

world's freshwater drinking supply, and certainly that makes them a natural resource unparalleled on the planet.

This legislation, which would establish a national committee to study our Nation's water needs and to make recommendations for a comprehensive national water strategy, sounds very good and very noncontroversial at first blush. But whenever a national water policy is first discussed, we in Michigan and the Great Lakes Basin get very nervous. And whether it is due to population expansion and to dryer areas of the Nation in the South or the West or global warming or whatever, water is going to be a very important need for many in the 21st century.

In fact, just last year, Mr. Speaker, Business Week magazine did a cover story about why the great oilman T. Boone Pickens thinks water is actually the new oil. As a result of these challenges, some have begun to promote the idea of a natural water policy to deal with these challenges, and attention will undoubtedly turn to the places that have freshwater like the Great Lakes. There have been numerous examples of this over the decades on both sides of the aisle here. But let me illustrate a recent one.

During the 2008 Presidential campaign, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, who was then running for President, told the Las Vegas Sun, "I want a national water policy. We need a dialogue between the States to deal with issues like water conservation, water reuse technology, water delivery, and water production." And he went on to say, "States like Wisconsin are awash with water."

Fortunately, in order to prevent efforts by others to divert Great Lakes water outside the Basin, last fall we enacted the Great Lakes Compact, which reserves for the Governors of the Great Lakes States the opportunity to regulate diversions of water from the Great Lakes Basin. The compact bans new and increased diversions of water outside the Great Lakes Basin with only limited, highly regulated exceptions, and it establishes a framework for each State and the two provinces in Canada to enact laws protecting the Basin. And after being ratified by the Great Lakes State, the compact passed this House last September by a vote of 390-25, and the Senate actually passed it under unanimous consent, was then signed into law by then-President Bush.

In order to ensure that this new water initiative does not infringe on the principles associated with the Great Lakes Compact, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee yesterday. Regrettably, it was not made in order. Quite simply, my amendment would have prevented the interagency committee, the National Water Initiative Coordination Office, the National Water Research and Assessment Plan from considering or promoting policies that would undermine

or interfere with the principles of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact.

The Great Lakes, as I said, are the very identity of my State of Michigan and all of us in the Great Lakes Basin, and we all take their care very seriously. My constituents will not abide even the prospect of a diversion of the Great Lakes water to other areas of the country where growth is beginning to outstrip their resources. And some might argue that the Great Lakes Compact provides all of the protections that we need.

I do agree that there are very strong protections in the compact, but I also fear that everything is subject to change. And while I am not suggesting that this legislation aims to divert Great Lakes water, it also does nothing to protect them or to protect and prohibit diversion either. Such protections would make, certainly, my constituents and all the people that live in the Great Lakes Basin much more comfortable with the establishment of a national water policy. And since those protections are not included in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing both this rule and the bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Michigan for her insightful comments and certainly her strong leadership on protecting what I believe to be the greatest natural resource not only in America but also in North America and our water supply.

I would inquire if the other side has any other speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. No, we do not.

I thank my friend for the handling of the rule on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply reiterate that while this issue is of great importance, there are many other issues facing this Nation, and for this entire week for this Congress to have done nothing else during this entire week is really unfortunate and it shows the manner in which the majority of this Congress, the leadership of the majority of this Congress is running this Congress, and the American people are finding out. They are discovering it.

We have no further speakers. At this time, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for his management of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for working to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor. As I said earlier, there really is nothing more important or elemental than our water and our water supply. We must manage it wisely. There is just too much at stake if we do not. I believe this bill is going to go a long way towards improving the way we manage our most precious natural resource and ensure that it is clean, safe, and abundant for future generations.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1145.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, in accordance with the qualifications specified under section 1238(b)(3)(E) of Public Law 106-398, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, in consultation with the ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individuals to the United States-China Economic Security Review Commission:

Dennis Shea of Virginia, for a term expiring December 31, 2010.

Robin Cleveland of Virginia, for a term expiring December 31, 2010, vice Mark Esper of Virginia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, appoints the following members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), Chairman.

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352 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. 1145.

□ 1044

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. 1145) to implement a National Water Research and Development Initiative, and for other purposes, with Ms. SPEIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GORDON Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1145, the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009.

Thirty-six States expect to experience significant water shortages by the year 2013. Diminished supplies of water and intense competition for limited resources are forcing local water agencies to make tough decisions on water allocations and limiting access to needed water by businesses and families.

When severe water shortages occur, the economic impact is substantial. In 2007, the Tennessee Valley Authority was forced to shut down a nuclear reactor due to a lack of acceptable cooling water in the Tennessee River. According to a report from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, each of the eight water shortages over the past 20 years from drought and heat waves resulted in \$1 billion or more in monetary losses. The Association of California Water Agencies reported in April of 2008 that California is now losing income and jobs due to the State's water supply crisis.

Over 20 Federal agencies carry out research and development on some aspect of water supply, water quality, or water management. Despite spending millions of dollars on research at each of these agencies, an increase in the number of water shortages and emerging conflicts over water supply suggest that we are still inadequately prepared to address the Nation's water management issue.

A new commitment is necessary to ensure that the United States can meet the water challenges over the next 20 years and onward. As chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, I have tasked the committee with advancing this issue through hearings and with legislation to address techno-

logical and strategic deficiencies at the Federal level. Our committee held hearings in 2008 and 2009 to examine the problems associated with dwindling water supplies across the Nation and to receive testimony as to how the Federal Government can help meet these challenges.

I am proud of the bipartisan support and collaboration that resulted in H.R. 1145. Ranking Member RALPH HALL has been a champion of produced water utilization legislation, and this bill incorporates research to pursue the goals established in his bill, H.R. 469. We are happy to accept constructive amendments from other Members of the minority, and the bill was reported out of the committee in a strong bipartisan manner.

H.R. 1145 will coordinate national research and development efforts on water and provide a clear path forward to ensure adequate water supplies for generations to come. This bill will ensure that we have an effective national water strategy that uses Federal research and development dollars efficiently and eliminates redundant programs.

H.R. 1145 has been endorsed by the National Beverage Association, by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Water Innovations Alliance, the National Resource Defense Council, Water Environment Research Foundation, the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, Food and Water Watch, Water Research Foundation, Alliance Environmental, and Clean Water Action.

In tough economic times, it is imperative that we use every dollar we spend effectively. Coordination of Federal agencies, activities, and strong partnerships with the State, local and tribal governments will ensure that Federal programs are focused on areas of greatest concern and that our efforts are complementary and effective.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The National Water Research and Development Initiative Act is the Science and Technology Committee's response to a lot of recommendations that were made by the country's top scientists on water research and development.

Our water supply is of vital importance to the health and well-being of our Nation, and this bill, as passed out of the committee and the good work that was done in the committee, demonstrates an effort on both sides to address concerns over water research.

No State is immune to water problems, whether there is too little of it or an overabundance of it. Yet in the last quarter century, our knowledge of water resources has been based on research that was conducted in the middle of the last century. While I support the concept behind the National Water Research and Development Initiative

Act, issues remain that need to be further addressed.

I am still convinced that several provisions of H.R. 1145 may duplicate provisions found in H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Lands Act of 2009, specifically the SECURE Water Act. We have to be mindful to ensure that these two bills complement each other and do not create additional bureaucratic burdens on water research efforts.

In addition to the concerns of repetitious Federal efforts, I am cognizant that the complex responsibility for developing and managing the Nation's water resources are shared between Federal, State, local, even tribal and private interests. Several Federal water laws have recognized States as having primacy over the allocation and use of water. This notion has been further reinforced by Supreme Court decisions. Therefore, we have to be very careful not to undermine the historical responsibility of State and local governments on managing their water resources. It is vitally important that the authorities given in this bill do not supersede or replicate efforts of these at the levels that I have just laid out.

Furthermore, I am concerned that the vague nature and description of the "National Water Census" in this bill may be a step toward federalizing groundwater, surface water, and other water resources normally managed by State and local entities. To that end, we offered and passed an amendment in committee to ensure State, local and tribal participation in coordination efforts. Previous efforts to organize water research and management have been generalized in what they call "top-down" agendas, with little or no participation from the States or local levels. The intent of this amendment was to encourage a true dialogue between the levels of government.

I am pleased that the chairman included language in the bill expanding the Energy-Intensive Industries Program established in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to include "research to develop water-efficient technologies that increase energy efficiency, including utilization of impaired water sources in production."

During the full committee markup, questions were posed about the definition of "impaired waters." These questions sought to clarify that impaired waters included water extracted during oil and gas exploration and production, also known as produced water. I applaud this effort and note that as a potentially significant source of water, the language of this bill should be interpreted to be inclusive of all sources of nonpotable water.

As we move forward with today's debate on H.R. 1145, I would like to commend the many Members who offered amendments in order to attempt to make this a better bill. However, there are several amendments that give me some concern. I am very hopeful that today's debate will address any apprehension and allow us to move the bill forward.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me again thank Ranking Member HALL for his help in this bill. We have had a number of hearings over the last 2 years. We have had open forums, we have had witnesses that have presented their testimony. He outlined a variety of legitimate concerns that came about at the committee level, such as produced water and getting a better definition. It was a better bill because of his help, and I thank him for that.

Concerning the Public Lands Act, I will just point out, as I had earlier, that the Public Lands Act, which was in the other body, is an implementation legislation, where this is legislation for research.

With that, I now would like to yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) such time as she may consume, again, an important member of our committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 1145, the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act. This bill is of great interest to me, as I serve as Chair of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment within the Transportation Committee.

My city of Dallas is a beautiful area with the Trinity River running through it. Protecting Dallas from flooding and ensuring the quality of the Trinity and surrounding environments are important to me and to my constituents.

Federally funded research on water is important to ensure an adequate supply of clean drinking water for our Nation. H.R. 1145 will ensure coordination among research programs at the different Federal agencies that support water research.

Whether the issue is storm water and flood mitigation, clean water, or watershed quality, investments in this area are critical. The type of research involves scientists who work in interdisciplinary teams, blending their individual talents in chemistry, microbial ecology, invertebrate biology, watershed ecology, and ecosystem modeling.

I want to thank Chairman GORDON for his leadership and Ranking Member HALL. I want to also thank him for incorporating amendments suggested by members of the committee, one including me.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009. I thank Chairman GORDON and the Committee for working hard to introduce this important legislation.

Demand for water resources has increased, while our management technology and infrastructure has essentially remained unchanged since the boom of water resource-related legislation in the 1970s and 1980s. In tandem with the rise in population and shift to different regions, the increase of water use by busi-

nesses, agriculture, and other interests demonstrates the need for this important legislation. The national population explosion has already begun to stress the water resources across the country. In Colorado alone, the population has grown by over 14 percent since 2000, a common theme across the Western states and the Southeast. Our nation is experiencing water supply and quality control challenges at all levels. This legislation ensures that current demand is met, that future supply is available, and that efforts requiring immediate attention are coordinated in an effective manner.

I am grateful that Chairman GORDON and the Committee saw fit to include the language of my amendment, which creates a pilot program that will serve as a national model for conservation through energy audits of water facilities. The Environmental Protection Agency will use this model to demonstrative the effectiveness of energy audits and implement similar programs throughout the country. I thank the Chairman and the Committee staff for recognizing this important priority.

The Congressional Budget Office indicates that if enacted, this legislation would cost \$8 million over the next four years. That equates to a mere 6 cents per American or 14 cents per average American family. According to an EPA study in 2002, "If capital investments remain at current levels, the potential gap between 2000 and 2019 would be approximately \$122 billion for wastewater infrastructure and \$102 billion for drinking water infrastructure." We are in a major economic crisis in this country. With increases in population over that same period expected to exponentially rise, inaction now could spell fiscal disaster for many communities for decades to come.

Many federally-coordinated programs have been enacted in the past with great success, including systems for forecasting floods and droughts and the development of water treatment and wastewater technologies, just to name a few. These have allowed our country to better manage and enhance our water resources. The legislation before us coordinates the activities of over 20 federal agencies currently charged with separately devising water resource policy, leading to less confusion over authority and implementation, which results in greater efficiency and savings for taxpayers.

Access to clean, reliable sources of water is a non-partisan issue. It affects every social, political, and economic class, affecting the prosperity and security of our communities. All Americans are looking to government to provide a forward-looking, scientifically based solution to a burgeoning problem.

We need a proactive approach to solving water resource issues in this country, one that addresses economic and environmental concerns. This bill will help ensure proper funding, maintenance, expansion, and enhancement of our conventional water and wastewater infrastructure, creating a greener, more energy efficient system for the future.

On behalf of my constituents in Colorado, and all Americans who elected us to protect their right to access to clean, reliable sources of fresh water, I urge my colleagues to vote "Yes" for this bill.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1145, the "National Water Research and Development Initiative Act." I am proud to support Chairman GORDON's legislation as a cosponsor of the bill. I thank the

Chairman, along with Chairman STUPAK and the Science Committee staff for bringing this bill to the floor. My home state of Utah is the second driest state in the nation. Over the past year, Utah has overcome a twelve year drought that threatened major industries in my district. This water shortage threatens recreation, tourism, ranching, and agriculture. All of these industries rely heavily on water usage.

This bill coordinates national research and development efforts on water and provides a clear path forward to ensure adequate water supplies for generations to come. It will help ensure that places like Utah have access to an effective national water strategy.

That is why I offered an amendment to this legislation in Committee which creates a data collection system to quantify and define the nation's water supply or the systems that produce this resource. I am pleased that my language is included in this bill.

This bill will help quantify water usage by allowing water users to share best practices and data in order to improve water resource management.

Utah's lack of water is a common story in the west and increasingly in other parts of the nation. The lack of water in Utah cripples economies and I am looking forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure this legislation is passed.

Thank you and I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. MINNICK. Mr. Chair, Idaho and the other Western states continue to deal with difficult water issues brought on by years of drought. We're tired of fighting over water, and we're ready for smart solutions to keep our cities strong, our drinking water clean and our crops healthy.

Today, the House will consider H.R. 1145, National Water Research and Development Initiative Act. This bill, sponsored by my colleague BART GORDON, coordinates research efforts on water and provides a clear path forward to ensure adequate water supplies for years to come.

My amendment will help our Nation better manage water by highlighting the usefulness of our nation's water research facilities and the need for these facilities to have what they need for groundbreaking research to help states like mine, where water issues are of great concern to every citizen.

Our nation depends on robust water research to help find better ways to manage shortages and severe droughts so that Idaho farmers, businesses and growing cities will have a dependable, clean water supply and so our energy backbone, the West's many power-producing dams, are able to function at optimum capacity. Research facilities compile data, coordinate with agencies, and provide the public with comprehensive information that will help us confront water issues as they arise. I urge my colleagues to support the manager's amendment to this bill that includes the Minnick of Idaho amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act.

There is a tendency to take the availability of clean drinking water for granted. Even in a state like Michigan, which is surrounded by water, we have become increasingly aware that the Great Lakes are a finite resource. To that end, the eight Great Lakes states came together last year and adopted a compact to

manage and protect the Lakes. With the approval of the Great Lakes Compact by Congress, at long last we closed the door to bulk diversion of Great Lakes water. The Compact also establishes a comprehensive management framework to protect this shared resource and requires Great Lake states to control their own large-scale water use.

In other parts of the Nation, it is clear that water supplies are under increasing stress. Drought, population increases; and growing demand has resulted in water shortages in many areas, and these shortages are expected to become more pronounced over time. Currently, more than 20 federal agencies carry out research on water, water quality, and water management. The bill before the House will begin to coordinate national research and development efforts on water to provide the tools and information to manage water resources more effectively.

I want to make clear that nothing in this legislation authorizes, encourages or mentions water diversion from the Great Lakes. That is off the table. What is under discussion today is better coordination of programs that already exist to improve federal activities on water, involving research, data collection, modeling, education and the development of technology to enhance water quality and supply. As much as any other region, the Great Lakes states stand to benefit from more effective use of federal water research and development dollars.

Let me also express my support for the amendment offered by Representatives KIRK and QUIGLEY which requires the National Water Research and Assessment Plan established in this legislation to include long-term projections of water levels and ice cover of major water bodies, especially the Great Lakes. The loss of winter ice on the Lakes results in faster evaporation of the water. We need better data to understand the decline of ice cover in the Great Lakes and the impact this decline has on water levels in the Lakes.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WELCH). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 1145

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) **INITIATIVE AND PURPOSE.**—*The President shall implement a National Water Research and Development Initiative (in this Act referred to as the "Initiative"). The purpose of the Initiative is to improve the Federal Government's role in designing and implementing Federal water re-*

search, development, demonstration, data collection and dissemination, education, and technology transfer activities to address changes in water use, supply, and demand in the United States, including providing additional support to increase water supply through greater efficiency and conservation.

(b) **INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—*Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish, or designate, an interagency committee to implement the Initiative under subsection (a). The Office of Science and Technology Policy shall chair the interagency committee.*

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—*The interagency committee shall include a representative from each agency that conducts research related to water or has authority over resources that affect water supply, as well as a representative from the Office of Management and Budget.*

(3) **FUNCTIONS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.**—*The interagency committee shall—*

(A) *develop a National Water Research and Assessment Plan (in this Act referred to as the "plan") in accordance with subsection (c) and in coordination with State, local, and tribal governments;*

(B) *coordinate all Federal research, development, demonstration, data collection and dissemination, education, and technology transfer activities pertaining to water;*

(C) *encourage cooperation among Federal agencies and State, local, and tribal governments with respect to water-related research, development, and technological innovation activities to avoid duplication of effort and to ensure optimal use of resources and expertise;*

(D) *facilitate technology transfer, communication, and opportunities for information exchange with non-governmental organizations, State and local governments, tribal governments, industry, and other members of the stakeholder community through the office established in paragraph (4);*

(E) *provide guidance on outreach to minority serving institutions that are eligible institutions under section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067a(a)) to encourage such institutions to apply for funding opportunities specified in the plan;*

(F) *encourage cooperation between Federal agencies, State and local governments, and tribal governments to develop standard methods for collecting, managing, and disseminating data on water; and*

(G) *not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter—*

(i) *identify from each agency described in paragraph (2) the statutory or regulatory barriers preventing the use of any technology, technique, data collection method, or model that would contribute to greater availability of water resources in the United States through enhanced efficiency and conservation; and*

(ii) *submit a report of the findings from clause (i) to Congress.*

(4) **NATIONAL WATER INITIATIVE COORDINATION OFFICE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—*Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish a National Water Initiative Coordination Office (in this Act referred to as the "Office"), with full-time staff, to—*

(i) *provide technical and administrative support to the interagency committee;*

(ii) *serve as a point of contact on Federal water activities for government agencies, organizations, academia, industry, professional societies, and others to exchange technical and programmatic information; and*

(iii) *communicate with the public on the findings and recommendations of the interagency committee based on the activities conducted pursuant to the Initiative.*

(B) **FUNDING.**—*The operation of the Office shall be supported by funds contributed from*

each agency represented on the interagency committee.

(c) **NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **PLAN DEVELOPMENT.**—*The plan required under subsection (b)(3)(A) shall establish the priorities for Federal water research, including federally funded research, and assessment for the 4-year period beginning in the year in which the plan is submitted to Congress. In the development of the plan, the interagency committee shall consider and utilize recommendations and information from State, local, and tribal governments and contained in reports that have addressed water research needs, including the 2007 report issued by the Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality (SWAQ) of the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Environment and Natural Resources and recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences.*

(2) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.**—*The plan shall—*

(A) *identify each current program and activity of each Federal agency related to the Initiative;*

(B) *identify funding levels for the previous fiscal year for each program and, if applicable, each activity identified in subparagraph (A);*

(C) *set forth a strategy and a timeline to achieve the outcomes described in subsection (d) and shall describe—*

(i) *each activity required of each agency responsible for contributing to each such outcome;*

(ii) *the funding levels necessary to achieve each such outcome; and*

(iii) *the distribution of funds between each agency based on such agency's role in carrying out such activity;*

(D) *be subject to a 90-day public comment period and shall address suggestions received and incorporate public input received, as appropriate; and*

(E) *be submitted to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.*

(d) **WATER RESEARCH OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENTS.**—*The plan shall outline and direct agencies under the interagency committee to work to achieve the following outcomes:*

(1) *Implementation of a National Water Census, which shall include the collection of data on national water resources to create a comprehensive database that includes information about the quantity, availability, and quality of ground water and surface water resources.*

(2) *Development of a new generation of water monitoring techniques.*

(3) *Development of technologies for enhancing reliable water supply, water reuse, and pollution prevention.*

(4) *Development of innovative technologies and tools to enhance water quality, including advanced water treatment and water purification technologies.*

(5) *Development of innovative technologies and tools to enhance water-use efficiency and tools to encourage public acceptance of such technologies and tools.*

(6) *Development of tools and processes to facilitate resolution of conflicts over water resources.*

(7) *Development of information technology systems to enhance water quality and supply.*

(8) *Improvement of understanding of water-related ecosystem services and ecosystem needs for water.*

(9) *Improvement of hydrologic prediction models and their applications.*

(10) *Analyses of the energy required to provide reliable water supplies and the water required to provide reliable energy supplies throughout the United States.*

(11) *Analyses of the social, behavioral, and economic barriers to sustainable use of water resources in the United States.*

(12) *Assessment of national water availability and use.*

(13) *Regional assessments of the status of water supplies and evaluation of potential*

changes in such status due to changes in land use, population size and distribution, and economic activity.

(14) Assessment of water quality, availability, and use in rural areas, including—

(A) maintaining water quality and enhancing energy efficiency of water treatment and delivery through the use of technologies or practices developed to address rural communities; and

(B) developing data and information to support water planning and conservation.

(e) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The President shall establish, or designate, an advisory committee to advise the interagency committee established under subsection (b).

SEC. 3. BUDGET COORDINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall provide guidance to each Federal agency participating in the Initiative with respect to the preparation of requests for appropriations for activities related to the plan.

(b) **CONSIDERATION IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.**—The President shall submit, at the time of the President's annual budget request to Congress, a description of those items in each agency's budget which are elements of the plan or help to achieve the outcomes of the plan.

SEC. 4. COORDINATION.

The interagency committee shall coordinate the activities of the Initiative with the United States Global Change Research Program.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT.

Concurrent with the annual submission of the President's budget to Congress, the President shall submit to Congress a report that describes the activities and results of the Initiative during the previous fiscal year and outlines the objectives for the next fiscal year. The report shall include detailed information on all programs and activities involved in the Initiative, including an analysis of progress towards achieving the outcomes listed in section 2(d).

SEC. 6. NATIONAL WATER PILOT TESTING FACILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study examining the feasibility and practicality of creating a national water pilot testing facility.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The study shall—

(A) examine Federal programs and facilities that currently engage in some form of water technology testing;

(B) evaluate the practicality and identify the potential costs of establishing a national water pilot testing facility; and

(C) examine the efforts of Federal agencies to establish testing facilities related to other technologies, including wind and solar, and the lessons learned from implementing these programs.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report on the key findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 7. DOE WATER TECHNOLOGIES FOR INCREASED ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTIVITIES.

Section 452(c)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17111) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) research to develop water efficient technologies that increase energy efficiency, including utilization of impaired water sources in production;”.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for coordination and outreach activities

conducted under this Act through the Office established in section 2(b)(4)—

(1) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;

(2) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

(3) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 111-82. Each 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 of the amendment, 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. GORDON OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

Page 2, line 10, strike “use,” and insert “use, quality,”.

Page 2, beginning on line 12, strike “efficiency and conservation” and insert “efficiency, conservation, and measures to abate water quality impairment”.

Page 2, line 24, strike “supply,” and insert “supply and water quality,”.

Page 3, line 20, strike “with” and insert “with institutions of higher education,”.

Page 3, line 22, strike “and” and insert “water resources managers, commercial end users, and”.

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

(F) provide guidance on outreach to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)) that are located in an area affected by drought and encourage such institutions to apply for funding opportunities specified in the plan;

Page 5, line 13, strike “and others” and insert “public-private collaborations, commercial end users, and others”.

Page 5, line 16, strike “public” and insert “public, including through a publicly accessible website,”.

Page 7, line 10, strike “period” and insert “period as noticed on the Office’s website”.

Page 7, line 14, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “and revised and resubmitted every 4 years thereafter.”

Page 8, line 2, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “and technologies, including techniques and technologies that provide publicly generated data useful to water managers.”

Page 8, line 21, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “, including spatial and temporal variation in natural supply, watershed hydrology, human and ecological demand, and infrastructure.”

Page 9, after line 17, insert the following:

(15) Development of resources to investigate the effects of invasive species on water supplies.

(16) Development of technologies and practices to treat eutrophic water bodies, including rivers, estuaries, and coastal waters.

(17) Development of tools to assist local water resource managers in anticipating changing water availability and use patterns in the preparation of a strategic plan for sustainable future operations.

(18) Development of a program to offer technical and planning assistance to States, localities, and regions that use or are planning to use land conservation as a method to protect water quality, as well as an analysis of the impact of land conservation on watershed hydrology.

(19) Improvement of understanding of the impacts from chemical impairments, including contaminants of emerging concern, such as endocrine disrupting compounds, pharmaceuticals, and personal care products, on water supply and quality.

(20) Analyses of the Nation’s water research facilities and identification of whether a need exists for additional facilities.

Page 10, after line 5, insert the following:

(c) **EVALUATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the submission of the President’s annual budget request to Congress, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall write a letter to Congress evaluating the budget as it relates to Federal water research and the success of the interagency committee in meeting the outcomes listed in section 2(d).

Page 10, line 7, strike “The” and insert the following:

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The

Page 10, after line 9, insert the following:

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the interagency committee should collaborate with public institutions of higher education whenever possible.

Page 10, line 18, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “and the indicators used to measure such progress.”

Page 12, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

SEC. 8. WATER RESOURCE RESEARCH INSTITUTES.

(a) **SUPPORT; COORDINATED PLAN.**—Section 104(b) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “, and” at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) support the goals of the National Water Research and Development Initiative; and

“(4) submit to the interagency committee under section 2(b) of the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009 a single, coordinated, annual report that identifies future water research needs.”.

(b) **TYPES OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 108 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 10307) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) Technical research on prevention and removal of contaminants of emerging concern, including endocrine disrupting compounds, pharmaceuticals, and personal care products, in water resources.”.

SEC. 9. PILOT PROGRAM.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a national pilot program exploring the use of energy audits of water related infrastructure to identify energy and water saving opportunities. As part of the program, each participating entity shall receive an Energy Star Benchmarking energy performance score to provide an initial screening of that entity, as

well as an ongoing tracking measure to compare their energy performance against similar entities nationwide.

Page 12, line 13, strike “and” after the semicolon.

Page 12, line 14, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 12, after line 14, insert the following:

(4) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

(5) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am offering this amendment to make important changes to H.R. 1145. A number of my colleagues joined me in drafting language for this amendment, and I applaud them for their good ideas and collaborative efforts. I want to thank Representatives ADLER, BEAN, CARDOZA, CONNOLLY, HALVORSON, INSLEE, MCCARTHY, MCCOLLUM, BETSY MARKEY, MINNICK, MOORE, PINGREE, POLIS, SCOTT and TITUS.

H.R. 1145 establishes a planning process for the Federal research and development efforts on water. This amendment clarifies that the plan should be revised and revisited as progress is made on the goals identified in this bill.

The bill, as reported from the committee, contained conflicting information about the length of authorization. This manager’s amendment corrects this discrepancy and authorizes the initiative for 5 years.

In addition, this amendment identifies additional external groups that the interagency committee and its coordination office should work with, including consumer-related businesses, water managers, and public-private collaborations.

The amendment also adds a number of new research outcomes for the committee to investigate, including polluted coastal waters, changing patterns of water availability, the impacts of invasive species, the emerging contaminants of concern, such as a variety of other disruptors.

This amendment also provides additional oversight procedures to the initiative to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being spent in the most effective manner.

□ 1100

These are important additions to H.R. 1145, and I ask my colleagues’ support on this amendment.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do rise today to speak about this

amendment offered by the chairman of my committee, Mr. GORDON, and I may want to ask the chairman a question or so about it.

There are a lot of provisions in the manager’s amendment that I support. I support the emphasis of ensuring a role for institutions of higher education. I support the provision that calls for the National Water Research and Assessment Plan to be updated every 4 years, to guarantee that the plan evolves with the growing body of knowledge garnered through our water research efforts, and I also support including the list of regional outcomes, the development of tools to assist local water resource managers.

There are several things that I had some problems about. One, as to whether or not it was necessary to enhance the research outcome number 9, “Improvement of hydrologic prediction models and their applications” with the following addition: “including spatial and temporal variation in natural supply, watershed hydrology, human and ecological demand, and infrastructure.” But I think we discussed those pretty well in committee and with some interest on how these additions make the research outcome better, but I’m convinced that they do.

I guess I would just ask the chairman, how can you ensure that this pilot program that we have set up in here would not change into a burdensome regulatory requirement that’s pushed off on the States or tribal units or some of those?

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you, Mr. HALL. That’s a good question. Let me first say that this is a large amendment and we try to deal in a collaborative way in our committee. Unfortunately, everyone doesn’t have the privilege to serve on our Science Committee, and there was a lot of interest in this bill. So there were lots of amendments, many of which were incorporated here. As I say, I think we would be better off in a more collaborative way having vetted these. But I think that we have had the opportunity to do that more recently. And let me address your very real legitimate question concerning scaling out this EPA program.

First of all, as I think we all know, 20 or 30 percent of water is lost through various utilities. I was reading a story the other day where several utilities still have wooden pipes from decades back. So this is a voluntary program that would allow the various utilities to ask the EPA to come in and help them with an analysis on how they could be more efficient and save money with their program. So, again, it’s voluntary.

I would also say this is just an authorization. If the EPA does not feel they have the resources to do it, they don’t have to without a further appro-

priation, but I think it will help them, again, utilities on a voluntary basis to use that precious water resource in a more efficient way.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, history has indicated to me in my long time working with the chairman, I know that as this bill moves through the Senate, we’ll be working together on these things through conference and address the concerns that we have raised.

We support the committee, and I thank the chairman for his discussion.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let me first again concur with Mr. HALL. This is going to be a continuing process. We will go on to a conference with the Senate at a later date, and all of these issues will be reviewed. We want the best bill possible.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today the House of Representatives is considering H.R. 1145, the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009.

As a supporter of this legislation, I would like to especially thank the committee chairman, Mr. GORDON from Tennessee, for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

This bill is an appropriate response to the concerning state of our national water supply. As our Nation’s population continues to increase, so must our ability to conserve and to reuse our water resources. We simply cannot afford to continue to take our scarce water resources for granted. And we must also educate our constituents and, quite frankly, ourselves on how to best protect a natural resource that we depend on for our survival.

The National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009 will establish an interagency committee to develop a research and assessment plan to protect and to expand our water resources. H.R. 1145 will make the Federal Government a leader, a leader, in effectively addressing our water resource challenges through intense research, collection of essential data, and the development of new technology.

Mr. Chairman, in my district, I’m proud, as you know, that Orange County Water District has successfully developed and implemented a cutting-edge water reuse technology. The Groundwater Replenishment System in Orange County, California, purifies 70 million gallons of treated sewer water every day through an advanced purification process involving microfiltration, reverse osmosis, and ultraviolet light and hydrogen peroxide treatment. The result is that we get 100,000 Orange County families more drinking water every day. The system is a premier groundwater replenishment project, the premier one in the world, and so many States and local governments

and foreign governments have come to Orange County to take a look at the system.

I believe that H.R. 1145 will encourage communities throughout the country to embrace this type of innovation, and I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important initiative.

Once again, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this. It's so important for us to make sure that in the future we have water for our constituents.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I want to thank Chairman GORDON for yielding time to me and for including my amendment in his manager's amendment, and I thank his staff for working with me to make sure that all interested stakeholders, including public-private collaborations such as the Milwaukee Water Council in my district, will be able to interact with and follow the interagency committee's work.

This Federal water research initiative will certainly impact a host of affected stakeholders, not just Federal agencies, including those in my district. The Milwaukee area, which I represent, is blessed to sit on Lake Michigan, and, of course, Lake Michigan is one of the most tremendous resources that makes up the Great Lakes and is one of the largest freshwater sources on the planet.

The Milwaukee area also has a concentration of companies in the business of water and academic prowess in the water research field. An effort is underway, spearheaded by the Milwaukee Water Council, to better align these companies and the academic research strength in the area to create a hub for freshwater science, research, and water technology development. This is why I offer an amendment today to enhance the ability of these key stakeholders like the Milwaukee Water Council to participate in the agenda-setting process created by the bill.

Importantly, the amendment clarifies that public-private collaborations formed around water research and technology development at the State and local levels are important parts of the stakeholder community. This is key. But just don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. The 2004 National Academies of Science report made clear that we must prioritize making the Federal agenda-setting process transparent to the various stakeholders who have a stake in the outcomes of this initiative. The report also noted that one of the weaknesses of the coordination role played by the Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality, SWAQ, administered by the Office of Science and Technology Policy is that the SWAQ lacks connections, formal or informal, to States, stakeholders, and other users. The SWAQ is invisible to the public at large

as well as the research community outside of the Federal agency leadership.

It's so important that in authorizing this office we address this potential pitfall. My amendment that has been included in the manager's package would supplement the great work already done by Chairman GORDON and the Science Committee on this front. It will call for the creation of a public Web site to display important information on the range of reports and activities by this committee, including the posting of notices about opportunities for stakeholders to comment on the Federal water research plan. It's certainly my hope that these steps boost and strengthen the link and interaction between non-Federal stakeholders including the Milwaukee Water Council and the Federal water research initiative.

Again, I thank the chairman and the staff for working with me to make sure that the stakeholders will have one more tool available.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from across the Potomac River, Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1145. This important legislation will improve Federal coordination in the protection of water quality across America. I had the privilege of proposing two amendments to this legislation, both of which were graciously incorporated by the chairman in the manager's amendment.

Congresswoman McCOLLUM and I introduced an amendment to ensure that the interagency task force established by this bill will provide guidance on reducing endocrine disruptor pollution. These contaminants, which come from pharmaceuticals and other sources, are having dramatic negative impacts on rivers and lakes across the country. For example, watersheds in the national capital region, including the Potomac and James Rivers, have tributaries where 80 to 100 percent of bass have intersex characteristics. We must expedite our efforts to identify sources of this pollution and ways to filter it out of drinking water to protect public health and safety.

I also introduced an amendment to direct the interagency working group to develop a technical assistance program to help States and localities use land conservation to protect water quality. This is an important feature in regions like Northern Virginia, where sprawl threatens the integrity of drinking water supplies. In fact, we saw that demonstrated dramatically in a Public Broadcasting program just this last week with Hedrick Smith that really highlighted this as a major issue for our science moving forward.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1145, and I deeply thank Chairman

GORDON for his leadership on this very important legislation.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON).

Mrs. HALVORSON. Thank you, Chairman GORDON, for the opportunity to speak in support of the manager's amendment. I applaud the Science and Technology Committee for the hard work you've put into this important legislation.

Water issues are something I hear about often when I'm back in my district meeting with constituents. Many of my mayors have told me that the biggest challenge facing their communities is our aging water infrastructure problems. Residents in many small rural towns do not have reliable access to safe drinking water. This is not only a public safety issue but it is also an economic development issue. Communities with inadequate water infrastructure or an unsafe drinking water supply are unlikely to attract the types of commercial development that will put people back to work.

There is little doubt that the business community has a tremendous stake in the future of our Nation's water supply. That is why I am pleased the manager's amendment includes language I put forward to ensure that the interagency committee created by H.R. 1145 works together with the business community. Small businesses especially need help accessing the information and innovation technologies that will allow them to become smarter and more efficient consumers of water.

□ 1115

As a member of the Small Business Committee, I am proud to play a role in making this process possible. This manager's amendment recognizes that our Nation's water challenges will require not only intergovernmental cooperation, but also public-private partnerships.

Working together, government and the private sector can pool resources and implement the ambitious goals outlined by the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act.

I thank Chairman GORDON again for the opportunity to speak in support of the manager's amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM), and I want to thank her for her important contribution to this amendment.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Thank you, Chairman GORDON.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my strong support for the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act and for the manager's amendment.

My State of Minnesota claims over 10,000 lakes and is the headwaters of

the Mississippi River and is part of the Great Lakes chain of lakes. We have Lake Superior on our northern shore.

Improving the coordination of Federal research is important for my State and for our country, and we need to do a better job of making use of data to make good policy.

This amendment includes three important provisions, and I would like to talk about them briefly.

The first part of my amendment, which is included in the manager's amendment, clarifies the bill's focus to include both water quality and quantity. Federal jurisdiction on water policy tends to create a division between the two, but the science often overlaps. To achieve the goal of coordination of research across all Federal agencies, it's important to support a comprehensive research agenda, and this legislation does that.

Second, in the area of water quality, this amendment adds research objectives related to chemical impairments in our water supply, specifically contaminants of emerging concern. These contaminants include pharmaceuticals, personal care products and the endocrine disrupting compounds. Researchers have found that exposure to these contaminants can produce deformities and reproductive problems in aquatic species and insects.

Today we know enough about these contaminants to be worried, but not enough to provide good information to our State health officials and to our constituents. Research on these contaminants must be a Federal priority, and this legislation moves in that direction.

Finally, the amendment will link the existing work of the 54 federally funded research centers with the new Federal water research plan called for in H.R. 1145. The National Institutes for Water Resources are located in the institutions of higher education all across this country. This research network is underutilized as a resource.

This amendment would make it a priority for the National Institutes for Water Research to support the goals of H.R. 1145, and it will increase coordination among the centers so they are more effective partners in Federal water quality efforts.

This amendment promotes a Federal approach to water research. It is comprehensive, effective, and it is one that leverages all of our Federal research partners to work together.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the bill. And, again, I thank Chairman GORDON for his leadership on this issue and his staff for all the work that they have done on this important issue.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I want to first thank Chairman GORDON for his hard work on this important legislation and for in-

cluding the text of my amendment in his manager's amendment. This bill is critical to States like Nevada where drought constantly threatens the availabilities of our already limited water supply and, thus, our environment and our economy.

My language in this manager's amendment directs the interagency committee established in the bill to work to improve water prediction models and their applications, including analysis of variations and natural supply, watershed hydrology, human and ecological demand, and infrastructure.

As we celebrate Earth Day this week, it's important that we recognize that water has become and will continue to be a significant limiting resource for the Western United States.

So it is vital that we fully understand the current distribution of this resource while also being able to accurately predict the impacts of future conditions like growth and climate change on its availability. Accurate prediction about the availability of water resources will help our communities as they work to ensure that businesses and families have access to clean, safe and adequate water supply.

Our drinking and wastewater utilities are required to plan for a number of long-term uncertainties. In order to successfully plan and adapt to change, much more focused, applied research must be done.

The Desert Research Institute in Nevada is tackling this problem head-on by establishing the Nevada Water Resources, Data Modeling and Visualization Center. It will enable better understanding of the present and future distribution of water within our State.

Accordingly, DRI, in collaboration with UNR and UNLV, has established an experimental facility in Boulder City to collect data regarding water interactions in desert soils. This will lead to improved predictions of the potential impact of a changing climate on groundwater recharge.

The work being done at educational institutions in Nevada illustrates just how much potential there is to improve Federal coordination of predictive water modeling. Whether communities are worried about drought or flooding, snowmelt or urban runoff, the improvement of water prediction models will help communities across the country adapt to changes in the natural and the built-in environment.

So thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for your hard work and for including me in this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need to start our close here. We have no further speakers.

Again, I want to thank Ms. TITUS, Ms. JOHNSON, all the others who helped us put together this manager's amendment.

I certainly want to thank Mr. HALL and his staff as we have gone through,

really, the last 2 years with hearings in the committee, with workshops, with a variety of different efforts to hear all and come forth with a good bill on a very important issue.

As I mentioned earlier, there's going to be 40 States for the year 2013 that are going to have a water crisis. We need to address this.

Let me say one final thing about this manager's amendment. It's a little larger than usual. There have been some new, but I think, worthwhile items introduced there. I think they need to continue to be vetted. I don't like to just bring things in off the street.

And I want Mr. HALL to know that as we go through the process that we will continue this discussion if there are any concerns about amendments that were incorporated into this manager's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 145, the "National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009."

My amendment is critical to improving the health of many different types of water bodies, especially a treasured resource in my own district—Barnegat Bay. My amendment will task the interagency committee, established in this bill, with implementing a plan to develop technologies and practices that would treat eutrophic bodies of water, including estuaries.

The Barnegat Bay estuary covers over 42 miles of shoreline from the Point Pleasant Canal to Little Egg Harbor Inlet in southern New Jersey. The flow of fresh water from rivers, creeks and groundwater into the Barnegat Bay produces the special conditions that are important for the survival of crabs, fish, birds, and other wildlife.

The eutrophication of Barnegat Bay is causing such environmentally detrimental consequences as the decline in fish populations, the decline of shellfish stocks, increased algae blooms, and loss of seagrass habitat. These problems are causing the deterioration of water quality, loss of biodiversity, and the disruption of ecosystem health and function.

The eutrophication of the Barnegat Bay estuary is also negatively impacting one of the most treasured pastimes of the residents of my district—fishing. The continued decline of the health of the bay has resulted in such a sharp decline in the bay's fish population that it has detrimentally affected both recreational and commercial fishermen in my district. Fishing is a treasured family tradition for many residents of Ocean County, New Jersey, and for others, it is a source of their livelihood. Something must be done to improve the health of the bay while at the same time improving the economic and recreational pursuits of the people of my district.

Eutrophication is the process by which a body of water becomes eutrophic, typically as a result of mineral and organic runoff from the surrounding land. The increased growth of plants and algae that accompanies eutrophication depletes the dissolved oxygen content of the water and often causes a die-off of other organisms.

Barnegat Bay is one of 28 congressionally-designated National Estuary Programs in the country, and it is in serious need of help.

While the many estuaries in the country are diverse in their characteristics and the issues that they face, the most critical factor affecting many of them, and especially Barnegat Bay, is eutrophication.

I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment and H.R. 1145.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Chairman for including my amendment into the manager's package. This important bill addresses a critical component to how we adapt to a changing climate and I am honored to have contributed to the creation of this vital piece of legislation.

Washington State faces a decrease in spring snowpack of nearly thirty percent by the 2020's, forty percent by the 2040's and sixty-five percent by the 2080's. While this statewide information is significant to understand the regional impacts of the changing climate on water availability, the information only skims the surface of what our communities need to know to ensure the availability of our water resources.

Many water resource managers lack the specific information on how changing climate conditions will impact the availability of, and demand for, water in their communities. In order to correctly plan for future operations, utility managers must have accurate information on how climate change and other factors will impact specific water sources. With the tools provided in this amendment, Evergreen Rural Water of Washington, a non-profit organization serving the needs of small water systems in Washington State, will be able to continue their important work to provide local water systems with on-site technical assistance, formal training, equipment lending and training information while considering specific impacts of climate change to these local water systems.

Some utilities, such as Seattle Public Utilities, have assessed the vulnerability of their water supply to climate change and have begun to develop adaptation strategies to prepare for the impacts of the change in temperature while other utilities have not, either due to the lack of resources or lack of awareness about the implications for the specific system they manage. By developing tools used for the anticipation of changing water availability and use patterns for the preparation of a strategic plan for sustainable future operations, we can downscale the information developed by federal water research to a utilizable level so that all utility companies will be able to plan for the future water resource for their customers.

I am honored that my amendment was included in the manager's package as it will bridge the gap between the research implemented on the federal level and what is needed on the ground by water resource managers and utilities.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SALAZAR). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. KOSMAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111-82.

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. KOSMAS:

At the end of section 2(d) of the bill, add the following (with the correct sequential provision designations [replacing numbers currently shown for such designations]):

(15) Assessment of the impacts of natural disasters, including floods, hurricanes, and tornadoes, on water resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

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

I thank Chairman GORDON for bringing this important bill to the floor to address our water research needs.

Access to clean and reliable water supplies is an issue that affects every community across our country. In my district along the central Florida coastline, local communities also must deal with the other impacts of weather conditions such as hurricanes, which have the potential to affect our water supplies. However, this is not just a coastal issue, as recent floods in North Dakota and Florida, tornadoes in Tennessee and Alabama, and other weather events across the country, have exhibited to us and show us the need for this to be addressed at a national level.

My amendment, which adds a provision to the Water Research Outcomes and Assessments section, mandates an assessment of the impacts of major weather events on our water supplies. Hurricanes, floods and tornadoes can lead to salt water intrusion, infrastructure damage, sewer overflows, storm water runoff and other conditions that can harm our water supplies and the surrounding environment.

A better understanding of these impacts will aid local communities and States in addressing water supply issues before, during and after major storms.

Combined with the provisions in this bill, including the requirement to develop innovative tools to enhance water treatment and water purification technologies, this amendment will help address the impacts of major weather events over the long run through the development and implementation of policies to prevent and mitigate such vulnerabilities to our water supplies.

A nationally coordinated assessment of major weather events will ensure that our constituents have access to safe, reliable water supplies without interruption and that providers will be able to meet Federal standards and that we will use our resources in a more cost-effective and efficient manner.

I would like to yield 2 minutes of my time to the Congressman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS).

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I want to congratulate my colleague from Florida on this amendment. I think it's an important amendment, and I think this bill comes at a very important time.

Just today our Ohio EPA director, Chris Korleski, announced funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act coming to the State of Ohio and specifically to Ohio's water projects, over 69 drinking water projects and 255 water pollution control projects. And what the EPA director said in his statements, I think, is very telling. He said this additional Federal funding will provide jobs while also improving Ohio's worn water infrastructure.

Yes, we have a worn water infrastructure in the State of Ohio and in many States across the Midwest, and it is particularly taxed at times of natural disaster. So I think assessing the value of looking at tornadoes, looking at floods and looking at the way in which our water resources are impacted is critically important because we do have a system, a system that is aging.

When we talk about combined sewers, as we have in Cincinnati, and we have combined sewer systems across the Midwest and on the east coast, we recognize that at times of flooding we have raw sewage coming out into our waterways, into our streams, and they are especially taxed.

We need to make sure that the appropriate precautions are in place to try to prevent these overflows, but also to help fix those systems in the aging communities in order that when we have natural disasters, we are able to ensure the population that we have clean drinking water available to everyone.

I want to thank my colleague from Florida for her efforts.

Ms. KOSMAS. I appreciate your comments, Congressman DRIEHAUS, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KOSMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me just thank the gentlewoman for her amendment and her leadership on our committee in terms of space and science. This amendment makes our bill a better bill.

Ms. KOSMAS. Thank you very much for your comments.

I reserve the rest of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment. Although I don't necessarily oppose the amendment, I do have a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I actually rise in support of the amendment offered by Representative KOSMAS of Florida.

The amendment simply directs the agencies under the interagency committee to assess the impacts of natural disasters on water resources.

We know that national disasters such as floods, droughts, hurricanes and all of that can have a very significant effect on water levels and cause major disruptions in local communities.

In my home State of Texas, we have recently seen the extremes of way too much water in the form of hurricanes and too little, many times in the form of droughts.

It's important that we achieve a better understanding of the impacts of these natural disasters on water resources so that local managers and State officials can plan and manage for future use and economic growth. It simply makes sense that we coordinate efforts at the local, State and national level to achieve these ends.

□ 1130

I have long been a proponent of this type of coordination. During the 109th Congress, I sponsored a bill to create the National Integrated Drought Information System, and I am proud to say the program is currently up and running. NIDIS coordinates and integrates observations so that local water managers can better plan and can better predict for future uses.

While our Nation will always face natural disasters of one form or another, we can do more to mitigate the effects through careful study and careful planning. The gentlelady's amendment moves in that direction, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS).

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

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

In section 2(d), add at the end the following new paragraph:

(15) Assessment of potential water storage projects that would enhance water supply, water planning, and other beneficial uses.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment ensures that potential water storage reservoirs and their hydropower resources are kept on the table when it comes to our Nation's future water and power supplies.

I have the privilege of representing a rural district in central Washington. Constituents in my district and throughout the Pacific Northwest have benefited tremendously from the emissions-free and renewable hydropower generated from water reservoirs in the Columbia River Basin. In fact, over 80 percent of Washington State's electricity needs are met through hydropower.

Water reservoirs, such as Lake Roosevelt behind Grand Coulee Dam and the reservoirs behind the Snake River Dam have not only provided much-needed hydroelectricity, but also deliver water for irrigation, barge transportation, drinking water, flood control and recreation purposes.

Many of our Nation's water storage reservoirs contribute to the generation of hydropower, which is, Mr. Chairman, a renewable and clean energy resource. Hydropower projects have provided emissions-free electricity for generations.

Recent debate here in Washington, D.C. has been focused on global climate policies and how wind and solar can be energy solutions for the future. I agree that these technologies should be part of our energy portfolio, but our country needs an all-of-the-above approach to meet our needs. We need wind, solar, hydro, oil, natural gas and nuclear power.

However, we must recognize that the wind doesn't blow all the time and that it gets dark at night. In my region of the Pacific Northwest, hydropower is the renewable backup resource for wind power. When the wind subsides, hydropower generation is increased to offset the loss of wind power. Without hydropower, wind generation would not be the reality that it is today.

Yet some do not recognize that hydropower is a renewable resource and fail to see the need for new water storage reservoirs that help develop and foster these and other renewable energies, reservoirs that have helped develop our Nation and will continue to provide multiple uses, including hydropower. There is simply no reason why we should discount potential new water storage and reservoirs in the future.

So to that end, Mr. Chairman, my amendment directs the relevant agencies to assess potential water storage projects that would enhance water supply, water planning and other beneficial uses.

While I pointed out the benefits of hydropower, this amendment does not predetermine outcomes. It simply puts potential water storage as a consider-

ation when looking at our entire water supply outlook. Whether it is for drinking water, irrigation or for power generation, it puts that on the table.

So I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will just quickly say thank you to Mr. HASTINGS for this amendment. I think it is a constructive amendment. I think it may need some fine-tuning so it can fit best into this bill and the constructs of the bill, but it certainly is constructive and certainly something we should do, and we will work with you.

I will be voting for the amendment, and as we go through the process will be trying to work with you to again make it fit into the bill better so we can go into conference.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's working with us on this and would be more than happy to work with him.

To that end, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Science Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Washington's amendment. Potential reservoirs and new hydropower should continue to play a major part in our water and energy supplies.

As areas of the country struggle with water shortages or increasing demands on the water supply, we have to be willing to be creative in the ways we address water use and water storage problems. This is a thoughtful amendment and an improvement to the bill. I commend Mr. HASTINGS for his leadership on this effort.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate again the support of the distinguished chairman and the ranking member. With that, I urge adoption of the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CARDOZA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. CARDOZA:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 9. STUDY.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences for a study on the impact of changes in snow pack, including snow pack from the Sierra Nevada, on water resources and its relation to water supply, including the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment addresses a grave concern in California with the San Joaquin Valley water quality. Water is the basic necessity of life. Without clean, available water, we can't produce, grow, play, work and in fact even live. It is important to research and preserve our resources, and my amendment focuses on the vital water resources of California.

Every year, the snow pack in the Sierra Nevada slowly melts and flows down the mountain, providing clean, reliable water year-round to our farms, homes, businesses and municipalities. But now global warming threatens this natural system and threatens the health of our families. As the atmosphere warms, the snow pack melts too quickly to use and we lose the vital components of life.

For 50 years, visionary leaders harnessed Mother Nature and brought water from the mountains down into the valley to meet the needs of a thriving and growing State. Our economies flourished under that water system and it was efficient and it was the pride of the West. But recently our State has more than doubled in population and we have done little to keep pace with this growth. In fact, instead of keeping pace with the growth, we have actually lost significant amounts of our water supply.

It is therefore even more important today to support this amendment as we desperately search for good water that can continue to nourish our crops and feed our children. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I am not opposed to the amendment, I recommend its passage, and I yield back my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. I thank my colleague and dear friend from Texas. I also want to thank the staff of the committee and the chairman of the committee for working with us to make this amendment possible on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the passage of this amendment and to

greater availability of clean water in California.

I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I want to thank you for this constructive amendment. You have been a leader on water issues in California. I know that is a very sensitive issue there, and thank you for helping make a good bill better.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and I appreciate his input.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111-82.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

At the end of section 2(d) of the bill, add the following (with the correct sequential provision designations [replacing numbers currently shown for such designations]):

(15) Improvement of understanding of water-intensive sectors of the economy and industrial needs for water.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment and the overall bill, the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act. As we all know, parts of the United States are currently in a drought situation. Even Florida, which many people think of as being water rich, is suffering from drought. Last year, for instance, the City of Tampa imposed a total restriction on lawn watering and other recreational uses for water. Our water resources are becoming scarce in various parts of our great country.

In the short-term we will have to find temporary solutions to navigate through these droughts. But in the long term we will need a plan to prevent such a crisis from happening again. My amendment to H.R. 1145 adds to the water research outcomes a study of water-intensive sectors of the economy and industrial needs for water.

Passage of my amendment will ensure that the interagency committee created under this bill will look at how water is used across the country, from golf courses and fast food restaurants

to manufacturing plants and other industries. Understanding how such industries need and use water will be critical to meeting our future needs while stimulating economic growth. Without it, any water research plan would be incomplete.

I certainly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think this amendment is very important to ensure that we assess water supply and water needs for communities and we keep in mind the industries and businesses that employ the folks in these communities.

We don't believe the bill should be about pitting one water user against another, but rather it should help to ensure enough water for all users by focusing on new methods and technologies for conservation and efficiency.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not in opposition to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me just thank the gentlelady from Florida for this constructive amendment. I think again this helps to make a good bill better, and I urge support of her amendment.

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank the gentleman, who is very knowledgeable in this area for supporting this amendment. Economic development does depend upon water resources in so many sectors of our economy. I am very enthusiastically supporting his bill, and I am delighted that he believes that this amendment helps to make the bill, which is already a good bill, a little bit better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. ARCURI:

At the end of section 2(d) of the bill, add the following (with the correct sequential provision designations [replacing numbers currently shown for such designations]):

(15) Improvement of understanding of competing water supply uses and how different uses interact with and impact each other.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Chairman, I would first off like to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their leadership on this very important bill, a bill so important to America, not just America today but to the future generations of America, to ensure that our greatest natural resource, that is water, of course, continues, and that we continue to have the abundance of it that we enjoy in this country.

My amendment asks for improvement of understanding of competing water supply uses and how different uses interact with and impact each other.

□ 1145

And I've heard from many of my colleagues throughout the country and seen for myself firsthand in New York the problem that occurs when different interests begin to compete over our precious water resources. And when I say "compete," obviously we have competition for use of water through agriculture, through business, through energy production, through transportation, through business use, and obviously, recreation and consumption and transportation as well. So there are many uses for water.

However, the unique thing about water is that not only is it renewable, but the water resource can be used repeatedly to service several different aspects of our economy and of people's needs. And I think it's important, however, that we study that and see how different interests can interact with each other and most efficiently use our water resource to maximize it.

And I use this example. In my own home district we have a reservoir, Hinckley Reservoir, that is used for drinking water for about 130,000 people. There is also a use of that reservoir for hydropower, and also use of that to feed the barge canal for transportation and recreation use. And there's often disagreements and infighting in terms of how to best utilize that. And I think we need to study that and see what is the most efficient way that we can do it.

I see it again in other places like the Finger Lakes, where again there are disputes between whether we use the water in Seneca Lake for drinking purposes, for recreation or for energy production. So I think it's important that we work to make a determination how best to allow competing interests to interact with each other to most effi-

ciently and effectively utilize our number 1 most precious resource, and that of course is water.

So I would strongly urge the passage of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise not in opposition, but to make a statement about the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I have some question about it, but I don't think I have a question I want to propound to you because we have discussed it. And your amendment would add to the growing list of research outcomes, the improvement of understanding of competing water supply uses and how different uses interact with each other and impact each other. And I know you understand that, and we've discussed it.

I would ask whether or not it means using water for irrigation is competing with industrial uses or the ecosystem management, like releasing large volumes of water from dams competing with the use of water for electricity generation or recreational activities. And we've had some of that at Lake Texoma in my district.

But as we go through and this goes on to the Senate and we have conference committees, and I know you've always been willing to explain your position, and we'll work together on that.

So I'm satisfied with the bill, and I would hope that we pass the bill.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KIRK:

At the end of section 2(d) of the bill, add the following (with the correct sequential provision designations [replacing numbers currently shown for such designations]):

(15) Projection of long-term ice cover and water level outlook for major water bodies in the United States, including the Great Lakes, the potential impacts of the results of such projections on infrastructure, and resource management options based on such projections.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. I am very honored to rise on behalf of the Kirk-Quigley amendment on behalf of me and our newest Member of Congress, Congressman QUIGLEY, who replaced Rahm Emanuel in the House.

When we look at the Great Lakes, we look at one of the crown jewels of our country's environment. But we have seen data over the last few years showing a declining lake level. That lake level has been estimated by the Army Corps of Engineers using projections that just last over the next 6 months.

Under the Kirk-Quigley amendment, we would draw on the additional resources of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which is able to project lake levels for quite a bit longer than the Army Corps' 6-month standard.

The purpose of this amendment is to generate more science and data about what's happening to the dropping levels of the Great Lakes. Next to me is a chart showing an environmental disaster that did not happen in the United States. Instead, it happened in the former Soviet Union, now Kazakhstan, which shows the Aral Sea, a great inland sea, very much like Lake Michigan, subjected to a very poorly designed Stalinist irrigation plan that drank it dry. We should never allow an environmental catastrophe like what happened in Kazakhstan to happen in the United States.

From the data that we have, we have a number of causes which could potentially be involved in the disappearance of the Great Lakes. One of them could be the declining levels of ice cover over the Great Lakes. Due to other forces, the normal coverage of ice over Lake Michigan, for example, has been declining, therefore, possibly allowing evaporation all year long. This declining level could be involved in the lowering of the lake. We need more data to support that conclusion. Good data, in my view, leads to good policy.

At this stage, we do not know why the levels of Lake Michigan are dropping. But NOAA tells us from 1972 to 2008 Lake Michigan ice cover has declined by approximately 30 percent, or a drop of 7,000 square kilometers from 1972-1973 winter, to approximately 5,000 square kilometers last year. This is a decline of 40 percent.

Now the Lake Carriers Association estimates that a 1-inch decline in Great Lakes waters causes the ships to reduce their cargo from 50 to 270 tons. This translates to 8,000 tons of lost cargo in the lakes each year, or equivalent of enough iron ore to make 6,000 automobiles in the United States.

For economic reasons, for ecological reasons, for scientific reasons, I think the Kirk-Quigley amendment should pass to give further resources to look at this emerging trend in an ecosystem that directly involves the future of 30 million Americans and many of our Canadian allies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to thank him for this amendment and offer my support and request that the committee do pass this amendment.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition?

Mr. KIRK. On this, then, I'd like to close by saying that this is a bipartisan amendment endorsed by the National Wildlife Federation and by the Lake Michigan Alliance. It represents the ability of the Federal Government to look further into what is an evolving environmental trend in a place that's home to 90 percent of America's freshwater. And with that, I would urge adoption of the amendment and getting to work on what is happening with the falling Great Lakes levels.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Chairman for his good work on this legislation and look forward to working with him on this issue.

I rise in strong support of the amendment from the gentleman from Illinois.

The Great Lakes provide drinking water to over 40 million people and 90 percent of the U.S. water supply.

Urban sprawl, air and water pollution, and habitat fragmentation are already stressing ecosystems of the Great Lakes region.

This amendment will ensure essential long-term forecasting of water levels of major bodies of water, including the Great Lakes, in order to develop adequate adaption and management plans.

I thank the gentleman and I urge my colleague to support the Kirk amendment.

Mr. KIRK. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. TEAGUE:

Page 8, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “, including analyses of the amount, proximity, and type of water required for the production of alternative and renewable energy resources.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is about something simple, laying yet another block in the foundation on which we can achieve energy independence.

Personally, I am an oil man. I have always been an oil man and I always

will be. And one of the first things that I learned when I started working on oil wells when I was 17 years old is that sometimes when you drill a well you get a lot of water. You have to figure out what to do with that. Can you put it into a stream? Do you need to re-inject it into the Earth? Or can we use it for something else?

It's a question as old as the oil and gas industry, just as the relationship between water and energy is as old as water itself. And as we look toward achieving energy independence through a focus on renewable and alternative energy, creating jobs, bolstering our national security and improving our environment along the way, we are going to have to better understand that important and ancient connection.

My amendment ensures that the relationship between renewable energy development and water resources is established as a priority for Federal water planning, research and development.

Mr. Chairman, we are proponents of wind, sun and biofuels, because they are renewable resources. But water is not. If we draw down our aquifers to the point that they can not recover and tax our rivers to extinction, much of the American West will be unrecognizable. That is not an option. And not harnessing the abundant renewable resources we possess in places like New Mexico is not an option either.

Research, planning and the development of new technologies will free us to develop energy in harmony with our environments and with needed resources like freshwater.

When we site solar farms, we need to consider not only the sun's intensity, but the proximity and sustainability of needed water resources as well.

When choosing a path toward the production of biofuels on a massive scale, we need to ask, what are the implications for freshwater of developing corn-based ethanol in the Midwest versus algae-based biofuels in the deserts of New Mexico?

When we consider wind, nuclear, and every other component of a comprehensive plan to move our Nation toward energy independence, we need to know what the implications are for our precious freshwater resources.

There's even a biodiesel project in my district called Cetane Energy that produces freshwater as part of its fuel production process. That adds an interesting dynamic to the water intensity of Cetane's production and is exactly the sort of thing that we need to better understand as we expand our renewable energy portfolio and move toward energy independence.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not oppose it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I have some reservations about it, but they're reservations I think that we can work as it goes through and on through the conference committee. I appreciate this amendment, and I do not object to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. ROSKAM:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 9. GAO STUDY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) STUDY.—The Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study, and prepare a report, on whether the requirements of this Act are duplicative of existing programs that provide for water research, development, demonstration, data collection and dissemination, education, and technology transfer activities regarding changes in water use, supply, and demand in the United States, including an analysis of the State Water Resources Research Institute Program (authorized by section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984, and organized as the National Institutes for Water Resources), the United States Global Change Research Program, and subtitle F of title IX of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11).

(b) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall determine whether the contents of the report prepared under subsection (a)—

(A) support the implementation of sections 1 through 8 of this Act; or

(B) support a conclusion that such sections should not take effect.

(2) JUSTIFICATION.—If the President makes a determination under paragraph (1) that differs from the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office, the President shall provide a justification for the difference.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Sections 1 through 8 of this Act shall not take effect unless the President has made an affirmative determination under subsection (b)(1)(A).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, it's a fairly straightforward amendment. To briefly put it into context, it's trying to follow up on President Obama's inaugural address where he really challenged Congress and the American people to go through the Federal budget line by line, looking carefully at programs. I don't want to put words into the President's mouth, but if I were to paraphrase, I would say that part of the subtext of the challenge is to look where there is possible duplication, and that's what this amendment seeks to do. It respects the underlying legislation and says, well, if we're going to be doing this program—in other words, if we're going to be coordinating the Federal Government's approach to water problems—then let's do it in the context of clarity.

So here is what it says: We're going to have an amendment, and we're going to direct the GAO to do a study about the possible duplication of programs. In the interim, notwithstanding the passage of the bill, it's going to suspend the implementation date of the program to wait until the GAO comes back with the study. If the President finds that there are duplications, he can move forward and waive the underlying findings, but he has got to do it in a declarative way. In other words, he needs to affirmatively move forward and say, "Look, I've evaluated these duplications, and on balance, I think we should do this," or maybe in the alternative he'll say, "Let's not do it that particular way."

There are only two programs that are specifically cited as sort of a heads-up to the GAO that they need to take a look at. One is the U.S. Global Change Research Program, which is a current program that the GAO says take a look at or that we tell the GAO to take a look at. The other is the State Water Resources Research Institute Program, which again is flagged, but notwithstanding that, it says to take a look at the other programs that are out there. If there is a duplication, bubble it up to the surface, and let's make a decision from there.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the thrust of the gentleman from Illinois' amendment in terms of trying to stop the duplication of programs to save money. We need to be doing that every day. The irony is that this is what this bill does. This bill looks at the 20 agencies that invest in water research, and it coordinates that so we can get our best bang for the buck. It also helps to do away with that type of duplication.

So, as well-intended as the gentleman is, his amendment, I'm afraid,

would be contrary to what he wants to accomplish. It would only slow down the process of this coordination and slow down the process of better utilizing our resources and saving that money. So it really is, again, with the best of intentions, but this amendment, I think, would counter that.

Not being a member of the committee, he did not have the benefit of the hearings that we had, of the roundtable discussions that we had, of all the input that we had, and I think that's the reason that he also might not be aware of the wide endorsements of this bill. This bill is endorsed by the National Beverage Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the Water Innovation Alliance, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Water Environmental Research Foundation, the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, the Food and Water Watch, the Water Research Foundation, and the Alliance for Environmental and Clean Water Action.

Again, we tried to follow his advice and accomplish that, and I think this bill does and has, really, wide and active support. His amendment would only stop that implementation or it would slow it down, which would certainly be counter to his intentions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Well, I thank the gentleman for his comments, Mr. Chairman.

I would just go to the underlying purpose of the legislation, as it's sort of the declared statement of the committee, which is to improve the Federal Government's role in designing and in implementing Federal water research, development, demonstration, data collection and dissemination, education, and technology transfer activities to address changes in the water use, supply and demand in the U.S., including providing additional support to increase water supply through greater efficiency and preservation.

There is one word that isn't in there, and that is the word "duplication," and I think sometimes we all benefit from another perspective coming in. I respect greatly the expertise of the committee, but every once in a while, there's maybe another perspective that could come along that will say: You know what? In the great scheme of things, the pace at which Congress is moving and the pace at which programs are being put in place, let's hit the pause button here, and let's have the GAO go out and really span the spectrum because, in the underlying legislation, it is absolutely silent as to duplicative efforts.

So I accept the criticism at face value. It's a valid argument, but I think that this is an improvement. It's not meant to be an impediment, and clearly, it empowers the President of the United States to waive the finding. I think it's a simple, straightforward type of thing that's in spirit with the inaugural statement of the President.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that, in section 3, paragraph 3, part of the bill says, "The technical innovation activities to avoid duplications of effort and to ensure optimum use of resources and expertise."

You said a "criticism" of your amendment. I hope you didn't take that as a criticism. Again, I compliment the thrust of your amendment, but we have incorporated that here.

Let me also say that there is a synergy oftentimes also with research. NASA and NOAA may be working on a similar project, but because they're working on something similar, you wouldn't necessarily say that it was duplicative and not useful but, rather, that there was a synergy of working together. In our bill, we specifically say avoiding that duplication.

So, again, I think you have the best of intentions, and I think that we have accomplished those. For that reason, I would have to oppose your amendment because it would stop us from getting on to the work of saving money and of having a program that is so important. There are 40 States in our Nation right now that are facing serious water shortages or droughts or water problems between now and the year 2013.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Actually, this amendment seeks, as the gentleman has expressed, to return us to the original purpose of the bill by focusing on the duplication that exists among Federal agencies involved in water research efforts and attempting to streamline these efforts. I think we always have to be good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars as we work through legislation up here.

I support the amendment because I believe it's a good amendment, and it's looking after the taxpayers, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

Insert after section 7 the following (and designate subsequent provisions accordingly):

SEC. 8. WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER REUSE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In consultation with the interagency committee, the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development at the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a wastewater and stormwater reuse and recycling technology demonstration program, consistent with section 2(d)(3).

(b) ACTIVITIES.—Under the program established in subsection (a), the Assistant Administrator shall develop and fund projects to demonstrate, evaluate, and test the techniques and technologies to reuse and recycle stormwater and wastewater at the building, site, neighborhood, and watershed scales for urban, industrial, agricultural, environmental, and recreational uses as well as to augment potable water supplies.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, along with my colleague, BETSY MARKEY from Colorado, to offer this amendment to create a wastewater and storm water reuse and recycling technology demonstration program within the Environmental Protection Agency.

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to Chairman GORDON and to his staff for working with us to refine the amendment. This is important work that's being done. I appreciate the debate and the energy, and we are pleased to offer this small element that, I think, makes a big difference.

Water reuse involves taking wastewater or storm water, giving it the appropriate level of treatment for its intended use and using the resulting reclaimed or recycled water for a new, beneficial purpose. These beneficial purposes can range from agriculture and landscape irrigation, to industrial processes, to toilets, to replenishing groundwater.

It's clear that this is not necessarily a new technology. According to the Water Reuse Association, reclaimed water has been used for crop irrigation for more than 100 years and for landscape irrigation for more than 70 years. The Earth has recycled and reused water for millions of years through the natural water cycle, but the amount of water that we reuse and recycle is just, if I may use the phrase, "a drop in the bucket" compared to what we could be doing, which is why I think a new demonstration project is in order.

Across the globe, water consumption has tripled in the last 50 years. According to the EPA, at least 36 States are anticipating local, regional or State-wide water shortages by 2013 even under non-drought conditions. As com-

munities grow and water supplies decrease, they will be forced to seek alternative sources of water. In an era of climate change and water stress, water reuse and recycling has a great deal of potential to help alleviate pressures on water managers and to help communities become less dependent on ground and surface water sources.

A demonstration program will help reduce the costs of these technologies, and it will also help communities overcome the technical and social barriers to water reuse and recycling.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition. Though I'm not totally opposed to it, I'd like to make a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the purpose of the National Water Research and Development Initiative was to streamline, organize and coordinate Federal water research and development efforts. Although I support the underlying premise of the gentleman's amendment, I think it's duplicative of legislation we've already passed.

A little more than 2 months ago, this body passed H.R. 631, the Water Use Efficiency and Conservation Act offered by Mr. MATHESON of Utah under a suspension of the rules by a voice vote. Because this Matheson bill has not been passed by the Senate, I think we can work through this bill, and I withhold any opposition to this amendment with the understanding that I already know the gentleman, and have worked with him for a lot of years. I know we can work through any problems that we have with it.

So, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I don't see my cosponsor here, so I'm the last speaker. I'm prepared to close if you have no other speakers.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I respect my good friend and colleague, the ranking member, and I appreciate what he mentioned in terms of the prior legislation, but I would say that was just research.

What we're attempting here is to be able to have demonstration projects. The EPA has done a great deal of work in this area in helping communities across the country undertake recycling and reuse projects. What we're doing here is having a coordinated program in the agency rather than just a few projects here or there that would allow the EPA to do the monitoring, evaluation and documentation necessary to promote the new technologies nationwide. Reclaimed or recycled water is highly engineered for safety. Indeed, the quality can be more predictable than some existing surface and groundwater sources. Right now, only about 5

to 6 percent of municipal wastewater effluent in the United States is reclaimed and beneficially used for any purpose.

In addition to enhancing water supplies, these technologies can help the environment by reducing the diversion of water from sensitive ecosystems, reducing nutrient and pathogen loads from wastewater discharges to waterways and reducing pollution from storm water runoff.

□ 1215

So beyond research, we really need a coordinated program of demonstration.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple amendment to create a program to pursue technology demonstration projects at the building, site, neighborhood, and watershed scales.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of our amendment, numbered 10, to the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act.

In the West, and especially in the state of Colorado, water is a resource more precious than gold. For the many farmers and ranchers in my district in Eastern Colorado, finding ways to reuse and conserve water in urban areas is a matter of survival. For them, the idea of water recycling is not a new one.

In the Rocky Mountain region, we use recycled water for everything from Public Park landscaping, commercial and industrial uses, to fire protection. Reclaimed domestic wastewater serves as industrial water at power plants, helps to restore wetlands and even assists with dust control at construction sites—something that anyone who drives I-25 from Denver to Fort Collins on a windy day can appreciate.

As communities in the West, and especially in Colorado's fourth congressional district, continue to grow, the issue of water conservation and reuse becomes even more urgent. Most conservative estimates tell us that Colorado's Front Range will face soaring water prices to pay for new water systems by the year 2058. Cities will become super dense to shrink lawns and shorten water pipelines.

As the Front Range grows along with Denver and Colorado Springs, Colorado's Eastern Plains will face increasing competition for their already scarce water sources. Large swaths of farmland will go dry if we don't work to actively protect the water for our agricultural communities. A whole way of life that has existed since families first started homesteading on land in the West will disappear if we don't find ways to reuse and recycle water.

For the people I represent, investing more resources in creating a wastewater and stormwater reuse and recycling technology demonstration program within the Environmental Protection Agency is a matter of our future survival.

I urge all members to support my amendment to H.R. 1145.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 111-82.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. SHADEGG: Page 3, after line 17, insert the following (and correct sequential provision designations accordingly):

(D) identify Federal water-related research, development, and technological innovation activities that are duplicated by more than one Federal agency or program and make recommendations to the President on how to avoid such duplication;

Page 6, line 22, insert the following (and correct sequential provision designations accordingly):

(C) identify Federal water-related research, development, and technological innovation activities that are duplicative of such activities occurring at the State, local, and tribal government level;

Page 10, after line 5, insert the following:
(c) ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE EFFORTS.—The President, in carrying out the activities under subsections (a) and (b), shall ensure that each Federal agency participating in the Initiative shall not request appropriations for activities identified under section 2(c)(2)(C).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, the committee report for H.R. 1145 states that the purpose of the bill is to coordinate the Federal Government's water programs to ensure they are conducted in an "efficient and cost-efficient manner." There are currently over 20 Federal agencies carrying out research and development on water programs, not counting the State agencies that engage in the same kind of work or those at the county or local level.

While the interagency committee is directed in the bill to avoid duplication of efforts, the bill fails to take the necessary step to implement that directive. It does not in fact provide the committee with explicit authorization to recommend against the funding programs that are duplicated amongst different Federal agencies or initiatives that are duplicated at the State level as well as at the Federal level.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. It has simply two provisions. The first says that they should identify Federal water-related research and development technological innovative activities that are duplicated by more than one Federal agency or program and make recommendations to the President how to avoid such duplication. Simple, straightforward. Simply says where there is duplication, make a recommendation to the President of the United States on how I might avoid that duplication.

The second says to identify Federal water-related research development and technological activities that are duplicative of those conducted at the

State and local or at the tribal government level. Again, simple and straightforward.

That is the essence of my entire amendment. It is intended to look at the issue of efforts at the Federal level which duplicate each other and to at least make a recommendation that they be consolidated for reasons of efficiency, and to do the same with regard to State, local or tribal efforts.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that everyone in America is currently tightening their belt. The least this Federal Government can do is to look—and that's all my legislation does is require the government to look if those things are duplicated and eliminate that duplication where it can be done efficiently.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, let me say to my friend from Arizona, you come at this with the right attitude, and that's what we're trying to do. The purpose of this bill is to not only do away with duplication but also to have these 20 different agencies working in a more effective way. But let me explain, again unintentionally, but the impact of your amendment.

Your amendment would require the administration to determine what research, development and technology innovation programs exist in all States, local and tribal governments. In addition to the 50 States, there are over 500 federally recognized tribes, over 87,000 local government entities, and so compiling this information would be an enormous and expensive undertaking. And the gentleman's amendment is silent as to who would pay for this. In fact, the gentleman's amendment is silent as to whether the State, local or tribal governments would be forced to bear some of the costs of implementing this census.

And let me give you a couple of practical problems here. Let's say there was a tribe somewhere that was spending \$1,000 working on a desalinization project. Well, that would preempt a Federal effort that could be much more significant and worthwhile.

Another example would be, for instance, if there was a groundwater extraction issue in central Florida, might be dramatically different from a groundwater issue in central Arizona. But if Florida has a program examining groundwater extraction, the Federal Government would be precluded from doing research which might be relevant and helpful to the people of central Arizona.

So again, I think both of us have the same objective, which is what we try to accomplish in this bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SHADEGG. My concern about the comments of the gentleman, I would share those comments. I am concerned about the cost of such an effort, but nowhere in the legislation that I have offered is there, in fact, a requirement that all duplicative programs be researched or that a certain amount be expended to do that.

But more importantly, in the gentleman's remarks he's at least twice said that the duplicative programs would be eliminated, and I would simply suggest that in the wording of the amendment we offered, we make no such requirement. There is no requirement, for example, if there were a program being conducted by a tribe and also by the Federal Government that it must be eliminated or one that was being conducted by the State of Arizona versus the Federal Government, that it must be eliminated. Indeed, the language of the amendment as written simply says they are to make recommendations to the President on how to avoid simple recommendations on how to avoid that. And in addition, it leaves the issue open with regard to conflicts with State and local implementation to simply say there is, in fact, a duplication without requiring any elimination that, for the very reasons the gentleman has noted, indeed, to have Arizona researching water recharge and Florida doing it with very different situations makes all the sense in the world.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. As I read your amendment, it says the President in carrying out the activities under subsection A and B shall ensure that each Federal agency participating in the initiative shall not request appropriations for activities that are identified under the section. So I think it is a mandate.

But even if it wasn't, let's take that off the table. Even if it wasn't, it still requires all 50 States, 500 Federal recognized tribes, and 87,000 local government entities to have a census or an inventory. This could be an enormous expense.

Again, I think we're in sync, but let me again remind the gentleman that this bill has been well vetted and it has been endorsed by a number of groups, including the National Beverage Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the Water Innovation Alliance, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Water and Environmental Research Foundation, the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, Food and Water Research Foundation, the Alliance Environmental, and Clean Water Action.

So I think this has been vetted. And, again, I think we're on the same wavelength, but I am afraid that the gentleman's amendment would have unintended consequences in causing a great deal of expense to local governments, State governments and entities all across the country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHADEGG. Could I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 30 seconds.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Representative SHADEGG of Arizona. The amendment requires the interagency committee to identify areas of duplication, and I don't like that word "duplication" at all. And it recommends to the President ways to avoid such duplication. The amendment also calls on the President to ensure the Federal agencies do not pursue activities already being conducted by States, localities, and tribal units.

And duplication spawns red tape, and the best example of red tape I can think of is Wilbur and Orville Wright's first airplane was a page-and-a-half handwritten contract, and the Osprey, the tilt wing that is one of the most modern airplanes today, just the paperwork on that weighs around 20,000 pounds. That's how bad red tape can actually get.

I think it's a commonsense amendment here that carries out the underlying goal of the bill. One of the main purposes behind creating the interagency program was to reduce duplication across agencies thereby streamlining efforts and saving taxpayers dollars. It makes no sense in these economic times for fellow agencies to duplicate effort in Washington and makes even less sense for them to duplicate activities already taking place in our States and local communities.

I commend the gentleman in offering the amendment, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to respond to the point about the language of the bill or the amendment as offered because I think there is a clear misunderstanding here. The language that was referred to, "the President shall not request" or the "President shall instruct the agencies participating shall not request appropriations for those activities" is not applicable to the actual duplicative conduct. It is to the research to determine what is duplicative.

There is nothing mandatory in this amendment. We intentionally wrote it to say it would be a simple recommendation of the President to eliminate duplication. The prohibition is on requesting further funds to do these activities because in the course of doing the activities, we believe that can be done as part of the other work under the legislation.

But just to be very clear, the "shall" language does not refer to duplicative efforts. The amendment does not offer binding language to say, if it's duplicative, you cannot engage in it. And

that's simply a misreading of the language of the bill.

I would urge my colleagues to support this. I believe it's a straightforward provision that would save the taxpayers money. It is simply advisory. It asks these agencies to take a look at areas that are duplicative. I think it's the least we can do under the circumstances.

I yield back.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me just say I think two friends can see the same accident and report it differently, both trying to do their best in doing that.

In response to Mr. SHADEGG, first of all, in the "shall," the "shall" was the President shall not spend any money on this project. So that means nothing could be done there. But, again, the bigger picture is we share the same objective, and that is to try to coordinate this important research to try to do it as economically as possible.

Again, I share that view with him. We tried to accomplish that in this bill, and I am afraid that it would only create additional expense to put so many—87,000 different local governments and agencies through this process of having to inventory whether they are doing anything.

For that reason, I oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111-82.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

Page 4, line 11, strike "and".

Page 4, line 24, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 4, after line 24, insert the following:

(H) assess the role of Federal water research funding in helping to develop the next generation of scientists and engineers at institutions of higher education.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would urge the Federal Water Research Interagency Committee established under the bill to examine and assess the impact of Federal water research funding on helping to develop the next generation of water scientist engineers.

Quite simply, I call this amendment the Talent Amendment. If we want to develop the best technology, and I believe we will, we need a cadre of prepared scientists and engineers at our Federal agencies and in the commercial-user community.

□ 1230

Without the trained scientists and engineers to do the work, it is really difficult to envision how this important work will get done.

My district is located on Lake Michigan, the only Great Lake contained entirely within the United States of America. And my district is also home to the largest academic freshwater research facility on the Great Lakes, the Great Lakes Wisconsin Aquatic Technology and Environmental Research (WATER) Institute. There is no doubt in my mind that the decisions made under this Federal Water Research Initiative, including funding decisions, will play a role, whether directly or indirectly, in developing water researchers, scientists, and engineers not only in the Milwaukee area, but across the Nation.

I think it is only common sense that we, as a Nation, take a look at how those funds are being used, not only to develop the new technology and tools, but how it is helping or can work to better help train and develop the next generation of water scientists and engineers. That is what this amendment does.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition though I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Representative MOORE of Wisconsin. This amendment requires the interagency committee to assess the role of Federal water research funding in helping to develop scientists and engineers at colleges and universities.

One of the goals of the Water Research Initiative is to facilitate technology transfer, communication, and opportunities for exchange with non-governmental organizations, such as institutions of higher education. Developing collaborative opportunities with colleges and universities will hopefully increase the quality of the research and development of water solutions, but also spur students to pursue science, technology, engineering, and math careers, and we are very much in favor of that.

It is vital for the future success and competitiveness of our Nation that we encourage more and more students to pursue these exciting fields. We know that more and more nations are graduating large numbers of scientists and engineers. If we are to remain the leader in innovation and entrepreneurial development, then we need to invest in the young men and women who will design and build tomorrow's solutions.

Representative MOORE's amendment simply requires that we examine how water research funding is helping to meet our science and engineering education needs. I support the gentlelady's intent and her amendment.

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would now yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you, Ms. MOORE.

I want to concur with Mr. HALL's eloquent support of this amendment. It is an excellent amendment; it is constructive, and it helps to make this bill better. I want to thank you for bringing it to our attention.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY).

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of our amendment to the National Resource Development Initiative Act.

In the West, and especially in the State of Colorado, water is a resource more precious than gold. For many farmers and ranchers in my district in eastern Colorado, finding ways to reuse and conserve water in the urban area is a matter of survival. For them, the idea of water recycling is not a new one.

In the Rocky Mountain region, we use recycled water for everything from public park landscaping, commercial and industrial uses, to fire protection. Reclaimed domestic wastewater serves as industrial water at power plants, helps restore wetlands, and even assists with dust control at construction sites—something that anyone who drives I-25 from Denver to Fort Collins on a windy day can appreciate.

As communities in the West, and especially in Colorado's Fourth Congressional District, continue to grow, the issue of water conservation and reuse becomes even more urgent. Most conservative estimates tell us that Colorado's Front Range will face soaring water prices to pay for new water systems by the year 2058. Cities will become super-dense to shrink lawns and shorten water pipelines.

As the Front Range grows, along with Denver and Colorado Springs, Colorado's Eastern Plains will face increasing competition for their already scarce water sources. Large swaths of farmland will go dry if we don't work to actively protect the water for our agricultural communities. A whole way

of life that has existed since families first started homesteading on land in the West will disappear if we don't find ways to reuse and recycle water.

For the people that I represent, investing more resources in creating a wastewater and storm water reuse and recycling technology demonstration program within the Environmental Protection Agency is a matter of our future survival.

I thank Chairman GORDON for his leadership on the committee.

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I have spent the last couple of Earth Days with high school students touring the Water Research Institute in my district, and just spending time with these young people, hoping that they will become our next generation of water scientists and engineers.

I want to just end by thanking Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for working with me on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-82 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. KOSMAS of Florida.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. TEAGUE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. KOSMAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin

Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria

Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin

Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocchieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett

Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Issa
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell

Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Loftis, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Mischaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson

Table listing names of members of the House of Representatives, such as Petri, Pierluisi, Pingree, Pitts, Platts, etc., organized in columns.

NOT VOTING—14

Table listing names of members under the 'NOT VOTING—14' category.

□ 1302

Mr. PENCE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

AYES—423

Table listing names of members voting 'AYES' under the 'RECORDED VOTE' section.

Table listing names of members of the House of Representatives.

Table listing names of members of the House of Representatives.

NOES—1

McClintock NOT VOTING—14

Table listing names of members under the 'NOES—1' and 'NOT VOTING—14' categories.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1312

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 200 and 201, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 236, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—194

Table listing names of members voting 'AYES' under the 'RECORDED VOTE' section.

Brown (GA)	Hensarling	Paulsen	Kosmas	Neal (MA)	Serrano	Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Brown (SC)	Herger	Pence	Kratovil	Nye	Sestak	Bartlett	Gerlach	Olson
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Hoekstra	Petri	Kucinich	Oberstar	Shea-Porter	Barton (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Paul
Buchanan	Hunter	Pitts	Langevin	Obey	Sherman	Biggert	Gohmert	Paulsen
Burgess	Inglis	Platts	Larson (WA)	Olver	Sires	Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Pence
Burton (IN)	Inslie	Poe (TX)	Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Skelton	Bishop (UT)	Granger	Petri
Buyer	Issa	Posey	Lee (CA)	Pallone	Blackburn	Blackburn	Graves	Pitts
Calvert	Jenkins	Price (GA)	Levin	Pascrell	Blunt	Guthrie	Guthrie	Platts
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Putnam	Lewis (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Boehner	Hall (TX)	Hall (TX)	Poe (TX)
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich	Lipinski	Payne	Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Cantor	Jones	Rehberg	Loeb sack	Perlmutter	Boozman	Heller	Heller	Price (GA)
Cao	Jordan (OH)	Reichert	Lofgren, Zoe	Perriello	Boustany	Hensarling	Hensarling	Putnam
Capito	King (IA)	Roe (TN)	Lowe y	Peters	Brady (TX)	Herger	Herger	Radanovich
Carter	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)	Lujan	Peterson	Brown (GA)	Hoekstra	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Cassidy	Kingston	Rogers (KY)	Maloney	Pingree (ME)	Brown (SC)	Hunter	Hunter	Reichert
Castle	Kirk	Rogers (MI)	Markey (MA)	Polis (CO)	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Inglis	Inglis	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Kline (MN)	Rohrabacher	Marshall	Pomeroy	Buchanan	Issa	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Childers	Lamborn	Rooney	Massa	Price (NC)	Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Coble	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen	Matheson	Quigley	Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Roskam	Matsui	Rahall	Camp	Johnson, Sam	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Cole	LaTourette	Royce	McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Cantor	Jones	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	Latta	Ryan (WI)	McCollum	Richardson	Camp	Jordan (OH)	Jordan (OH)	Roskam
Crenshaw	Lee (NY)	Scalise	McDermott	Rodriguez	Cantor	King (IA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cuellar	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt	McGovern	Ross	Capito	Kingston	Kingston	Scalise
Culberson	Linder	Schock	McIntyre	Rothman (NJ)	Carter	Kirk	Kirk	Schmidt
Dahlkemper	LoBiondo	Schock	McMahon	Roybal-Allard	Cassidy	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schock
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Schrad er	McNerney	Ruppenger	Castle	Kline (MN)	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Deal (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Lucas	Meek (FL)	Rush	Chaffetz	Lamborn	Lamborn	Sessions
Dent	Lummis	Sensenbrenner	Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Childers	Lance	Lance	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions	Michaud	Sablan	Coble	Latham	Latham	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Shimkus	Miller (NC)	Salazar	Coffman (CO)	Latta	Latta	Shuler
Dreier	Lynch	Shuler	Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Cole	Lee (NY)	Lee (NY)	Shuster
Drie haus	Mack	Shuster	Mitchell	T.	Conaway	Linder	Linder	Simpson
Duncan	Maffei	Simpson	Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Crenshaw	LoBiondo	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Ehlers	Manzullo	Smith (NE)	Moore (KS)	Sarbanes	Cuellar	Lucas	Lucas	Souder
Emerson	Marchant	Smith (NJ)	Moore (WI)	Schakowsky	Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
Fallin	Markey (CO)	Souder	Moran (VA)	Schauer	Davis (KY)	Lummis	Lummis	Sullivan
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns	Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Deal (GA)	Mack	Mack	Terry
Fleming	McCa ul	Sullivan	Murtha	Schwartz	Dent	Manzullo	Manzullo	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	McClintock	Taylor	Nadler (NY)	Scott (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Marchant	Thornberry
Foxx	McCotter	Terry	Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	McCaul	McCaul	Tiahrt
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Thompson (PA)			Dreier	McCotter	McCotter	Turner
Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Thornberry			Duncan	McHenry	McHenry	Upton
Galle gly	McKeon	Tiahrt	Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Emerson	McMorris	McMorris	Walden
Garrett (NJ)	McMorris	Tiberi	Jackson (IL)	Norton	Fallin	Rodgers	Rodgers	Wamp
Gerlach	Rodgers	Turner	Meeks (NY)	Pierluisi	Flake	Mica	Mica	Westmoreland
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Upton			Fleming	Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Walden			Forbes	Miller (MI)	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Wamp			Fortenberry	Minnick	Minnick	Wittman
Granger	Miller, Gary	Waters			Foxx	Mitchell	Mitchell	Wolf
Graves	Minnick	Westmoreland			Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim	Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Murphy, Patrick	Whitfield			Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Myrick	Young (FL)
Hall (TX)	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (SC)						
Harper	Myrick	Wittman						
Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer	Wolf						
Heinrich	Nunes	Yarmuth						
Heller	Olson	Young (AK)						
	Paul	Young (FL)						

NOES—236

Abercrombie	Cohen	Grayson
Ackerman	Connolly (VA)	Green, Al
Adler (NJ)	Conyers	Green, Gene
Andrews	Cooper	Griffith
Baca	Costa	Grijalva
Baird	Costello	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Courtney	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Crowley	Halvorson
Bean	Cummings	Hare
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Harman
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Davis (TN)	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hill
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Himes
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hinche y
Bordallo	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Boren	Dicks	Hirono
Boswell	Dingell	Hodes
Boucher	Doggett	Holden
Boyd	Donnelly (IN)	Holt
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Honda
Braley (IA)	Edwards (MD)	Hoyer
Bright	Edwards (TX)	Israel
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	Jackson-Lee
Butterfield	Ellsworth	(TX)
Capps	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Etheridge	Kagen
Carnahan	Faleomavaega	Kanjorski
Carney	Farr	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Filner	Kildee
Chandler	Foster	Kilpatrick (MI)
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kilroy
Clarke	Fudge	Kind
Clay	Giffords	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Cleaver	Gonzalez	Kissell
Clyburn	Gordon (TN)	Klein (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Fortenberry Moran (KS) Reyes
 Jackson (IL) Norton Smith (TX)
 Meeks (NY) Pierluisi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1319

Messrs. CONYERS, RUSH and Ms. RICHARDSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall 200; “aye” on rollcall 201; and “no” on rollcall 202.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 271, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—160

Aderholt	Alexander	Bachmann
Akin	Austria	Bachus

NOES—271

Abercrombie	Cleaver	Grayson
Ackerman	Clyburn	Green, Al
Adler (NJ)	Cohen	Green, Gene
Altmi re	Connolly (VA)	Griffith
Andrews	Conyers	Grijalva
Arcuri	Cooper	Gutierrez
Baca	Costa	Hall (NY)
Baird	Costello	Halvorson
Baldwin	Courtney	Hare
Barrow	Crowley	Harman
Bean	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Dahlkemper	Heinrich
Berkley	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Berman	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hill
Bilbray	Davis (TN)	Himes
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hinche y
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hirono
Boecieri	DeLauro	Hodes
Bono Mack	Dicks	Holden
Bordallo	Dingell	Holt
Boren	Doggett	Honda
Boswell	Donnelly (IN)	Hoyer
Boucher	Doyle	Inslie
Boyd	Drie haus	Israel
Brady (PA)	Edwards (MD)	Jackson-Lee
Braley (IA)	Edwards (TX)	(TX)
Bright	Ehlers	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Ellsworth	Kagen
Calvert	Engel	Kanjorski
Campbell	Eshoo	Kaptur
Cao	Etheridge	Kennedy
Capps	Faleomavaega	Kildee
Capuano	Farr	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cardoza	Fattah	Kilroy
Carnahan	Filner	Kind
Carney	Foster	King (NY)
Carson (IN)	Frank (MA)	Kissell
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Klein (FL)
Chandler	Gallegly	Kosmas
Christensen	Giffords	Kratovil
Clarke	Gonzalez	Kucinich
Clay	Gordon (TN)	Langevin

Larsen (WA)	Nadler (NY)	Scott (GA)
Larson (CT)	Napolitano	Scott (VA)
Lee (CA)	Neal (MA)	Serrano
Levin	Norton	Sestak
Lewis (CA)	Nunes	Shea-Porter
Lewis (GA)	Nye	Sherman
Lipinski	Oberstar	Sires
Loeb sack	Obey	Skelton
Lofgren, Zoe	Olver	Slaughter
Lowey	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Lujan	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lungren, Daniel	Pascrell	Snyder
E.	Pastor (AZ)	Space
Lynch	Payne	Speier
Maffei	Perlmutter	Spratt
Maloney	Perriello	Stark
Markey (CO)	Peters	Stupak
Markey (MA)	Peterson	Sutton
Marshall	Pierluisi	Tanner
Massa	Pingree (ME)	Tauscher
Matheson	Pollis (CO)	Taylor
Matsui	Pomeroy	Teague
McCarthy (CA)	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
McClintock	Rahall	Tierney
McCollum	Rangel	Titus
McDermott	Richardson	Tonko
McGovern	Rodriguez	Towns
McHugh	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
McIntyre	Ross	Van Hollen
McKeon	Rothman (NJ)	Velázquez
McMahon	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
McNerney	Royce	Walz
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Meeeks (NY)	Rush	Schultz
Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Michaud	Sablan	Watson
Miller (NC)	Salazar	Watt
Miller, Gary	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman
Miller, George	T.	Weiner
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Moore (KS)	Sarbanes	Wexler
Moore (WI)	Schakowsky	Wilson (OH)
Moran (VA)	Schauer	Woolsey
Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Wu
Murphy, Patrick	Schrader	Yarmuth
Murtha	Schwartz	

NOT VOTING—7

Harper	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Jackson (IL)	Reyes	
LaTourette	Smith (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1332

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. SALAZAR, 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. 1145) to implement a National Water Research and Development Initiative, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 352, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment re-

ported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NUNES. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nunes moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1145 to the Committee on Science and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT ON BARRIERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies from each agency on the interagency committee established under section 2(b) the statutory or regulatory barriers—

(A) that prevent the use of technology, technique, data collection method, or model considered under this Act; and

(B) that, due to such barrier to using such technology, technique, method, or model, contribute to the loss of jobs in rural or agricultural economies dependent on the greater availability of water resources in the United States;

(2) identifies the long-term consequences on job losses of such barriers that continue to be in effect; and

(3) recommends steps to remove such barriers.

(b) REPORT ON IMPACTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies the economic impacts of water diversions for water supply, conservation for fish species (including the Delta smelt), and water quality impairment in the San Joaquin Valley of California; and

(2) recommends steps to mitigate such economic impacts to preserve the water-dependent rural economy.

Mr. NUNES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that we suspend the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, to put it bluntly, the people of the San Joaquin Valley are experiencing an economic disaster, the scope of which is unprecedented. In fact, it has surpassed the worst levels of the Great Depression. Indeed, over the past 2 years, I have pleaded with this body and State officials and my colleagues here in Congress to avoid this man-made disaster.

In January of 2008, I testified before the Water and Power Subcommittee and asked that the Democrats that controlled Congress overturn a court-imposed, man-made drought in California.

In February, and again in June of 2008, I asked the Governor and Interior Secretary to declare states of emergency and focus State and Federal resources to develop new water supplies to avoid this economic disaster.

In July of 2008, I again returned to the Water and Power Subcommittee to testify about the unfolding disaster and pleaded that the committee take action to increase the water supply. Despite my pleas, this Congress and our President have done nothing.

Unemployment in the San Joaquin Valley now averages close to 20 percent, with some communities nearing 50 percent. An economic disaster is not looming for the people of the San Joaquin Valley, it is here, and it is here as a direct result of government action, namely, the use of precious water resources in an attempt to value fish over families.

There is a solution to the poverty and economic havoc confronting the San Joaquin Valley, but it doesn't come from a new study of an old problem. Relief won't come from a long-winded stump speech, a chant at a water rally, or an impassioned speech on this floor. It has to come through legislative action by this body.

I have introduced a “no cost” bill that would provide immediate relief to suffering Californians. And just last week, Secretary of the Interior Salazar announced \$260 million of stimulus money to address the crisis in California. But not \$1 came to mitigate the effects of the southern San Joaquin Valley.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should be outraged. They expressed outrage for the last administration's alleged failure to deal with the consequences of Hurricane Katrina, but they have said nothing about the current administration's failure to undertake a single act to address this ongoing disaster.

The folks in the San Joaquin Valley have had to resort to finding assistance from food banks. I'd like to draw your attention to this picture here. Kristian Reyes, age 3, and his brother, Kelvin Reyes, age 5, were turned away from a local food bank just recently. Additionally, there was an additional 50 families that were turned away that day.

Let me make it clear. We're not asking for a \$1 billion bailout. We're not even asking for \$1. All we need is this Congress to move emergency legislation that would allow the delta pumps to return to historic export levels.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill does nothing to resolve this crisis. Therefore, the Republicans have had to resort to offering a motion to recommit that directs the President to account for the economic impacts of cutting off water to families and dedicating this precious resource to a 3-

inch minnow called the Delta Smelt that I want to draw your attention to. This is absolutely ridiculous. This is a national disgrace when the breadbasket of the world cannot even feed the people that live and work there.

When a government is unable to provide citizens access to a reliable water supply, the government has failed. We need to be part of the solution, not the problem.

It's time to stop valuing fish over families. Pass this motion to recommit, and send a message to the people of the San Joaquin Valley that, at a minimum, you are willing to own up to the problem that this Congress has created.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion; although I do not oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. First of all, let me thank the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) for his interest in this bill. And let me also point out, I don't know whether he saw this morning in one of the major newspapers, the headline was "Drought Conditions Hit California Earlier Than Usual." Certainly California has a problem. But not only California, but 40 States by the Year 2013 are going to be experiencing droughts and other problems with water. That's why this bill is so very important.

Now, the gentleman from California, not being a member of our committee, understandably, probably doesn't realize how we work in a collaborative, bipartisan fashion, and how that, during the hearing of this bill, Mr. ROHRABACHER, also from California, presented an amendment almost identical to this, and it was accepted unanimously by our committee. Additionally, there are other ongoing studies.

But I do clearly agree that this is an issue of concern. And I think putting an exclamation point is perfectly fine. And for that reason, we will accept this amendment or, rather, this motion to recommit to reinforce the amendment that Mr. ROHRABACHER already has put in and is part of the text of this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I agree with his decision to accept this amendment.

I just want to say that it's not as easy as my colleague from California has suggested. This is a long, statewide water system that serves many different interests. You can turn on the pumps as he says. The pumps are on. You can send more water to the central valley and move the unemployment to the farmers in the delta region, to the farmworkers in the delta region. We've

already unemployed thousands of fishermen, thousands of shoreside businesses. We've spent hundreds of millions of dollars in disaster relief because this system does not have enough water in it. In fact, what has happened over the last several years is more water was taken illegally from the northern areas.

He says that the Secretary announced nothing to help the people in the central valley. Finally, after years of discussion, we were able to fund the in-delta barriers that we think will release additional water, protect the fish, and allow us to use the delta more efficiently.

Finally, after years of discussion, we put the money into the removal of the dam in Mr. HERGER's district that will benefit downstream users.

Finally, after many, many years of asking for water recycling, water reuse, \$126 million was put in for the cities in Southern California so they can start the process of recycling, reusing water and taking the pressure off the central valley farmers, taking the pressure off of the delta areas.

That's the kind of coordinated activity that has finally begun under the Obama administration. It simply didn't happen under the previous administration. There were no new water recycling projects of any significance. There was a fooling around with the science. We've lost months during this drought of going back and trying to redo the science.

We saw what happened when Klamath decided he knew more about the science than the people on the Klamath River and the fish and wildlife agencies. We had the largest salmon kill in the history of the West Coast, and you ended up spending hundreds of millions of dollars to help out farmers, to help out fishermen, to help out small businesses all over Northern California, Oregon and Washington.

We will accept this amendment, but we won't accept the recitation of history.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker and Members, welcome to the world of water in California. This is a very serious issue. Sadly, it has been a confrontational issue for more decades than I would care to describe to you, but I am pleased that the gentleman from California offered the amendment. And I want to thank Chairman GORDON for accepting the amendment because it does underline the serious nature of drought conditions, not just in California. We had them in Georgia just recently in the last 2 years. The fact is that water in our country and water around the world is one of the most precious resources that we have, and that's why this bill is important.

□ 1345

That's why we need to use all the water management tools in our water

toolbox. We can recite our version of past history. I have differences with my colleague Congressman MILLER on a number of those issues. I have differences with a number of my colleagues from California who have tried to bring consensus together and who are under difficult circumstances to balance the needs for farmers, the needs for urban water use and to restore the environment.

I want to thank the chairman for adopting this amendment, and I want to thank my colleague for offering it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 1145 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1145, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 1139.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 392, noes 28, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—392

Abercrombie	Burgess	DeLauro
Ackerman	Burton (IN)	Dent
Aderholt	Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, L.
Adler (NJ)	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, M.
Akin	Calvert	Dicks
Alexander	Camp	Doggett
Andrews	Campbell	Donnelly (IN)
Arcuri	Cantor	Doyle
Austria	Cao	Dreier
Baca	Capito	Driehaus
Bachmann	Capps	Duncan
Bachus	Capuano	Edwards (TX)
Baird	Cardoza	Ehlers
Barrett (SC)	Carnahan	Ellison
Barrow	Carney	Ellsworth
Bartlett	Carter	Emerson
Barton (TX)	Cassidy	Eshoo
Bean	Castle	Etheridge
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Fallin
Berkley	Chaffetz	Farr
Berman	Chandler	Pilner
Berry	Childers	Flake
Biggart	Cleaver	Fleming
Bilbray	Clyburn	Forbes
Bilirakis	Coble	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Coffman (CO)	Foster
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Frank (MA)
Blackburn	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Blumenauer	Connolly (VA)	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Cooper	Fudge
Bocchieri	Costa	Gallegly
Boehner	Costello	Garrett (NJ)
Bono Mack	Courtney	Gerlach
Boozman	Crenshaw	Giffords
Boren	Crowley	Gingrey (GA)
Boswell	Cuellar	Gohmert
Boucher	Culberson	Gonzalez
Boustany	Cummings	Goodlatte
Boyd	Dahlkemper	Gordon (TN)
Brady (PA)	Davis (AL)	Granger
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Graves
Bright	Davis (IL)	Grayson
Broun (GA)	Davis (KY)	Green, Al
Brown (SC)	Davis (TN)	Griffith
Brown, Corrine	Deal (GA)	Grijalva
Brown-Waite,	DeFazio	Guthrie
Ginny	DeGette	Gutierrez
Buchanan	Delahunt	Hall (NY)

Hall (TX)	Matsui	Roskam
Halvorson	McCarthy (CA)	Ross
Hare	McCarthy (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Harman	McCaul	Roybal-Allard
Hastings (FL)	McClintock	Royce
Heinrich	McCollum	Ruppersberger
Heller	McCotter	Rush
Hensarling	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
Herger	McGovern	Ryan (WI)
Herseth Sandlin	McHenry	Salazar
Higgins	McHugh	Sánchez, Linda T.
Hill	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Himes	McKeon	Sarbanes
Hinojosa	McMahon	Scalise
Hodes	McMorris	Schauer
Hoekstra	Rodgers	Schiff
Holden	McNerney	Schmidt
Hoyer	Meek (FL)	Schock
Hunter	Meeke (NY)	Schrader
Inglis	Melancon	Schwartz
Inslee	Mica	Scott (GA)
Israel	Michaud	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Miller (NC)	Sessions
(TX)	Miller, Gary	Sestak
Jenkins	Miller, George	Shadegg
Johnson (GA)	Minnick	Shea-Porter
Johnson (IL)	Mitchell	Sherman
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Moore (KS)	Shuler
Jones	Moore (WI)	Shuster
Jordan (OH)	Moran (VA)	Simpson
Kagen	Murphy (CT)	Sires
Kanjorski	Murphy, Patrick	Skelton
Kaptur	Murphy, Tim	Smith (NE)
Kennedy	Murtha	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Myrick	Smith (WA)
Kilroy	Napolitano	Snyder
Kind	Neal (MA)	Souder
King (IA)	Neugebauer	Space
King (NY)	Nunes	Speier
Kingston	Nye	Spratt
Kirk	Oberstar	Stearns
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Obey	Stupak
Kissell	Olson	Sullivan
Klein (FL)	Oliver	Sutton
Kline (MN)	Ortiz	Tanner
Kosmas	Pallone	Tauscher
Kratovil	Pascarell	Taylor
Lamborn	Pastor (AZ)	Teague
Lance	Paul	Terry
Langevin	Paulsen	Thompson (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Larson (CT)	Pence	Thompson (PA)
Latham	Perlmutter	Thornberry
LaTourette	Perriello	Tiahrt
Latta	Peters	Tiberi
Lee (NY)	Peterson	Tierney
Levin	Petri	Titus
Lewis (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Tonko
Lewis (GA)	Pitts	Towns
Linder	Platts	Turner
Lipinski	Poe (TX)	Upton
LoBiondo	Polis (CO)	Van Hollen
Loeback	Pomeroy	Visclosky
Lofgren, Zoe	Posey	Walden
Lowey	Price (GA)	Walz
Lucas	Price (NC)	Wamp
Luetkemeyer	Putnam	Watt
Luján	Quigley	Weiner
Lummis	Radanovich	Welch
Lungren, Daniel E.	Rahall	Westmoreland
E.	Rangel	Wexler
Lynch	Rehberg	Whitfield
Mack	Reichert	Wilson (OH)
Maffei	Richardson	Wilson (SC)
Maloney	Rodriguez	Wittman
Manzullo	Roe (TN)	Wolf
Marchant	Wilson (AL)	Yarmuth
Markey (CO)	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Markey (MA)	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)
Marshall	Rogers (MI)	
Massa	Rohrabacher	
Matheson	Rooney	
	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOES—28

Altmire	Hinchey	Stark
Baldwin	Hirono	Tsongas
Braley (IA)	Holt	Velázquez
Carson (IN)	Honda	Waters
Clarke	Kilpatrick (MI)	Watson
Clay	Kucinich	Waxman
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Woolsey
Dingell	Miller (MI)	Wu
Edwards (MD)	Nadler (NY)	
Fattah	Schakowsky	

NOT VOTING—12

Bonner	Jackson (IL)	Smith (TX)
Engel	Moran (KS)	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Reyes	Schultz
Harper	Scott (VA)	
Hastings (WA)	Slaughter	

□ 1404

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WELCH and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 204, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 204, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 204, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 204, I was unavoidably detained due to committee meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 204, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 1145, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT ON BARRIERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies from each agency on the interagency committee established under section 2(b) the statutory or regulatory barriers—

(A) that prevent the use of technology, technique, data collection method, or model considered under this Act; and

(B) that, due to such barrier to using such technology, technique, method, or model, contribute to the loss of jobs in rural or agricultural economies dependent on the greater availability of water resources in the United States;

(2) identifies the long-term consequences on job losses of such barriers that continue to be in effect; and

(3) recommends steps to remove such barriers.

(b) REPORT ON IMPACTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies the economic impacts of water diversions for water supply, conservation for fish species (including the Delta smelt), and water quality impairment in the San Joaquin Valley of California; and

(2) recommends steps to mitigate such economic impacts to preserve the water-dependent rural economy.

Mr. GORDON from Tennessee (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unani-

mous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. 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—yeas 413, nays 10, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Capito	Ellsworth
Ackerman	Capps	Emerson
Adler (NJ)	Capuano	Engel
Akin	Cardoza	Eshoo
Alexander	Carnahan	Etheridge
Altmire	Carney	Fallin
Andrews	Carson (IN)	Farr
Arcuri	Carter	Fattah
Austria	Cassidy	Finer
Baca	Castle	Fleming
Bachmann	Castor (FL)	Forbes
Bachus	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Baldwin	Chandler	Poster
Barrett (SC)	Childers	Frank (MA)
Barrow	Clarke	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Clay	Fudge
Barton (TX)	Cleaver	Gallegly
Bean	Clyburn	Gerlach
Becerra	Coble	Giffords
Berkley	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Berman	Cohen	Gohmert
Berry	Cole	Gonzalez
Biggart	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Connolly (VA)	Gordon (TN)
Bilirakis	Conyers	Granger
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Graves
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Grayson
Bishop (UT)	Costello	Green, Al
Blackburn	Courtney	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Crenshaw	Griffith
Blunt	Crowley	Grijalva
Bocchieri	Cuellar	Guthrie
Bonner	Cummings	Gutierrez
Bono Mack	Dahlkemper	Hall (NY)
Boozman	Davis (AL)	Hall (TX)
Boren	Davis (CA)	Halvorson
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Hare
Boucher	Davis (KY)	Harman
Boustany	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Boyd	Deal (GA)	Hastings (WA)
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Heinrich
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Heller
Braley (IA)	Delahunt	Herger
Bright	DeLauro	Herseth Sandlin
Brown (SC)	Dent	Higgins
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hill
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, M.	Himes
Ginny	Dicks	Hinchee
Buchanan	Dingell	Hinojosa
Burgess	Doggett	Hirono
Burton (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Hodes
Butterfield	Doyle	Hoekstra
Buyer	Dreier	Holden
Calvert	Driebeaus	Holt
Camp	Duncan	Honda
Campbell	Edwards (MD)	Hoyer
Cantor	Edwards (TX)	Hunter
Cao	Ehlers	Inglis
	Ellison	Inslee

Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers

NAYS—10

Brown (GA)
Culberson
Flake
Foxx

NOT VOTING—9

Baird
Boehner
Harper

□ 1413

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1139, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1139, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 78, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—342

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocchieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley

Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg

NAYS—78

Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers

NOT VOTING—12

Boehner
Clyburn
Doyle
Harper

□ 1422

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Reichert
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg

Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier

Fallin
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant

Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Sullivan
Thornberry
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)