

Carter (GA) Guthrie
Carter (LA) Hageman
Carter (TX) Harris
Cartwright Harshbarger
Casar Hayes
Case Higgins (LA)
Casten Hill
Castor (FL) Himes
Castro (TX) Hinson
Chavez-DeRemer Horsford
Cherfilus- Houchin
McCormick Houlihan
Chu Hoyer
Ciscomani Hoyle (OR)
Clark (MA) Hudson
Clarke (NY) Huffman
Cleaver Huizenga
Cloud Hunt
Clyburn Issa
Cohen Ivey
Cole Jackson (IL)
Comer Jackson (NC)
Connolly Jackson (TX)
Correa Jackson Lee
Costa Jacobs
Courtney James
Craig Jayapal
Crawford Jeffries
Crenshaw Johnson (GA)
Crockett Johnson (SD)
Crow Jordan
Cuellar Joyce (OH)
Curtis Joyce (PA)
D'Esposito Kamlager-Dove
Davids (KS) Kaptur
Davis (IL) Kean (NJ)
Davis (NC) Keating
De La Cruz Kelly (IL)
Dean (PA) Kelly (MS)
DeGette Kelly (PA)
DeLauro Khanna
DelBene Kiggans (VA)
Deluzio Kiley
DeSaulnier Kilmer
DesJarlais Kim (CA)
Diaz-Balart Kim (NJ)
Dingell Krishnamoorthi
Doggett Kuster
Duarte Kustoff
Duncan LaHood
Dunn (FL) LaLota
Edwards LaMalfa
Ellzey Lamborn
Emmer Landsman
Escobar Langworthy
Eshoo Larsen (WA)
Espallat Larson (CT)
Evans Latta
Ezell LaTurner
Fallon Lawler
Feenstra Lee (CA)
Ferguson Lee (FL)
Finstad Lee (NV)
Fischbach Lee (PA)
Fitzgerald Leger Fernandez
Fitzpatrick Lesko
Fleischmann Letlow
Fletcher Levin
Flood Lieu
Foster Lofgren
Foushee Loudermilk
Foxx Lucas
Franklin, Scott Luetkemeyer
Frost Luna
Fry Luttrell
Fulcher Lynch
Gallagher Mace
Galleo Magaziner
Garamendi Malliotakis
Garbarino Maloy
Garcia (IL) Mann
Garcia (TX) Manning
Garcia, Mike Massie
Garcia, Robert Mast
Gimenez Matsui
Goldman (NY) McBath
Gomez McCaul
Gonzales, Tony McClain
Gonzalez, McClellan
Vicente McCollum
Gooden (TX) McCormick
Gottheimer McGarvey
Granger McGovern
Graves (LA) McHenry
Graves (MO) Meeks
Green (TN) Menendez
Green, Al (TX) Meng
Grothman Meuser
Guest Mfume

Miller (IL) Miller (OH)
Miller (WV) Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Nickel
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Strong

Suoizzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)

NAYS—24

Babin
Biggs
Brecht
Burchett
Carl
Cline
Clyde
Collins
Crane
Davidson
Donalds
Estes
Gaetz
Good (VA)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Hern
McClintock
Norman
Perry
Rosendale
Roy
Steube
Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—14

Frankel, Lois
Golden (ME)
Gosar
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Kildee
Molinaro
Nehls
Norcross
Pressley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1437

Mr. CLINE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I missed votes due to an illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 96, “nay” on rollcall No. 97, and “yes” on rollcall No. 98.

CREATING CONFIDENCE IN CLEAN WATER PERMITTING ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7023.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085 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. 7023.

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

□ 1445

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. 7023) to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes, with Mr. MEUSER 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.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in section 6 of House Resolution 1085 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

□ 1445

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act, which will make permitting processes under the Clean Water Act more efficient, consistent, and transparent while continuing to protect our Nation's water quality.

The Clean Water Act became law in 1972 with strong bipartisan support and an understanding that clean water supports healthy communities, as well as every industry across the United States, from farming to fishing to manufacturing.

Unfortunately, we have seen this important law become increasingly weaponized over the years to delay permits and prevent critical infrastructure and energy projects from moving forward without providing any additional environmental protection.

Ultimately, the weaponization harms the health and well-being of our Nation. This bill will address these problems and greatly benefit manufacturers, farmers, energy producers, road constructors, home builders, water treatment plants, and supply chain managers, among others, by providing clarity under the Clean Water Act.

Every person throughout the country relies on these industries and will also benefit from the regulatory flexibility and faster completion of these projects.

I emphasize that this bill does not overhaul or weaken the Clean Water Act. Instead, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act codifies longstanding, effective permitting practices and makes targeted, commonsense reforms.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all of my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who worked on various aspects of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this commonsense legislation that is going

to provide clarity to the Clean Water Act permitting process, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7023.

This bill significantly restricts the oversight and regulatory authorities of the EPA and Corps of Engineers under the Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act, enacted over 50 years ago, is the Nation's bedrock environmental law for restoring and maintaining the "chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters" and water resources.

However, the changes in H.R. 7023 defy the act's overarching intent and gut the independent authority of both agencies to ensure that projects and activities are carried out with only minimal impacts to water resources.

This partisan bill weakens clean water protections while providing exemptions, legal shields, and limited oversight to special interest polluters and large-scale projects that demand higher scrutiny.

The bill disregards congressional intent in establishing EPA's independent oversight authority over clean water permits, undermines permitting requirements, eliminates judicial review and public engagement, rolls back oversight of mining companies and industrial polluters, inadvertently slows down permit processing with increased bureaucracy, and complicates State-determined decisions.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would also significantly reduce remaining Clean Water Act protections over critical rivers, streams, lakes, and wetlands that survived last year's Supreme Court ruling.

Not satisfied with the Court's Sackett decision that eliminated protections for more than 50 percent of the wetlands and up to 70 percent of the streams, this package of anti-clean water proposals would further hamstring the EPA's and Corps' abilities to operate independently to protect our Nation's waterways.

These proposals go in the wrong direction by giving even more to polluters and sacrificing the needs of communities that depend on clean water.

After Sackett, Congress should be working to restore the protections of the Clean Water Act that worked for over 50 years and to move H.R. 5983, the Clean Water Act of 2023, a bill that I have cosponsored with over 130 of my colleagues, to restore clean water protections over our waters, many of which serve as irreplaceable sources of water for families, our communities, our farms, our businesses, our industries, and our quality of life.

We have made too much progress in cleaning up the rivers and streams for Congress to give up now. Mr. Chairman, that is why I am opposed to the proposed changes in H.R. 7023 that weaken bedrock Clean Water Act protections.

The bill will add additional hurdles to EPA's ability to issue water quality

standards. It will reduce, if not eliminate, opportunities for the public to seek redress when they are harmed by violations of the Clean Water Act. It would effectively eliminate EPA's ability to oversee and block dangerous projects.

Communities will not benefit from these changes, but mining companies, the oil and gas industry, and other toxic polluters will.

My colleagues would like to approve projects faster, but we need to ensure that projects are built with full consideration of the impacts to human health and the environment. I support the EPA and the Corps working with local communities, Tribes, and States to make these important decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a copy of the minority views to H.R. 7023 that were cosigned by myself, Ranking Member LARSEN, and an overwhelming majority of Democrats on the committee.

MINORITY VIEWS

H.R. 7023

We oppose H.R. 7023. This bill significantly restricts U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) oversight and regulatory authorities under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Clean Water Act, enacted over 50 years ago, is the nation's bedrock environmental law for "restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters" and water resources.

However, the changes in H.R. 7023 defy the overarching intent of the Clean Water Act and gut the independent authority of both agencies to ensure that projects and activities are carried out with only minimal impacts to water resources. This partisan bill weakens CWA protections while providing exemptions, legal shields, and limited oversight for special interests, polluters, and large-scale projects that demand higher scrutiny.

The bill disregards Congressional intent in establishing EPA's independent oversight authority over CWA permits; undermines permitting requirements; eliminates judicial review and public engagement; rolls back oversight of mining companies and industrial polluters; inadvertently slows down permit processing with increased bureaucracy and complicates state-determined decisions.

This legislation offers these anti-CWA changes as a salve to specific projects and grievances rather than a sustainable solution to permitting. Large-scale mining proposals, such as Pebble Mine in Alaska or Spruce Mine in West Virginia, or ecologically devastating flood control projects, such as the Yazoo Pumps in Mississippi, were blocked by bipartisan presidential administrations under the EPA's Section 404(c) authority once the impacts were thoroughly evaluated. Although EPA has utilized this authority very sparingly (only 14 times since its creation in 1972), H.R. 7023 will effectively eliminate the authority altogether.

H.R. 7023 also seeks to alter the review of "linear" projects, which includes oil and gas pipelines, electrical transmission lines, and similar projects. These projects often span hundreds of miles and cross multiple state lines; however, H.R. 7023 will limit the consideration of the environmental impacts of these projects, in apparent violation of the Clean Water Act requirement that such projects have only a minimal cumulative adverse impact on the environment. The bill

also prevents judicial review by vastly shortening the statute of limitations; limiting standing to file suit; and limiting the Court's options for recourse. In short, H.R. 7023 will greenlight large projects with minimal review while also limiting opportunities for legal challenges to ecologically damaging permits or projects.

If this sounds familiar, that is because it is. The changes proposed in H.R. 7023 will remove opportunities for local communities to review and, where appropriate, challenge the ecological, economic, and public health effects of projects with potentially significant local impacts. H.R. 7023 seeks to allow private industry and development to steamroll through towns and states, constructing projects with minimal review and disregard of local perspectives. If H.R. 7023 is enacted, the potential adverse impacts to waterbodies (such as reduced water quality or availability); to the environment (such as increased greenhouse gas emissions or other contamination); and to residents (such as perpetuating environmental justice concerns) will be borne by the local and surrounding communities without a voice or venue to have their concerns heard.

Lastly, H.R. 7023 contradicts itself by slowing down permitting processes, sowing uncertainty, and decreasing flexibility. As one example, Section 2 of H.R. 7023 will add a formal rulemaking process in place of an existing and more efficient guidance process. This will slow down the issuance of water quality standards without increasing transparency or public participation and remove flexibility for updates. It will also open the standards to judicial review.

The impacts of the CWA rollbacks in H.R. 7023 are exacerbated by the context in which this bill is considered. In May 2023, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Sackett v. EPA* severely restricted the waters that are subject to CWA protections. It is estimated that the decision removed protection nationwide from at least 50% of wetlands, and at least 60% of streams. With a much smaller number of waters subject to permitting or CWA requirements, additional limitations, expediting, and loopholes to the process are the opposite of what Congress needs to be doing to protect our water resources. Exposing the waters and wetlands that remain under Clean Water Act protections to additional pollution or destruction will do nothing to restore and maintain water quality.

During consideration of H.R. 7023, Committee Democrats sought to lessen the negative impacts of this legislation and require EPA to verify that the changes in the bill would not have negative impacts to water quality and availability issues that communities currently face nationwide.

Representative Pat Ryan (NY) offered an amendment to delay the effective date of the bill until the EPA Administrator determines that the changes will not result in increased discharges of forever chemicals (such as PFAS) or nutrients that cause harmful algal blooms. Providing legal cover for chemicals in waste streams from mines or other industrial polluters and limiting technologies that could remove pollution could certainly lead to increased discharges and pollution levels. The amendment would have ensured that communities are not left with the environmental and economic burden of cleaning up and removing such pollutants.

Representative Greg Stanton (AZ) offered an amendment to prohibit changes made by the bill from taking effect until the EPA Administrator determines that the bill will not result in contamination of state-designated drinking water sources, reduce surface water availability or reduce water quality in drought-prone areas. Additional fill activities or pollutants could severely limit public

drinking water sources for communities in arid or drought-stricken areas.

Representative Chris Pappas (NH) offered an amendment to require permittees to conduct proactive monitoring for emerging contaminants and forever chemicals at wastewater treatment plants in order to receive the permit shield offered under the legislation. Industrial polluters should not be incentivized to hide potential discharges of forever chemicals, such as PFAS pollution. Instead, we must work to identify and measure these chemicals in our waste streams.

The Clean Water Act has been an effective tool for improving the health of our rivers, streams, lakes, and wetlands. Unfortunately, progress restoring impaired waterbodies has slowed and, in some areas, reversed. Communities face new challenges from emerging contaminants, impacts of climate change, and declines in Federal assistance. Waterbodies subject to the CWA have already shrunk significantly. H.R. 7023 ignores all these realities and provides additional loopholes for polluters, industry, and developers.

In our view, this legislation is unnecessary, unwarranted, and a further attack on clean water nationwide. For these reasons, we oppose H.R. 7023.

Rick Larsen, Ranking Member.

Grace F. Napolitano, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Jared Huffman, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Valerie Foushee, Frederica S. Wilson, André Carson, Julia Brownley, Dina Titus, Mark DeSaulnier, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Jesús "Chuy" García, Rob Menendez, Steve Cohen, Val Hoyle, Hillary Scholten, Pat Ryan, Seth Moulton, Marilyn Strickland, Salud O. Carbajal, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Chris Pappas.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, our permitting system is a great burden to our Nation. It delays infrastructure projects indefinitely, stops us from bringing energy sources online, and deters investments in our communities. Let's make no mistake, permitting is holding back America.

H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act, seeks to unleash the American economy. It is a package of commonsense reforms that will reduce regulatory burdens, establish certainty, and increase transparency in our permitting system.

This bill will, in turn, create opportunities for home builders, farmers, loggers, and small business owners alike, enticing them to invest in projects that help our local economies grow and our rural communities flourish.

I highlight section 5 of H.R. 7023. Section 5 is the language of my bill, the Reducing Permitting Uncertainty Act.

Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act allows the EPA to veto a dredge and fill permit. However, the EPA has taken it upon itself to proactively reject the permits and retroactively take away permits.

In a country of due process, it seems absurd that a Federal agency can dic-

tate whether a project is good or bad before an application is even filed.

If we reject ideas before they mature, we crush any chance of ingenuity, growth, and progress in this country. Do innovators no longer deserve the opportunity to make their case and share their creative solutions?

Further, the ability to take away permits when projects are well underway is outrageous, a constant threat that the government will waltz in and shut down years of hard work—talk about creating an unwelcoming atmosphere for our job creators.

This section of H.R. 7023 is not a dramatic departure from the status quo. It is clarifying a timeframe.

When an application is pending, the EPA can make a determination whether or not to veto. It does not change the process, nor does it take away the EPA's right to veto. It just makes things clearer for those who want to bring projects online and help unleash the American economy. It returns our process to one that is science- and fact-based, rather than politically motivated.

Mr. Chair, I thank Congressman ROUZER for his work on this package of reforms.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a copy of the Statement of Administration Policy in opposition to H.R. 7023, which states that this legislation will "weaken the Clean Water Act, remove protections for waterways that are vital to the well-being of American families, and undermine ongoing, bipartisan efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure permitting processes."

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 7023—CREATING CONFIDENCE IN CLEAN WATER PERMITTING ACT—REP. ROUZER, R-NC

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 7023, which would weaken the Clean Water Act, remove protections for waterways that are vital to the well-being of American families, and undermine ongoing, bipartisan efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure permitting processes. The Administration is making historic investments and taking unprecedented action to modernize and accelerate permitting to ensure that infrastructure projects get designed and built swiftly and in a way that reflects community input and protects clean air, clean water, and public health. H.R. 7023 would create uncertainty, confusion, and conflict in permitting processes by: restricting community input and environmental analysis and information that is needed to inform Federal decisions to protect the public; curtailing the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to keep pollutants out of water supplies upon which communities rely; and, weakening bedrock environmental protections. H.R. 7023 is out of step with the type of bipartisan permitting reforms that the Administration supports and that Congress should pass.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, our predecessors in Congress worked in a bipartisan manner to enact the Clean Water Act, one of the Na-

tion's bedrock environmental laws. The legislation before us today was not developed in that same bipartisan manner, and it undermines the Clean Water Act. I oppose this bill.

The pro-clean water bipartisan consensus has held firm for decades, allowing communities to enjoy cleaner water and giving businesses the certainty they need to create jobs and spur economic growth.

Thanks to historic investments like the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act, our economy is on the move. We have added nearly 15 million jobs since President Biden took office, and unemployment has been under 4 percent for the longest stretch in more than 50 years.

Wages are up; inflation is coming down; and we are growing the economy from the middle out and the bottom up. That is the context in which our colleagues are proposing to shatter this bipartisan consensus around clean water since the passage of the Clean Water Act.

This bill will not improve Clean Water Act project permitting or create certainty. In fact, it does the opposite.

According to the Statement of Administration Policy, this bill will "undermine ongoing, bipartisan efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure permitting processes."

The SAP further confirms the bill will "create uncertainty, confusion, and conflict in permitting processes."

What will this bill achieve? It weakens clean water protections. It provides exemptions and legal shields for permit holders. It limits oversight for projects that demand higher scrutiny.

What does this bill do for communities? It closes the door for local communities seeking review of projects that are running through their neighborhoods and gives private developers the green light to ignore local perspectives on large-scale projects.

This legislation prioritizes the needs of polluters who want to fast-track questionable projects over the public's interest and concern.

What does this bill do for the permitting process? In some cases, it slows down the process. The bill adds bureaucratic steps to the process of establishing water quality standards that will slow the implementation of these standards while exposing them to increased litigation.

What does it do for clean water? Nothing good. The legislation eliminates EPA's oversight of ecologically devastating projects and makes it easier for industrial polluters to discharge potentially harmful or toxic chemicals into our rivers and streams with no accountability.

For example, my colleagues have criticized EPA's use of its Clean Water Act review or veto authority. Yet, the record shows EPA's use of this authority has been consistent with congressional intent. I see no reason for removing this authority.

Since enactment of the Clean Water Act in 1972, EPA has only exercised this authority 14 times—most recently in relation to large-scale mining proposals in Alaska and West Virginia. EPA's use of this authority has, in fact, been bipartisan. EPA used it 2 times during Democratic administrations and 12 times during Republican administrations.

Moving this legislation now is an assault on water quality. The adverse impacts of the provisions in this bill will be substantial on their own.

However, enacting rollbacks is an extreme choice in the wake of the 2023 Sackett ruling by the Supreme Court that restricted the waters subject to the Clean Water Act protections. It is estimated the Sackett ruling removed protection nationwide from at least 50 percent of wetlands and up to 70 percent of streams.

With a much smaller number of waters subject to the Clean Water Act, additional loopholes to the process like those proposed in the bill are the opposite of what Congress needs to do to protect our water resources.

Clean water is not an abstract concept. What is at stake in this legislation is whether people have reliable, drinkable, clean water with which to conduct business, recreate, carry out daily tasks, and sustain life.

During committee consideration of this bill, Democrats sought to lessen the negative impacts of this legislation and require the EPA to verify that the changes from this bill would not have negative impacts on water quality or availability. Unfortunately, those amendments were rejected on mostly a party-line vote.

Similarly, several Democrats offered amendments to the Rules Committee to ensure the bill did not harm local fisheries, rural and disadvantaged communities, multistate drinking water sources, or infants and children. Again, those amendments were blocked from consideration.

If thoughtful oversight of our Nation's waters and the permitting process that protects these waters is still a bipartisan goal, the House of Representatives can do far better than take up H.R. 7023.

Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 7023, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1500

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DUARTE).

Mr. DUARTE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act.

This bill provides relief to farmers, small businesses, and energy producers across the Central Valley and throughout the United States by cutting red tape, streamlining reviews, and providing greater regulatory certainty under the Clean Water Act.

I am proud that H.R. 7023 includes my initiative taking much-needed steps to fix inconsistencies in the per-

mitting process under the Clean Water Act. In particular, this bill ensures that EPA permit writers do their jobs in a clear and reliable manner, including clear, objective, concrete limits on specific pollutants or water body conditions that permittees can rely on.

Currently, the EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit writers often include language in permits that provide loopholes for antidevelopment groups to sue and block permits needed for critical energy and other infrastructure improvements. My provision closes those loopholes and limits opportunities for unwarranted lawsuits.

This bill doesn't roll back the Clean Water Act. It codifies decades-old EPA policy to shield permit holders from activist lawsuits as long as they acted in good faith and according to the specific terms of their permit.

This type of regulatory certainty and legal protection for permit holders is necessary for improving our Nation's infrastructure, especially California's Central Valley water infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, a commonsense reform that will strengthen the permitting process for permit seekers and holders, as well as provide greater clarity for permitting agencies.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to H.R. 7023, including a letter from 49 organizations expressing concern that legislation containing several misguided attacks on clean water in the Clean Water Act puts polluter profits ahead of public health and would jeopardize the water that our families, communities, businesses, and wildlife depend on.

March 18, 2024.

Re Oppose H.R. 7023, an attack on our clean water protections.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our members and supporters, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H.R. 7023, the misleadingly named "Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act." This bill contains several misguided attacks on clean water and the Clean Water Act, puts polluter profits ahead of public health, and would jeopardize the waters that our families, communities, and wildlife depend on.

Numerous provisions of H.R. 7023 shield industrial dischargers that would pollute or destroy our streams, lakes, wetlands, and other waters from responsibility, thereby imposing on downstream communities the burden of increased pollution and flooding, to say nothing of the costs of remedying those threats. In particular:

Section 2 would give polluters new ways to slow down the Environmental Protection Agency's process for updating water quality criteria. Criteria reflect EPA's assessment of the scientific evidence about how pollutants in our waterways adversely affect human health and aquatic life, and include non-binding recommendations for water quality standards that states can adopt to prevent those harmful effects. By subjecting EPA's issuance of criteria to additional administrative processes and opening them up to industry lawsuits, this bill could delay improved protections reflective of scientific developments—which is particularly concerning for emerging contaminants.

Section 3 would authorize EPA to issue "general" permits under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program for industrial and municipal polluters. This new authority lacks safeguards that Congress included in the parallel general permitting program for "dredge and fill" activities, namely that the activities must have minimal adverse environmental impacts. It also would greatly limit EPA's ability to terminate such a permit if the agency determined it was causing unacceptable harm to the environment.

Section 4 would make it easier for industrial operations to dump PFAS, also known as "forever chemicals," and other emerging contaminants into the nation's waters without accountability. Specifically, the bill would shield dischargers from Clean Water Act liability even if they are aware of certain pollutants in their waste streams but do not disclose it to pollution control officials who do not have reason to expect such contaminants.

Section 5 would virtually eliminate EPA's ability to stop mammoth polluting projects like the Pebble Mine in Alaska's Bristol Bay watershed. This rarely-used authority (invoked only 14 times in the Act's history) is crucial to prevent the most egregious projects from destroying precious fisheries, drinking water supplies, and other resources.

Section 6 would require the Army Corps of Engineers to permanently retain a fast-track permit for highly destructive and polluting oil and gas pipelines and greatly weaken the Corps' nationwide permitting program—a program that is already far too lax in preventing and mitigating the harm caused by projects that fill in the nation's waters. The bill would double the duration of general permits, such that advancements in best practices for the dozens of activities covered by such permits would not be required promptly. And it would excuse the Army Corps of Engineers from considering the full environmental consequences of permitted activities, as well as the effects of such activities on endangered species.

Section 7 would prevent effective judicial review of projects that fill in and destroy wetlands, streams, and other waters. The bill would impose an impractically short statute of limitations on court review of "dredge and fill" permits, which would likely force concerned citizens to file suit on more permits in order to preserve their rights, in many instances before the impacts of the permitted project are fully understood. The bill would also severely hamstring courts' authority to provide a remedy for illegal permits because permits found unlawful would ordinarily remain in effect and allow continued harm to water resources while the Army Corps of Engineers reexamines them.

In contrast to these provisions, polling continues to show that people actually want stronger federal protections for our nation's waters. Too many communities, especially Indigenous communities, communities of color, and low wealth communities, still lack clean water. Congress should be focused on putting people before polluters and working to ensure everyone, no matter their race, zip code, or income, has access to clean water, rather than attempting to undermine our critical clean water protections.

Again, we urge you to VOTE NO on H.R. 7023, an attack on our clean water safeguards that would endanger the waters our families and communities depend on and work against the Clean Water Act's objective "to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters."

Sincerely,

Alabama Rivers Alliance; Alliance for the Great Lakes; American Rivers; Amigos Bravos; Appalachian Trail Conservancy; Bayou

City Waterkeeper; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Food Safety; Children's Environmental Health Network; Clean Water Action; Clean Wisconsin; Committee on the Middle Fork Vermilion River; Community Water Center; Earthjustice; Environmental Justice Health Alliance; Environment America.

Environmental Law & Policy Center; Environmental Protection Network; Food & Water Watch; For Love of Water (FLOW); Freshwater Future; GreenLatinos; Izaak Walton League of America; Kentucky Waterways Alliance; Latino Farmers & Ranchers International, Inc.; Lawyers for Good Government; League of Conservation Voters; Maryland Pesticide Education Network; Massachusetts Pollinator Network; Massachusetts Rivers Alliance; Mississippi River Collaborative; National Audubon Society.

National Wildlife Federation; National Resources Defense Council; New Mexico Wild; Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides; Ohio River Foundation; People and Pollinators Action Network; PolicyLink; River Network; Sierra Club; Southern Environmental Law Center; Surfrider Foundation; The Water Collaborative of Greater New Orleans; Toxic Free North Carolina; Waterkeeper Alliance; Waterkeepers Chesapeake; WE ACT for Environmental Justice; We the People of Detroit.

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION
ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, March 19, 2024.

Re Vote no on bills that could result in harm to national parks

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Since 1919, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System. On behalf of our 1.6 million members and supporters nationwide, I write to share NPCA's thoughts on select legislation being considered by the House of Representatives the week of March 18, 2024.

H.R. 6009—Restoring American Energy Dominance Act: NPCA opposes this legislation, which stops the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) from updating its onshore oil and gas program for the first time in 35 years. Not only does this legislation halt a public regulatory process partway through, it prohibits BLM from proposing any substantially similar rules. This effectively prohibits BLM from updating this program in the future, making it harder for the agency to oversee the federal onshore leasing program.

The proposed rule follows recommendations by the Government Accountability Office and implements reforms already passed into law. In the rule, BLM makes the leasing process more straightforward and streamlines paperwork and filing requirements for industry, making the leasing and auction processes more consistent while updating it for the 21st century. The proposed rule also ensures that BLM considers proximity to national parks and other special places during the parcel selection process. By taking a holistic approach to parcel selection, BLM can avoid conflicts later in the leasing process and costly and time-consuming lawsuits while protecting irreplaceable cultural and natural treasures. This approach also ensures that lands used for conservation and recreation purposes by millions of Americans are not impeded by oil and gas development.

During the comment period for the proposed rule, over 99% of all comments were supportive. The current leasing system and onshore oil and gas program is antiquated and does not offer proper oversight or ensure protections and fair returns to American taxpayers. We urge a No vote on H.R. 6009.

H.R. 1023—the Cutting Green Corruption and Taxes Act: NPCA opposes this legislation, which repeals implementation of the Methane Emissions Reduction Program (MERP). MERP is critical to ensuring the successful and efficient reduction of oil and gas methane emissions and spurring economic innovation in methane mitigation. Methane is a greenhouse gas that traps over 80 times more heat on our planet than carbon dioxide in the short term. Methane is often leaked and vented during oil and gas operations, degrading air quality around national parks, driving climate change, threatening public health, and harming unique resources that national parks protect, like dark night skies. We urge a No vote on H.R. 1023 to protect national parks, visitors and communities and our climate from harmful and wasteful methane emissions.

H.R. 7023—the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act: NPCA opposes this legislation, which weakens or delays the protection of our waterways under the Clean Water Act. Over 220 national park units do not meet water quality standards for visitor health and park resources. Instead of creating more protections that help clean up park waterways, this bill slows down EPA's ability to set and revise water quality standards. It also creates new general permits for discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System without the safeguards of a similar program. The bill essentially eliminates EPA's ability to apply a rarely used, but necessary authority under Sec. 404(c) to stop large, polluting projects like the Pebble Mine near Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in Alaska's Bristol Bay watershed. Finally, the bill prevents effective judicial review of projects that fill in wetlands, streams and other waters. We urge a No vote on H.R. 7023 to prevent rolling back clean water protections for our parks and communities.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

KRISTEN BRENGEL,

Senior Vice President, Government Affairs.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Chair, as the vice chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7023.

This bill is a combination of attacks on the Clean Water Act that, all together, will threaten access to the clean, safe water our communities rely on.

This bill would protect polluters and make it easier for dangerous pollutants like lead, mercury, and arsenic to enter our waterways. The more pollutants that enter our source waters, the greater the cost to clean them up. The greater the cost it is to clean up our water, the more expensive it is for our constituents.

In my district, we have seen the rising costs of water, and plenty of communities are also struggling to afford their water bills. While I have been working throughout this Congress to improve access to affordable, quality water in my district and beyond, the majority has been undermining my efforts and others with bills like this.

For example, in committee, I offered an amendment that would have protected our drinking water from pes-

ticides and prevented water rate increases by passing the cleanup costs to the polluters. My Republican colleagues voted down this commonsense amendment and preferred to have my constituents and their constituents pay for bad actors.

Water is an essential resource, and people in Ohio's 13th Congressional District depend upon access to clean water for their lives and livelihoods.

We must protect our waters from dangerous pollutants and also prevent working people and families from having to foot the bill for pollution and discharges.

Finally, I would also like to discuss how this bill relates to last year's disaster in East Palestine, Ohio, which occurred just miles away from my district, and the ongoing issues we are seeing as a result.

Changes within H.R. 7023 would allow large projects like railways or pipelines to go forward without any consideration for the broader impact that they will have on the communities that they are constructed in.

The bill limits what is considered an impact, so when used for a new rail line, the Corps will not be able to consider a rail spill, toxic materials that may be transported on the railroad, or other disastrous scenarios, just like we saw in Ohio.

These secondary impacts can be huge for the nearby environment and the communities, and with the East Palestine derailment, they certainly were.

Worse yet, other parts of this bill will limit the ability to review, taking away the ability of a community to advocate for itself and be involved in the process of a major project in their own neighborhoods.

I will continue, Mr. Chair, advocating for sensible permitting reform that allows businesses to grow and considers the health and safety of consumers in adjacent communities, but, Mr. Chair, this bill is not it.

I firmly believe H.R. 7023 will only make ongoing issues worse in my State and district, as well as yours. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I am speaking today in support of H.R. 7023. This bill includes language from my legislation, the Water Quality Criteria Development and Transparency Act.

As a Member of Congress, I value input from my constituents. The EPA, however, sees input from stakeholders differently, at least with regard to water quality criteria for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits.

EPA claims that these criteria are just guidance, not a final agency action that should require a proper regulatory review process. States can technically adopt different criteria, but the EPA makes this process so burdensome that most States are forced to adopt the

EPA guidances. In other words, guidances become regulations, and that is the goal and endgame of the EPA.

The EPA then voluntarily takes comments and feedback on these criteria. They have a body that reviews the criteria, an internal science board comprised of bureaucrats. An internal review from its own board is not a real robust review.

The language from my bill, the Water Quality Criteria Development and Transparency Act, ensures the development of these criteria would be treated with the same respect as any other regulations—that is, listening to stakeholder feedback. The stakeholders are constantly dealing with the new burdens from the EPA. As the true experts, they deserve consideration by the EPA.

Additionally, in the most limited way possible, the EPA needs to be held accountable through the judicial system. Activists have abused the judicial system for decades. Our stakeholders should have an opportunity to keep the EPA accountable. Personally, I would prefer no new onerous criteria, but career bureaucrats being solely in charge of this criteria should frighten everyone.

Feedback from stakeholders ensures that the criteria remain relevant, and the EPA must consider the opinions of industry pros and stakeholders in making these criteria relevant. All new criteria and new regulations should incorporate their input and expertise.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD two letters expressing opposition to H.R. 7023 and its efforts to reopen Federal protections of pristine salmon habitat within and around Bristol Bay, Alaska, including a letter from the Bristol Bay Defense Fund and the United Tribes of Bristol Bay.

JANUARY 30, 2024.

Re Oppose Anti-404(c) Clean Water Act Legislation

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICK LARSEN,
Ranking Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE: On behalf of the Bristol Bay Defense Fund, we write in opposition to the "Reducing Permitting Uncertainty" language amending Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act, which would eviscerate the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) authority to prohibit, restrict, deny, or withdraw permits for destructive projects that would pollute our nation's water resources. These changes to Section 404(c) are a direct attack on the nation's clean water, Clean Water Act, and the EPA. While purporting to streamline the permitting process for development projects, these changes to Section 404(c) would threaten the very foundation of environmental protection for our nation's wetlands and aquatic ecosystems, compro-

ming their ecological integrity and ultimately impacting water quality, public health, and economic stability.

The provisions of H.R. 7206, Amendment to H.R. 7023, or any similar anti-404(c) language would gut the EPA's ability under Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act to stop giant polluting projects that would have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies, fisheries, wildlife, and recreational areas like the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska. By limiting the EPA to as little as 30 days to invoke its 404(c) authority, H.R. 7206 would eliminate any meaningful opportunity for review by the public (including the project proponent) and would preclude the EPA from conducting the type of careful analyses that have supported previous 404(c) determinations. H.R. 7023 would similarly eviscerate the EPA's authority.

These anti-404(c) provisions ignore the EPA's rare and judicious use of Section 404(c), invoked only 14 times in the Clean Water Act's 52-year history. They represent a blatant attempt to green light and fast track even the most egregious projects that would destroy our Nation's water resources.

The Clean Water Act stands as a testament to our Nation's commitment to protecting our precious water resources. Weakening Section 404(c) would be a detrimental step backward, compromising environmental health, public well-being, and economic stability. We urge you to oppose these provisions or any similar language that would hobble the EPA's ability under Section 404(c) to limit the most devastating projects from destroying our nation's fisheries, drinking water, and other natural resources.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to working with you to safeguard our precious water resources for the benefit of all Americans.

Sincerely,

Bristol Bay Defense Fund.
United Tribes of Bristol Bay.
Commercial Fishermen for Bristol Bay.
Businesses for Bristol Bay.
SalmonState.
Wild Salmon Center.
Native American Rights Fund.
Natural Resources Defense Council.

Re Oppose Anti-404(c) Clean Water Act Legislation

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICK LARSEN,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAVES AND RANKING MEMBER LARSEN: On behalf of Trout Unlimited, we write in opposition to the "Reducing Permitting Uncertainty" language amending Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act, which would eviscerate the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) authority to prohibit, restrict, deny, or withdraw permits that are exceptionally destructive to our nation's water, fish and recreational resources. These changes to Section 404(c) undermine our country's ability to maintain and protect clean for fish, wildlife, communities and businesses. The proposed changes to Section 404(c) would jeopardize important public resources critical to fish, wildlife, public health and recreation and while favoring private industries that often don't have the best interests of the public in mind.

The provisions of H.R. 7026, which is offered as an amendment to H.R. 7008, or any similar anti-404(c) language would restrict the EPA's ability under Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act to restrict, prohibit or limit projects that would have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies,

fisheries, wildlife, and recreational areas like the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska. The 404(c) authority has only been used 14 times in the 52-history of the Clean Water Act, most often by Republican Administrations. The Clean Water Act 404(c) tool requires significant scientific, legal and public input and processes and cannot be considered a tool that is currently wielded injudiciously.

On behalf of our more than 130,000 members and supporters in Alaska and across the country, we urge you to oppose these provisions or any similar language that would weaken EPA's ability under Section 404(c) to limit the most egregious projects from destroying our nation's fisheries, drinking water, and other natural resources.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to working with you to safeguard our clean water resources for the benefit of all Americans.

Sincerely,

NELLI WILLIAMS,

Alaska Director, Trout Unlimited.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN).

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7023.

Mr. Chair, despite meeting every stipulated requirement, my amendment to this dangerous bill to protect our children from pollutants in their water was not ruled in order.

Something is not right. This is unacceptable as a matter of parliamentary process, and it is unacceptable because our children's health is at risk.

Infants and children are among the most vulnerable to the negative health effects of pollutants in their water. They are often the closest to the source. They crawl on the floor and in the grass, and they put anything they find in their mouths, including their hands, which puts them at greater risk of exposure to toxins.

Their immune systems are the least prepared to handle this exposure. Children's internal organs are still developing and maturing. According to the National Institutes of Health, kids' immune systems may provide less natural protection against toxins than adults. Infants and children face more critical periods when exposure to toxic chemicals may alter their health for the rest of their lives.

The Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act would increase the risk to our children by limiting the tools and processes that the EPA utilizes for monitoring the health of our water, improving water quality, and limiting pollutants from entering our waters in the first place.

The amendment I submitted was simple. It would have paused the changes within the bill until the EPA could certify that they would not lead to increased discharges of pollutants that have adverse effects on infants and children from increased exposure.

Some of these pollutants we may see more of are linked to neurological disorders, behavioral changes, and certain forms of cancer, including breast cancer, leukemia, and brain tumors.

My colleagues and I across the aisle may not agree on the merits of the

Clean Water Act or the importance of protecting our local waters from contamination and degradation, but surely we can all agree that protecting our Nation's infants and children from toxic chemicals is our shared responsibility and that we simply need to know where there is poison in our water and whether we are giving it to our children.

For that reason, Mr. Chair, at the appropriate time I will offer my amendment as a motion to recommit because I will never stop fighting for our children.

This is not just a bad bill. It is dangerous for our kids.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this motion to recommit for our children.

Ms. Scholten moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7023 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN AND INFANTS.

This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the date on which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency issues a determination that the implementation of this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, will not result in discharges (within the meaning of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act) that may have adverse effects on the health of children or infants, including birth defects, learning disabilities, asthma, and cancer.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act, a bill that pushes back against the out-of-control EPA and ensures that important projects are approved in a timely manner.

The EPA has used the Clean Water Act to delay or block projects and ensure a radical climate agenda is fulfilled, all at the cost of projects that are critical for the United States.

The EPA is often inconsistent, not transparent, and unfair in its decisions to approve projects, even when those projects have no negative impact on the environment.

This bill will cut red tape, strengthen the permitting process in favor of those seeking the permits, provide clarity to the EPA to ensure that they are following what the law intends, and, most importantly, fight back against the militant climate agenda.

Look, we all know that the EPA can be a bad actor in the permitting process, but they are not the only ones that are standing in the way. We also have to deal with these environmental groups that continually sue to delay these projects from going through, claiming that the costs outweigh the benefits. Of course, we know what they really mean—these projects don't fur-

ther their climate agenda, so they must be stopped.

That is why this bill includes my legislation, the Judicial Review Timeline Clarity Act. The Judicial Review Timeline Clarity Act ensures that any lawsuit seeking judicial review of a section 404 general or individual permit must be filed within the first 60 days of the permit's issuance.

If the court decides that the Army Corps did not comply with the law in approving projects, it will be remanded back to the Secretary, where they have 180 days to take action that the court has ordered.

□ 1515

Businesses are busy. They are already buried under regulation after regulation which takes obscene amounts of time and resources to comply with. In this case, they already have to demonstrate that these projects will have basically no impact on the health of water or show that they have exhausted all alternatives to discharging.

Even with these strict regulations, environmental groups sue to stall these projects, claiming that they will have a negative impact on the environment. The goal is to keep them held up in court.

Our court system is already being attacked from every angle. Let's not let the environmentalists continue to manipulate the courts to push their climate religion. It should be an efficient and speedy process so businesses can build the infrastructure that our country depends on.

The Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act will bring needed reforms to litigation and ensure any challenge to these permits are efficient, fast, and fair.

In closing, I thank the work of Chairman GRAVES and Subcommittee Chairman DAVID ROUZER.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7023, another example of team extreme's polluters over people agenda.

Folks may be wondering why we are talking about a bill that tries to gut the Clean Water Act in what is supposed to be energy week for House Republicans. The answer is pretty straightforward. This week actually has nothing to do with energy policy. It certainly has nothing to do with clean water policy.

The common thread is team extreme's bromance with polluting industries who want to dismantle our environmental laws so they can poison our air, water, and climate without any accountability. That is why we are debating this terrible bill that will roll back 50 years of clean water protections.

Now, in the Sackett decision, the Supreme Court severely limited Clean

Water Act protection for tributaries and headwaters. The decision was a disaster, and it is why Congress right now should be trying to move legislation that builds up and protects the Clean Water Act. We should be giving the EPA further tools to hold industry accountable, to safeguard the power of States and Tribes so that they can protect sensitive ecological areas and embolden our communities to have an active role in the permitting process for projects that will impact their livelihoods.

Republicans are doing the exact opposite here. In the aftermath of Sackett, they are trying to gut the Clean Water Act even further by removing the EPA's ability to deny Clean Water Act permits, by removing NEPA and ESA protections, as well as State consultation. Republicans are trying to eliminate judicial review, making it virtually impossible for a community to challenge a project that has been hastily approved through this new permitting process.

The bottom line: This makes it a lot easier for polluting industries to wreck our lakes and rivers and streams. It puts polluters over people.

It is worth remembering, in the face of these constant attacks on our environmental protections, why we created the Clean Water Act in the first place. The purpose was to protect communities and the environment.

Just 50 years ago, we had lakes and streams that you couldn't wade into, much less fish in. There were rivers that caught fire and couldn't be put out. Team extreme wants to take us back to that. In typical fashion, they try to hide the effects of this bill behind a euphemistic title: The Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act.

If Congress had a truth-in-labeling requirement for bills around here, this would be called the dirty water permitting act. Enough of the gaslighting. Enough of putting polluters over people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman GRAVES and Chairman ROUZER for working on this legislation.

Mr. Chair, the reality is that America has been wrapped in a bureaucratic morass. We have been wrapped in red tape. It is impossible to do things like build roads. It is impossible to deploy things like transmission that are critical to help to renew and update the electrical grid. This is because of what we have seen as an extreme agenda out of this White House.

Just yesterday we talked about the fact that the average American family is now spending an additional \$1,000 a month just complying with rules and regulations out of this administration.

Mr. Chair, I remind you, this is the administration that said they would

not impose additional costs upon any family making less than \$400,000 a year. That is exactly what their agenda is doing, whether it is blocking energy production and driving up energy costs or whether it is the shrinkflation you have seen with smaller products at the grocery store or higher utility bills. Every American family is facing this new hidden tax.

What Chairman GRAVES and Chairman ROUZER have done is they have brought together a bill that brings common sense to the Clean Water Act process.

I represent south Louisiana. We live at the bottom of one of the largest watersheds in the world and certainly the largest watershed in the United States. We go from Montana to New York to Canada and drain all of this area. Everybody's discharge, everybody's runoff, comes to our State.

Do you really think I would have an interest in dirtier water being at the bottom of the watershed, being in the area that has the greatest commercial fisheries in the continental United States and one of the biggest recreational fishing destinations in this country?

No, it doesn't make any sense.

What this legislation does is help to streamline the process. I thank the chairman for working with us to include a provision that codifies the general NPDES permits that would simply require notice if the general permit is not going to be revised. It simply lets the applicant know or the existing permit holder know if it is not going to be reissued or renewed. This is another one that helps to improve the legal process.

Mr. Chairman, I actually met with John Kerry and Brian Deese, White House officials under the Biden administration who have both left now, but who brought up to me, while they were working for the White House, they said that we have got to fix this judicial review thing. This bill does it.

What it does is something very simple that applies common sense to the situation. It says that it is fine, you can file a lawsuit if you have a problem with the decision that was made. However, first you have to try to participate and resolve your issue in the public comment process, in the public participation process, rather than waiting for the record of decision, by standing out there on the outside filing a lawsuit just as a delay tactic. These are not helpful tactics. On the contrary, these are malicious tactics. I appreciate the inclusion of that because that moves it in the right direction.

Look, in closing, Mr. Chairman, this entire bill builds upon the incredible work that was done in the revisions or the improvements in the modernization of the National Environmental Policy Act that President Biden signed into law back in June that simply tries to ensure that we shrink the amount of time and that we shrink the scope of work that is done in looking at envi-

ronmental assessments and environmental impact statements.

All of this bureaucratic morass, all of this additional cost that is being heaped upon American families, all it is doing is slowing down our economy and giving strategic advantage to countries like China, which is not in our interest.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I stand today in vehement opposition to H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act.

It is amusing that we are having an energy week conducted by a majority that uses all of its energy to fight against the interests and well-being of the American people. This bill is emblematic of the Republican Party that shamelessly prioritizes the investments of their billionaire donors over the health of our children, our communities, and our environment, not to mention our economy.

Every Member of this body likes to claim to be here to advance the needs of our constituents, but it seems like every day the Republican Party tries to tear down the very laws that aim to protect their own constituents, as well as mine, from corporate polluters pumping toxins into our air and drinking water.

It seems like every day they fight to repeal the investments that are creating thousands of good-paying union jobs in districts like mine, lowering our energy bills, and creating a healthy, livable future for our kids.

Pittsburgh is the 22nd most polluted city in the Nation, and this year was the first year that we didn't get a failing grade from the American Lung Association. I know far too well what happens when corporate polluters are absolved of responsibility and accountability for their actions, which several portions of this bill seek to enable.

I am proud to fight against those who seek to endanger our communities, endanger our children, through polluted air and tainted water, just so they can give another handout to the billionaires and Big Oil CEOs who bankroll their campaigns. I am proud to represent western Pennsylvania and the city of Pittsburgh where we have worked hard to remove and replace over 10,000 lead service lines, largely thanks to Federal protections and investments these Republicans are trying to repeal.

The only confidence this bill gives me is that Republicans will take any opportunity to eliminate oversight and safeguards for our environment and to silence the voices of those in communities who are tired of unbreathable air and toxic water.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the passage of this legislation.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chair, I don't think I have ever heard so much nonsense in such a short period of time.

As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act, of which I am a sponsor.

In the five decades since its enactment, the Clean Water Act has helped improve the quality of water bodies throughout this country. H.R. 7023 is focused on improving sections 402 and 404 permitting processes under the Clean Water Act. The keyword here is "improve," not remove, not eliminate, not undermine, but improve.

Improving permitting under the Clean Water Act has been a priority of mine as chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. I have heard over the course of a number of hearings about the successes and challenges of the Clean Water Act. Throughout these conversations, one theme has become clear: Years of weaponization of this law by various administrations and radical activists are hurting our economy without providing any meaningful environmental benefit.

Today, we have heard our colleagues from across the aisle say this legislation will gut the Clean Water Act by rolling back critical water protections, but the fact of the matter is that is just not so. This bill does not modify the scope of the Clean Water Act, nor does it change the current permitting requirements. Let me say that again. It does not change current permitting requirements. It simply closes loopholes to prevent the continued weaponization of the permitting process, all of which has nothing to do with water quality.

I firmly believe that regulations should be easy to understand and easy to follow, which has the added benefit, by the way, of making them easier to enforce. Our competitors across the globe often disregard any kind of regulatory structure or permitting. When they want to do something, when they want to build a canal, they just go do it.

We are better than that. We believe in environmental protection. However, this does not mean we should be forced to wait years to build a manufacturing plant, new infrastructure, or energy projects due to weaponization of the regulatory process. Such delays only give our international competitors a distinct advantage and harm our country's economy as well as our energy security, which also, by the way, directly affects our national security.

Mr. Chair, it is simple: Clear processes lead to good decisionmaking and more consistent outcomes. H.R. 7023 helps achieve that.

For example, this bill better ensures that section 402 NPDES permits are straightforward and developed in a more transparent way, from the data used to develop the permit to language

that is used within the permit. Currently, the EPA develops water quality standards through their own internal processes, routinely dismissing comments from outside stakeholders. This legislation would require the EPA to bring interested parties to the table when crafting water quality standards. It would also require NPDES permit writers to use clearer, more specific language when developing a permit and provide a liability shield for good faith actors who are adhering to their permit terms.

For section 404 dredge and fill permits, this legislation creates more consistency and provides more legal clarity. For example, it clarifies the EPA can only veto a permit when a 404 application is active, not before an application has been filed or after a permit has been issued. It also codifies many longstanding practices for the application of nationwide permits by the Corps and creates clearer standards for judicial review to protect against frivolous lawsuits.

Section 404 permits, particularly nationwide permits, are often targeted by radical environmentalists and get bogged down by litigation. This legislation helps to protect against these kinds of frivolous lawsuits.

□ 1530

Additionally, this bill requires the EPA and the Corps to, at long last, issue and make public post-Sackett decision implementation guidance for the definition of waters of the United States, WOTUS, so that we can finally get jurisdictional determinations moving and projects done.

This bill enjoys support from a wide range of stakeholders and constituencies, from water utilities to energy groups to farmers to Main Street businesses. This legislation will enable the law to be executed and enforced more effectively, save taxpayers money, and provide more consistency for permit holders, seekers, and writers.

I will also note this bill is a team effort representing the input of several of my T&I colleagues. In particular, I thank Congressmen OWENS, STAUBER, DUARTE, BURLISON, and GARRET GRAVES, all of whom have contributed provisions to this package.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides energy predictability and certainty that our utilities, energy, manufacturing, and agricultural industries need to succeed, which are so critical to American greatness in energy, food production, and the manufacturing necessary to improve the standard of living of every American.

That is what this is about, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. That was my last speaker, Mr. Chair, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, clean water was not always a partisan issue, and no issue has more support among American families than the protection of our Nation's waters.

Now is the worst time to lower our guard on protecting clean water, as recent years have shown major water challenges across the U.S. such as drought in the West, floods in the East, and water contamination in many States.

We need to be doing everything to ensure our cities, our businesses, and our farmers have sufficient, safe, and sustainable supplies of water to meet our economic and agricultural needs, our quality-of-life needs, and our day-to-day survival. I have dedicated much of my time in Congress to protecting our critical water supplies and making sure we capture, use, and reuse every available drop of water in our communities, and I do not plan to stop now.

Recent public surveys in the West have found that residents are more concerned than ever about inadequate water supplies. Almost 9 in 10 Westerners say that inadequate water supply is a serious problem in their State.

This is especially true in my home State of California. As the Metropolitan Water District commented to our subcommittee 1 year ago, a strong and clear Clean Water Act is important to the day-to-day operations of water agencies and source water protection efforts.

Congress should be reinstating protections to the Clean Water Act that the Supreme Court removed to continue to protect our streams and wetlands that have been protected since the inception of the act.

Streams, rivers, and wetlands are critical to capturing and storing rain and snowmelt to ensure a long-term supply of water and to recharge our underground aquifers; yet, this bill limits or eliminates protections over waters that provide the source of drinking water to over 117 million Americans.

Yes, there is a cost to protecting our communities, our sources of drinking water, and our environment. However, that cost should be borne by those seeking to pollute our waterways or fill our wetlands for their own personal gain, rather than transferring that cost to Americans or to downstream States.

This bill would increase levels of pollution in our water bodies, increase risk of downstream flooding, and increase certainty that communities like mine cannot maintain sustainable sources of drinking water.

Worst of all, hardworking American families would have to pay for the pollution caused by others.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 7023, I urge my colleagues to vote against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, H.R. 7023 is critical to achieving more efficient project completion by streamlining and improving permitting processes under the Clean Water Act.

As has been stated, this bill will support everyday Americans making targeted, commonsense reforms to the Clean Water Act, balancing the need for environmental protections along with energy and infrastructure improvements.

This bill is the product of hard work by many members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. In particular, I thank Subcommittee Chairman DAVID ROUZER for his leadership on this issue, and Representatives ERIC BURLISON, BURGESS OWENS, PETER STAUBER, JOHN DUARTE, and GARRET GRAVES for their work who all contributed legislative language to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I am here today to speak in strong opposition to the proposed legislation, H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act.

This bill would modify requirements under the well-established Clean Water Act, limiting the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) authority to regulate the discharge of pollutants into United States waters.

If passed, it would represent a significant regression from over 50 years of well-established precedent regarding pollution prevention.

Moreover, it would defy the overarching intent of the initial legislation, which was to provide for more agency oversight and accountability of industrial polluters, not less.

I offered for consideration to the Rules Committee, the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 21, which sought to help ensure that any harmful impact, which would inevitably result from the passage of this dangerous bill, is documented, and reported to Congress.

Specifically, the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 21 would have added the following language to the end of the bill text in H.R. 7023:

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall submit to Congress a report on any disparate impacts on minority and disadvantaged communities, and communities previously or currently designated as having cancer clusters, including impacts to human health, environmental quality, and local economies, that may result from the implementation of this Act, including the amendments made by this Act.

In my home-state of Texas and in my district particularly, there have been multiple revelations of cancer clusters in many of the underserved and minority communities.

For instance, the Fifth Ward, Kashmere Gardens, and the larger Northeast community along with other communities in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, are all regions with minority and underserved populations that have been disproportionately and gravely impacted by harmful environmental pollutants and toxins.

In a time where we are still seeking to combat the deadly and dangerous impacts of environmental injustice in my district, and across the country, we must be taking more vigilant steps to protect our communities and the environment for current and future generations.

Instead, this partisan package repeals, weakens, or otherwise erodes the oversight and regulatory powers of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Army Corps of Engineers established by the Clean Water Act (CWA) over 50 years ago.

While the CWA requires projects to minimize their impact on the environment, this bill hamstring EPA's oversight of large-scale projects and changes the process by which it reviews "linear" projects like oil and gas pipelines.

At the same time, the bill also significantly hampers the legal action the government can take against polluters, shortens the timeline for judicial review, and removes opportunities for local governments to give input on projects affecting their communities.

Coupled with the ruling in *Sackett v. EPA* last year that changed the definition of what qualifies as protected waters under the CWA, this bill is simply a shameful attempt to swing the door open for corporations to maximize their profits at the expense of the health of the general public.

Although the bill purports to "cut red tape" and speed up the permitting process, adding a formal rulemaking process instead of maintaining the system by which the EPA currently issues guidance will actually slow it down and open these permits up to judicial review.

It is time we stop playing these senseless and harmful political games that only put the health of the American people at risk.

It is time for my Republican colleagues to join me and my Democratic colleagues across the aisle in working towards common sense, bipartisan solutions for the advancement and protection of our Nation and the American people.

Yet, here we are again, instead of finding real solutions to real crises—such as providing aid to our allies abroad and providing long-term funding to yet again avert a government shutdown—House Republicans have instead chosen to once again waste precious floor time on political stunts on behalf of Big Polluters.

For these reasons, this Resolution providing consideration for this bill and the other anti-environment bills in this rule package should be voted down.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this reckless and shortsighted bill.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-25, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 7023

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 "Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act".

SEC. 2. WATER QUALITY CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPARENCY.

(a) INFORMATION AND GUIDELINES.—Section 304(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(10) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE.—After the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall issue any new or revised water quality criteria under paragraph (1) or (9) by rule."

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Section 509(b)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1369(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "section 402, and" and inserting "section 402,"; and

(2) by inserting "and (H) in issuing any criteria for water quality pursuant to section 304(a)(10)," after "strategy under section 304(l)."

SEC. 3. FEDERAL GENERAL PERMITS.

Section 402(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(6)(A) The Administrator is authorized to issue general permits under this section for discharges of similar types from similar sources.

"(B) The Administrator may require submission of a notice of intent to be covered under a general permit issued under this section, including additional information that the Administrator determines necessary.

"(C) If a general permit issued under this section will expire and the Administrator decides not to issue a new general permit for discharges similar to those covered by the expiring general permit, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of such decision at least two years prior to the expiration of the general permit.

"(D) If a general permit issued under this section expires and the Administrator has not published a notice in accordance with subparagraph (C), until such time as the Administrator issues a new general permit for discharges similar to those covered by the expired general permit, the Administrator shall—

"(i) continue to apply the terms, conditions, and requirements of the expired general permit to any discharge that was covered by the expired general permit; and

"(ii) apply such terms, conditions, and requirements to any discharge that would have been covered by the expired general permit (in accordance with any relevant requirements for such coverage) if the discharge had occurred before such expiration."

SEC. 4. CONFIDENCE IN CLEAN WATER PERMITS.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH PERMITS.—Section 402(k) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(k)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(k) Compliance with" and inserting the following:

"(k) COMPLIANCE WITH PERMITS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), compliance with"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) SCOPE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), compliance with the conditions of a permit issued under this section shall be considered compliance with respect to a discharge of—

"(A) any pollutant for which an effluent limitation is included in the permit; and

"(B) any pollutant for which an effluent limitation is not included in the permit that is—

"(i) specifically identified as controlled or monitored through indicator parameters in the

permit, the fact sheet for the permit, or the administrative record relating to the permit;

"(ii) specifically identified during the permit application process as present in discharges to which the permit will apply; or

"(iii) whether or not specifically identified in the permit or during the permit application process—

"(I) present in any waste streams or processes of the point source to which the permit applies, which waste streams or processes are specifically identified during the permit application process; or

"(II) otherwise within the scope of any operations of the point source to which the permit applies, which scope of operations is specifically identified during the permit application process."

(b) EXPRESSION OF WATER QUALITY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(t) EXPRESSION OF WATER QUALITY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS.—If the Administrator (or a State, in the case of a permit program approved by the Administrator) determines that a water quality-based limitation on a discharge of a pollutant is necessary to include in a permit under this section in addition to any appropriate technology-based effluent limitations included in such permit, the Administrator (or the State) may include such water quality-based limitation in such permit only in the form of an effluent limitation that specifies—

"(1) the pollutant to which it applies; and

"(2) the numerical limit on the discharge of such pollutant, or the precise waterbody conditions to be attained with respect to such pollutant, required to comply with the permit."

SEC. 5. REDUCING PERMITTING UNCERTAINTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(c) The Administrator" and inserting the following:

"(c) SPECIFICATION OR USE OF DEFINED AREA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator";

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by inserting "during the period described in paragraph (2) and" before "after notice and opportunity for public hearings"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) PERIOD OF PROHIBITION.—The period during which the Administrator may prohibit the specification (including the withdrawal of specification) of any defined area as a disposal site, or deny or restrict the use of any defined area for specification (including the withdrawal of specification) as a disposal site, under paragraph (1) shall—

"(A) begin on the date on which an applicant submits all the information required to complete an application for a permit under this section; and

"(B) end on the date on which the Secretary issues the permit."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to a permit application submitted under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. NATIONWIDE PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) by striking "(e)(1) In carrying" and inserting the following:

"(e) GENERAL PERMITS ON STATE, REGIONAL, OR NATIONWIDE BASIS.—

"(1) PERMITS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "(2) No general" and inserting the following:

"(2) TERM.—No general"; and

(B) by striking “five years” and inserting “ten years”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the environmental effects of an activity under paragraph (1) or (2), the Secretary shall consider only the effects of any discharge of dredged or fill material resulting from such activity.

“(4) NATIONWIDE PERMITS FOR LINEAR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary shall maintain general permits on a nationwide basis for linear infrastructure projects that do not result in the loss of greater than ½-acre of waters of the United States for each single and complete project (as defined in section 330.2 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph)).

“(B) DEFINITION OF LINEAR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—In this paragraph, the term ‘linear infrastructure project’ means a project to carry out any activity required for the construction, expansion, maintenance, modification, or removal of infrastructure and associated facility for the transmission from a point of origin to a terminal point of communications or electricity or the transportation from a point of origin to a terminal point of people, water, wastewater, carbon dioxide, or fuel or hydrocarbons (in the form of a liquid, liquescent, gaseous, or slurry substance or supercritical fluid), including oil and gas pipeline facilities.

“(5) REISSUANCE OF NATIONWIDE PERMITS.—In determining whether to reissue a general permit issued under this subsection on a nationwide basis—

“(A) no consultation with an applicable State pursuant to section 6(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535(a)) is required;

“(B) no consultation with a Federal agency pursuant to section 7(a)(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)) is required; and

“(C) the requirements of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) shall be satisfied by preparing an environmental assessment with respect to such general permit.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONWIDE PERMIT PROGRAM.—In carrying out section 404(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may not finalize or implement any modification to—

(1) general condition 15 (relating to single and complete projects), as included in the final rule titled “Reissuance and Modification of Nationwide Permits” and published on January 13, 2021, by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers (86 Fed. Reg. 2868);

(2) the definition of single and complete linear project, as included in such final rule (86 Fed. Reg. 2877); or

(3) the definition of single and complete project, as included in section 330.2 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

SEC. 7. JUDICIAL REVIEW TIMELINE CLARITY.

Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (u);

(2) in subsection (u), as so redesignated, by striking “Nothing in the section” and inserting “SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section”; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (s) the following:

“(t) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any applicable provision of law relating to statutes of limitations, an action seeking judicial review of—

“(i) an individual or general permit issued under this section shall be filed not later than the date that is 60 days after the date on which the permit was issued; and

“(ii) verification that an activity is authorized by a general permit issued under this section shall be filed not later than the date that is 60 days after the date on which such verification was issued.

“(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to authorize an action seeking judicial review of the structure of, or authorization for, a State permit program approved pursuant to this section.

“(2) LIMITATION ON COMMENCEMENT OF CERTAIN ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no action described in paragraph (1)(A) may be commenced unless the action—

“(A) is filed by a party that submitted a comment, during the public comment period for the administrative proceedings related to the applicable action described in such paragraph, which comment was sufficiently detailed to put the Secretary or the State, as applicable, on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review; and

“(B) is related to such comment.

“(3) REMEDY.—If a court determines that the Secretary or the State, as applicable, did not comply with the requirements of this section in issuing an individual or general permit under this section, or in verifying that an activity is authorized by a general permit issued under this section, as applicable—

“(A) the court shall remand the matter to the Secretary or the State, as applicable, for further proceedings consistent with the court’s determination;

“(B) with respect to a determination regarding the issuance of an individual or general permit under this section, the court may not vacate, revoke, enjoin, or otherwise limit the permit, unless the court finds that activities authorized under the permit would present an imminent and substantial danger to human health or the environment for which there is no other equitable remedy available under the law; and

“(C) with respect to a determination regarding a verification that an activity is authorized by a general permit issued under this section, the court may not enjoin the activity, unless the court finds that the activity would present an imminent and substantial danger to human health or the environment for which there is no other equitable remedy available under the law.

“(4) TIMELINE TO ACT ON COURT ORDER.—If a court remands a matter under paragraph (2), the court shall set and enforce a reasonable schedule and deadline, which may not exceed 180 days from the date on which the court remands such matter, except as otherwise required by law, for the Secretary or the State, as applicable, to take such actions as the court may order.”.

SEC. 8. IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall begin a process to issue guidance on the implementation of the final rule published on September 8, 2023, by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency and titled “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’; Conforming” (88 Fed. Reg. 61964).

(b) PUBLIC COMMENT.—In issuing the guidance required under subsection (a), the Administrator and the Secretary shall—

(1) prior to such issuance, solicit comments from the public on such guidance; and

(2) ensure that such comments and any responses to such comments are made publicly available.

(c) COMPLIANCE.—Any guidance issued pursuant to this section shall comply with the decision of the Supreme Court in *Sackett v. EPA*, 598 U.S. 651 (2023).

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended,

shall be in order except those printed in House Report 118–428. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the 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. BERGMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118–428.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be construed as affecting the ban on oil and gas development in the Great Lakes described in section 386 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15941).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am here today to offer my amendment to H.R. 7023.

Michigan’s First District is home to more than 2,000 miles of Great Lakes coastline. It is by far the most of any congressional district, and it touches three of the five Great Lakes.

For those of us who call Michigan home, the Great Lakes play an invaluable role for our natural ecosystems, communities, economies, and our general way of life.

Protecting our lakes is a unifying goal that crosses all political lines.

My amendment is simple. It would clarify that nothing in this legislation would affect the longstanding ban on oil and gas drilling in the Great Lakes under the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

To be clear, I don’t believe a reasonable reading of H.R. 7023 would directly lead to drilling activities in our Great Lakes. Nonetheless, if there is one thing I have learned in my years in the military and here in Congress, Mr. Chair, you can’t always trust the Federal bureaucracy to do the reasonable and right thing.

The vital importance of the Great Lakes to those of us who live near them demands certainty and security. This is a concrete assurance that these protections, which have wide bipartisan support, will stay in place.

This is especially true when we are discussing permitting under the Clean Water Act, including for energy producers.

With this protection included, H.R. 7023 will be able to properly balance

sound environmental stewardship with responsible infrastructure development and cut the amount of red tape.

Providing regulatory certainty and clarity while maintaining longstanding protections, like the ban on Great Lakes drilling, is not a zero-sum game. We can and must do both.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clarifies that nothing in this act affects the existing ban on oil and gas drilling in the Great Lakes.

Legislation banning the issuing of new drilling permits in the Great Lakes was passed in 2005 with support from both parties.

□ 1545

While legislation before us does undermine Clean Water Act protections, it does not affect the existing ban on drilling in the Great Lakes.

Republicans would like to call this week energy week, so let's look at the state of American energy today. Despite what you hear on the other side of the aisle, we are experiencing a record oil boom in the United States—a record oil boom.

There is no war on oil. The United States is the largest crude oil producer in the world, outpacing Russia, Saudi Arabia, and other OPEC countries.

Last fall, President Biden had approved more permits for oil and gas drilling on public lands than the previous President had at the same point in his Presidency.

Through passage of the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act, President Biden and House Democrats are addressing both the immediate needs for affordable gas prices for consumers as well as the long-term investments in a clean energy future that will also tackle the climate crisis.

Already since the Inflation Reduction Act's passage, 292 major clean energy projects have been announced that would create over 100,000 jobs across the country.

Just like America can dominate both oil production and clean energy deployment, we can promote American energy while also ensuring protection of our environment.

I have no objection to the amendment or its adoption.

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chair, explicitly maintaining protections that prevent oil and gas drilling in the Great Lakes will provide certainty for the millions of Americans who call the region home

while we work to improve Federal permitting.

Mr. Chair, once again, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-428.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following:
SEC. 4. NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) TERMS.

Section 402(b)(1)(B) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(b)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) are for fixed terms—

“(i) not exceeding 10 years, for a permit issued to a State or municipality; and

“(ii) not exceeding 5 years, for a permit issued to any person not described in clause (i); and”.

Page 5, after line 4, insert the following:

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 402(l)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(l)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “section 402” and inserting “this section”; and

(B) by striking “federal” and inserting “Federal”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “Section” and inserting “section”; and

(B) by striking “402(p)(6)” and inserting “subsection (p)(6)”; and

(C) by striking “402(l)(3)(A),” and inserting “subparagraph (A),”; and

(D) by striking “402(l)(3)(A).” and inserting “such subparagraph.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and 47 States and U.S. territories with delegated authority under the Clean Water Act to issue permits for public works up to 10 years.

Under the Clean Water Act's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, NPDES, Federal, State, and territory regulators can issue permits for 5 years, and that is it. That arbitrary permit duration no longer matches the construction timeline for public works, like modernizing wastewater treatment plants and building new water recycling facilities.

When the Clean Water Act was signed into law in 1972, publicly owned wastewater treatment plants were being constructed principally to provide primary

or secondary treatment. Things have changed over the last five decades. Now, these plants are looking at tertiary and even higher standards, taking longer time for the engineering as well as the construction. Some of these plants are even installing fuel cells, such as in my district, Pittsburgh, California.

Increasing the NPDES permit from 5 to 10 years ensures that the Federal permitting process accurately reflects the timeframes to construct a public water project, upholding the Clean Water Act protections.

U.S. EPA and many State Clean Water Act regulators, including the California State Water Resources Control Board, have a backlog of permits, some of these multiple, multiple years. That is why many, if not most, of these NPDES permits issued nationwide expire long before they can be renewed and remain in effect, sometimes for years.

Mr. Chair, this amendment, if adopted, would clear the backlog and provide the necessary time to plan, engineer, and build the facilities.

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, although I claimed the time in opposition, I did, of course, note that I am not opposed. I support this amendment offered by my colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) as it furthers the purpose of the underlying legislation by offering more flexibility and regulatory certainty to permit holders.

This amendment will provide publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities with the ability to have their permits under section 402 of the Clean Water Act issued for 10 years, up from the current 5 years.

In doing so, the amendment will reduce administrative strains and bureaucracy, while giving communities more flexibility to take on important wastewater infrastructure projects with certainty.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the bipartisan support for this amendment. It makes a lot of sense to expand up to 10 years. It may be that an entity would like to have a permit for less than 10 years, and this amendment would allow that, but more importantly, it does allow a permit to go for a full 10 years.

The bipartisan support is much appreciated, even though it was presented in opposition, which I understand needed to be done to meet the rules.

Mr. Chairman, nevertheless, with that in mind, I urge my colleagues to vote “aye,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-428.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON CORPS STAFFING NEEDS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the staffing needs of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Corps of Engineers to process applications for, and issue, permits under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, based on the number of such applications submitted during the 5-year period preceding such date of enactment; and

(2) the impact that funding for additional full-time employees would have on processing timelines for such permits.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan and straightforward amendment to help pass the backlog of permits that have slowed down the development of infrastructure and energy projects across this country.

As the co-chair of the bipartisan Climate Solutions Caucus, I am very excited to be able to offer this amendment alongside my Republican co-chair, ANDREW GARBARINO, and caucus members DAVID VALADAO and MIKE LAWLER.

Our caucus has heard from businesses, experts, and agency officials that have all expressed the very same message: Permitting in our country takes too long, and our Nation's climate and infrastructure goals are being diminished as a result.

Ensuring timely review processes is also critical as our Nation hopes to maximize the potential of recent historic legislation, including the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. In other words, slow permitting means slower progress for our economy.

In issuing permits, the Federal Government does their due diligence to ensure that these projects will not cause

undue harm to our communities, waters, and environment. That said, under no circumstances should issues with agency staffing hamstring the permitting of projects, costing us good-paying jobs, time, and money for our businesses.

Unfortunately, the EPA faces a significant backlog. At the end of fiscal year 2023, the Agency's backlog of general permits under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System impacted 600 facilities nationwide. Further, in 2018, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers cited that the average time to complete a standard individual permit is 329 days.

Every day that a permit is not issued, time, jobs, and the potential vitality of an entire project may be lost. The EPA and the Army Corps have a responsibility to meet their regulatory permitting deadlines so that we can get shovels in the ground and projects online and on time.

That is why I offered this very straightforward and bipartisan amendment that will help us to better understand how staffing shortfalls are impacting permitting timelines. This amendment does two major things. It requires the EPA and the Army Corps to issue a report on the staffing needs that they have to process and issue permits under the Clean Water Act based on data over the last 5 years. The amendment also requires the agencies to cite the impact that funding for additional full-time employees might have on processing timelines.

This will allow Congress to be able to take any requisite action to be able to support the hardworking public servants who process these applications and who help reduce that backlog moving forward.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans alike, to support my bipartisan amendment. I thank those who have already supported this amendment, and I especially thank Ranking Member LARSEN for his leadership and support.

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would help provide Congress with useful information on the staffing needs for processing Clean Water Act permits.

Ensuring the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers have the necessary resources to issue permits combined with the commonsense permitting reforms included in the underlying legislation will benefit energy and other infrastructure projects in communities across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the bipartisan nature with which this amendment has been accepted and received. I urge my colleagues to vote “aye” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JAMES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 118-428.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ . SAVINGS CLAUSE RELATING TO PFAS.

Nothing in this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall affect the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct research on perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, today, I stand before my colleagues with a grave concern that demands our immediate attention.

The Great Lakes, the lifeblood of our region, are under siege from a silent yet deadly threat, PFAS chemicals. These persistent, toxic substances pose a significant risk to both human health and our environment. Congress cannot afford to turn a blind eye to this pressing issue. The health and well-being of Michigan and Great Lakes communities depend on it.

That is why I have submitted an amendment that would bar any of the provisions in this bill from attempting to impede research into PFAS chemicals. Stopping PFAS research would be a disservice to the public and to millions of Americans who rely on the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow political agendas to stand in the way of scientific progress and the health of our people. Our people are too important for that.

That is why I am similarly supporting an amendment from my friend, Representative JACK BERGMAN from Michigan, which would also ban gas and oil drilling in the Great Lakes.

This isn't a left versus right issue. This is an issue that impacts all of us and future generations.

Congress must do all that it can to protect the Great Lakes, and one step is supporting comprehensive research initiatives to fully understand the extent of PFAS contamination and its potential impacts.

We owe it to future generations to safeguard the Great Lakes and ensure they remain a source of clean water and natural beauty for years to come. Let us unite in our commitment to protect our environment and the health of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I ask all of my colleagues to please support this very important amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES).

Communities across the Nation have learned firsthand of the human health risks associated with forever chemicals such as PFAS, a pollutant that is found in wastewater of municipal treatment works as well as in industrial discharges.

EPA is actively addressing PFAS concerns both by pushing to identify and limit large-scale industrial discharges of PFAS to treatment systems as well as developing an enforcement discretion policy for municipalities that may simply have PFAS chemicals in their sewage through no fault of their own.

□ 1600

While I share the gentleman's concern about the health risks of PFAS, I would point out that the underlying bill may create greater incentives for discharges to underreport or look the other way when it comes to PFAS discharges.

Since 1994, EPA has had in place a "permit shield" policy that provides dischargers with legal protection if they are applied for in good faith, and with honest disclosures of all pollutants potentially contained in the discharge.

However, the underlying bill codifies an expanded version of the permit shield, applicable to any discharger, whether a municipal treatment plant, a mining site, or industrial discharger regardless of whether they have made good-faith disclosures of all pollutants.

EPA has indicated that this expanded permit shield creates a disincentive for permittees to identify pollutants that are part of their waste stream during the development of their permit, including PFAS.

We should not be creating incentives for permittees to ignore the discharge of these chemicals.

I support the gentleman's amendment to ensure that nothing in the act affects the EPA's authority to research PFAS chemicals. However, I do not support the provisions in the underlying bill that will undermine EPA's ability to track ongoing discharges of PFAS making it more challenging to utilize this research to help the communities threatened by PFAS.

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

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chair, once again, I thank my colleagues for supporting this very important bill. The Great Lakes is important to the entire United States of America and to Michigan especially.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MOOLENAAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 118-428.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 7 the following:

SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON PERMIT ISSUANCE.

Title IV of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 407. LIMITATION ON PERMIT ISSUANCE.

"(a) PROHIBITION.—No permit may be issued under this title for any discharge from a point source that is owned or operated by an entity that—

"(1) is subject to the jurisdiction of a foreign country of concern (as defined in section 9901(7) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4651(7)); or

"(2) is a subsidiary of an entity that is subject to the jurisdiction of a foreign country of concern (as so defined).

"(b) APPLICATION.—This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with the obligations of the United States under applicable international agreements."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Chair, my amendment is straightforward.

It prohibits the EPA from issuing a water permit to a company that is based in a foreign country of concern as well as any of its subsidiaries.

The countries of concern are China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea. This is common sense.

As a member of the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, I have seen firsthand how the CCP is trying to disrupt American leadership around the world and replace it with their own authoritarian regime.

Here at home, Americans feel like China is constantly taking advantage of our country and our freedoms. They are sick and tired of seeing the CCP fly spy balloons over our country, bribe our servicemembers to spy on us, hack our computer systems, poison our com-

munities with fentanyl, and depress our children with secret social media algorithms based in Beijing.

Mr. Chair, if you talked to constituents in your hometown and asked them if we should allow CCP-affiliated companies to use 700,000 gallons of water a day, they would all say, of course not.

Unfortunately, in my district, the CCP-affiliated company called Gotion is trying to bully its way into town. The company was rejected in a recall election last November and now it is suing a rural township over its plans to build a factory and use 700,000 gallons of water a day.

The EPA should not be issuing permits to CCP-affiliated companies and their subsidiaries.

We cannot allow China to take advantage of our country's natural resources.

My amendment is necessary, and it is common sense.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, for over 50 years, the Federal-State partnership created by the Clean Water Act has allowed communities to enjoy clean water and has given businesses the certainty they need to create jobs and spur economic growth.

Yet, if this amendment becomes law, both EPA and every State who has taken on responsibility for implementing the Clean Water Act would have to deny clean water permits for any—I underscore any—facility or activity associated with a foreign government of concern.

That means that any U.S. subsidiary of a company with economic ties to China, Russia, or any other foreign country of concern would, by statute, be denied the ability to operate and expand in this country if their activities trigger Clean Water Act review.

I know Representative MOOLENAAR is concerned about the announced \$2.3 billion investment in the State of Michigan that is likely to create an additional 2,350 good-paying jobs, and that Michigan Governor Whitman has called "... the biggest ever economic development project in northern Michigan. ..."

However, this amendment is not limited to Michigan. How many other U.S. subsidiaries of foreign companies will also be caught up in this amendment?

How will the General Electric appliance manufacturing plants in Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and South Carolina continue to operate if this amendment is adopted? GE Appliances is a subsidiary of a Chinese-owned company.

How will this amendment affect Smithfield Foods' operations in Maryland and Virginia if these facilities are

forever denied clean water permits because of their association with a Chinese owner?

Motorola is one of the world's leading manufacturers of smartphones; however, this Chinese-owned company has numerous offices and manufacturing facilities throughout the U.S., including a new 136,000-square-foot facility in Richardson, Texas.

Will the Moolenaar amendment make it logistically impossible for Motorola to continue to operate in the U.S.?

House Democrats have been leading the charge to ensure that the Clean Water Act continues to accomplish both goals—clean water and job creation.

House Democrats will continue to build a strong record of sustainable job creation and support of domestic manufacturing.

Prohibiting the issuance of Clean Water Act permits for projects that have investment from certain foreign entities is likely to be unimplementable, will increase the potential for litigation and delay, and ultimately only threatens clean water.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Chair, again, I would just restate for the Members that we are talking about countries of concern—China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea.

When we consider that China and the CCP have been flying spy balloons, bribing our servicemembers, poisoning our communities with fentanyl, and the malign activities that they are engaging in around the globe, why would we submit ourselves and our greatest natural resources? To me it is just common sense. When we are funding projects, when we are developing the future of our country, why would we further our dependence on our adversaries?

Mr. Chair, just in closing, I would ask our colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 6 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BEAN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 118-428.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 9. APPROVAL OF FLORIDA PERMIT PROGRAM.

The notice of the Environmental Protection Agency approving the State of Florida's

request to carry out a permit program for the discharge of dredged or fill material pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), published on December 22, 2020, and titled “EPA's Approval of Florida's Clean Water Act Section 404 Assumption Request” (85 Fed. Reg. 83553) shall have the force and effect of law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chair, ERROR: 404 not found. It is the dreaded computer message that appears when you visit a website or access a file that no longer exists.

Unfortunately, it is also the message that more than 1,000 critical development projects throughout the free State of Florida may receive due to the uncertainty surrounding the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's continued ability to issue section 404 program permits.

Lake County, Florida, alone estimates a billion dollars of economic development that now faces uncertainty. This is due to a District of Columbia Federal judge's decision to vacate Florida's 404 permitting program, a decision that will have serious implications for the future of our environment and our economy.

The ability for States like Florida, Michigan, and New Jersey to take the lead in regulating their natural resources is vital, but it is especially important for a State like Florida where our growing economy is contingent on the continued protection of our environment.

That is why my amendment simply seeks to provide permitting certainty to the now more than 1,000 projects that are lined up in limbo by codifying Florida's successful 404 program. Our program has proven time and time again that Florida can do a much better job, more efficiently and effectively, issuing permits for necessary projects better than the Federal Government has.

Mr. Chair, as Floridians, we understand the important role our environment plays in our economy and in Floridians' way of life.

Florida, please, is asking everybody to join us because we need the flexibility to make decisions that are best suited for the Sunshine State's environmental and economic needs, reduce project costs, and save taxpayer dollars, all while improving responsiveness to applicants and the communities' projects they serve.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues for their support of this important amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, the Clean Water Act was specifically enacted as a Federal-State partnership.

Today, EPA has approved 47 States to implement the point source discharge program under section 402 of the Clean Water Act. Their status as coregulators makes comprehensive implementation of the programs possible.

However, far fewer States have sought approval to regulate the discharge of dredge and fill materials under section 404 of the act, with only New Jersey and Michigan currently approved to implement this authority.

This amendment is directly related to whether Florida followed the rules in seeking approval of its own section 404 program.

Recently, a Federal district court struck down the previous administration's approval of Florida's 404 permit authority on the grounds that both State and Federal agencies failed to follow the rules in approving the State's program.

I am not opposed to the State of Florida or any State seeking to manage 404 authority within its border. However, this amendment seeks to legislatively mandate approval of a program, without changes, that was adopted without proper oversight and review.

The State of Florida can pursue implementing a 404 program, but through the proper approval process, and Congress should not mandate a program that has been deemed deficient by the courts.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chair, the Environmental Protection Agency still maintains a strict permit-by-permit oversight of Florida's permitting decisions, but you have heard me say that thousands of projects are on hold.

You may ask: What are you talking about, Congressman BEAN? What projects are we talking about? What projects are on hold right now?

Let me tell you what is on hold, Mr. Chair: Projects to restore Florida's Everglades and prevent damaging discharges from Lake Okeechobee are on hold; public projects to build sidewalks, improving bridges, utilities, roads, highways across the Sunshine State are on hold. We can't do them. Solar energy projects, including solar power stations and other electric utility projects impacting our grid in the Sunshine State are on hold; stormwater infrastructure repairs at U.S. Naval Air Station Pensacola damaged due to Hurricane Sally, but the repairs are on hold because we can't get the Federal Government to act fast. We are ready to go. We are ready to go.

What else is on hold? We have a school in Jacksonville, a desperately needed school ready to be built. It is on hold because the Federal Government put everything on hold.

Give us the chance to continue this important work in the State of Florida. I ask my colleagues to reconsider their opposition. Join us and let's take the Sunshine State back on course to bring these projects to light.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 118-428.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, strike lines 15 and 16, and insert the following:

“(B) LIMITATION.—A general permit issued under subparagraph (A) may not authorize an activity of an excluded project if the Comptroller General makes a determination—

“(i) during the period ending on September 30, 2026, that the total amount of covered credits claimed exceeds the amount of covered credits predicted to be claimed in the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office for fiscal years 2022 through 2026; or

“(ii) during the period ending on September 30, 2031, that the total amount of covered credits claimed exceeds the amount of covered credits predicted to be claimed in the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office for fiscal years 2027 through 2031.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) COVERED CREDIT.—The term ‘covered credit’ means any tax credit under the amendments made by sections 13101, 13102, and 13103 of Public Law 117-169 (commonly known as the Inflation Reduction Act).

“(ii) EXCLUDED PROJECT.—The term ‘excluded project’ means a linear infrastructure project for the transmission of electricity with respect to which—

“(I) the taxpayer has received or expects to receive a covered credit; and

“(II) the Secretary has not verified that an activity of the project is authorized by the applicable general permit before the date on which the Comptroller General makes a determination described in subparagraph (B).

“(iii) LINEAR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.—The term

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1085, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, after listening to the gentleman from Florida, I would like a double dose of whatever he is taking.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, what our amendment does is, it addresses some-

thing that I think both Conservatives and Liberals should be excited about. Let me explain.

Under the Inflation Reduction Act, this large, incredibly expensive energy bill, the Congressional Budget Office did an estimate to determine the total amount of subsidies that this legislation would cost the American taxpayers.

Then you have had folks like Goldman Sachs that have come in and done evaluations and determined that that assessment was likely off by a factor of three or even four. Let me say that again. The estimate was off by a factor of three or even four.

What the base text of this legislation does is it provides for an expedited processing or environmental review of Clean Water Act requirements. Our amendment simply says, once you hit that cap of how much the Congressional Budget Office said this bill was going to cost, said the Inflation Reduction Act was going to cost, you no longer get the expedited process strictly for linear infrastructure projects; otherwise, projects like transmission.

If you are a Conservative, you should be supportive because you are simply capping the cost of this project at what the Congressional Budget Office said. If you are a Liberal, you should be supporting this. You are beating up on the bill right now. This caps or stops the effect of that bill, the expedited process, once you hit the cap that you all thought you were voting for.

Mr. Chair, this should be a win-win. This should have bipartisan support. I think that this is an appropriate amendment. I think the amendment ensures that congressional intent is preserved by limiting the cost of these incredibly expensive subsidies at the rate that Members of Congress who supported this legislation believed they were spending.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, House Democrats support including local input in the development of large-scale infrastructure projects directly affecting local communities. During committee consideration of this bill, we opposed attempts to curtail local input.

This amendment is another example of curtailing local input to push through large-scale projects. However, this amendment picks winners and losers for what types of projects get to be jammed through the process.

I proudly supported the investments in our infrastructure and clean energy future contained in the bipartisan infrastructure law, the Chips and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act last Congress. These critical bills were about creating jobs, advancing infrastructure investments, and accelerating the economy of the future.

House Democrats are committed to improving the quality of life for all Americans by building the economy from the middle out and bottom up. However, this amendment gives a fast lane for Clean Water Act permits to fossil fuel-related linear infrastructure projects.

It purposefully excludes renewable energy projects, including solar and wind, and other clean energy alternatives that benefited from the Inflation Reduction Act. It also excludes efforts to bolster energy reliability and resilience and nationwide efforts to upgrade the Nation's energy grid. I suspect this is why several energy companies, including the American Clean Power Association, Edison Electric, and the Chamber of Commerce are also opposed to this amendment.

Again, I remain concerned that under H.R. 7023, local voices are excluded from the development of linear projects generally. Adding Mr. GRAVES' amendment, which doubles down on the fast-tracking of fossil fuel-related energy infrastructure, only strengthens my opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, as well. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentlewoman's response, and I guess I am confused. First of all, this amendment does absolutely nothing to affect public participation. It does nothing. It does nothing to affect local input.

This amendment does apply to linear infrastructure, as she noted, things like transmission, but I remind my friend across the aisle, the gentlewoman from California, you can't have your cake and eat it too.

The gentlewoman can't be opposed to the bill, opposed to the underlying bill, and then when this amendment actually stops the expedited authority under this legislation from applying to projects also say that she opposes that.

Does the gentlewoman support the expedited process or does she not? I am very baffled by the comments. Either you oppose the underlying bill or you support the underlying bill. I have heard the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) both express opposition to the underlying bill.

Let me say it again: What this amendment does, it says that this expedited authority only for linear transmission projects, linear infrastructure projects, it no longer applies once you hit the financial cap that was estimated, the financial score that was estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

I would think that my friend from California would actually be supportive of this legislation, of this amendment if she is opposed to the underlying bill. It caps, it curtails the use of this expedited authority that I believe Mr. HUFFMAN indicated he believed would result in trashing the environment.

Let me say it again, you can't have your cake and eat it too. If you are a fiscal conservative, you should support this amendment because it stops this runaway, excessive subsidy for technologies that have been around for 40, 50 years. It stops the expedited authority for those type of projects. Why we are subsidizing technologies that have been around for 40 or 50 years, I do not understand. Other countries don't in many cases.

Secondly, if you are a Liberal, if you are out there saying that this bill is extreme, you should support this amendment because it no longer allows for the expedited authority once you hit the financial cap.

I ask my friends across the aisle: Do you want to have your cake or do you want to eat it because you only get one choice?

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 99, noes 323, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—99

Armstrong	Hageman	Obornolte
Arrington	Hern	Ogles
Babin	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Bacon	Hill	Perry
Barr	Hunt	Posey
Bean (FL)	Issa	Radewagen
Biggs	Jackson (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (NC)	Johnson (SD)	Rosendale
Boebert	Jordan	Roy
Bost	Kustoff	Scalise
Brecheen	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Buck	LaTurner	Self
Burlison	Lesko	Sessions
Carey	Letlow	Smith (MO)
Cline	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Luna	Spartz
Clyde	Malliotakis	Stefanik
Collins	Mann	Steil
Crane	Massie	Steube
Davidson	McCaul	Tenney
Duncan	McClain	Thompson (PA)
Ellzey	McClintock	Tiffany
Fallon	McCormick	Timmons
Fry	McHenry	Van Drew
Good (VA)	Miller (IL)	Van Duyne
Gooden (TX)	Miller (OH)	Weber (TX)
Granger	Miller (WV)	Wenstrup
Graves (LA)	Mooney	Williams (NY)
Green (TN)	Moore (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Greene (GA)	Moran	Wittman
Griffith	Moylan	Womack
Grothman	Newhouse	Yakym
Guthrie	Norman	Zinke

NOES—323

Adams	Baird	Beyer
Aderholt	Balderson	Bice
Aguilar	Balint	Billirakis
Alford	Banks	Bishop (GA)
Allen	Barragán	Blumenauer
Allred	Beatty	Blunt Rochester
Amo	Bentz	Bonamici
Amodei	Bera	Bowman
Auchincloss	Bergman	Boyle (PA)

Brown	Gomez	Neguse
Brownley	Gonzales, Tony	Nickel
Buchanan	Gonzalez,	Norcross
Bucshon	Vicente	Norton
Budzinski	Gottheimer	Nunn (IA)
Burchett	Graves (MO)	Ocasio-Cortez
Burgess	Green, Al (TX)	Omar
Bush	Guest	Owens
Calvert	Harris	Pallone
Cammack	Harshbarger	Panetta
Caraveo	Hayes	Pappas
Carbajal	Himes	Pascrell
Cárdenas	Hinson	Payne
Carl	Horsford	Pelosi
Carson	Houchin	Peltola
Carter (GA)	Houlahan	Pence
Carter (LA)	Hoyer	Perez
Carter (TX)	Hoyle (OR)	Peters
Cartwright	Hudson	Petterson
Casar	Huffman	Pfluger
Case	Huizenga	Phillips
Casten	Ivey	Pingree
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Plaskett
Castro (TX)	Jackson (NC)	Pocan
Chavez-DeRemer	Jackson Lee	Porter
Cherfilus-	Jacobs	Quigley
McCormick	James	Ramirez
Chu	Jayapal	Raskin
Ciscomani	Jeffries	Reschenthaler
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Cleaver	Joyce (PA)	Ross
Clyburn	Kamlager-Dove	Rouzer
Cohen	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cole	Kean (NJ)	Ruppersberger
Comer	Keating	Rutherford
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Correa	Kelly (MS)	Sablan
Costa	Kelly (PA)	Salazar
Courtney	Khanna	Salinas
Craig	Kiggans (VA)	Sánchez
Crawford	Kiley	Sarbanes
Crenshaw	Kilmer	Scanlon
Crockett	Kim (CA)	Schakowsky
Crow	Kim (NJ)	Schiff
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Curtis	Kuster	Scholten
D'Esposito	LaHood	Schrier
Daids (KS)	LaLota	Schweikert
Davis (IL)	Lamborn	Scott (VA)
Davis (NC)	Landsman	Scott, David
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Sewell
Dean (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
DeLauro	Latta	Slotkin
DelBene	Lawler	Smith (NJ)
Deluzio	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Lee (FL)	Smucker
DesJarlais	Lee (NV)	Sorensen
Diaz-Balart	Lee (PA)	Soto
Dingell	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Donalds	Levin	Stansbury
Duarte	Lieu	Stanton
Dunn (FL)	Lofgren	Staubert
Edwards	Lucas	Steel
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Stevens
Escobar	Luttrell	Strickland
Eshoo	Lynch	Strong
Españat	Mace	Suozi
Estes	Magaziner	Swalwell
Evans	Maloy	Sykes
Ezell	Manning	Takano
Feenstra	Mast	Thanedar
Ferguson	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Finstad	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Fischbach	McClellan	Titus
Fitzgerald	McCollum	Tlaib
Fitzpatrick	McGarvey	Tokuda
Fleischmann	McGovern	Tonko
Fletcher	Meeks	Torres (CA)
Flood	Menendez	Torres (NY)
Foster	Meng	Trahan
Foushee	Meuser	Trone
Fox	Mfume	Turner
Franklin, Scott	Miller-Meeks	Underwood
Frost	Mills	Valadao
Fulcher	Moolenaar	Van Orden
Gaetz	Moore (UT)	Vargas
Gallagher	Moore (WI)	Vasquez
Gallego	Morelle	Veasey
Garamendi	Moskowitz	Velázquez
Garbarino	Moulton	Wagner
Garcia (IL)	Mrvan	Walberg
Garcia (TX)	Mullin	Waltz
Garcia, Mike	Murphy	Wasserman
Garcia, Robert	Nadler	Schultz
Gimenez	Napolitano	Waters
Goldman (NY)	Neal	

Watson Coleman	Westerman	Wild
Webster (FL)	Wexton	Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—15

Doggett	Grijalva	Pressley
Frankel, Lois	Harder (CA)	Rose
Golden (ME)	Kildee	Simpson
González-Colón	Molinaro	Williams (TX)
Gosar	Nehls	Wilson (FL)

□ 1651

Messrs. CARSON, GIMENEZ, JAMES, Ms. MALOY, Messrs. DUNN of Florida, RESCHENTHALER, EMMER, KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. STEEL, Messrs. MOOLENAAR, CARDENAS, LUTTRELL, Ms. OMAR, Messrs. COSTA, FULCHER and WEBSTER of Florida changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HUNT, FALLON, MOYLAN, and CLINE 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. There being no further amendment under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, 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. 7023) to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1085, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California). The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Scholten of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7023 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, nays 213, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—205

Adams	Garcia, Robert	Pappas
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Pascarell
Allred	Gomez	Payne
Amo	Gonzalez,	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Vicente	Peltola
Balint	Gottheimer	Perez
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Peters
Beatty	Hayes	Pettersen
Bera	Himes	Phillips
Beyer	Horsford	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Houlahan	Pocan
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley
Bonamici	Huffman	Ramirez
Bowman	Ivey	Raskin
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Brownley	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Budzinski	Jacobs	Ryan
Bush	Jayapal	Salinas
Caraveo	Jeffries	Sánchez
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Cárdenas	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Carson	Kaptur	Schiff
Carter (LA)	Keating	Schneider
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Scholten
Casar	Khanna	Schrier
Case	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Casten	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
Castor (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Castro (TX)	Kuster	Sherman
Cherfilus-	Landsman	Sherrill
McCormick	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin
Chu	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Lee (NV)	Soto
Cleaver	Lee (PA)	Spanberger
Clyburn	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Cohen	Levin	Stanton
Connolly	Lieu	Stevens
Correa	Lofgren	Strickland
Costa	Lynch	Suozi
Courtney	Magaziner	Swalwell
Craig	Manning	Sykes
Crockett	Matsui	Takano
Crow	McBath	Thanedar
Cuellar	McClellan	Thompson (CA)
Davids (KS)	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McGarvey	Titus
Davis (NC)	McGovern	Tlaib
Dean (PA)	Meeks	Tokuda
DeGette	Menendez	Tonko
DeLauro	Meng	Torres (CA)
DelBene	Mfume	Torres (NY)
Deluzio	Moore (WI)	Trahan
DeSaulnier	Morelle	Trone
Dingell	Moskowitz	Underwood
Doggett	Moulton	Vargas
Escobar	Mrvan	Vasquez
Eshoo	Mullin	Veasey
Españlat	Nadler	Velázquez
Evans	Napolitano	Wasserman
Fletcher	Neal	Schultz
Foster	Neguse	Waters
Foushee	Nickel	Watson Coleman
Frost	Norcross	Wexton
Galleo	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Garamendi	Omar	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Pallone	
Garcia (TX)	Panetta	

NAYS—213

Aderholt	Bost	Collins
Alford	Brecheen	Comer
Allen	Buchanan	Crane
Amodei	Buck	Crawford
Armstrong	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Arrington	Burchett	Curtis
Babin	Burgess	D'Esposito
Bacon	Burlison	Davidson
Baird	Calvert	De La Cruz
Balderson	Cammack	DesJarlais
Banks	Carey	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Carl	Donalds
Bean (FL)	Carter (GA)	Duarte
Bentz	Carter (TX)	Duncan
Bergman	Chavez-DeRemer	Dunn (FL)
Bice	Ciscomani	Edwards
Biggs	Cline	Ellzey
Bilirakis	Cloud	Emmer
Bishop (NC)	Clyde	Estes
Boebert	Cole	Ezell

Fallon	Kiggans (VA)	Perry
Feenstra	Kiley	Pfluger
Ferguson	Kim (CA)	Posey
Finstad	Kustoff	Reschenthaler
Fischbach	LaHood	Rodgers (WA)
Fitzgerald	LaLota	Rogers (AL)
Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Rosendale
Flood	Langworthy	Rouzer
Fox	Latta	Roy
Franklin, Scott	LaTurner	Rutherford
Fry	Lawler	Salazar
Fulcher	Lee (FL)	Scalise
Gaetz	Lesko	Schakowsky
Gallagher	Letlow	Schweikert
Garbarino	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Garcia, Mike	Lucas	Self
Gimenez	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Gonzales, Tony	Luna	Smith (MO)
Good (VA)	Luttrell	Smith (NE)
Gooden (TX)	Mace	Smith (NJ)
Granger	Malliotakis	Smucker
Graves (LA)	Maloy	Spartz
Graves (MO)	Mann	Stauber
Green (TN)	Massie	Steel
Greene (GA)	Mast	Stefanik
Griffith	McCaul	Steil
Grothman	McClain	Steube
Guest	McClintock	Strong
Guthrie	McCormick	Tenney
Hageman	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Harris	Meuser	Tiffany
Harshbarger	Miller (IL)	Timmons
Hern	Miller (OH)	Turner
Higgins (LA)	Miller (WV)	Valadao
Hill	Miller-Meeks	Van Drew
Hinson	Mills	Van Dwyne
Houchin	Moolenaar	Van Orden
Hudson	Mooney	Wagner
Huizenga	Moore (AL)	Walberg
Hunt	Moore (UT)	Waltz
Issa	Moran	Weber (TX)
Jackson (TX)	Murphy	Webster (FL)
James	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Johnson (SD)	Norman	Westerman
Jordan	Nunn (IA)	Williams (NY)
Joyce (OH)	Obernalte	Wilson (SC)
Joyce (PA)	Ogles	Wittman
Kean (NJ)	Owens	Womack
Kelly (MS)	Palmer	Yakym
Kelly (PA)	Pence	Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Frankel, Lois	Kildee	Simpson
Golden (ME)	Molinaro	Williams (TX)
Gosar	Nehls	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Pressley	
Harder (CA)	Rose	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1701

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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 213, noes 205, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—213

Aderholt	Babin	Bean (FL)
Alford	Bacon	Bentz
Allen	Baird	Bergman
Amodei	Balderson	Bice
Armstrong	Banks	Biggs
Arrington	Barr	Bilirakis

Bishop (NC)	Graves (LA)	Mills
Boebert	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Bost	Green (TN)	Mooney
Brecheen	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Buchanan	Grothman	Moore (UT)
Buck	Guest	Moran
Bucshon	Guthrie	Murphy
Burchett	Hageman	Newhouse
Burgess	Harris	Norman
Burlison	Harshbarger	Nunn (IA)
Calvert	Hern	Obernalte
Cammack	Higgins (LA)	Ogles
Carey	Hill	Owens
Carl	Hinson	Palmer
Carter (GA)	Houchin	Pence
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Perry
Chavez-DeRemer	Huizenga	Pfluger
Ciscomani	Hunt	Posey
Cline	Issa	Reschenthaler
Cloud	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)
Clyde	James	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Rosendale
Comer	Jordan	Rouzer
Crane	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Crenshaw	Kean (NJ)	Salazar
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Davidson	Kiggans (VA)	Scott, Austin
Davis (NC)	Kiley	Self
De La Cruz	Kim (CA)	Sessions
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Donalds	LaLota	Smith (NJ)
Duarte	LaMalfa	Smucker
Duncan	Lamborn	Spartz
Dunn (FL)	Langworthy	Stauber
Edwards	Latta	Steil
Ellzey	LaTurner	Stefanik
Emmer	Lawler	Steube
Estes	Lee (FL)	Strong
Ezell	Lesko	Tenney
Fallon	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Ferguson	Lucas	Timmons
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Fischbach	Luna	Valadao
Fitzgerald	Luttrell	Van Drew
Fitzpatrick	Mace	Van Dwyne
Fleischmann	Malliotakis	Van Orden
Flood	Maloy	Wagner
Fox	Mann	Walberg
Franklin, Scott	Massie	Waltz
Fry	Mast	Weber (TX)
Fulcher	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	McClain	Wenstrup
Gallagher	McClintock	Westerman
Garbarino	McCormick	Williams (NY)
Garcia, Mike	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Gimenez	Meuser	Wittman
Gonzales, Tony	Miller (IL)	Womack
Good (VA)	Miller (OH)	Yakym
Gooden (TX)	Miller (WV)	Zinke
Granger	Miller-Meeks	

NOES—205

Adams	Cherfilus-	Frost
Aguilar	McCormick	Galleo
Allred	Chu	Garamendi
Amo	Clark (MA)	Garcia (IL)
Auchincloss	Clarke (NY)	Garcia (TX)
Balint	Cleaver	Garcia, Robert
Barragán	Clyburn	Goldman (NY)
Beatty	Cohen	Gomez
Bera	Connolly	Gonzalez,
Beyer	Correa	Vicente
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Courtney	Green, Al (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Craig	Griffith
Bonamici	Crockett	Hayes
Bowman	Crow	Himes
Boyle (PA)	Davids (KS)	Horsford
Brown	Davis (IL)	Houlahan
Brownley	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Budzinski	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Bush	DeLauro	Huffman
Caraveo	DelBene	Ivey
Carbajal	Deluzio	Jackson (IL)
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Jackson (NC)
Carson	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carter (LA)	Doggett	Jacobs
Cartwright	Escobar	Jayapal
Casar	Eshoo	Jeffries
Case	Españlat	Johnson (GA)
Casten	Evans	Kamlager-Dove
Castor (FL)	Fletcher	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Foster	Keating
	Foushee	Kelly (IL)

Khanna	Nickel	Sherrill
Kilmer	Norcross	Slotkin
Kim (NJ)	Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (WA)
Krishnamoorthi	Omar	Sorensen
Kuster	Pallone	Soto
Landsman	Panetta	Spanberger
Larsen (WA)	Pappas	Stansbury
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Stanton
Lee (CA)	Payne	Stevens
Lee (NV)	Pelosi	Strickland
Lee (PA)	Peltola	Suozi
Leger Fernandez	Perez	Swalwell
Levin	Peters	Sykes
Lieu	Pettersen	Takano
Lofgren	Phillips	Thannedar
Lynch	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Magaziner	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Manning	Porter	Titus
Matsui	Quigley	Tlaib
McBath	Ramirez	Tokuda
McClellan	Raskin	Tonko
McCollum	Ross	Torres (CA)
McGarvey	Ruiz	Torres (NY)
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Trahan
Meeks	Ryan	Trone
Menendez	Salinas	Underwood
Meng	Sanchez	Vargas
Mfume	Sarbanes	Vasquez
Moore (WI)	Scanlon	Veasey
Morelle	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Moskowitz	Schiff	Wasserman
Moulton	Schneider	Schultz
Mrvan	Scholten	Waters
Mullin	Schrier	Watson Coleman
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wexton
Napolitano	Scott, David	Wild
Neal	Sewell	Williams (GA)
Neguse	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—14

D'Esposito	Harder (CA)	Rose
Frankel, Lois	Kildee	Simpson
Golden (ME)	Molinaro	Williams (TX)
Gosar	Nehls	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Pressley	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1709

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide regulatory and judicial certainty for regulated entities and communities, increase transparency, and promote water quality, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 96, "nay" on rollcall No. 97, "yea" on rollcall No. 98, "nay" on rollcall No. 99, "yea" on rollcall No. 100 and "nay" on rollcall No. 101.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 96, H. Res. 987; "nay" on rollcall No. 97, H. Con. Res. 86 "yea" on rollcall No. 98, H.R. 1836; "nay" on rollcall No. 99, Mr. Graves of Louisiana amendment No. 8; "yea" on rollcall No. 100, motion to recommit H.R. No. 7023; and "nay" on rollcall No. 101, H.R. 7023.

□ 1715

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 1068

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove myself as a cosponsor of H. Res. 1068.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Alabama). The gentleman's request is granted.

HONORING HENRY BELL OF EAST TEXAS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate my friend, Henry Bell, on 35 years of service to the Tyler Area Chamber of Commerce. This incredible milestone is a testament to his dedication, leadership, and unwavering commitment to the economic growth of the east Texas community.

Throughout Henry's tenure, he has been a driving force behind the chamber of commerce's success.

Henry's deep knowledge of the resources, traditions, and history of east Texas, combined with his natural ability to build strong relationships, have helped attract new businesses and create countless jobs in east Texas.

Under his guidance, the Tyler Area Chamber of Commerce has become a beacon of economic development, serving as a valuable resource and support system for businesses large and small.

The Tyler Area Chamber is a regional top five chamber boasting more than 2,000 member businesses, organizations, and individuals.

Beyond his professional contributions, Henry has sought to serve the Tyler community by dedicating his time and talents outside of work and in keeping with the traditions of five generations of Bells who have served before him.

Once again, I congratulate Henry Bell on this remarkable milestone. The east Texas community is proud to have him, and we have been blessed because of him.

HONORING EUGENE CORNACCHIA

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Eugene Cornacchia, the longest serving president of St. Peter's University in Jersey City, New Jersey.

President Cornacchia is retiring this year after 17 years leading this prestigious university.

During his tenure, President Cornacchia helped St. Peter's become a university and gain national recognition. He helped start the university's first doctoral programs and the new schools of business, nursing, and education. He oversaw the construction of

the new student center, Panepinto Hall, and the creation of the STEM empowerment center.

In addition, President Cornacchia secured more than \$134 million in funding and \$25 million in Federal grants for the school.

I enjoyed being there along with my two sons, Donald and Jack, to watch St. Peter's magical run during the 2022 NCAA tournament. Since then, they both have graduated from the school. I will be rooting for the Peacocks during tonight's tournament, as well.

Mr. Speaker, President Cornacchia is an exceptional leader and will be missed at St. Peter's University.

HONORING JOHN KRYGER, REVERED FDNY VETERAN

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor John Kryger, a revered FDNY veteran and stalwart of Rockland County, who passed away on March 18, 2024, at the age of 81. John's work to improve fire safety and his service to our community exemplify a life dedicated to protecting others.

Serving with distinction in the FDNY from 1965 to 1986, he later became deputy fire coordinator for Rockland County, passionately advocating for fire safety and prevention since 2004.

John's impactful journalism, notably the "Fire's Deadly Rage" series, sparked significant community action, leading to a surge in smoke alarm installations across Rockland County. His dedication extended into education as a fire instructor and his leadership with the Rockland County Illegal Housing Task Force, tirelessly working to enforce fire safety and building codes.

Beyond his professional achievements, John's involvement in the West Haverstraw Volunteer Fire Department and numerous fire service associations highlighted his commitment to his community. His legacy as a firefighter, educator, and advocate leaves a lasting impact on Rockland County.

We extend our deepest sympathies to his family, his many friends, and his beloved colleagues in the fire service and remember John Kryger for the profound impact he had on making our community safer.

His legacy of dedication and service will continue to inspire future generations.

KULDEEP RAWAT AWARD

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a hometown university and HBCU making a gigantic impact in northeastern North