

reauthorization of the federal career and technical education (CTE) program. Unfortunately, I remain concerned that the bill included changes to the funding formula for states that would result in significant cuts to CTE funding for West Virginia and several other states beginning in 2021.

The removal of a hold harmless provision will result in a direct loss of \$4.07 million to West Virginia, a cut of nearly 20 percent over a three-year period. Given West Virginia's economic struggles in recent years, we can ill afford drastic cuts to workforce training programs. As the legislative process continues, I urge the U.S. Senate to find an equitable solution and consider states that will be disadvantaged by the removal of the hold harmless provision.

Without additional changes to the funding formula, in its current form I will oppose the bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

High school, community college, and trade school students in Houston and Harris County, Texas deserve the opportunity to receive a high-quality career and technical education (CTE). CTE education is the pathway for many in our community and throughout our great country to a good paying job and the middle class.

High-quality CTE programs are critical for our nation's economy. Nearly every sector of our economy, from refiners and shipbuilders along the Houston Ship Channel to medical device manufacturers and information technology firms, rely on skilled STEM-educated workers to innovate and compete in the global marketplace.

For over thirty years, the federal government has provided direct support to CTE programs nationwide through the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. Congress has not successfully reauthorized the Perkins Act in 11 years, delaying the needed reforms and additional resources our CTE students deserve.

Today's legislation delivers the reforms and resources that will help improve our local career and technical education programs. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will provide states more flexibility in the use of federal resources in response to changes in education and the economy and reduce administrative burdens and simplify the process for states to apply for federal resources. This legislation will increase federal investment in CTE program by nine percent over the life of the authorization and reward success and innovation in CTE program practices that have been proven to best serve students and employers.

I ask all my colleagues to join in supporting this bipartisan legislation that is broadly supported by job creators and educators from across our great nation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Strengthening Career and Technical Education Act.

I devoted 35 years to workforce education so I know the career and economic opportunities possible through technical education. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that there are 90 distinct career paths in my home state—Michigan—offering an average salary of \$50 thousand or more that do not require

a 4 year college degree. That salary is well above the state median annual wage of \$45 thousand.

Yet we lack effective technical training opportunities to reach those paths. Too often young people are unaware of those opportunities and far too often access to career and technical education is lacking. CTE programs give students the opportunities to experience those careers and build skills needed for careers.

This bipartisan legislation updates federal law to support CTE programs and to improve access. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, it's estimated that the U.S. spends \$1.6 trillion dollars on human capital development each year. That includes spending on K-12 education, post-secondary education, and employer-based training. In spite of all that spending, fewer than half of Americans ages 25 to 64 have completed a credential beyond high school. All over my district I hear from employers about the need for workers with the right skills. Career and technical education is one way to do this.

I am pleased this legislation encourages states to utilize work-based learning, but I would also note that I think we can further strengthen it by encouraging apprenticeships, both registered and unregistered. As our nation continues to transition itself from analog to digital, so must our workforce. Apprenticeships are needed not only in traditional trades, but also in emerging fields like advanced manufacturing and the technology sector. President Trump demonstrated his commitment to this workforce development model in a speech last week, and I look forward to working on this model with the Chairwoman.

With these important reforms, we can help ensure the labor force of tomorrow has the skills it needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2353, 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.

WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 392 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1654.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1440

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the House meets for the second day in a row to consider another infrastructure bill that has come from the House Natural Resources Committee and its Subcommittee on Water, Power, and Oceans, of which I have the honor of chairing. My subcommittee has a strong infrastructure agenda, already hearing testimony on a number of bills aimed at improving our Nation's infrastructure and advancing an all-of-the-above energy and water strategy.

Many of our bills, including H.R. 1654, which we are considering today, apply simple solutions to expedite maintenance or construction of water and power infrastructure throughout the Nation. It is vital to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, and one of the biggest roadblocks is the excess of regulatory red tape that applicants have to wade through before they can even move one shovel of dirt.

In Colorado, where I live, a water project was recently completed where water owned by the city of Colorado Springs was taken from a reservoir 60 miles to the south to the city of Colorado Springs for treatment and distribution. The project took 6 years to build. But before that could happen, there were over 200 permits and applications that had to be granted, any one of which could have stopped the whole thing, and that cost \$160 million in application fees, lawyers' time, and mitigation. That took 8 years. That took longer than the project itself.

Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK's Water Supply Permitting Coordination

Act seeks to cut regulatory red tape by creating a one-stop-shop permitting process to the Bureau of Reclamation in order to streamline the current multiagency permitting processes for new or expanded non-Federal surface storage facilities.

However, this bill is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill allows water storage project sponsors the flexibility to opt out of this process and, instead, choose the agency and process that works best for them.

While the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act will allow for much-needed relief in the sponsor's State of California, this bill will benefit States throughout the West, including my own State of Colorado.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill goes hand-in-hand with language in the WIIN Act, which was signed into law last year, that supports additional water storage capacity across the West.

I commend my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for bringing up this commonsense piece of legislation that simply looks to cut regulatory red tape for water storage projects that are essential to survival in the West.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my House colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are debating today what is being called an infrastructure bill. I wish that were actually the case. Our country certainly needs Congress to take action to address our country's infrastructure needs, yet this Congress is spending its time today debating another sham infrastructure bill that won't actually provide a single cent for real infrastructure.

Our Nation currently spends less on infrastructure as a percentage of our GDP than at any time during the past 20 years, and it shows. Far too many areas around the country have infrastructure that is crumbling before our eyes. We have seen this occur with the recent tragedy and the situation for water at the Oroville Dam in California, and this bill offers no solutions for these issues. In truth, this bill is simply an environmental deregulation bill disguised as an infrastructure bill.

Now, the bill's proponents have claimed that environmental laws, and specifically NEPA, are blocking new dam construction. This claim, Mr. Chairman, simply put, is bunk. According to the Bureau of Reclamation, not a single dam has been denied construction because of a lack of coordination between Reclamation and other agencies or because of delays associated with environmental review or permitting.

So why do we not see all sorts of new dams sprouting up around the West like we did for years and years in the previous century?

Because there is no new water to be captured, and because, frankly, all the

best dam locations around the West were taken in the previous century when we had a heck of a dam-building spree.

New dams don't get built because they don't yield enough water to justify their multibillion-dollar price tags. You can ask the CRS if you don't believe other experts. In 2012, the Congressional Research Service found that the most likely causes of delay for major infrastructure projects are a lack of funding and State permitting issues, not environmental laws.

Now, new surface storage may be appropriate in some cases. The fact is, however, that much of the United States is already saturated with dams because of that dam-building spree we had in the previous century. The United States built tens of thousands of dams in the 20th century. California alone built 1,400 major dams. The best dam sites are already taken. Other than extraordinarily wet years like this one, thankfully, in California we are having a hard time even filling up the reservoirs that we already built.

Despite these facts, my Republican colleagues continue to peddle this fiction that we have to gut our Nation's environmental laws to build new dams and other infrastructure. I guess we should not be surprised because this crusade against our Nation's environmental laws is being led by a President whose relationship with the truth is complicated at best.

A couple of weeks ago, President Trump claimed that projects like the Hoover Dam were built in 5 years because they didn't have to go through years of permitting and regulation that current infrastructure projects are subjected to.

Well, the independent fact checkers at The Washington Post evaluated this claim and they awarded the President's claim, as you can see to my right, three Pinocchios, which is the rating for statements that include "significant factual error and/or obvious contradictions."

Now, the fact checkers noted that, according to the U.S. GAO, 95 percent of public infrastructure projects are actually excluded from environmental reviews under current law. They further pointed out that the President ignored the many years of planning, permitting, negotiating, and preparing that was required to make sure that projects like the Hoover Dam were financially feasible and actually had public support.

In fact, dam planning on the Colorado River began in 1902, yet the Hoover Dam was not completed until 1937. Not completed, I might add, until the Roosevelt administration put actual public infrastructure dollars on the table to get that project financed and moving. The project took many years because, even despite the absence of modern environmental laws, big complicated projects take time to plan and finance, and they always have.

I am sorry that my Republican colleagues refuse to let such facts get in

the way of their decades-long crusade against our country's bedrock environmental laws, but I hope we will eventually move on from this debate and get on to addressing real problems affecting our infrastructure, and that real problem is investment.

In terms of water infrastructure, our Nation is still not making necessary investments like water reuse projects and recycling projects. These are 21st century infrastructure projects that can provide us with water supplies that don't depend on the whims of an increasingly unpredictable hydrology. Given our changing climate, we can no longer rely exclusively on our 20th century infrastructure projects like dams.

Despite this, we have barely scratched the surface on building modern water infrastructure projects like reuse, recycling, desalination, groundwater storage, storm water capture, and water-use efficiency projects. Our country currently reuses less than 10 percent of our Nation's wastewater. Climate change will require us to do better. As George W. Bush's Reclamation Commissioner once said, the reuse of wastewater and recycled water could actually be the next river for the Western United States to tap for critical water supply.

This Congress should be working across the aisle to fully tap that next great river for the 21st century.

Reoperating existing facilities, modernizing those operations, is another example of something we should be working together on across the aisle.

All around the West we are dealing with dams and reservoirs that are being operated with the best technology from decades ago. The flood control manual at Oroville Dam, for example, hasn't been updated since 1970, which actually makes it cutting edge when compared to many of the reservoirs that are operating on 1950s flood control manuals. We are using slide rules instead of computers, with meteorological predictions that are based on historic data, backward-looking data, instead of looking up at the sky and using the data from modern satellite technology.

At Folsom Dam, we are watching a long overdue update to operations as part of a new auxiliary spillway. Forecast-informed operations, which is something that I have long advocated as part of comprehensive water legislation, is something we could work on together, and it would provide significant increases in water supply.

If my Republican friends are interested in expediting environmental reviews for infrastructure projects, then there is another thing that we can work on together, and that is we can end the slashing of budgets in Federal agencies that are in charge of environmental reviews for infrastructure projects. Budget cuts do nothing but hamper the ability of these agencies to participate in the review process and to protect our other Nation's fisheries and other natural resources.

This bill before us today compounds the problem by further undercutting the important role these agencies play to protect our natural resources. That is why several conservation and fishing industry groups have warned that this Congress should reject this bill, that it threatens tens of thousands of jobs in the fishing industry across the Pacific Coast.

Many of our Nation's iconic fisheries are already on the brink of extinction. We have heard firsthand in our committee from the fishermen struggling to pay their mortgages, boats being scrapped because owners can't pay mooring fees, homes being repossessed, and restaurants, hotels, and other retail and service businesses struggling just to scrape by. Let's not add to these struggles by passing an ill-conceived bill that does nothing to actually improve our infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Members are advised and reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work on this.

Mr. Chairman, I always get excited when I hear people speak on the floor, especially when they come from California. Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting when people want to tell us what is the best way to make things happen.

It is interesting, in California, when the legislature was controlled by Democrats, they did waive CEQA, but it wasn't for a dam. It wasn't to prepare for a drought we were going through. But they waived it twice, all for sports. One was in San Francisco, and one was in L.A. It seems odd, but sometimes people have their priorities, I guess, not in the right place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, California and the West recently endured the worst drought in our century. Though it was the worst drought, this was not our first. We have faced droughts for generations, and each time the rain and snow came back and delivered the water that we needed to survive.

Just like previous years, this past winter was a godsend to Californians; the wettest on record. Living in the naturally dry region that we do, you would think it would be common practice to prepare for inevitable times of drought by capturing water when Mother Nature blesses us with the rain and snow. But the fact is that we aren't doing enough to store the water we do get for the times we don't get it.

So what can we do now? What would help the people in our district and across California and across the West to prepare for future droughts that we know are coming?

We should start by building more dams and reservoirs.

So what is stopping us?

Well, some is a ridiculous permitting process that forces us to wait and wait and wait when actually we should be acting.

Just look at history. Take the High Savery Dam in Wyoming. It took 14 years to permit the project but only 2 years to build it. It was finished in 2004. Think about how much the world has changed in those 14 years of time.

In 1990, somewhere around 5 million people had cell phones and only about 15 percent of Americans owned a computer. By 2004, when the dam was finished, about 180 million people had cell phones and 62 percent of Americans owned a computer. In 1990, the most popular movie was *Total Recall*. By 2004, we were already on to *Shrek 2*.

Looking forward to my home State, we can't wait 14 years after starting the permitting process to finish our projects. The Temperance Flat Reservoir, once fully operational, can provide enough water to meet the needs of 172,000 households for an entire year. Finishing the Sites Reservoir proposal could provide 2 million California homes with enough water for a year. That is an astounding number. But, Mr. Chairman, I am sure on this floor we will hear those 2 million should actually wait. But I guess for a baseball stadium, no need to wait.

So fixing the process isn't just about saving some headaches or a few hours of time. This is about making sure millions of people in California and across America have the water they need and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK for this legislation. Fixing this permitting process for water storage is more than just common sense. It is about making us a nation of doers again to get the American what they actually need.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK has worked. He has tried to work with both sides of the aisle. He has been through this process.

But you know what?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK has been home. He has been listening to his constituents on both sides of the aisle that don't have water. We have been through these droughts. We know these droughts will come again, and they have only been worse in the last couple of years.

Why?

Because of what has been imposed by the Federal Government. Even in the years where we have more than 170 percent of snowpack, we don't keep the guarantee of 100 percent of the water.

So as the environmental laws continue to take water away and put it out to the ocean instead of providing for the fruits to be grown and the fiber across our country and provide the water for the citizens of California, we should build more dams, and they should not have to wait 14 years with only 2 years to build it. We can do bet-

ter, we should do better, and we will do better when we pass this bill.

□ 1500

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I was in the California Legislature for at least one of the those environmental waiver bills that the majority leader referenced involving an NFL stadium, and I am glad to hear him criticize that because I, too, criticized it. It was a bipartisan mistake. I voted against it.

There was a bit of vindication because at least one of those stadiums ended up not getting built anyway, despite the environmental waiver, and it sort of exposed the fact that these environmental laws are often put forward as scapegoats. We are often told that if you just clear away the environmental permitting, we can do these things.

There were many other reasons why that stadium didn't get built, complicated issues involving NFL franchises and financing, which is usually the real scapegoat when these projects aren't moving forward. So it is a worthy example to talk about in the context of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, droughts are nature's fault; they happen. But water shortages are our fault. Water shortages are a choice that we made a generation ago when we stopped building new reservoirs to meet the needs of a growing population.

The unvarnished truth is we will not solve our water shortages until we build more reservoirs, and we cannot build new reservoirs until we overhaul the laws that have made their construction endlessly time-consuming and, ultimately, cost-prohibitive.

For years, the Natural Resources Committee has heard testimony from frustrated water districts unable to navigate the Byzantine maze of regulations and the phalanx of competing, overlapping, duplicative, and often contradictory Federal agencies.

After years spent trying to satisfy one agency, another suddenly pops up to claim jurisdiction with an entirely new set of demands in an often endless permitting process, despite the fact they are studying the same project in the same location with the same data. The burden this places on our ability to deliver water for the next generation is crushing.

The leader mentioned the High Savery Dam in Wyoming—14 years to permit, only 2 years to actually build. The Federal Government has literally studied four storage projects in California nearly to death. One project, the Sites Reservoir, had over 50 alternative

locations studied, and there is no end in sight for the feasibility process on that potential reservoir. Similar delays have prevented the expansion of the Shasta reservoir for 39 years.

Mr. HUFFMAN tells us that no dam permits have been denied because of this. The problem is very few dam permits have been approved because of this. And the costs are caused by cost-prohibitive delays in time that run up millions and millions of dollars in costs until the agencies simply throw up their hands and give up.

H.R. 1654 will bring order from this bureaucratic chaos. It establishes a framework in which Federal agencies with permitting responsibilities for the construction of new reservoirs must work together, coordinate their schedules, share data and technical materials, and make their findings publicly available. The end result will be fewer delays, more efficient use of taxpayer dollars, and, ultimately, more abundant water supplies.

It is modeled on the Obama administration's approach to constructing new electric transmission lines to accommodate its reliance on wind and solar generation. There is nothing new in this process. In October of 2009, the administration formed the Interagency Rapid Response Team for Transmission, a consortium of nine Federal agencies to coordinate a single unified environmental review document for each project analysis.

It is also modeled on provisions sponsored by House Democrats that expedited improvements on the Hetch Hetchy dam serving the San Francisco region. This bill simply says, if there is a potential project on Interior or Agriculture Department lands, then the Bureau of Reclamation will be the coordinating agency for the permits. That is a one-stop permitting agency.

It will call together all of the agencies, the local and State jurisdictions and tribal governments of our Indian nations, establish a timeframe for studying decisionmaking, and then coordinate all the reviews and analyses and opinions and statements and permits or licenses and other Federal approvals required under Federal law.

It also requires transparency, assuring that all data is available to the public online so the science guiding these decisions can be rigorously scrutinized by all interested parties.

It also allows water agencies to fund the review process if Federal funding isn't provided, removing one of the excuses that Federal agencies have made in slow-walking or stalling project reviews.

I want to make this very clear: It does not bypass or alter or waive any environmental or safety laws. It doesn't waive CEQ or ESA or NEPA or any other law. It simply says the process needs to be more efficient, and the government agencies should coordinate and cooperate with each other rather than talking past each other as isolated and often inscrutable fiefdoms.

Five years of drought in California brought entire cities within months of exhausting their water supplies. The epic drought has now been followed with the wettest year on record, and we have helplessly watched our dams spilling millions of acre-feet of water to the ocean because we have no place to store the excess for the next drought.

Perhaps that is nature's way of reminding us that, if we didn't store water in wet years, we won't have it during dry ones, and the economic and social devastation have been immense.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, if you want to misuse our environmental laws to block any new water storage, well, then you should vote against this bill. We will continue to see increasingly severe water shortages and spiralling water and electricity bills.

But if you want to preserve our environmental laws, you ought to be supporting this bill because it places those laws back within a workable and practical framework, and it places our society back on the road to an era of abundance where our children can enjoy green lawns and gardens, brightly lit homes, and abundant and affordable groceries from America's agricultural cornucopia.

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

Mr. Chair, the State of California is being mentioned quite a bit in this conversation.

It bears noting that the State of California is not asking for this legislation; and, in fact, the State of California has consistently opposed the rolling back of environmental standards and is busy passing bill after bill in this State legislative session to try to backfill for anticipated rollbacks in Federal environmental standards. So, certainly, if we are talking about the State of California and what it wants and it needs, its elected leaders are taking a very different direction than posing the false choice between environmental standards and infrastructure.

Again, the United States Bureau of Reclamation has emphasized that there are other factors, that it is not environmental review that has stopped any water projects in the West. The Congressional Research Service has reached the same conclusion.

And I just heard from my friend, Mr. McCLINTOCK, that we can't build new reservoirs until we change these laws. Well, I have got to point out that California has built new reservoirs under current law. You can ask the folks in Contra Costa County about Los Vaqueros Reservoir.

They didn't need any environmental waivers or special legislation. They built their dam. And in fact, they are getting ready to move forward with an expansion of that surface storage project. It should be broadly supported,

and they are not asking for any special tweaks to the environmental laws. The same would apply to Diamond Valley Reservoir in southern California.

And, in fact, we have actually added nearly 6 million acre-feet of new surface and groundwater storage over the past few decades in California, all while honoring bedrock environmental protections like ESA and NEPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Centennial State of Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative McCLINTOCK, for putting forward a very sensible piece of legislation.

The Colorado Water Congress, who supports this bill, stated in their letter:

The economic viability of the State of Colorado is dependent on safe and reliable water supply. In recent years, the ability of water managers to meet growth demand and to create water storage has become more challenging.

In Colorado, the Windy Gap Project, whose formal environmental permitting process began in 2003, won't see construction start until at least 2019, with water storage ready by 2022—16 years to permit, 3 years to build.

For too long, Federal agencies have failed to properly coordinate and time their reviews of water supply project applications, resulting in missed opportunities for increased water storage during our wetter seasons.

Water is the lifeblood of Western communities. Without it, most communities in the Western United States could not survive, so it only makes sense to store as much of it as we reasonably can during those wetter years. Yet the Federal Government presents roadblock after roadblock that prevents a timely and cost-effective completion to many of these projects.

This legislation will streamline the permitting process and increase agency accountability by placing the Bureau of Reclamation at the center of the process and ensuring all other agencies are required to report to it in a timely fashion.

It is an effective piece of legislation, an effective approach to a problem that should not exist. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, this is an issue that is, I think, one of most important long-term issues that we deal with not only in California and Western States but, really, in the world, because the fact is that water is a crucial element of the sustainability of all of us, and it always has been.

With the planet clicking 7 billion people a couple of years ago, soon to be 9 billion people by the middle of this century, with climate change clearly impacting our ability to manage our water supplies, we must look at the

long-term needs of using all the water tools in our water toolbox. And this is one effort to, in fact, look at how we can provide additional storage capacity not only in California, but elsewhere, so that when we have these periodic times—and we measure water on 10-year averages.

We have had near-record rainfall and snow in the snow-packed mountains of California, which we were blessed with the last 4 months. And after five of the most extremely dry periods of time, to have this rain and snow is wonderful.

But we know that you have got to plan for the future. And so in cases like California where it is either feast or famine, having an additional water reservoir supply is one of the important water management tools in our water toolbox, along with conservation, along with better irrigation technologies which we are implementing, along with conservation of all sorts of kinds, desalinization. All of these matter, as does storage.

This year, millions and millions of acre-feet of water have gone unused because of the lack of storage. This measure will help, but there are other things that we have to do to fix the broken water system in California, in the West, and, really, we can be a template if we better manage our water resources for the entire planet in the light of climate change.

I ask that we support this legislation. It is helpful, and we must do much more.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from California for supporting this very important legislation.

We all, all of us in California, have experienced what happens when you have radical environmentalist nonsense determining policy. We have just gone through one of the worst droughts in our history, yet during that drought, those wonderful California environmental planners saw to it that billions of gallons of freshwater were dumped into the ocean instead of being redirected towards producing food crops in our Central Valley area or providing water to drink or providing water so that people could afford to have water throughout our State. Instead, it was dumped into the ocean.

Now, what we needed and what we need now that the drought is over is more water storage because we are in favor of people, not some grandiose concepts of what a better view counts—now, without people in it, that is, of course.

Now we need to think about what our policies will impact on average people. And what we have in this radical environmental approach is opposition to storing water, now that we have some extra water, right after a drought.

Now, whose side are you on?

You can't tell me you are on the side of ordinary people, because when water

prices go up and there is not enough water for the crops, the price of food goes up and the price of water goes up.

Who is the worst hurt?

America's lowest income people are the ones who are hurt the most, the ones who can't afford to pay the little extra for food that it costs when it costs more money to grow crops in the middle of a drought.

□ 1515

So with that said, I dramatically support doing something for the people, not some environmental theory—nonsensical theories in most cases—that we are facing doom if we store water.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If we store water, that is going to be bad for the environment? I mean, I am sorry. That makes no sense to me.

And it doesn't make sense to ordinary people either that after a drought, that in some way it is against the environment to make it easier for us to store water so we don't have to have the same destruction and the same lowering of the standard of living of our poorer people when the next drought comes around.

This act by Mr. TOM MCCLINTOCK, H.R. 1654, will make it easier and quicker for us to build these dams. By the way, if we don't do this, many of those dams will probably be built, only we are talking about the evaporation not of water, but of money. After you have to go through years and years of paperwork, what evaporates is the money that should be going into education and transportation programs.

No. It is wrong all the way around not to permit people to go as fast as we can rationally and engineeringwise to build storage for our water supply today so when the next drought comes around, ordinary people won't be hurt.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Orange County for those comments. I have been to Orange County and I have seen the cutting-edge water management work taking place in Mr. ROHRABACHER's district. Among other things, they are doing amazing ground-water recharge and water-use efficiency, water recycling. In fact, they have got one of the most cutting-edge potable reuse systems in the country. It is their reliance on those 21st century water management tools instead of large reservoirs—that, for the most part, were running dry during this drought we just went through—that enabled them to get through the most critical drought any of us have ever seen in much better shape than any communities around the State.

So kudos to the forward-looking water managers in Orange County. But if the gentleman is concerned about

low-income people being impacted by water shortage and water management issues, I really hope he will pay a visit to my district, because on the north coast of California, you get the other end of this water management challenge.

The fishing communities of the north coast have been hammered by the fact that our iconic salmon runs are teetering on the brink of extinction. We have left very little flow in the rivers, and this drought only exacerbated the problem.

So I am representing people that are deeply impacted by water shortage and water management decisions that need to be part of this consideration instead of trivialized when we talk about water wasting out through the estuary. This is water that sustains these fishery runs that have been the lifeblood of the communities in my district for many years.

Now, just to inject a couple of facts into what has been called a radical environmental agenda that caused the waste of all of this water during the drought—in fact, that didn't happen. In 2014, the fact is only 4 percent of all the runoff in the entire Bay Delta Watershed flowed to San Francisco Bay solely for environmental protection. In 2015, it was even less. Two percent of the runoff for the entire watershed made it all the way out to San Francisco Bay solely for environmental purposes. The rest of that flow that made it through was to control salinity in the delta so that you could continue to serve municipal and industrial and other water-use needs. Most of that water was diverted and used.

We need to remember the facts in what can sometimes be a hyperbolic discussion of California water.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GOSAR), who is also a subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, legislation sponsored by my good friend and colleague, TOM MCCLINTOCK.

For centuries, Western States have fought over scarce water supplies. We even have an expression in the West that says whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting over.

The water scarcity in the West led our visionary forefathers to build Federal water storage projects throughout to provide water, hydropower, recreation, flood control, and environmental benefits while adhering to State water rights. These were nonpartisan endeavors, as evidenced by President John F. Kennedy dedicating the San Luis Dam in California.

Now, while the Central Arizona Project came after President Kennedy, it continues to bring prosperity to Arizona's cities, tribal communities, and ranches almost 50 years from its inception.

The Glen Canyon Dam and other projects affiliated with the Colorado River Storage Project provided the backbone of a regional economy that produced year-round water and emissions-free hydropower.

Lake Powell, the reservoir behind Glen Canyon, allows for millions of dollars' worth of recreational boating annually and even provided the scenery for the astronaut crash landing in the 1968 science fiction classic, "The Planet of the Apes."

For generations, these projects provided benefits to a growing society, but what the Federal Government helped give, it has been taking away.

The current regulatory process for constructing new surface water storage is a bureaucratic maze that requires numerous permits and approvals from a multitude of different Federal, State, and local agencies. Conflicting requirements continue to cause unnecessary delays, kill jobs, and result in us failing to capture precious water supplies. Ranchers, agricultural and municipal water providers and other stakeholders in the West need a clear process without the bureaucracy.

H.R. 1654 establishes such a process by creating a one-stop-shop permitting shop, with the Bureau of Reclamation in charge of the permitting process for these important water storage projects in 17 Western States. This makes a lot of sense, as the Bureau of Reclamation's multipurpose water projects made the West what it is today. Generations of our prior leaders focused on the need to capture water and deliver it to cities and fields.

Our communities always need water, and with the projected population increases, we are going to need a lot more of it in the near future.

Let's build on the good work of previous generations. Get the bureaucracy out of the way and pass H.R. 1654 so we have a clear process moving forward for preserving worthwhile water infrastructure projects.

There is an old adage: save for a rainy day. In this case, it should be: save on a rainy day.

This act facilitates that very concept.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for sponsoring such needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It has been a good conversation, but I hope one thing is clear: this is not an infrastructure bill. This is an environmental deregulation bill that is masquerading behind the issue of infrastructure.

Environmental laws, environmental reviews are not the reason new dams have not been built and it is not the reason new dams will not be built. All of the serious analyses point to other factors, the big one being they don't generate enough water to justify the huge price tags that go along with

these projects. They are just rarely financeable, rarely do they make economic sense. So let's not scapegoat the environmental laws to try to address that problem.

Now, if my colleagues across the aisle are interested in an honest infrastructure bill, including a water infrastructure bill, they will find a lot of willing partners across the aisle, including myself. We have put forth all sorts of ideas. We want to see water infrastructure. Surface storage and new dams can be part of that, but we have got to put real dollars on the table. We have got to do what prior generations did when they got serious about building infrastructure, and not hide behind this ulterior agenda of gutting our environmental laws, repackaging that, and representing that as being responsive to our Nation's critical need for new infrastructure. This bill simply doesn't meet that test.

I request that my colleagues vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I close, I do want to point out a bit of circular reasoning that my friend from California is using. He says that it is not the environmental regulations or the red tape that slows down the construction of dams, it is the high cost. But what he doesn't recognize or is not willing to admit is that the high cost is caused by all the red tape and environmental regulations. So that is arguing in circles, and I don't accept that.

Again, I commend the bill's sponsor for this bill that looks to promote additional and much-needed water storage throughout the West.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1654

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 "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BUREAU.—The term "Bureau" means the Bureau of Reclamation.

(2) COOPERATING AGENCIES.—The term "cooperating agency" means a Federal agency with jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion,

statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations, or a State agency subject to section 3(c).

(3) QUALIFYING PROJECTS.—The term "qualifying projects" means new surface water storage projects in the States covered under the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding, unless the project applicant elects not to participate in the process authorized by this Act.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Bureau is established as the lead agency for purposes of coordinating all reviews, analyses, opinions, statements, permits, licenses, or other approvals or decisions required under Federal law to construct qualifying projects.

(b) IDENTIFICATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COOPERATING AGENCIES.—The Commissioner of the Bureau shall—

(1) identify, as early as practicable upon receipt of an application for a qualifying project, any Federal agency that may have jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, approval, or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations; and

(2) notify any such agency, within a reasonable timeframe, that the agency has been designated as a cooperating agency in regards to the qualifying project unless that agency responds to the Bureau in writing, within a timeframe set forth by the Bureau, notifying the Bureau that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the qualifying project;

(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the qualifying project or any review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision associated therewith; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments on the qualifying project or conduct any review of such a project or make any decision with respect to such project in a manner other than in cooperation with the Bureau.

(c) STATE AUTHORITY.—A State in which a qualifying project is being considered may choose, consistent with State law—

(1) to participate as a cooperating agency; and

(2) to make subject to the processes of this Act all State agencies that—

(A) have jurisdiction over the qualifying project;

(B) are required to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the qualifying project; or

(C) are required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the qualifying project.

SEC. 4. BUREAU RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The principal responsibilities of the Bureau under this Act are—

(1) to serve as the point of contact for applicants, State agencies, Indian tribes, and others regarding proposed qualifying projects;

(2) to coordinate preparation of unified environmental documentation that will serve as the basis for all Federal decisions necessary to authorize the use of Federal lands for qualifying projects; and

(3) to coordinate all Federal agency reviews necessary for project development and construction of qualifying projects.

(b) COORDINATION PROCESS.—The Bureau shall have the following coordination responsibilities:

(1) PREAPPLICATION COORDINATION.—Notify cooperating agencies of proposed qualifying

projects not later than 30 days after receipt of a proposal and facilitate a preapplication meeting for prospective applicants, relevant Federal and State agencies, and Indian tribes—

(A) to explain applicable processes, data requirements, and applicant submissions necessary to complete the required Federal agency reviews within the timeframe established; and

(B) to establish the schedule for the qualifying project.

(2) **CONSULTATION WITH COOPERATING AGENCIES.**—Consult with the cooperating agencies throughout the Federal agency review process, identify and obtain relevant data in a timely manner, and set necessary deadlines for cooperating agencies.

(3) **SCHEDULE.**—Work with the qualifying project applicant and cooperating agencies to establish a project schedule. In establishing the schedule, the Bureau shall consider, among other factors—

(A) the responsibilities of cooperating agencies under applicable laws and regulations;

(B) the resources available to the cooperating agencies and the non-Federal qualifying project sponsor, as applicable;

(C) the overall size and complexity of the qualifying project;

(D) the overall schedule for and cost of the qualifying project; and

(E) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that may be affected by the qualifying project.

(4) **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.**—Prepare a unified environmental review document for each qualifying project application, incorporating a single environmental record on which all cooperating agencies with authority to issue approvals for a given qualifying project shall base project approval decisions. Help ensure that cooperating agencies make necessary decisions, within their respective authorities, regarding Federal approvals in accordance with the following timelines:

(A) Not later than 1 year after acceptance of a completed project application when an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact is determined to be the appropriate level of review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) Not later than 1 year and 30 days after the close of the public comment period for a draft environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), when an environmental impact statement is required under the same.

(5) **CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.**—Maintain a consolidated administrative record of the information assembled and used by the cooperating agencies as the basis for agency decisions.

(6) **PROJECT DATA RECORDS.**—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, ensure that all project data is submitted and maintained in generally accessible electronic format, compile, and where authorized under existing law, make available such project data to cooperating agencies, the qualifying project applicant, and to the public.

(7) **PROJECT MANAGER.**—Appoint a project manager for each qualifying project. The project manager shall have authority to oversee the project and to facilitate the issuance of the relevant final authorizing documents, and shall be responsible for ensuring fulfillment of all Bureau responsibilities set forth in this section and all cooperating agency responsibilities under section 5.

SEC. 5. COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **ADHERENCE TO BUREAU SCHEDULE.**—

(1) **TIMEFRAMES.**—On notification of an application for a qualifying project, the head of each cooperating agency shall submit to the Bureau a timeframe under which the cooperating agency reasonably will be able to complete the authorizing responsibilities of the cooperating agency.

(2) **SCHEDULE.**—

(A) **USE OF TIMEFRAMES.**—The Bureau shall use the timeframes submitted under this subsection to establish the project schedule under section 4.

(B) **ADHERENCE.**—Each cooperating agency shall adhere to the project schedule established by the Bureau under subparagraph (A).

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD.**—The head of each cooperating agency shall submit to the Bureau all environmental review material produced or compiled in the course of carrying out activities required under Federal law, consistent with the project schedule established by the Bureau under subsection (a)(2).

(c) **DATA SUBMISSION.**—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, the head of each cooperating agency shall submit all relevant project data to the Bureau in a generally accessible electronic format, subject to the project schedule established by the Bureau under subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 6. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, after public notice in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Administrative Procedure Act”), may accept and expend funds contributed by a non-Federal public entity to expedite the evaluation of a permit of that entity related to a qualifying project.

(b) **EFFECT ON PERMITTING.**—

(1) **EVALUATION OF PERMITS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the evaluation of permits carried out using funds accepted under this section shall—

(A) be reviewed by the Regional Director of the Bureau of the region in which the qualifying project or activity is located (or a designee); and

(B) use the same procedures for decisions that would otherwise be required for the evaluation of permits for similar projects or activities not carried out using funds authorized under this section.

(2) **IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary and the head of each cooperating agency receiving funds under this section for a qualifying project shall ensure that the use of the funds accepted under this section for the qualifying project shall not—

(A) substantively or procedurally impact impartial decisionmaking with respect to the issuance of permits; or

(B) diminish, modify, or otherwise affect the statutory or regulatory authorities of the cooperating agency.

(c) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—None of the funds accepted under this section shall be used to carry out a review of the evaluation of permits required under subsection (b)(1)(A).

(d) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public, including on the Internet.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115–186. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115–186.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 2, after the period insert “Such term shall also include State-led projects (as defined in section 4007(a)(2) of the WIIN Act) for new surface water storage projects in the States covered under the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding, unless the project applicant elects not to participate in the process authorized by this Act.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my subcommittee chairman, Mr. LAMBORN, for his leadership on this, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK for bringing the bill in chief forward here that I am asking to amend today.

This amendment ensures that State-led projects can also enjoy the coordination that the bill itself will do, State-led surface storage projects such as Sites Reservoir. These will be defined in the WIIN Act and they will be eligible under H.R. 1654’s permitting.

Doing so enables States to direct their own resources towards infrastructure needs at lower cost and improves States’ ability to partner with the Federal Government on projects that provide both State and Federal benefits.

Adopting this amendment to include State-led projects will allow the development of more water infrastructure more rapidly and at no additional cost to the Federal Government. For example, in my home State of California, the voters have approved billions of dollars toward infrastructure projects such as Sites Reservoir—not too far from my neighborhood—which will include enough water storage for millions more people in our State.

Now, if you know the saga of Sites Reservoir, the locals there will tell you they have been talking about it, studying it, poking it, prodding it for about 40 years. Bureaucracy plays a major role in that.

So the bill in chief is not looking to change environmental laws or get rid of environmental laws. Indeed, my colleague on the other side of the aisle talked about having an honest discussion in this area. Well, an honest discussion would show that the bill in chief is one that is merely coordinating. It is not changing the Water Quality Act. It is not changing NEPA, CEQA, or anything else, other than getting these people all in one room to coordinate at one time.

Yes, we, indeed, have costs involved, because people give up, whether it is

private sector money or the people that pass bonds as State voters give up after a while because they don't think their dollars are actually getting to the projects, when they hear needless, endless delays, when we have this game of bureaucratic badminton being played by various agencies knocking one idea to another, taking years of time and additional costs, especially those surprise ones at the last minute.

Lake Oroville is in my own backyard. Now, what we have seen there since the crisis happened with the breakage of the spillway is that coordination under an emergency, where, even though there are some trying to throw roadblocks in there, people recognized coordination was needed, because when 188,000 people have to evacuate an area due to some unknown factors with how the infrastructure is holding up, then they saw the need to fix it.

□ 1530

And the spillway at Lake Oroville is going to be fixed pretty rapidly over a 2-year period and made usable in this short amount of time. So that is how coordination can work to get a needed project done when it can be an emergency.

What we need to quit doing is waiting for emergencies like this and on levee projects when we know for years and years that levee projects—highways, bridges, other infrastructure that have this bureaucratic badminton played when people are trying to get these projects done—need to be coordinated. That is what this bill does.

My amendment adds to it, again, an important ability for State dollars under State-led infrastructure projects to be included in that. So I think it makes a heck of a lot of sense and will help our voters like in California and others around the country to be able to enjoy that coordination.

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. We support the amendment. It improves the bill by expanding opportunities for increased water storage across the West. I urge its adoption.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Marin for yielding me 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman LAMALFA. As I said earlier, we need to fix the broken water system in California because reliability is key.

We have a water system that was designed for 20 million people. Today, we

have 40 million people living in California. By the year 2030, we are going to have 50 million people living in California.

The simple truth is that in the San Joaquin Valley, where I live, which has been ground zero for the impact of an unreliable water supply because of this broken system, we have felt the devastation of the drought. This lack of reliability is due to many factors that have intensified as a result of climate change, impact on regulations, and other factors.

Luckily this year, as I noted earlier, it has been a deluge of rain and snow, and for that we are thankful. But we know in California that it is either feast or famine, and so, sadly, we must plan for the future, and that means including surface storage and using subsurface replenishment of our ground water and all the other water tools that are part of this water toolbox that is critical for the long term.

We need more storage. We need the underlying legislation that this provides. While not completely fixing or resolving our challenges, it is a small step, and, as was noted before, this does not amend NEPA or CEQA, but it simply provides a timeline, and a timeline is a good thing.

This collaboration that this legislation envisions is not too different from the collaboration that the Governor is working with the Department of the Interior on, the proposal to fix the plumbing system in the delta. They have a record of decision that has a timeline.

So if surface storage water is going to receive funding and support under the WIIN Act that we passed in December, matching State funds, along with this effort to provide the timeline, will be helpful.

Let me finally say that sustainability of our agricultural economy, sustainability of putting food and fiber on America's dinner table every night, and helping feed other parts of the world is really what we are talking about here. Reliability is key to making sure that we are sustainable under the adverse impacts of a lack of a fixed water system. We need to address this.

This legislation is a small step in providing timelines for certainty for this collaboration for this process to work better. I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague, Mr. COSTA, for his bipartisan support and effort in ensuring we have a proactive way of doing things in California on water infrastructure. I appreciate that a lot.

So for anybody to say that the amount of effort it takes to get past the bureaucratic process, to simply get the existing permits under existing laws, is not burdensome is naive. Indeed, whether we are talking highway projects, levee projects, bridge projects, and, more particularly, this

bill, water storage projects, we need this coordination.

So the coordination will mean more for the American people, more for the people of my own State, with less dollars, less delay, and they can start enjoying the fruits of this project, the fruit of their tax dollars.

So my amendment simply adds to that, State-led efforts, whether it has been a bond passed by a State or other State funding in California and other States, that they, too, can enjoy that coordination that this bill would provide.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I, unfortunately, must oppose this amendment. I am not sure if it was the intent of my friend, Mr. LAMALFA, but it appears that this amendment would prioritize permitting surface storage projects under the WIIN Act and not groundwater storage WIIN Act projects.

The WIIN Act, of course, authorized money for both surface and groundwater storage projects. These projects are yet to be named and prioritized. That still needs to happen.

Yet this amendment applies this bill's streamlining provisions to WIIN's "State-led projects for new surface water storage projects."

Now, providing surface storage above all other types of water infrastructure projects certainly is in keeping with some of the obsession with new dams that we have heard from my colleagues across the aisle. But the truth is, there are all sorts of other worthy projects that are needed if we are going to get serious about water infrastructure in California; and to put a thumb on the scale for one particular kind is not the right way to go.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-186.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. CONDITION ON APPLICABILITY.

This Act shall not apply to any project that the Secretary determines could cause harm to commercial fisheries.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, am concerned about

the long-term prospects for water infrastructure and storage in the West.

As the western climate continues to get hotter, we are going to have more hot, dry, drought years. That is why many States and communities, including the cities that I represent, are doing all that they can to make their water infrastructure more resilient, to reduce unneeded runoff, to recycle water, and to store as much ground water as possible.

To support these critical activities, Congress needs to invest in our country's water infrastructure. The bill before us today does not do any of these things. It does not authorize new or additional funding for water projects. It is not an infrastructure bill.

Instead, the bill before us today makes many Americans nervous because it loosens key environmental safeguards and imposes arbitrary deadlines for the approval of dams on our rivers and streams. This bill threatens the health of our streams, our rivers, and coastlines, which could harm fish populations important to commercial fisheries.

Therefore, I am offering a straightforward amendment. It simply requires proposed new dams to go through the normal project review process if they are likely to harm commercial fisheries.

The construction of poorly permitted dams has been a major cause of mortality for California's fisheries. In California's Central Valley, they currently block Chinook salmon and steelhead from more than 90 percent of the historical spawning habitat.

My amendment will help protect my State's economically important fisheries from further harm. Commercial fisheries from my home State sustain thousands of jobs across California and the West Coast, and, currently, we have what can only be described as a fisheries crisis.

Many fisheries are at record-low population levels. According to some estimates, 78 percent of California's native salmon will be extinct or disappear within the next century if current trends continue.

Simply put, many West Coast fishermen and fisherwomen who depend on California's fish runs are hanging on by a thread. The thousands of fishermen and fisherwomen, and other employees of restaurants, hotels, and other businesses that depend on healthy fish runs, have been struggling mightily.

Even now, many fishermen and fisherwomen are still recovering from the total closure of the ocean salmon fishery along the West Coast in 2008 and 2009, because of poor California salmon returns. The closure devastated the Pacific Coast fishing industry and, ultimately, required millions of dollars in disaster aid from Congress.

In recent years, fishery managers have also had to severely restrict commercial fishing season because of low population levels. My amendment will help prevent future harm to people who are already struggling just to get by.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, first I would point out to my friend from California, if the climate continues to warm, we are not going to be able to store as much water in our mountains as snow, and we are going to need much more surface water storage reservoirs than the laws have allowed us to build because of the delays they have imposed in planning and construction.

The gentleman's amendment gives the Secretary of the Interior the ability to ignore this streamlining law if he determines it could "cause harm to commercial fisheries."

Well, now, remember, this bill makes no changes to any of our existing laws or regulations. It makes no changes to the licenses and permits required for a project or the criteria for obtaining those licenses and permits. It makes no changes to any law or regulation that could affect commercial fisheries or, for that matter, anything else.

It simply says that the agencies and jurisdictions involved with these projects have to cooperate and coordinate and communicate with each other, and it requires the science guiding these decisions to be available to the public to review and scrutinize.

So why the amendment? Well, for one reason and one reason only, I think, because for the last 8 years, we have had an administration that was actively hostile to constructing new reservoirs. That administration has used the fragmented nature of the approval process as a way to delay projects indefinitely. That is what this proposal corrects.

Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment would allow any administration so inclined to make a specious finding as an excuse to ignore this law. Project applicants would not know from one election to the next whether their millions of dollars of studies and investments would suddenly come to naught, and projects already well along in the planning and approval process could find their efforts coming to a screeching halt.

For our laws to work, they must be predictable and fair. Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment is a poison pill to render this law unpredictable and capricious.

The irony is this: the gentleman's constituents in southern California have the most to lose from his amendment because southern California depends on surplus water from northern California. And let me make this very clear to the gentleman and his constituents: northern California has first claim on northern California water.

If we can't store the extra water in the north, there is no surplus for the south, and the gentleman's constituents can look forward to dead lawns and gardens, brown parks, empty swim-

ming pools, astronomical water and electricity prices, spiraling grocery prices, and a future where they will have to ration and stretch every drop of water and every watt of electricity in their parched and sweltering homes. They might want to ask him about that some day.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from northern California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of this amendment.

My colleague across the aisle just asked the rhetorical question: Why is this amendment needed?

It is needed because fishing jobs matter. The people whom I represent on the north coast of California and also other fishing communities up and down the Pacific Coast, including Oregon and Washington, their jobs matter, and their limited opportunity to have their interests considered when a dam project is moving forward is what is shortened by the streamlining in this bill.

Their interests are already subordinated oftentimes, but they get subordinated even further by the streamlining in this case, which places the Bureau of Reclamation, the proponent of the new dam, in charge of the administrative record, which places the fish agencies—which often advance the interests of protecting fisheries—in a subordinate role to the Bureau of Reclamation that controls the administrative record, which imposes shortened timelines to make it even harder for their interests to be considered.

Fishing jobs matter. And the truth is, right now, in my district and in many other fishing communities, people are hurting because they have been damaged by poorly operated and poorly permitted dams.

Let's not make things worse. This amendment is absolutely necessary, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would first point out that commercial fisheries are controlled and regulated by the Secretary of Commerce, not the Secretary of the Interior, and yet it is the Secretary of the Interior to whom the gentleman would give the power to ignore this streamlining law and impose endless, repetitive, and duplicative delays in the consideration of these projects.

I would again point out that all of the considerations that are given to fisheries, that are given to environmental laws, that are given to engineering laws, everything that goes into the planning process in our dams under

our laws and regulations is fully respected under this measure.

All that it does is say that the agency, that the Bureau of Reclamation, when an application is provided, will pull these agencies together, and all of the jurisdictions and all of the affected parties establish a timetable according to their best judgment of what is necessary, have them talk with each other, and then stick to that plan.

That is what the bill does, and that is why it is so desperately needed in a State that has not built a major reservoir of over a million acre-fee of storage since the New Melones was completed in 1979.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD three letters, including one from the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, which is the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the West Coast, collectively representing thousands of family-wage jobs and the West Coast commercial fishing industry that contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy, strongly opposing this bill, H.R. 1654, and supporting the amendment.

PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION
OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS,

June 12, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA) is the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the West Coast, representing the interests of hundreds of family-owned commercial fishing operations who harvest and deliver fresh seafood to American consumers and for export. Collectively, we represent many thousands of family wage jobs and a West Coast commercial fishing industry that contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy.

On behalf of the hundreds of hard working commercial fishermen we represent, we are OPPOSED to H.R. 1654 for many reasons, among them the following:

While the concept of streamlining permitting for federal water projects is attractive on its face, our primary problem in the arid west is not a lack of water storage projects, but lack of funds for maintaining and repairing the many existing projects that are already in place. Hundreds of existing water projects are badly in need of repair, with many dangerously close to failing. And as we recently witnessed with the catastrophic failure of the Oroville Dam, an "expedited review process" like what is envisioned in H.R. 1654 could lead to poor or rushed impacts analyses potentially resulting in further catastrophe or economic disruption. It is now apparent that the Oroville Dam's 2017 emergency spillway failure was predicted—but the warning signs were ignored—in its expedited environmental impacts review process.

H.R. 1654 is simply the wrong approach. It would undermine existing laws protecting both the public and public resources by making the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) the lead agency for all environmental reviews, in effect leaving Reclamation in control of the entire environmental review process. However, Reclamation has neither the expertise nor the capacity of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service to inform the development of major infrastructure projects to reduce their impact on valuable wildlife and fisheries. Under H.R. 1654, these agencies would be stripped of their authority

and duties to oversee and authorize water storage projects, to the detriment of the people of the West and the American taxpayer.

H.R. 1654 also implements overly restricted and burdensome project review timelines, including provisions that would require expedited review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)—timelines that may be inappropriate for very complex projects like the damming of streams and rivers. These fast-tracking provisions interfere with the ability of agencies and the public to meaningfully analyze proposed complex projects, and could also limit the public's ability to weigh in on infrastructure developments that could affect communities for decades. Further, the bill permits non-federal public entities to contribute funds to expedite project permitting, raising serious conflicts of interest questions about the fairness and impartiality of the federal review process.

H.R. 1654 also establishes perverse incentives for western states to cede their independent authority. Under the new regulatory scheme, state agencies could be compelled to adhere to the bill's procedures, thereby requiring those state agencies to cede control to Reclamation and comply with its timelines. This weakens the essential and independent role that states play in reviewing proposed water infrastructure projects within their borders.

We sincerely request that you vote NO on H.R. 1654. This bill will not solve the problems it purports to address, and it would have widespread consequences far beyond water deliveries and water storage, including adverse effects to regional and local fishing industry economies and the jobs and communities those economies support.

Sincerely,

NOAH OPPENHEIM,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN RIVERS,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: I am writing on behalf of American Rivers and our 200,000 members to oppose H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, which is before the Committee on April 26, 2017. We understand that new surface storage projects are a consideration as part of a multi-faceted portfolio aimed at addressing long term drought in the Western United States. We also share Congress' view that long-term, balanced solutions to drought and water supply security that support and protect local economies, the viability of agriculture, municipal water supplies, recreation, and the riparian environment are critical to the future of Western communities. H.R. 1654, however, fails to provide a long-term, balanced solution, and goes far beyond the scope of authorities vested in the Bureau of Reclamation (the "Bureau") while undermining the critical role other federal agencies, tribes, and states play in the permitting of water supply projects in the West. We remain concerned about the potential harmful impacts to management authorities designed to protect streams and conserve watersheds. In light of these concerns, we ask you to oppose H.R. 1654.

This legislation amends the Reclamation Act, 43 U.S.C. 371, et seq., in a way that undermines the management authorities of other federal agencies, tribes, and states. H.R. 1654 allows the Bureau to preempt state laws and procedural requirements for agency decision-making by dictating unreasonable deadlines. It also weakens authorities under Endangered Species Act and Clean Water

Act, as well as other federal laws, by subordinating all other State and federal agencies to the Bureau's sense of how much time those administering agencies should have to do their jobs.

Specifically, H.R. 1654:

Designates the Bureau as the lead agency and allows the Bureau to set the schedule for all federal authorizations, including those issued pursuant to the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA), and other federal authorizations, even where those authorizations have been delegated or devolved to the states or Native American tribes.

Forces all other federal, state, and tribal agencies to comply with the Bureau's schedule and to defer to the Bureau's proposed scope of environmental review.

Effectively waives the Endangered Species Act or the Clean Water Act if a state, tribe, or federal agency cannot meet the Bureau's schedule or misses a deadline. The Bureau and the project applicant may simply proceed with the proposed action and the authorization is waived. There are no similar remedies or penalties if the Bureau or the project applicant fails to meet a deadline, or if delay caused by Bureau or the project applicant results in an agency missing a deadline. The end result of this and the following provisions could be that states and tribes may be forced to deny certification for new projects in order to avoid potential legal liability.

It is important that federal natural resource agencies retain the authority and responsibility to condition operations of surface storage projects so as to protect streams and other public resources. A key part of protecting watersheds, especially in the arid West, is maintaining healthy flows in streams. For years, American Rivers has worked with the federal land management agencies, tribes, states and other stakeholders to protect healthy river flows on public lands. Federal land managers, states, tribes and the public have an important role to play in protecting streams—based on the Property Clause of the Constitution, Section 505 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and other authorities—and they also have a responsibility to work with their stakeholders to do it right. Provisions of H.R. 1654 would harm the ability of federal land managers, states, and tribes to use these authorities to protect streams, rivers, and vital fisheries.

We oppose H.R. 1654, and urge Congress to carefully consider the impacts of the legislation on federal, tribal and state authority before proceeding further and determine if legislation is needed.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW NIEMERSKI,
*Director, Federal Policy,
American Rivers.*

GOLDEN GATE SALMON ASSOCIATION,
Petaluma, CA, June 12, 2017.

Re H.R. 1654 (McClintock)—OPPOSE.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA: The Golden Gate Salmon Association is a coalition of salmon fishermen and women, both sport and commercial, and related businesses. As a business-oriented advocacy organization focused on conservation and restoration of Central Valley salmon stocks, with members throughout California, we write to offer our strong opposition to H.R. 1654 (McClintock), the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act." This legislation threatens tens of thousands of fishing related jobs and could result in severe impacts to a salmon fishing industry that is highly vulnerable today.

SURFACE STORAGE AND CALIFORNIA'S SALMON FISHING INDUSTRY

Surface storage projects have been the leading cause of the decline of California's historic salmon fishery. In the past decade, surface storage projects contributed to the first ever, historic closure of the California salmon fishery in 2008 and 2009. A fishery worth an estimated \$1.4 billion in annual economic activity to California in a normal season was shattered. This had devastating impacts on the 23,000 men and women whose livelihoods depend on the commercial and recreational salmon fishery.

In significant part as a result of dam projects, the health of our coastal fishing communities has decreased. We've seen a decline in the number of commercial salmon boats registered to fish from almost 5,000 in the late 1980's to just over 1,000 today. Once bustling salmon ports, like Fort Bragg and Eureka are lined with crumbling docks and pier pilings. In some places there aren't enough fish crossing the docks to maintain basic infrastructure like boat repair yards, fuel docks and ice making machines. Where once proud freshly painted houses beamed pride of fisherman ownership, too many are sadly in need of repair. Go to any California harbor with commercial fishing activity and inspect the deck hardware and rigging on boats and you'll see what deferred maintenance looks like for people who struggle to keep a roof over their family's heads and pay the bills.

Because of low populations of adult salmon in 2017, salmon fishing for much of Northern California has been closed entirely this year. For the remainder of the California coast, the commercial fishing fleet has lost approximately two thirds of their traditional fishing season. These low population numbers are the result of the drought and the impacts of existing surface storage projects.

Decision-makers should respond to this crisis by strengthening efforts to restore salmon runs. However, H.R. 1654 could increase the impacts of dam projects on salmon, with potentially devastating consequences.

SPECIFIC CONCERNS

This legislation threatens to weaken analysis and permitting for surface storage projects, with significant potential impacts on salmon. GGSA offers the following specific concerns.

Interfering With The Use of the Best Available Science: The bill would allow the Bureau of Reclamation to control the administrative record used by all federal agencies in reviewing surface storage projects. At best, the Bureau lacks the environmental expertise of the regulatory agencies on a range of issues, including salmon. In addition, as a potential applicant for surface storage projects, the Bureau would have a clear conflict of interest, were they to be given control of the record used by all federal agencies. Further, the Bureau has a record of asserting dubious environmental benefits from surface storage projects and working to suppress analysis by federal agencies. As a result, it is highly inappropriate for the Bureau to be given control of a single administrative record to be used by all federal agencies.

Interfering with Agency Review: The bill would give the Bureau authority to establish a binding schedule for all federal agency environmental review and permitting. For the same reasons cited above, this is inappropriate. In addition, this requirement would produce unnecessary, costly and time consuming litigation, in the likely event that a schedule adopted by the Bureau does not allow adequate time for review by regulatory agencies.

Undermining State Review of Projects: In cases where states chose to opt in, the bill would give the Bureau control over the administrative record and schedule for state agencies. In such a case, the bill would allow the Bureau undue control over state analysis and permitting. This is highly inappropriate, given more than a century of traditional federal deference to state law.

Surface Storage Bias: Surface storage construction and operation is among the water management activities with the most severe impacts on salmon and salmon rivers. This legislation inappropriately restricts analysis for the most environmentally destructive method of storing water and generating new water supplies, but not for less destructive activities.

For the above reasons, we urge you to oppose this damaging and unnecessary bill.

Thank you for considering our comments.
Sincerely,

JOHN MCMANUS,
Executive Director.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, by that token, I will include in the RECORD the support of the United States Chamber of Commerce as well as the Family Farm Alliance and others in support of this bill and the jobs that will expand as a result of its adoption.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce urges you to approve H.R. 1654, the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act," which would streamline the permitting process for new surface water storage projects. The Chamber may consider including votes on, or in relation to, H.R. 1654 in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

H.R. 1654 would establish the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for coordinating environmental reviews and permitting new or expanded non-federal surface storage facilities. The bill also would allow the Secretary of the Interior to accept funds from non-federal public entities and to use those funds to expedite the permitting process for designated projects. This type of coordination and streamlining is essential to the development and construction of much-needed water storage projects.

The structure of H.R. 1654 tracks the permit streamlining provisions contained in Title 41 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, which was passed during the 114th Congress. The Chamber urges you to approve H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY,
Senior Vice President & Chief Policy Officer.

FAMILY FARM ALLIANCE,
Klamath Falls, OR, March 8, 2017.

Hon. TOM McCLINTOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCLINTOCK: On behalf of the Family Farm Alliance (Alliance), we write to express our support for your "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act". This important legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes.

The Alliance is a grassroots organization of family farmers, ranchers, irrigation districts and allied industries in 16 Western states. Several of our members are mutual ditch and irrigation districts. The Alliance is focused on one mission: To ensure the availability of reliable, affordable irrigation water supplies to Western farmers and ranchers.

The "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act" provides a critical first step towards addressing current regulatory and bureaucratic challenges that many times will delay or even halt the development of new water supply enhancement projects in the Western United States. The recent drought has ramped up much-needed Congressional interest to enact legislation that will allow Western water providers to better manage and prepare for future dry times. Now, the heaviest rain in a decade has overwhelmed parts of the West Coast, underscoring the critical importance of having modernized and enhanced water storage infrastructure in place to optimize water resources management for the future.

Family Farm Alliance members rely on the traditional water and power infrastructure built over the last century to deliver irrigation water supplies vital to their farming operations. Our membership has been advocating for new water storage facilities for over twenty years, and we have provided specific recommendations to Congress and the White House on how to streamline restrictive federal regulations to help make these projects happen.

As you are aware, developing new water storage projects is much easier said than done. For many reasons—political, economic and social—the construction of traditional surface water storage projects is undertaken on a much more limited basis than in decades past. Even if federal authorization and funding, or funding from non-federal sources, is secured for a new storage project, the existing procedures for permitting the development of additional water supplies can make project approval incredibly burdensome.

By the time project applicants approach federal agencies for permits to construct multimillion dollar projects they have already invested extensive resources toward analyzing project alternatives to determine which project is best suited to their budgetary constraints. However, current procedure dictates that federal agencies formulate another list of project alternatives which the applicant must assess, comparing potential impacts with the preferred alternative. These alternatives often conflict with state law or are simply not implementable in the first place yet valuable resources are required to be expended to further study these additional alternatives in the federal permitting process.

Thus, we strongly support your bill. We look forward to working with you, the 115th Congress and other interested parties to build a consensus for improving the federal regulatory and permitting process. If we don't find a way to restore water supply reliability for Western irrigated agriculture through a combination of new water supply and management infrastructure, other water supply enhancement efforts and demand management—our country's ability to feed and clothe itself and the world will be jeopardized.

This bill takes an important step towards addressing this critical need. I encourage you or your staff to contact Dan Keppen if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

PATRICK O'TOOLE,
President.
DAN KEPPEEN,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
WATER AGENCIES,
June 19, 2017.

Re Support for H.R. 1654.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) is pleased to support H.R. 1654, the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act". ACWA's 450 public water agency members supply over 90 percent of the water delivered in California for residential, agricultural, and industrial uses.

As demonstrated by California's recent historic drought, it is important that Congress take actions now that help ensure California has sufficient water supplies for the future. Had the streamlining provisions contained in H.R. 1654 been in effect prior to the drought, California's water infrastructure and water supplies could have been improved to help mitigate much of the current personal and economic suffering that occurred.

Moreover, H.R. 1654 is consistent with policy principles ACWA has formally adopted embracing environmental and economic sustainability as co-equal priorities for water management in California.

Thank you for this opportunity to express ACWA's support for H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

DAVID REYNOLDS,
Director of Federal Relations.

VOITH HYDRO INC.
York, PA, June 20, 2017.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: On behalf of Voith Hydro, I am writing today to extend our strong support for H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act. Voith Hydro is a manufacturer of hydroelectric equipment and technology based in York, Pennsylvania. Additionally, we have Voith Hydro Services facilities located in Chattanooga, Tennessee and Springfield, Oregon. Voith Hydro currently employs approximately 680 workers across the United States. Water storage issues are critical to our ability to provide both the energy and jobs that sustain a nation.

As you are well aware, water provides multiple benefits to communities across the country. Without an abundant supply of water storage in the United States, hydropower production cannot reach its full potential. These same communities have been able to thrive in large part due to abundant water supplies and the production of renewable hydropower, especially in your home district in Northern California. Increasing water storage throughout the country will allow for better management during drought conditions, and thus prevent power outages to communities reliant on hydroelectricity.

Streamlining the permitting process to expand and develop new water storage throughout the United States is critical to increasing and upgrading our Country's infrastructure. I am pleased to see that Congress continues to consider bills targeted to improve the permitting processes and hope that other infrastructure permitting streamlining continues, especially as it concerns hydropower development.

I encourage the passage of the Water Supply Permitting Act this week in the House of Representatives and look forward to working with you on similar issues in the future.

Thank you for your leadership on water storage and other critical issues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. GALLO,
President and CEO.

MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
OF ORANGE COUNTY,
Fountain Valley, CA, May 30, 2017.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: The Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC) is pleased to support your measure, H.R. 1654—"The Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act." We applaud your efforts to streamline the permitting process that relates to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands. This coordination is long overdue and will ultimately benefit the entire state.

The rains this past winter emphasized the critical need California has for surface water storage. We cannot let this resource slip out to the ocean due to lack of places to put it. Allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to be the coordinating agency for projects on Interior or Department of Agriculture lands will make the process more efficient and speed up the process for critical water infrastructure projects in our state.

The Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC), a water agency serving the needs of more than two million residents and 28 retail water agencies, voted unanimously to support your legislation and to assist with its passage.

On behalf of the MWDOC Board of Directors, we are pleased to support H.R. 1654 and sincerely thank you for your efforts to address the ongoing water infrastructure needs in California.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact either Jim Barker, our advocate in Washington, or MWDOC General Manager, Rob Hunter.

Sincerely,

WAYNE S. OSBORNE,
Board President.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 232, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—179

Adams	Carbajal	Davis (CA)
Agullar	Cardenas	Davis, Danny
Barragan	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Bass	Cartwright	DeGette
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Beyer	Ciциlline	DelBene
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Demings
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Clay	Deutch
Bonamici	Cleaver	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan	Clyburn	Doggett
F.	Cohen	Doyle, Michael
Brady (PA)	Connolly	F.
Brown (MD)	Conyers	Ellison
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Engel
Bustos	Courtney	Eshoo
Butterfield	Crist	Espallat
Capuano	Crowley	Esty (CT)

Evans	Lipinski	Rosen
Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Lofgren	Ruiz
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger
Fudge	Lowe y	Rush
Gallego	Lujan Grisham,	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	M.	Sánchez
Gonzalez (TX)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes
Gotthelmer	Lynch	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Maloney,	Schiff
Green, Gene	Carolyn B.	Schneider
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Hanabusa	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Hastings	McCollum	Scott, David
Heck	McEachin	Serrano
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Himes	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	Meng	Sherman
Huffman	Moore	Sinema
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Sires
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Jeffries	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Soto
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Speier
Kaptur	Norcross	Suo zzi
Keating	O'Halleran	Swalwell (CA)
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Takano
Kennedy	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Khanna	Panetta	Titus
Kihuen	Pascrell	Tonko
Kildee	Payne	Torres
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Kind	Peters	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Veasey
Kuster (NH)	Pocan	Vela
Langevin	Polis	Velázquez
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Vislowsky
Lawrence	Quigley	Walz
Lawson (FL)	Raskin	Watson Coleman
Lee	Renacci	Welch
Levin	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Richmond	Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Jones
Aderholt	Denham	Jordan
Allen	Dent	Joyce (OH)
Amash	DeSantis	Katko
Amodei	DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Babin	Donovan	King (IA)
Bacon	Duffy	King (NY)
Banks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Kinzing er
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Knight
Barr	Dunn	Kustoff (TN)
Barton	Emmer	Labrador
Bergman	Estes (KS)	LaHood
Biggs	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Faso	Lamborn
Bishop (MI)	Ferguson	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Latta
Black	Flores	Lewis (MN)
Blackburn	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Blum	Foxx	Loudermilk
Bost	Franks (AZ)	Love
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Brat	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bridenstine	Gallagher	MacArthur
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Marchant
Brooks (IN)	Gianforte	Marino
Buchanan	Gibbs	Marshall
Buck	Gohmert	Massie
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Mast
Budd	Gowdy	McCarthy
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Byrne	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McKinley
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McMorris
Chabot	Guthrie	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Harper	McSally
Cheney	Harris	Meadows
Coffman	Hartzler	Meehan
Cole	Herrera	Messer
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Comstock	Hill	Mullin
Conaway	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Cook	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Correa	Hudson	Noem
Costa	Huizenga	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Olson
Cramer	Hunter	Palazzo
Crawford	Hurd	Palmer
Cuellar	Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (LA)	Perry
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Peterson

Pittenger	Rutherford	Turner
Poe (TX)	Sanford	Upton
Poliquin	Schweikert	Valadao
Posey	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Reed	Sessions	Walden
Reichert	Shimkus	Walker
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Walorski
Roby	Simpson	Walters, Mimi
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Westerman
Rooney, Francis	Smucker	Williams
Rooney, Thomas	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
J.	Stewart	Wittman
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Womack
Roskam	Taylor	Woodall
Ross	Tenney	Yoder
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Rouzer	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Royce (CA)	Tipton	Young (IA)
Russell	Trott	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—20

Castro (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Scalise
Gabbard	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
Gosar	Long	Tiberi
Granger	Meeks	Wasserman
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Schultz
Issa	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine

□ 1612

Messrs. YODER, REED, BUDD, CURBELO of Florida, CORREA, PITTENGER, MULLIN, WITTMAN, AND KATKO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ESPAILLAT, BLUMENAUER, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last Thursday evening, we played the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity. This is normally the time when the losing manager has to congratulate the winning

manager. Over the last 10 years, I have become fairly proficient at congratulating Mr. DOYLE.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to tell a lot of jokes because, as we all know, at the Republican practice the Wednesday morning before, an individual opened fire on the Republican team and wounded the majority whip, Mr. SCALISE; both Capitol Police officers who were part of Mr. SCALISE's security detail; and two volunteers who were assisting us in our practice. So I don't have a lot of jokes today, Mr. Speaker.

I do want to congratulate Mr. DOYLE and his team. They played fair and square. They were extremely gracious before the game. We had a unity prayer. We had a unity introduction of the players. The night before, Mr. DOYLE and his team invited the Republican team, believe it or not, to the Democratic political headquarters. I went with my two sons. The food was great, and the fellowship was even better.

So I do sincerely want to congratulate him and his players for playing the best game. They deserved to win.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Republican team. We had approximately 25 of our Members at the practice. Every one of them exhibited courage and composure. They all looked out for their fellow teammates.

We had an equivalent number of staff and volunteers. We had two of the best Capitol Hill police officers it is possible to have. They risked their lives.

I want to say this, and then I will yield to my good friend, Mr. DOYLE.

The shooter that attacked the Republican baseball team, Mr. Speaker, was attacking democracy. When we are at full strength on this floor, there are 435 of us. Every one of us is a winner. We get here because we have won an election. We get here because we have got the faith of approximately 600,000 or 700,000 people who are depending on us to be their voice for democracy. We argue. We debate. But as I said in one of my interviews, before our names is United States Representative. United.

Last Thursday, at the baseball game, we were united. I could not be prouder of being a Member of this body, Mr. Speaker. I could not be prouder of the Republican team, including our MVP, RON DESANTIS; our honorary MVP, STEVE SCALISE; and every member of the Republican team.

Would the members of the Republican team stand and let's acknowledge their heroism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is different from the other years that we have stood up here. This trophy isn't for either team. This trophy is for STEVE.

I just want you all to know that when we got the news at our baseball practice about what was going on, the

only thing we could think about is that we are a family. When we stood in the dugout and prayed that you were safe and that no one was hurt, we weren't thinking about Democrats and Republicans. We were thinking about our fellow Members.

I was thinking about your son, Jack, and all the fun times I have had kidding him. I was thinking about CEDRIC RICHMOND's 3-year-old son, who was with us, and what would have happened if that shooter had come over to our dugout.

If there is a silver lining to that terrible day, it was reflected in the outpouring of people who showed up at our game. We normally get a crowd of 9,000 to 10,000. We had 25,000 people come to that game.

We normally raise about \$500,000 for the three charities that the game supports. I have a check here that says we raised \$1.5 million, but that is not correct. It is \$1.7 million. Some worthwhile charities are going to get a check they weren't expecting.

I want to reiterate what you said about our Capitol Police. To have someone shooting bullets at you, that is terrifying enough. To make the decision to put yourself out there and charge at that shooter to make sure that there wasn't a massacre takes a special kind of person.

To see Crystal throw that ball out last night at the women's softball game brought a lot of joy to my heart. We owe a real debt of gratitude to the Capitol Police who protect us on these grounds.

I want JOE to know that we continue to think about all of you. You are in our prayers, you are in our thoughts. Something terrible happened. For many of you, it might take days before it hits you. I would encourage anyone who is feeling that to talk to someone. Don't be bashful about that. This was a traumatic experience for your team, especially, but I want you to know that you are in our hearts and in our prayers.

As we said before, JOE and I are going to walk this trophy over to STEVE's office. When the hospital gives us clearance, we are going to go over to the hospital and present it to STEVE personally. This is for him right now. We want him to know that the entire Congress thinks about him every day, prays for him and his family, and we hope to get him back here on the House floor as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 180, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—233

Abraham	Gaetz	Murphy (PA)
Aderholt	Gallagher	Newhouse
Allen	Garrett	Noem
Amodi	Gianforte	Nunes
Arrington	Gibbs	Olson
Babin	Gohmert	Palazzo
Bacon	Goodlatte	Palmer
Banks (IN)	Gottheimer	Paulsen
Barletta	Gowdy	Pearce
Barr	Graves (GA)	Perry
Barton	Graves (LA)	Peterson
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Biggs	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Grothman	Poliquin
Bishop (GA)	Guthrie	Posey
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Reed
Black	Hartzler	Reichert
Blackburn	Hensarling	Renacci
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Brat	Hill	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Rokita
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rooney, Francis
Buck	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas J.
Bucshon	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Budd	Hurd	Roskam
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Calvert	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Carter (TX)	Jones	Russell
Chabot	Jordan	Rutherford
Chaffetz	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cole	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Sessions
Comer	Knight	Shimkus
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Shuster
Conaway	Labrador	Simpson
Cook	LaHood	Sinema
Correa	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Costa	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Latta	Smucker
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
Cuellar	Loudermilk	Stewart
Culberson	Love	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Taylor
Davidson	Luetkemeyer	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Maloney, Sean	Thornberry
Dent	Marchant	Tipton
DeSantis	Marino	Trott
DesJarlais	Marshall	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Turner
Donovan	Mast	Upton
Duffy	McCarthy	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walberg
Dunn	McHenry	Walden
Emmer	McKinley	Walker
Estes (KS)	McMorris	Walorski
Farenthold	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Faso	McSally	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Meehan	Wenstrup
Flores	Messer	Westerman
Fortenberry	Mitchell	Williams
Fox	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Womack

Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—180

Adams	Galleo
Aguilar	Garamendi
Amash	Gonzalez (TX)
Barragán	Green, Al
Bass	Green, Gene
Beatty	Grijalva
Bera	Gutiérrez
Beyer	Hanabusa
Blumenauer	Hastings
Blunt Rochester	Heck
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	Himes
F.	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Huffman
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal
Bustos	Jeffries
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.
Carbajal	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Katko
Carson (IN)	Keating
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Khanna
Chu, Judy	Kihuen
Ciilline	Kildee
Clark (MA)	Kilmer
Clarke (NY)	Kind
Clay	Krishnamoorthi
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)
Clyburn	Langevin
Cohen	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Lawrence
Conyers	Lawson (FL)
Cooper	Lee
Courtney	Levin
Crist	Lewis (GA)
Crowley	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	LoBiondo
Davis, Danny	Loebbeck
DeFazio	Lofgren
DeGette	Lowenthal
Delaney	Lowe
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham,
DeBene	M.
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray
DeSaulnier	Lynch
Deutch	Maloney,
Dingell	Carolyn B.
Doyle, Michael	Matsui
F.	McCollum
Ellison	McEachin
Engel	McGovern
Eshoo	McNerney
Españal	Meng
Esty (CT)	Moore
Evans	Moulton
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)
Foster	Nadler
Frankel (FL)	Neal
Fudge	Nolan

Norcross	Young (IA)
O'Halleran	Zeldin
O'Rourke	
Pallone	
Panetta	
Pascrell	
Payne	
Perlmutter	
Peters	
Pingree	
Pocan	
Polis	
Price (NC)	
Quigley	
Raskin	
Rice (NY)	
Richmond	
Rosen	
Roybal-Allard	
Ruiz	
Ruppersberger	
Rush	
Ryan (OH)	
Sánchez	
Sarbanes	
Schakowsky	
Schiff	
Schneider	
Schrader	
Scott (VA)	
Scott, David	
Serrano	
Sewell (AL)	
Shea-Porter	
Sherman	
Sires	
Slaughter	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (WA)	
Soto	
Speier	
Suozi	
Swalwell (CA)	
Takano	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Titus	
Tonko	
Torres	
Tsongas	
Vargas	
Veasey	
Vela	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Walz	
Watson Coleman	
Welch	
Wilson (FL)	
Yarmuth	

H.R. 1654—Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 318 and "yea" on rollcall No. 319.

SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dutiful service of the United States Secret Service. The Secret Service protects the President and Vice President, their families, and foreign dignitaries, while also investigating cybercrimes and preventing fraud. These men and women place their lives on the line daily to protect some of the most highly targeted individuals in the world.

Further, they continue to conduct counterfeit interdiction operations despite the increasing need for protective details and low retention numbers.

While the Secret Service is often in the news for personal shortcomings, the organization has had a storied history in protecting the United States. It is a remarkable fact that, within the last year, they have successfully conducted security operations for multiple Presidential candidates, the U.N. General Assembly, a visit to New York City by Pope Francis, and countless foreign dignitary visits to our soil.

So from all of us here in Congress, I would like to thank the Secret Service for their service to our Nation and for their sacrifices. In the coming months, I plan to routinely honor this great example of American exceptionalism.

THE BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION ACT

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the latest plan to gut the Affordable Care Act.

Senate Republicans, as has been reported, just unveiled their draft of their healthcare bill, the Better Care Reconciliation Act, which was developed entirely behind closed doors and will be rushed to a vote, from what I understand, without additional input or public debate.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this bill will not provide Americans access to better care and it will not create more affordable coverage.

Changes to Medicaid will mean Americans in the expansion population will eventually lose access to crucial services and supports, and shrinking the program will force States to cut services to the poor, the sick, and the elderly.

NOT VOTING—18

Cummings	Larsen (WA)
Doggett	Lieu, Ted
Gabbard	Long
Gosar	Meeks
Granger	Napolitano
Issa	Pelosi
Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)

□ 1632

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 319 (passage of H.R. 1654), I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 318 and No. 319 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Lowenthal Amendment. I would have voted "nay" on the Final Passage of