildlife refuges in the area also lose access to the water that comes through that ag system and gets to them.

In 2020, over 60,000 ducks died in the basin in that Klamath refuge due to avian botulism. I paid a visit up there to folks who were working voluntarily and through fish and wildlife to help try and bridge the gap from the water supply that wasn't there and recovering ducks. It is pretty terrible.

Here we are fishing out dead ducks from the refuge.

Down here on the bottom is one that we rescued that was really sick but that we took back to a center there where they were helping the ducks that were recoverable to recover and turn them back loose.

The picture up here shows just how ugly it is.

A thriving basin is a key part of the flyway all through the Western States, including from northern California on south. The flyway is so key toward having the type of diversity of wildlife that is enjoyed all through the Sacramento Valley, the San Joaquin Valley, and other areas of northern and southern California and Oregon for sportsmen and for everybody.

It doesn't happen when this is the policy of the Federal Government to basically take the water away from farms and the refuges.

As I mentioned, as affirmed by the courts in Oregon where the lake lies, also a portion of the basis is on my side

which Mr. BENTZ and I both represent, the stored water is, indeed, owned by the farmers solely for the use of the Klamath project.

□ 1245

They have paid for it. They continue to pay for its ongoing upkeep and improvement even when they don't get the water delivered to them. Isn't that something?

It is one thing to get a bill for the maintenance and upkeep if you are getting to use the supply, getting to use the asset. They don't even get to use the asset half the time now, but they still get the bill for it. It would not exist other than for that 7-foot enhancement that created the 400,000 acre-feet.

In 2022, they were initially going to get zero water. They did find a way to increase it to 50,000 acre-feet after some late storms, which is 12½ percent of the allocation of their water right. There was extra water, as I mentioned, in the lake to be used in the basin at the end of the year above an amount that the environmental biological opinion said had to be remaining in the lake. They chose not to give it up.

In 2021, they were given 6 percent, or 33,000 acre-feet.

In 2020, after some battling, they tried to pull the pin on them early in the spring after the farmers had planted. They did end up getting 140,000 acre-feet, which is about a third of their allocation.

In 2019, which was an amazing water year in northern California and other areas, they still received 92 percent of their allocation. Pretty good by these standards, but it still wasn't 100 percent.

Downstream of that, on the complex Klamath River situation, are also four hydroelectric dams that California, Oregon, environmental groups, and others have all been conspiring for a long time to have removed. Think about that for a minute.

There is a big push in the whole country, especially in my home State of California, to convert everything to electricity for its energy source—automobiles. You are hearing the big controversy over stoves right now, kitchen stoves.

In my home State and some cities, they are really pushing getting rid of those. Now, most of the people I know who have gas stoves in their houses really like them. It is really handy to regulate the temperature, the rate with which the heat comes up on what you are cooking. You can see the flame. There is a photograph of First Lady Jill Biden using one in her own kitchen in the White House, but they want to take this away. It is going to have to be replaced by electrical appliances, electric automobiles, electric yard tools such as leaf blowers and lawnmowers.

I still chuckle at the idea that they are trying to ban gas generators in California. Think about that for a

minute. A generator is something you use a lot of times in an emergency for a home or business. There are a lot of other purposes as well for them, but a lot of people use them in an emergency when the power goes out. If you don't have a gas- or diesel-powered generator, what are you supposed to go to when the power goes out if you need to turn it on? Many hospitals, rest homes, things like that will have a diesel-powered backup generator. They are now constantly under the gun by an air quality group, even though they rarely have to use it: This is not compliant. You have to replace it or get rid of it.

When we keep banning fuel-sourced appliances like this and turn to more electrification, where are you going to get the electricity, especially in my home State of California in which the grid on any given hot day might be on the edge of shutting down?

They have arrangements with the power companies that large manufacturers have pre-agreed agreements, I will say, that they should shut down when the grid gets tough on a really hot day when the electrical load that everybody is pulling is about to break the grid. If that happens, you will have people having to shut down their businesses, shut down manufacturing, shut down a cement plant, whatever it might be due to a prearrangement because we can't keep the power supply up where it needs to be.

They don't really have replacements. That is expensive for jobs. It is expensive to stop your business. It is going to be expensive for the ratepayers to have to bear the brunt of that as well that use electricity other than those businesses. We want to convert everything to electricity, huh?

I mean, we had a last-minute intervention in the California State Legislature to extend the life of the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant by an additional 5 years. They were slated to shut it down, two reactors, one in 2024, one in 2025. That plant alone is 9 percent of the power grid. How do you take a 9 percent chunk out of something that is already teetering on the edge of failing?

There is a similar case up here on the Klamath River with the four hydroelectric dams. One is on the Oregon side in Mr. BENTZ' district. The other three are on my side in California in Siskiyou County. They are hell-bent on getting them out. They think they have it done.

We are here to say no because we need the power supply and many other aspects of those dams that are important for the area. Indeed, the local folks have had two different measures in the county on the Oregon side and in Siskiyou County on the California side by well over 70 percent, an advisory vote saying to please keep the dams in place, that they are important. Siskiyou County voted 79 percent for that.

This course of action, of course, was based on one single study that sup-

posedly showed that the dams are contributing to high water temperatures and reduced flows, which are causing fish populations in the river to decline, especially the salmon. This is at the same time—you have dams so deep water in them, right?—on Lake Shasta and others, Lake Almanor, I think soon Lake Oroville, they are requiring Lake Shasta to be kept deeper so the water stays colder longer into the year so they can release colder water for the fish in the fall and early winter. It is all about cold water by keeping the lake deep.

If you take these dams out that have water stored behind them, you no longer have that deeper pool of water. They are trying to blame the dams with deeper pools of water for somehow raising the temperature. I mean, both sides of the mouth on these arguments here. This all came from a master's thesis by a government employee, not peer-reviewed. It contained no in-field research.

A former EPA science integrity officer, actually during the Obama era, a man named Paul Houser, was tasked with reviewing all of these efforts for the Klamath dam possible removal. His conclusion—again, the EPA science integrity officer—said it would be the worst of all outcomes to remove these hydroelectric dams—worst outcome for a lot of reasons, including environmental.

The three hydroelectric dams are the biggest taxpayers in the county on the Siskiyou County, California, side. Removing them will cause a huge hole in the budget of an already struggling county, which has had its timber business decimated, the mining business decimated. These large landholders, these large assets, are pretty fairly lucrative for the county.

When you couple that with already expensive energy in California, and probably in a lot of the country, this doesn't make any sense because this is, you know, green renewable power. When the rain falls behind a dam, that is renewable. It doesn't require a fuel source. That is the fuel source. Yet, of course, in my crazy State, it is not recognized as renewable if the size of the power plant is above 30 megawatts. It doesn't mean anything.

We all hear about, well, we need green power. I guess that can only mean windmills and solar panels. Try to get a permit. One environmental group says, "Hey, we want these solar panels. They are the greatest thing," or the windmills. The other groups, maybe rightly so, say, "Well, if we are going to cover a thousand acres with solar panels, we can't stand by and allow that to happen." It might affect the desert tortoise. We know the windmills chop up birds, sometimes falcons, sometimes endangered hawks, even eagles, stuff people care about.

In addition, they are not really very reliable sources of power. Indeed, some days in California, because of an anomaly where there might be too much

power coming off those grids due to the way the load is managed, they will find themselves having to pay people to take that power because they can't just easily shut it off. It is strange, strange thinking.

I am appalled that this is where we have allowed ourselves in California to be forced into by the ideal of green power.

What does that mean? Everything else becomes a peaker plant. Peaker plants got talked about a lot 20, 25 years ago in California when we had other energy crises. A peaker plant was supposed to help supplement what the grid might not be fulfilling normally. Indeed, the peaker plants are going to become the hydroelectric plants and the natural gas plants because they want to go so far and wide with solar and wind that you know you can't count on them at night or when the wind isn't blowing, or, funny enough, if the wind is blowing too fast, they have to shut the windmills down.

Our electrical situation in the State is already in peril. Removing these hydroelectric dams means about 70,000 homes' worth of power goes off the grid and a whole host of other things. It will destroy the current ecosystem habitat, including some endangered species' spawning grounds, by releasing 20 million cubic yards of toxic, some of it possibly toxic, material—indeed, silt. These dams have a lot of silt behind them that has accumulated over the years. They don't really have an explanation for what is going to happen with it or how it is going to be disposed of. They are just going to release it into the river.

If you ever hear anybody talk about turbidity from a slight action going on in the river, you have to get a permit to do the slightest thing in the river, whether it is a gravel plant or doing something to clean up the river, having to move some material because of flooding, because of silt, and other situations. It takes months and months or years to get a permit just to move a little bit of material out. They say this is okay that we are going to unleash 20 million cubic yards down the Klamath River. The turbidity makes it hard for spawning. It is hypocrisy.

One of the other effects will be lowering the water table underneath the ground or near the dams. They have helped to build up the water table. The underground water table will be negatively affected by their removal.

It will remove flood control capability that is important for the communities nearby. The dams are a good way to absorb that water supply. If too much should happen to come from a heavy rainfall, they provide flexibility.

They remove the ability to control the river and have a flush flow if you need it in order to move some material or should it be for a fish need or other things downriver. That flexibility is taken away by removal of the dams.

Of course, as I mentioned, it takes hydroelectric power capacity away

from the users of the power and those that benefit from the income from it, including the County of Siskiyou.

It will possibly cost the taxpayers of California, who, in a water bond, put forward \$250 million for the tearing down of dams. This is a water bond that builds water supply, builds water storage, but had that provision in there: \$250 million of California taxpayer money to help tear down the dams. The ratepayers from the utility, mostly on the Oregon side, also had to front \$200 million through a surcharge on their electricity, for a total of about \$450 million raised.

Magically, when they were putting forth the proposal to FERC on what it will cost to remove the dams, it came in at just under \$450 million. Well, they have already wasted about \$40 million, maybe up to \$50 million, talking about it, so they are down to an amount of somewhere around \$400 million left of that fund.

When they remove a dam, they find a lot of things that they didn't count on, including much more silt. Up in Washington, I think it was, they found triple the amount of silt that they had expected. Instead of 20 million, it could be 60 million cubic yards of silt polluting the river for how long? Who knows how long it will take. The one in Washington, I think, was only about 12 or 13 miles from where the dam is to the sea, where you would have to push the silt. On the Klamath, it is somewhere 120 to 150 miles, depending on the meander of the silt going all through that. The life cycle of the salmon is 3 years. Will there be enough salmon to make it back through this turbid water over that 3-year period to actually have the species that all the fuss is over?

This removal will diminish the value of Siskiyou County property owners by about \$1.5 billion, thereby lowering the tax rolls to the county. The electrical rates will have to go up, and the power supply will be even more uncertain.

Now, speaking about Mr. Houser a moment ago and the study he made on removing the dams being the worst option, for putting out that truth, he was fired by EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy at the time.

□ 1300

I guess they didn't really want the truth out there. They just wanted one paper that they had hinged all this on since that time. The 20 million cubic yards—which might be triple of that, who knows—it is about the equivalent of one dump truck of material every minute of every day for 6 years being dumped in the river.

Now, imagine the fine if you accidentally put a little bit of silt in the river or a stream, like under Waters of the United States, for example, which we will talk about here in a minute. Imagine how you would be fined otherwise as a private party doing that.

The salmon hatcheries downstream will be destroyed as part of the re-

moval. The salmon hatcheries that we are talking about are responsible for more smolts being raised than actually what the river has ever made.

There is a ridge under one of the dams, a natural ridge that was there that is much higher than the river level that no fish would have ever gotten over to begin with. They don't want to talk about that because they believe the fish were getting all the way up the additional 60, 70, 80 miles to Klamath Lake. Bad information.

Now they are trying to somehow cover over that in the dam destruction that they can maybe get rid of that ridge and have it act like it would have been a fish passage from the beginning of time. So it would do a lot to hurt the economy of the county, local agriculture, the flood control, many things up in that area.

There would be uncertainty when the river system would ever return to normal. It would result in, at the mouth of the river, at the ocean, underwater contamination at the Humboldt County estuary, which means basically loss of seabed life with all that material now being released with who knows what is in it.

This removal would even cause a violation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Siskiyou County's governance over water would be lost.

What are they going to do to replace the salmon with the hatchery gone?

The actual hatchery is down below the lowest dam.

Of course, there is the loss of recreation, land value, the lake time, use on those lakes, again, tax revenue to the county.

And the replacement water, where are the farmers and ranchers going to get that replacement water due to the lower groundwater status?

So there is not a whole lot of good that comes from tearing down these dams that were there for a good economic purpose and actually do have ecological pluses, as well.

So moving farther south from the Klamath Basin, our water supply in California has been enhanced in the last century by some very forward-thinking projects. The State Water Project in the 1950s and 1960s and the Federal water, known as the Central Valley Projects, in the 1930s and 1940s.

Joining me here is my colleague from central California, Mr. JOHN DUARTE, who is a farmer down there, as well as a nursery operator of many of the nursery crops that we use to grow many tree crops, vines, et cetera. So the importance of the water supply to agriculture and to the people of California from these projects is incredible.

Madam Speaker, I recognize my colleague, Mr. DUARTE, to offer whatever comments he would like to on the water supply and on how he has been treated by government in his agricultural operations down in his direction in the Central Valley, as well as the portion in my district in Tehama County.

Indeed, we have a mass amount of excellent and very valuable crops that are grown in California. Some of them Mr. DUARTE is responsible for helping other farmers to have and even grows himself. I happen to be a farmer in my real life, too. So we see the value of what is grown in California and that is imperiled by government action.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DUARTE).

Mr. DUARTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I couldn't agree with the gentleman more. California's Central Valley, whether it be the Sacramento Valley where Doug serves and represents or the South San Joaquin Valley where I serve and represent is really where America finds its greatest abundance of its salad bowl, its fruit bowl, almonds, plant protein—walnuts, pistachios. California leads the world in production of all of these crops and it really centers right in the Central Valley.

Many of these water resources, whether north of Sacramento or south of Sacramento, share the same assets, the same infrastructure.

So after several years of devastating droughts in California that have really hurt farm families and communities up and down our district—through acts of nature greatly, but also through mismanagement of our water resources and lack of infrastructure in California—it has really cut the abundance that delivers nutrition and affordability to so many American working families who are suffering from high inflation, both the energy costs, the food costs—and in California particularly—their housing costs, because we are simply not responding to the needs of our people as we need to.

So in the last couple of days after a very, very wet season and immense hope on the part of our farmers that relief is on the way and they would get water allocations, many farmers—and Doug is in my district—received a letter from the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in spite of historic rainfall, snowpack, and flooding throughout California, is warning irrigation districts, farmers and ranchers, that they may not get the water and should be prepared for reduced allocations and flow restrictions, which would threaten our food security.

Now these farmers are making plans today to plant rice, to plant tomatoes, to plant cotton, to plant vegetable crops. They are making decisions today as to whether they will invest more input into their almond production, their walnut production, their pistachio production based on what they think the market will bear for their crops when it is ready to harvest and sell, as well as what water they will have to see those crops through the growing year with.

Today, they are getting very, very disturbing mixed messages from the Bureau of Reclamation. So we should

review what some of the facts are that the Bureau of Reclamation needs to look at while warning these farmers that even in this water-abundant year they may not get their allocations.

The current capacity and water outlook at Shasta—Shasta Reservoir is a big reservoir in California. It has 6 million acre-feet of storage capacity. Currently it is at 2.7 million acre-feet with inflows of over 14,000 acre-feet a day coming in.

The Shasta Reservoir has more than 1 million acre-feet in storage this year as it did at this time last year.

The current snowpack in California—now, we are all waiting for the snowpack to come down and fill the reservoir, but we can model how the reservoir will fill based on the snowpack this year.

This year's snowpack accounts for one-third of California's water supply. The second snow survey from the Department of Water Resources was conducted on February 1. So we are waiting with anticipation with what the March 1 SAR snowpack report will bring, but we know from the precipitation events over the last month it is going to be substantially higher.

Nonetheless, the snowpack as of February 1 of this year was 205 percent of average up to that date. It contained over 33.7 inches of water or 205 percent, the average of water content, of what we normally have up to that date.

We know the daily snow center report of February 28 per the California Department of Water Resources shows the snow water equivalent at each of the reporting stations feeding into the Sacramento River, which supplies Lake Shasta, all of these stations are over 100 percent of normal snow water content.

Throughout California in the same report, there are 131 stations with all but four reporting a snow water equivalent percentage higher than 100 percent of normal.

At Mount Shasta, which feeds the Central Valley Project's largest reservoir, Shasta Lake, the 2023 snowfall is 202 percent higher this far into the winter with 97 inches of snowfall recorded. And as of February 27 of this year, just yesterday, Mount Shasta had received approximately 60 inches of snow in the past 3 days. That is 5 feet on top of the snowpack they already had.

Yet, California farmers' food producers, the champions of abundance, are being told to keep their powder dry, not to expect full water deliveries this year.

Now, apparently we still don't have enough water infrastructure in California, even with Shasta filling up, even with the snowpack set there to completely fill and top up our reservoirs throughout the State, even after the State failed to pump the delta and get the floodwaters taken out of the Central Valley, out of the delta and into storage south of the delta earlier this year, we are still going to be

topped up and farmers cannot expect full allocations of their water this year.

We need to be building dams. We need to be building reservoirs. We don't need to be tearing them down. And what Congressman LAMALFA has presented here today is an absolute insult to every working family in America who is having trouble affording the nutrition on their dinner plate that they could better afford just a few short years ago.

This is going to be the first generation in American history—my prediction—where we will see the diverse nutrition of produce and protein taken off the American working family's dinner plate and reverting American families to more starch-based diets that go in the opposite direction of what every health nutritionist tells us we need to be doing with American food plans.

So abundance is affordability. We need a pro-human attitude towards our energy policies, towards our water policies, and towards our food policies here in America.

I hope that the bureaucrats at the Bureau of Reclamation will listen to Congressman LAMALFA today and heed his warning, because the American working family cannot take any more of this inflationary abuse of our Natural Resources.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for yielding. I am glad to be here today.

Mr. LAMALFA. I am certainly glad you could join us. You made it as a Member of Congress because you have a great story to tell as a Representative and as a farmer, also.

So we do have amazing abundant water in Northern California this year where so much of it emanates and ends up taking care of our part of the State and other parts of the State, as well.

Shasta and Oroville—Oroville, I believe will fill this year. It didn't look like that maybe a little while back, but it holds 3.5 million acre-feet of capacity. It has a good chance of filling.

Lake Shasta is a little lagging behind that. With the snowpack we are looking at, it could top off. It holds 4.5 million. It, combined with the proposed Sites Reservoir project downriver, would get us that 6-million number.

But we have to build Sites Reservoir. It has been looked at for many, many years. It has been planned. The voters of California passed a bond.

Remember the one I talked about a while ago that is going to use \$250 million to tear out dams?

Well, it also puts forth a good amount of money to add to water storage.

So the Sites Reservoir has been able to corral around \$950 million of that \$4 billion or \$5 billion bond. The rest is going to other projects, it looks like.

So we need to get this done. We need Governor Newsom, who expressed his support for it, to get his bureaucrats to move on that and get the permits ap-

proved so we can start. If we had it this year, we would have had that dam nearly full at Sites Reservoir with all the amazing water that we have had. So it is an issue of planning ahead, like those before us used to do when they built the Central Valley Project, largely Mount Shasta, and the State Water Project, Oroville, and others. Folsom Lake near Sacramento, it should fill up pretty rapidly this year with the snowpack.

So we are doing pretty good. I have to give credit where it is due. Thank you to the BOR for some of the settlement contractors, particularly in my area, that did get 100 percent allocation. So they did right on that, based on how things were looking with the supply, but that is a narrow group.

When Mr. DUARTE talks about others that traditionally have grown 100 percent of their acres in normal-ish years, they have seen their permanent new normal is going to be 35 percent on a good year, perhaps. That isn't right. If we plan ahead and build the storage we need, which we know we can, we have done it, and the plans are out there to do that.

And when the delta pumps that he spoke about weren't run at max capacity to help fill another reservoir, known as the San Luis Reservoir, towards the west side of the central part of the valley, that facility holds 2 million acre-feet. Right now I think it is at about 75 percent full.

It wasn't looking so good a while back until we had Mother Nature bless us with so much. But see, they weren't running the pumps as hard as they could. They have other biological opinions that say, Well, you can't do this. You can't do that.

You have so much water in there, I don't know see how it is going to negatively affect the fish except if somebody is waving a document saying, No, you can't do that.

So we have to flush so much water through the delta that we could be capturing and not hurting a thing by running those two sets of pumps, one Federal and one State, and topping off the San Luis Reservoir.

Now, my neighbors might say: Well, Doug, what do you care about San Luis Reservoir for? It is way down past us. It can't possibly help us.

Well, the more we enhance the supply of the whole State, the better off we all are.

I want my neighbors down there to do well. I want my neighbors on the west side of the valley that got zero water, the west side of the Sacramento Valley, basically many, many acres had zero.

Some of the districts I mentioned had up to 18 percent, which in some cases wasn't even usable to them. So we saw dry fields like we had never seen.

□ 1315

So we saw dry fields like we have never seen; never seen. That ruins the

economies of small towns. It ruins the habitat for the flyways, I mentioned, coming out of the Klamath. There is no downside for having more water supply.

I just saw recently where the City of Oakland has approved 25,000 new homes, okay. Well, California does have a housing crisis; we need homes, but where is that water supply going to come from?

We will need approximately 12,500 acre-feet per year to sustain that amount of homes, if my numbers are right. Where is that going to come from? Magic?

They are going to have to take it from somewhere. We need to build the supply so we can continue to build the housing we need in the State.

JOHN, we have both experienced this in different parts of the State. We both see that what we are growing here is, indeed, valuable.

These crops that we are talking about here, the country relies on them. Many of these crops, 100 percent, 90 percent, 99 percent come from California.

If we don't have this water, then United States citizens don't have this food. It will have to be imported, or they will have to do without.

They will have to eat something else. Well, there isn't always something else if we are not planning for that.

So it isn't just about California and just a few farmers; it is about everybody.

Tell them about what you had to deal with on just trying to keep your operation going on a wheat field or an orchard or what have you.

Mr. DUARTE. So it is interesting at times to understand some of the investigations and things that we need to write new laws for, or we claim we need to write new laws because one politician does this or his son does that.

We can't possibly need new laws to prosecute some of this corruption. I was prosecuted for planting wheat in a wheat field during a global food crisis.

My family purchased a property up in Tehama County, in Congressman LAMALFA's district and planted wheat where wheat had been grown many times before.

The Army Corps of Engineers thought we were doing something different. The field agent drove by and gave it a windshield test and said, hey, you are deep ripping.

You are not cultivating 4 to 7 inches deep; you are cultivating 3 to 5 feet deep. No, we are not. Come out and look at it.

Wouldn't come out, wouldn't look at it, wouldn't take our invitation. Next February, he files a cease and desist order and tells us we can't harvest our crop of wheat.

We asked for a hearing. The Army Corps of Engineers didn't have time to give us a hearing; barely had time to drive by and look at what they thought they saw out the windshield.

The Pacific Legal Foundation, a pro bono civil rights law firm for many,

many property owners and clients around America, representing the Sackett and the current WOTUS cases at the Supreme Court, took up our case as a due process Fifth Amendment case. They can't tell you you can't farm your land without giving you a hearing.

Well, once that case started to progress forward, the Army Corps of Engineers went to the Department of Justice, and my family and I were prosecuted for planting wheat in a wheat field by the Department of Environment and Water of the Department of Justice under the Obama administration.

We ended up never getting a trial. We were found guilty by an Obama-appointed judge in summary judgment. Without a single day in court, we were found to have violated the Clean Water Act because our tillage implement lifted soil several inches and moved it laterally several inches while nearing a wetland; a wetland vernal pool that had been farmed many times before with the same farming systems we employed.

So America's food system is not only at risk because of water scarcity politics here in California or overregulation.

America's food system is at risk because we have regulatory agencies waiting with bated breath to prosecute any American farmer that stands up for their property rights, their right to farm, their right to produce food for American families.

It is a huge risk. Farmers all over America are making decisions to avoid these entanglements, avoid a fight, not farm, unless prices are incredibly high because it is just not worth it.

Add in the risk of water supply, add in the risk of inadequate infrastructure, add in the risk of arbitrary bureaucrats making decisions right up until the last minute that affect our ability to plan our farming even for the next year, and our food supply in America is in peril.

It is absolutely unquestionably in peril, and we see it reflected in every grocery store across America today. The food inflation is crushing working families in America.

Abundance is affordability. Until we become an abundant society and we understand the farmers, the energy producers to be the champions of abundance, and the regulators, the NGOs that would stop abundance any way they can to be the lords of scarcity, American working families are going to pay the cost at the gas pump.

They are going to pay the cost on their heating bill. They are going to pay the cost at the grocery store. They are going to suffer the housing inflation we have seen in California.

In California, a working family is spending 30 percent of their income on food and 33 percent of their income on housing.

There is nothing left for the other expenses they have in their lives, and this is all due to regulatory overload.

We are overburdened by regulations, we are overburdened by restrictions on what we do, and the American working family is paying for it every day.

So thank you, Congressman LAMALFA. Thank you for being a champion of abundance. Back in 2015, 2016, and 2017, we were having our battles.

Thank you for being here today. You are a friend of not only the farmer; you are a friend of the American working family and affordability and nutrition across the country.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. DUARTE, I appreciate you bringing this sad story forward; indeed, being regulated for practices that are normal practices that are supposed to be exempt under the Clean Water Act, which was formed in the early 1970s, that were reinterpreted under the Obama administration.

They decided to reinterpret, and now it is a wider scope. We are having this battle right now in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, this conversation where we are going to do a Congressional Review Act on the overreach of the regulation of waters of the United States, WOTUS. It is going to be in the Supreme Court soon.

So it is important we get back to a level of regulation that is reasonable. Nobody wants to skirt reasonable environmental laws, reasonable usage of water, all of the above. We all get that.

But the bureaucracy, as JOHN was saying, is just waiting to pounce upon you and level huge fines at people.

He is not the only one in Tehama County that has faced this. I had one grower—this is some years ago—that had a clover field that he wanted to relevel.

They showed up there and said, oh, you can't do this. They took at least 3 years, 3 crop years he didn't get to use his land, while the bureaucracy pontificated whether he was doing something right or wrong.

I mean, he is owed compensation for that. And others, for planting an orchard, changing their ground from one type of orchard to another.

That is somehow now a new regulatable situation that is not meant—Congress would not have had the guts to pass a Clean Water Act that did not have agriculture exemptions as it was written.

If they had not had those exemptions, there would have been a whole bunch ridden out of here on a rail had they been that abusive of farm policy and agriculture and the food supply.

Yet, they are getting away with it by a stroke of the pen by a bureaucracy, and it changes with administration.

President Trump, he saw they were wrong on this, and they were able to put through a modified policy on waters in the United States that actually was working and was reasonable, and Biden pushed it right out.

So this is what we face now; his agencies are pushing this. Waters of the United States: It means every drop of water that falls from the sky is under the jurisdiction of the United States.



Whether it is a puddle here—he talked about vernal pools that might hold some water here for a little while; that is going to become water of the United States.

There used to be a term known as navigable waterways, navigable rivers. Well, if you can't run a boat up and down it, it is probably not really navigable.

But they have expounded upon this definition so far and so wide that it works for the bureaucracy to be able to attack growers, to attack landowners, fine them, seize things from them.

So the American people should be outraged by this because farmers are just trying to provide. Madam Speaker, 99 percent of them are doing things correctly.

Yeah, you have your outliers that try and do things on the edge, but they are caught up with pretty soon, whether it is peer pressure or the reasonable regulations that should kick in.

They are trying to provide good things for the American people. They are made to feel like criminals. They are made to feel like why should I even bother?

So back in the 1970s, it was kind of popular to say after the oil embargoes, if you like imported oil, you will love imported food.

Do we want to really rely on some of our same overseas partners for our food supply? Can you imagine trying to—Russia has grown a lot of wheat in the past. Do you want to buy Russian wheat?

Ukraine, which is a good partner—it is part of the difficulty of wrestling with that situation. Ukraine is a major exporter of many agricultural crops and fertilizer.

Heck, somebody I know had a breathing apparatus that was only made in Ukraine. They had to wait a long time to get parts for it.

So do we want to be reliant on foreign sources for everything, China for pharmaceuticals? Well, we shouldn't put our food supply in that situation either.

We are on the road to do that due to lack of foresight, due to lack of water storage. We could be building Sites Reservoir, 1½ million acre-feet.

We need to keep chugging water into the San Luis Reservoir, which holds 2 million acre-feet. We could raise Shasta Dam 18 feet, which would yield 630,000 more acre-feet.

This is a representation of the water that was wasted during this winter, being allowed to run out the delta.

This is a snapshot in time here. You have got the upper delta running out into the ocean here; 6 million acre-feet during that snapshot in time. What are we doing here? We are not helping ourselves.

The economy is in a tough way, as Mr. DUARTE mentioned. The costs for struggling families, for their housing costs and their food costs, almost envelops everything else.

So where is the compassion for the American people on this? We seem to

be focused on a lot of other things. There are environmental issues that are brought up but show me where it actually is going to help the fish in the Klamath River. It isn't.

A lot of these other environmental issues, it doesn't really—since 1992, we have flushed hundreds of millions of acre-feet out to the ocean through the delta.

The Delta smelt is almost nonexistent now. They can't find it. When they do trawls for it, they cannot find it.

So it is almost like more water has actually harmed that fish. They have other predatory fish that are nonnative that are eating up all the salmon smelts there.

We don't do the right things about it. We do the wrong things. It penalizes good, honest, working people that are only trying to provide good things for the American people.

So, John, we have to keep telling the story because a lot of folks are just not quite understanding. They don't have time. They are too busy in their lives.

So for those that are viewing this today, I hope you will take this to heart and have your representatives do things that are going to help our food supply in this country and help farmers, help people that generate electricity.

On these environmental issues, you only seem to hear one side of it. No, those dams are not bad. Dams are actually created for a good purpose.

They don't yield the fish passage that is sometimes advertised. There are other remedies for that, but they are not allowed to come to the forefront. Can we build fish ladders around the dam?

Heck, in some cases, they are trucking fish from here to there because of drought situations. So why don't we have alternatives to these ideas?

This gets into a very important topic in my area too: forestry. We have overgrown forests that instead of a healthy 50 to 70 adult trees per acre, they will have 500, 600, even 1,000 trees per acre.

So what does that mean? Well, fire danger, big time. In my district, there is fire after fire. Last year in 2022, we kind of dodged a lot of bullets there.

In 2021, we had a million-acre fire. I have got the poster of it here. You have seen it before. Anyway, it is devastating toward the landscape, toward the habitat, and also affects the water supply because all this ash and silt washes into the water system and pollutes it.

It makes hydroelectric plants sometimes unusable because there is so much stuff that came down from the mountainside into the rivers, into the lakes.

We are not managing our forests properly. There is a Federal nexus to that; the U.S. Forest Service. The pace and scale at which they are doing things is way too slow to keep up with the amount of board feet that they are growing every year.

So how does that affect water? It affects not only water quality but water supply because the forest is sucking all the water in to have too many trees per acre.

What, you want to cut all the trees, Mr. LAMALFA? That is what I hear sometimes when I talk to the urban reporters on it.

No, we are not cutting all the trees. We are thinning. We are managing. We are having the amount of trees per acre at a ratio that is sustainable, that is healthy, and we are not doing that.

The trees are out there growing right now. There are manifold more board feet of trees that are being added to the supply every year than we are even coming close to harvesting, so that shows we are going backward on that.

That shows we are going backward on that.

□ 1330

The pace and scale with which we manage our Federal lands and allow the permitting on private lands to not cut every tree from here to Oregon, but to manage them—that is the first thing the environmental groups yell. "Oh, you guys are going to clear-cut everything. You are going to devastate the landscape."

Do you think what is happening now is good? A million-acre fire—several of my towns don't exist anymore in northern California. Many have heard of Paradise. Maybe you have seen some of those videos where 95 percent of that town burned down, and 85 people lost their lives. Many barely escaped. The town of Greenville in my district, 75 percent gone, and an adjacent town, Canyon Dam, was completely gone in minutes.

There is more up on the Klamath River even. Fire after fire because our forests are not managed, because the Federal Government can't get out of its own way to aggressively do what needs to be done.

We are way behind, so it affects air quality. The air plume, the smoke that went up in the plume from the Dixie fire in my district, came and settled over the East Coast because there was so much smoke. It affected air quality, I believe, here in Washington, all the way up to New York. People were advised not to go out and do athletic things because of air quality from a fire in my district.

I am sorry. We didn't want it to happen, but there it was, year after year, fire after fire. So, we need folks to be on our side on this thing. No, we don't want to wipe out the forest or cut down the owl or any of that stuff. The owls actually like a little room to fly between not overcrowded trees.

It will help our water supply. It will help the health of the forest. It will help not spend billions and billions on fire suppression every year once we are behind, endangering people's lives trying to put the fire out and flying the air tankers and all that fuel being expended trying to do that.

Let's talk CO<sub>2</sub>. I have a CO<sub>2</sub> poster over there as well. When we are talking CO<sub>2</sub>, which everybody is scared to death of around here as being the major pollutant, more CO<sub>2</sub> is released in those fires than a year's worth of cars driving in L.A., okay?

This climate change, which is half the time what they are talking about on the other side of the aisle in order to scare people to death, CO<sub>2</sub> represents only 0.04 percent of our atmosphere. The U.S. is a country leading the way on actually lowering the number anyway.

We are going to export our jobs and export our industry to countries that are doing nothing about it. China laughs at us as they build another coal-fired power plant every week, every 2 weeks, whatever it is. There are those that say, "Hey, you guys in America, you are not keeping up with the Paris accords," and they keep cranking out more and more. It makes us look like a bunch of fools.

This climate change religion they are pushing is going to be really expensive. Watch out for these corporations that are pushing what is called an ESG policy. We acted on that this week here legislatively because it is going to make Americans uncompetitive in the areas of energy and everything else.

This is pie-in-the-sky stuff they are pushing here. It is actually very harmful to America, which is always the innovator of the cleanest, best way of doing things. We are always seeking to improve. We got the best-running car and truck engines, yet it is never enough for the regulators, including in my home State where 70,000 currently used trucks, up until January 1, now have to be sold or scrapped or something else, and therefore, people don't get the stuff delivered to the stores or to their homes that they normally would. It is going to be more expensive.

I heard somebody talk about the PRO Act here a minute ago. In California, that was a bill that makes everybody have to be part of a workforce or union instead of an independent contractor.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DUARTE) to talk about regulations in California.

Mr. DUARTE. Madam Speaker, the other side of affordability is opportunity, and families can't make ends meet unless they have affordable food, affordable energy, affordable housing. They can't do the best they can do without opportunity.

Until America decides to take practical steps to power our grid, we are not going to have the industrial growth, the worker productivity, the opportunity that American families deserve.

I think Congressman LAMALFA makes a very clear case that other countries are happy to take those jobs, happy to provide their citizens with opportunities that American citizens won't have.

As we look at our global food system that is based in California and through-

out many States, a global food system will ship food to whoever can afford it best. In the emerging middle and upper classes in India and China, where they are running a carbon economy, where they are creating jobs, where their grid stays lit 24/7 and has plenty of room for industrial growth, is where we are seeing opportunity in work and jobs, and it is where Americans are going to see their dinner flow to.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, we want the American people to pay attention because this affects them. It isn't just for us to stand here and speak.

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

#### CONGRATULATING FLORIDA WINTER OLYMPIC MEDALISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Erin Jackson, Joey Mantia, and Brittany Bowe, the three speed skaters from Ocala, Florida, who represented the United States at the 2022 Winter Olympics and brought home gold and bronze.

It is not every day that you see a winter sport like speed skating coming out of the Sunshine State, so it really is a particular honor to be able to stand here and recognize the Olympians from my very own district.

To Erin, a gold medalist, and Joey and Brittany, both bronze medalists, you have made Florida's Third Congressional District and the United States so proud during the Olympics. Your hard work, dedication, and commitment to the American values of independence and self-determination are certainly worthy of celebration. We cannot wait to see what you will continue to accomplish in the future.

To the Ocala community and the coaches and parents who have helped these amazing athletes get to the top of their game, thank you. Of course, not only to Erin Jackson, Joey Mantia, and Brittany Bowe but to the entire Team USA, thank you for proudly representing the United States on the world stage and demonstrating to countries all over the world what it means to be an American.

Go Team USA.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF KEVIN MORSE

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate and honor the life of a dear friend, Kevin Morse.

As a husband, father to three sons, and friend to many, Kevin was a man loved by all. Whether you needed a mechanic, engineer, plumber, electrician, therapist, priest, or even a hug, Kevin would be there in an instant. He lived to help others.

Kevin was a family man through and through, and he loved his wife and kids more than anything in the world. As he watched his three boys grow up into

young men, he supported them all in their endeavors, attending every basketball game and cheering them on from the bleachers as loud as he could.

Now, when I say cheer them on, I mean he would beat the hell out of the banisters and railings with his cane. At the time, I was cheering for Metro State and could hear his endless banging up in the stands even while down on the floor. By the end of the game, there were more dents and scratches on the cane and the entire area around him. It was kind of his signature.

He was a role model for his boys, and he raised them to be kind, smart, and selfless. He served as the spiritual leader for his family and his community, exemplifying what it means to be a man of faith. He was gentle, patient, faithful, and forgiving, all the qualities of a man who you would want in a friend.

I have known Kevin for many years, and the impact that he had on my life is something that cannot be explained in words.

To his family, friends, and anyone who was lucky enough to have known Kevin, I extend my sincerest thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

I am honored to recognize Kevin Morse and his incredible legacy here on the House floor.

#### HONORING THE SERVICE OF LOGAN CATALANOTTO

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a student from my district, Logan Catalanotto.

I hope I got that right, Logan. If I butchered it, I am so sorry. But thank you, Logan, for your meaningful contribution to our community.

At just 17 years old, and a senior at Forest High School in Ocala, Logan decided to make his Eagle Scouts project an upgrade to the State Flag Commons area of the Ocala-Marion Veterans Memorial Park.

His troop, Scout Troop 72 of Ocala, has held events at the park over the last 2 years, and Logan decided to give back to the community by beautifying the memorial park.

The project, being an estimated \$32,000 worth of upgrades, is one that you typically don't get to see from someone as young as Logan, a project that he initiated.

His service to the veteran community has not gone unnoticed by the citizens of Ocala, as many have expressed great gratitude toward Logan for his dedication to the project.

It is acts of benevolence like these that truly restore faith in America's young people to spread kindness and do the right thing.

I could not be prouder of Logan for being a driver of positive change, generosity, and patriotism.

Thank you, Logan, for your service to the veteran community and to Florida's Third Congressional District.

#### HONORING THE LIVES AND SERVICE OF SERGEANT NOEL RAMIREZ AND DEPUTY SHERIFF TAYLOR LINDSEY

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate, remember,