

born and raised on a farm in Mahaska County, Iowa, and is the oldest of five siblings.

In the 1930s many children who were raised on farms elected not to attend high school, but Clarissa was inspired by her aunt to not only attend high school but to continue her education through courses at William Penn University, which is still in Oskaloosa today.

In the early 1940s, her love for children and teaching led her to pursue a career in education at Bryan County school, a small school south of New Sharon.

On August 14, 1945, Clarissa married her husband, Gerald, and together they had six children: Allan, Calvin, Norman, Kathleen, David, and Ken, who is a State senator and my colleague in the State senate in Iowa.

Clarissa, I wish you all the joy in the world as you celebrate this with your loved ones.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION ACT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 610) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 610

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "San Francisco Bay Restoration Act".

#### SEC. 2. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

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

#### "SEC. 124. SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION GRANT PROGRAM.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

"(2) SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN.—The term 'San Francisco Bay Plan' means—

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

"(B) on and after the date of the completion of the plan developed by the Director

under subsection (d), the plan developed by the Director under subsection (d).

"(b) PROGRAM OFFICE.—

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

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

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

"(c) ANNUAL PRIORITY LIST.—

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

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

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

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

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

"(iii) nearshore and endangered species recovery; and

"(iv) adaptation to climate change.

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

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

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

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

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

"(A) the Estuary Partnership;

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

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

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

"(d) SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN.—

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

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

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

"(e) GRANT PROGRAM.—

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

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

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

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

"(f) FUNDING.—

"(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

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

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

"(g) ANNUAL BUDGET PLAN.—For each of the budgets for fiscal years 2023 through 2026, the President, as part of the annual budget submission of the President to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall submit information regarding each Federal department and agency involved in San Francisco Bay protection and restoration, including—

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

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

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

"(2) a description and assessment of the Federal role in the implementation of the San Francisco Bay Plan and the specific role of each Federal department and agency involved in San Francisco Bay protection and restoration, including specific projects, activities, and studies conducted or planned to achieve the identified goals and objectives of the San Francisco Bay Plan."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 610, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a letter from Chairman JOHN YARMUTH of the House Committee on Budget agreeing to waive consideration of H.R. 610, as amended, as well as Chair DEFAZIO's response to Mr. YARMUTH expressing appreciation for his willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District in support of H.R. 610.

MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL  
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT,  
Los Altos, CA, June 10, 2021.

Re H.R. 610—San Francisco Bay Restoration Act—SUPPORT.

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

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPEIER: On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (Midpen), I write to express our support for your legislation, H.R. 610, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act. Comprised of over 65,000 acres of acquired and protected open space on the San Francisco Peninsula, Midpen is one of the largest regional open space districts in California. Our braided mission is to acquire and preserve in perpetuity open space and agricultural land of regional significance, to protect and restore the natural environment, to preserve rural character and encourage viable agricultural use of land resources, and to provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education.

As you know, the legislation would prioritize funding for the San Francisco Bay, a vital resource to our District, the regional community, and the entire state of California. The \$250 million authorized in the bill would provide critical federal investment to restoring the Bay's wetlands and estuaries, assist in the recovery of endangered species, and help to alleviate the impacts of climate change. We greatly appreciate the legislation's establishment of this federal partnership to improve the Bay Area and protect our coastal community and economy.

For these reasons, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District greatly supports the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act (H.R. 610). Thank you for your leadership and continued work on improving the Bay Area. If you have any questions or would like to further discuss our support, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

ANA M. RUIZ,  
General Manager.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 610. This legislation would create a stand-alone program for the San Francisco Bay within the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, in essence elevating restoration efforts of a water body that has been part of the national estuary program since 1993.

This legislation responds to an August 2018 Government Accountability Office report that found a centralized program would improve the existing efforts to restore and protect the San Francisco Bay.

This legislation would authorize \$25 million annually for fiscal year 2022 through 2026, with a cap on Federal funding for eligible projects and a cap on administrative expenses. H.R. 610 is supported by the delegation representing the bay and surrounding area, including our committee colleagues JARED HUFFMAN, MARK DESAULNIER, and JOHN GARAMENDI.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 610, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, June 2, 2021.

Hon. JOHN YARMUTH:

*Chair, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. YARMUTH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 610, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act. I appreciate your decision to waive formal consideration of the bill.

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

Thank you again, and I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the Committee on the Budget on this important issue.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,  
Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, May 27, 2021.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,

*Chair, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIR DEFAZIO: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 610, the San Francisco Bay Restoration Act. H.R. 610 contains provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, the committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Budget takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation or similar legislation and requests your support if such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,  
Chairman.

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

Last Congress we worked together to ensure bipartisan support for several regional water bills, including this one.

H.R. 610 codifies the Environmental Protection Agency's existing restoration work in the San Francisco Bay estuary and establishes a San Francisco Bay program office.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this bill is something I have been working on for 10 years and have introduced in every Congress since I came to Congress. It provides \$25 million a year for 5 years.

Over the last 200 years, 90 percent of the bay wetlands have disappeared. They are gone. What is even worse is that in less than 9 years, sea level rise in that region will effectively drown out all of the marshes. The damage will be irreversible.

Over the last 8 years the EPA has invested only \$45 million in San Francisco Bay. However, even though it is the largest estuary on the West Coast, Puget Sound received more than \$260 million and the Chesapeake Bay received \$490 million. That is an unbelievable difference in funding opportunities.

We can't afford to keep pushing this off. The San Francisco Bay supports 4 million jobs and provides 20 million Californians with clean drinking water.

It is the lifeblood of the region and a worthy investment of taxpayer dollars. Every dollar spent on restoration efforts generates \$2.10 in economic activity. More funding for the bay is a win-win. It would, in fact, be the right thing to do, the only fair thing to do considering how much more has been spent on other estuaries.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and recognition on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

I am so proud of Representative JACKIE SPEIER, with whom I have the privilege of corepresenting San Francisco. JACKIE SPEIER has been our champion on San Francisco Bay, and this San Francisco Bay Restoration Act is a vital step to restoring our cherished bay.

It is an honor to be joined in this legislation with other bay area colleagues, JARED HUFFMAN, JOHN GARAMENDI, MIKE THOMPSON, JERRY MCNERNEY, MARK DESAULNIER, BARBARA LEE, RO KHANNA, ANNA ESHOO, and ZOE LOFGREN. I also thank Senators DIANNE

FEINSTEIN and ALEX PADILLA, who have introduced a Senate companion bill.

Madam Speaker, Members may not know, but the San Francisco Bay is an icon of California and a national treasure: inspiring us with its beauty and its might, enriching our lives with world-class recreation, tourism, and jobs.

The bay area delta, of which it is a part, is also the economic lifeblood of our coast, contributing over \$370 billion to our economy each year and supporting more than four million jobs.

As part of the bay-delta estuary, it is a vital part of public health, providing drinking water for millions of Californians, a key force in combating the climate crisis.

But, for centuries, this magnificent estuary has been overexploited and underprotected. Today, 90 percent of the bay area's wetlands have been destroyed, undermining the strength of our coastal economies and communities.

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Act—sponsored and championed by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER over many years—would make a long overdue \$125 million investment in restoration efforts. It improves coordination from San Francisco to Washington, as it revives our wetlands to protect our coastal communities, improves our water quality, strengthens our climate resilience, including by combating sea level rise.

In 2018, the GAO concluded that a centralized initiative providing improved coordination and communication across efforts, along with dedicated Federal funding, would be the best chance for long-term restoration and protection of this vital geographic area on the West Coast. And this bill introduced by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER provides exactly that.

Californians have fought to increase appropriations for the bay area for years, and we are grateful for the support of then-chair Nita Lowey of the Appropriations Committee and the chair of the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, BETTY MCCOLLUM. We secured an increase of \$3 million in funding for the bay.

Last year, with the support of Transportation and Infrastructure chair PETER DEFAZIO and, hence, the committee of Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee chair GRACE NAPOLITANO, the House passed this Bay Restoration Act by a voice vote, and then again as part of our infrastructure bill, H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act. Now we want to make it the law of the land.

Our communities and our lives are heavily enriched by the bay-delta estuary. This investment is an economic, health, environmental, and moral imperative.

I urge Members to support it with strong bipartisan support, and I hope that it will be bipartisan on the part of our colleagues on the West Coast, who

know the value of the quality of life that the bay estuary project brings to us. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge support of this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 610, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

#### NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MUSEUM ACT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1703) to amend title 40, United States Code, to require the Administrator of General Services to enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Children's Museum to provide the National Children's Museum rental space without charge in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1703

*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 "National Children's Museum Act".

##### SEC. 2. NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MUSEUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-81) designated the Capital Children's Museum, the predecessor to the National Children's Museum, as the "National Children's Museum";

(2) the National Children's Museum operates under section 501(C)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is organized under the laws of the District of Columbia;

(3) the mission of the National Children's Museum is to inspire children to care about and change the world; and

(4) the National Children's Museum is located in the federally owned Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center.

(b) NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MUSEUM.—Chapter 67 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### "§ 6735. National Children's Museum

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator of General Services shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Children's Museum for the oper-

ation of the National Children's Museum in the approximately 32,369 square feet of space commonly known as suite C-001 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Space') of the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center for the duration of the retail space license agreement between Trade Center Management Associates, LLC, or a successor entity, and the Museum, dated December 4, 2017, including any exercised renewal options.

"(b) CONTENTS.—The cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall include provisions that—

"(1) require, for the period in which the General Services Administration owns or controls the Space, the General Services Administration to provide rent for the Space;

"(2) terminate such agreement if—

"(A) the Museum does not continue to qualify as a nonprofit organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

"(B) the Museum no longer uses the Space as a children's museum; and

"(3) prohibits the Museum from transferring the interest in such agreement.

"(c) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—To carry out this section, the Administrator shall use funds derived from—

"(1) the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation fund; or

"(2) the International Trade Center fund.

"(d) REPORT.—The cooperative agreement under subsection (a) shall require the National Children's Museum to submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an annual report on the operations and finances of the Museum."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 67 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"6735. National Children's Museum."

##### SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1703, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1703, the National Children's Museum Act, which I have sponsored. Last Congress, the House passed this bill by voice vote.