

This bipartisan, bicameral bill, which I introduced with Republican RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and which has been introduced in the Senate by Democrat CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland and Republican SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia would require the General Services Administration to enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Children's Museum, a congressionally designated museum, to allow the museum to remain in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, a Federally owned building in the Nation's capital without charge for the duration of its existing lease.

The National Building Museum operates under such an agreement. The National Children's Museum is the only congressionally designated museum required to pay rent in a Federal building.

Originally named the Capital Children's Museum, the museum was a staple in D.C. for decades. The museum opened in 1974 in a former convent on H Street Northeast. In 2003, Congress recognized the immense value of having a children's museum in the Nation's capital and officially designated the museum as the National Children's Museum.

After being closed for several years, the museum reopened last year in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center in downtown D.C. where it immediately attracted visitors from throughout the Nation's capital and the entire Nation. However, only 18 days later, the coronavirus pandemic forced the museum to close its physical space.

Still, the museum continued to offer valuable online resources to our children as they navigated new, challenging learning circumstances, including over 75 at-home experiment and project video programs and monthly podcasts. The museum has served teachers in 45 States and the District through its virtual field trips since the pandemic began. However, due to revenue losses during the pandemic and other costs, the museum has said it will close permanently without enactment of this bill.

This bill would allow the National Children's Museum to continue to benefit the millions who visit and live in the Nation's capital and the national capital region.

Madam Speaker, I support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to lead this effort with my good friend and colleague, the chair of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, Ms. NORTON.

As Congresswoman NORTON said, this important legislation directs the General Services Administration to provide rent relief to the National Children's Museum that is currently housed in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center right here in Washington, D.C.

Currently, the museum is the only federally designated museum sitting in a Federal building that is required to pay rent. This bill will give the museum the same benefits afforded to other congressionally designated museums.

Prepandemic, the museum offered our children the ability to interact with exhibits that were focused on science, technology, engineering, arts, and math. And that allowed children to foster a greater appreciation for our STEM fields.

As our country reopens and we look to the future, the museum will continue to build off that success and become even more valuable of a resource for our youth. In that spirit, I actually look forward to visiting with some of my colleagues soon and talking about this important bill. It is just frustrating that it is the only museum that is congressionally directed that has to pay another government agency, the GSA, for rent when they weren't allowed to be open.

So this is a commonsense bill. It has been great to work with Congresswoman NORTON, and I support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my good friend, Mr. DAVIS, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. NORTON for her cooperation on this. It is great to be back on the floor and see everybody. I enjoy this greatly. I certainly hope everybody supports this commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, like my friend, 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. 1703, 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.

OCEAN POLLUTION REDUCTION ACT II

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 587) to modify permitting requirements with respect to the discharge of any pollutant from the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 587

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 2. SAN DIEGO POINT LOMA PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(9) to the extent potable reuse is permitted by Federal and State regulatory agencies,

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

(c) MILESTONES.—The Administrator shall determine development milestones necessary to ensure compliance with this section and include such milestones as conditions in each permit issued under this section before December 31, 2035.

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

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 587.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1245

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the city of San Diego in support of H.R. 587.

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO,
San Diego, CA, June 14, 2021.

Hon. SCOTT PETERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PETERS: On behalf of the City of San Diego, I am writing to you in support of the Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II (OPRA II) H.R. 587.

OPRA II is the product of a decades-long regional collaboration and will deploy advanced technology to purify recycled water. Additionally, this legislation is critical to implementing the comprehensive Pure Water San Diego program, which will provide a reliable, sustainable source of drinking water while simultaneously reducing treated discharge to the ocean by nearly 50 percent. This bill delivers certainty and provides a more streamlined process to comply with

regulations, provided the City meets stringent water recycling milestones.

Under OPRA II, the City of San Diego must demonstrate that its Pure Water program is able to produce 83 million gallons of water a day, nearly one-half of the City's water supply demand by 2036. Over the same period, the program is expected to reduce treated discharge from the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant, which will be continuously monitored and subjected to ongoing research efforts by academic, local, state, and national entities.

The City of San Diego is grateful for your leadership on this important legislative effort.

Sincerely,

TODD GLORIA,
Mayor,
City of San Diego.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 587. The legislation, introduced by Representative SCOTT PETERS, clarifies that the city of San Diego, California, can utilize the standard Clean Water Act National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit process to continue operation of the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant with alternative standards.

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

Currently, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant applies for and receives a waiver under the Clean Water Act to discharge wastewater with less than full secondary treatment, the baseline requirement of the Clean Water Act. The facility qualifies for the waiver by meeting certain criteria and must renew its application every 5 years.

As part of a long-term effort, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant is working to reduce its discharges to coastal waters. This effort involves water recycling and will redirect a portion of the facility's discharge. However, the facility's discharges to coastal waters will never be eliminated.

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

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 587, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 587, introduced by Congressman PETERS from California and others from his home State, is a bipartisan bill that aims to make permanent a regulatory exemption under the Clean Water Act. This exemption allows certain wastewater treatment facilities seeking to discharge to the ocean to apply for permit modifications that offer alternatives to the Clean Water Act's secondary treatment standards.

These alternative standards must be met every 5 years during the normal

permit renewal period. This permit renewal process is lengthy, complex, and costly.

The city of San Diego's Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant has been operating under this regulatory exemption for well over two decades.

The objectives of this bill are worthy and a win-win for the city and the environment.

Madam Speaker, the bill will help ensure that San Diego has long-term certainty for its water supply and will save the city millions of dollars and protect regional ratepayers from billions in new costs by providing this regulatory certainty while preserving applicable standards.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

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

Madam Speaker, I introduced the Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II, or OPRA II, for three reasons: one, to ensure that the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant's waiver process is fair and efficient; two, to further reduce the facility's pollution output to the ocean; and three, to increase our region's freshwater supply.

The city's proposed wastewater recycling plan, the Pure Water Program, will guarantee the region's water security and further reduce the amount of wastewater that flows into the ocean from the plant.

OPRA II requires that the city of San Diego demonstrate that the Pure Water Program can produce 83 million gallons of freshwater a day by 2036. This is an estimated one-third of the entire city's drinking water needs. Over the same period, the program is expected to reduce treated wastewater flows from the Point Loma plant by over 100 million gallons.

This bill replaces the complex and expensive secondary treatment waiver application with a simpler process, as long as the city meets stringent water recycling milestones.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 587 would support the water recycling and conservation efforts of the city of San Diego's Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant by making permanent its longstanding regulatory exemption under the Clean Water Act.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill, and I urge support of this bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, 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. 587.

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.

PROMOTING UNITED GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO SAVE OUR SOUND ACT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1144) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for programs and activities to protect the water quality of the Puget Sound, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1144

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Promoting United Government Efforts to Save Our Sound Act” or the “PUGET SOS Act”.

SEC. 2. PUGET SOUND COORDINATED RECOVERY.

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

“SEC. 124. PUGET SOUND.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COASTAL NONPOINT POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM.—The term ‘Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program’ means the State of Washington’s Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program approved under section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990.

“(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Program Office.

“(3) FEDERAL ACTION PLAN.—The term ‘Federal Action Plan’ means the plan developed under subsection (c)(3)(B).

“(4) INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION.—The term ‘International Joint Commission’ means the International Joint Commission established by the Treaty relating to the boundary waters and questions arising along the boundary between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington January 11, 1909, and entered into force May 5, 1910 (36 Stat. 2448; TS 548; 12 Bevans 319).

“(5) PACIFIC SALMON COMMISSION.—The term ‘Pacific Salmon Commission’ means the Pacific Salmon Commission established by the United States and Canada under the Treaty concerning Pacific salmon, with annexes and memorandum of understanding, signed at Ottawa January 28, 1985, and entered into force March 18, 1985 (TIAS 11091; 1469 UNTS 357) (commonly known as the ‘Pacific Salmon Treaty’).

“(6) PROGRAM OFFICE.—The term ‘Program Office’ means the Puget Sound Recovery National Program Office established by subsection (b).

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

“(8) PUGET SOUND FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TASK FORCE.—The term ‘Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force’ means the Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force established under subsection (c).

“(9) PUGET SOUND FEDERAL TASK FORCE.—The term ‘Puget Sound Federal Task Force’ means the Puget Sound Federal Task Force established in 2016 under a memorandum of understanding among 9 Federal agencies.

“(10) PUGET SOUND NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.—The term ‘Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference’ means the management conference for the Puget Sound convened pursuant to section 320.

“(11) PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘Puget Sound Partnership’ means the State agency created under the laws of the State of Washington (section 90.71.210 of the Revised Code of Washington), or its successor agency that has been designated by the Administrator as the lead entity to support the Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference.

“(12) PUGET SOUND REGION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘Puget Sound region’ means the land and waters in the northwest corner of the State of Washington from the Canadian border to the north to the Pacific Ocean on the west, including Hood Canal and the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘Puget Sound region’ includes all watersheds that drain into the Puget Sound.

“(13) PUGET SOUND TRIBAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.—The term ‘Puget Sound Tribal Management Conference’ means the 20 treaty Indian tribes of western Washington and the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission.

“(14) SALISH SEA.—The term ‘Salish Sea’ means the network of coastal waterways on the west coast of North America that includes the Puget Sound, the Strait of Georgia, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

“(15) SALMON RECOVERY PLANS.—The term ‘Salmon Recovery Plans’ means the recovery plans for salmon and steelhead species approved by the Secretary of the Interior under section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 that are applicable to the Puget Sound region.

“(16) STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ‘State Advisory Committee’ means the advisory committee established by subsection (d).

“(17) TREATY RIGHTS AT RISK INITIATIVE.—The term ‘Treaty Rights at Risk Initiative’ means the report from the treaty Indian tribes of western Washington entitled ‘Treaty Rights At Risk: Ongoing Habitat Loss, the Decline of the Salmon Resource, and Recommendations for Change’ and dated July 14, 2011, or its successor report that outlines issues and offers solutions for the protection of Tribal treaty rights, recovery of salmon habitat, and management of sustainable treaty and nontreaty salmon fisheries, including through Tribal salmon hatchery programs.

“(b) PUGET SOUND RECOVERY NATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Environmental Protection Agency a Puget Sound Recovery National Program Office, to be located in the State of Washington.

“(2) DIRECTOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Director of the Program Office, who shall have leadership and project management experience and shall be highly qualified to—

“(i) direct the integration of multiple project planning efforts and programs from different agencies and jurisdictions; and

“(ii) align numerous, and possibly competing, priorities to accomplish visible and measurable outcomes under the Action Agenda.

“(B) POSITION.—The position of Director of the Program Office shall be a career reserved position, as such term is defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code.

“(3) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; STAFFING.—Using amounts made available pursuant to subsection (h), the Administrator shall delegate to the Director such authority and provide such staff as may be necessary to carry out this section.

“(4) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(A) coordinate and manage the timely execution of the requirements of this section, including the formation and meetings of the Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force;

“(B) coordinate activities related to the restoration and protection of the Puget Sound across the Environmental Protection Agency;

“(C) coordinate and align the activities of the Administrator with the Action Agenda, Salmon Recovery Plans, the Treaty Rights at Risk Initiative, and the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program;

“(D) promote the efficient use of Environmental Protection Agency resources in pursuit of the restoration and protection of the Puget Sound;

“(E) serve on the Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force and collaborate with, help coordinate, and implement activities with other Federal agencies that have responsibilities involving the restoration and protection of the Puget Sound;

“(F) provide or procure such other advice, technical assistance, research, assessments, monitoring, or other support as is determined by the Director to be necessary or prudent to most efficiently and effectively fulfill the objectives and priorities of the Action Agenda, the Salmon Recovery Plans, the Treaty Rights at Risk Initiative, and the Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program, consistent with the best available science, to ensure the health of the Puget Sound ecosystem;

“(G) track the progress of the Environmental Protection Agency towards meeting the agency’s specified objectives and priorities within the Action Agenda and the Federal Action Plan;

“(H) implement the recommendations of the Comptroller General set forth in the report entitled ‘Puget Sound Restoration: Additional Actions Could Improve Assessments of Progress’ and dated July 19, 2018;

“(I) serve as liaison and coordinate activities for the restoration and protection of the Salish Sea with Canadian authorities, the Pacific Salmon Commission, and the International Joint Commission; and

“(J) carry out such additional duties as the Director determines necessary and appropriate.

“(c) PUGET SOUND FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TASK FORCE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(A) COMPOSITION.—The Puget Sound Federal Leadership Task Force shall be composed of the following members:

“(i) The following individuals appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture: