

the purpose of educational and career advancement.

The bill authorizes national activities to assist States and local providers in developing valid, measurable, and reliable performance data, and in using such performance information for the improvement of adult education and family literacy education programs. The bill also includes provisions to support research and evaluation of adult education activities at the national level. Finally, the bill places an emphasis on integrating English literacy with civics education, as well as adult education and occupational training activities.

#### Title III—Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act

Title III of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act makes amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, which authorizes the public employment services and the employment statistics system. Amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act generally maintain current law but also reflect the need to align the statute with the other changes in the bill such as including the State employment services in the unified State plan; aligning performance accountability indicators with those indicators used for core programs—as described in section 116 of title I; renaming “employment statistics” to the “workforce and labor market information system” and updating the Workforce Information Council; and providing for staff professional development in order to strengthen the quality of services. Authorization of appropriations for the workforce and labor market information system and the workforce information council is provided for each of the fiscal years of 2015 through 2020.

#### Title IV—Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

Title IV of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act amends and reauthorizes the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The Rehabilitation Act was last reauthorized in 1998.

The Rehabilitation Act is an important law for individuals with disabilities, particularly those with significant disabilities. It authorizes programs that affect the daily lives of many individuals with disabilities, including the vocational rehabilitation program (training, services, and supports for employment); the independent living program; and research and information on new technology to assist individuals with disabilities.

There remains a critical need for employment and training services for individuals with disabilities. Almost 25 years after the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, it is still difficult for many individuals with significant disabilities to find full time employment that is commensurate with their skills, interests, and goals. Yet State vocational rehabilitation programs can play a significant role in meeting this need by providing training, services and supports for individuals with disabilities.

It is especially important to provide young people with disabilities more opportunities to practice and improve their workplace skills, to consider their career interests, and to get real world work experience. Those activities are prioritized in the amendments to the Act. For example, the bill requires State vocational rehabilitation agencies to make “pre-employment transition services” available to all students with disabilities, and to coordinate those services with transition services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. State vocational rehabilitation programs will set aside at least 15 percent of their Federal program funds to help young people with disabilities transition from secondary school to postsecondary education programs and employment.

In addition, these amendments establish a framework to ensure every young person with a disability, regardless of their level of disability, has the opportunity to experience competitive, integrated employment. These requirements will provide young people with disabilities with the opportunity to develop their skills and to use supports, available through State vocational rehabilitation programs, to experience competitive, integrated employment as they leave school and enter the workforce.

In order to better align the Independent Living program that serves individuals with significant disabilities living in the community with other similar efforts, the amendments transition the administration of the Independent Living program from the Department of Education to the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living. The transition moves the program to an agency with a lifespan and community focus and will better allow the program to fulfill its goal to support “independent living . . . and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.”

The amendments also incorporate “independent living” into the name and mission of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research and similarly move that program’s administration from the Department of Education to the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living in order to better align the program priorities with agency goals and priorities.

#### Title V—General Provisions

The bill repeals the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 in its entirety, replacing it with reforms to better serve unemployed and underemployed workers as well as employers. In doing so, authority is provided to the Secretaries of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services to establish a smooth and orderly transition period to implement this Act.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act maintains without change from the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 a nondiscrimination requirement. The requirement not only prohibits participating organizations from discriminating against those who need job training assistance, but it also requires faith-based organizations to stop considering religion when hiring staff as the price of partnering with the federal government to help these job seekers.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA) prohibits the government from substantially burdening religious exercise. RFRA applies to every federal law, and it protects the right of religious hiring, notwithstanding the restrictive language we just affirmed. This specific use of RFRA is explained in an extensive Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) memorandum dated June 29, 2007.

This use of RFRA to protect religious hiring by religious organizations even when a federal grant program prohibits it was recently reaffirmed by the Office on Violence Against Women (OVAW) of the Department of Justice. In reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) last year, Congress inserted into the law a broad nondiscrimination requirement such as the one we maintain in today’s workforce bill. On April 9, 2014, OVAW issued “Frequently Asked Questions” about [this new—should this read “the VAWA”] nondiscrimination requirement. In Q and A 6, OVAW explained the OLC memorandum on RFRA’s applicability and set out the way a religious organization that engaged in religious

hiring may take part in VAWA-funded services despite the addition of the nondiscrimination requirement.

Q and A 6 further includes a link to a long-standing Department of Justice form, the Certificate of Exemption for Hiring Practices on the Basis of Religion, used by religious organizations to appeal under RFRA to participate in DOJ programs.

The religious hiring freedom is a vital freedom for religious organizations. Therefore I am pleased to stress this important protection found in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 803.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 9, 2014 at 10:47 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 496.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4923, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 641 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. 4923.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1329

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. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK 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 Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is my distinct honor to present the fiscal year 2015 Energy and Water bill for consideration before the full House. I would like to recognize the efforts of our chairman, Mr. ROGERS, and Ranking Member LOWEY to bring this bill to the floor. Their efforts to bring the appropriations process back to regular order ensures that our Federal discretionary spending receives the full scrutiny of this body and our committee process.

□ 1330

I would also like to thank Ranking Member KAPTUR for all of her work. Her contributions and advice have made this legislation stronger.

The bill before us totals \$34.01 billion for activities for the Department of Energy, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies under our jurisdiction. This is a \$50 million reduction from last year's funding levels.

The bill prioritizes investments in this Nation's infrastructure and national defense. As we do each year, we worked hard to incorporate priorities and perspectives from both sides of the aisle.

For instance, this bill overcomes the budget request's proposed cut of nearly \$1 billion to the critical programs of the Army Corps of Engineers. The request would have led to economic disruptions at our ports and waterways as our ports and waterways filled in and would have left our communities and businesses vulnerable to flooding. Instead, this bill recognizes the critical work of the Corps and provides \$5.492 billion for these activities, \$959 million above the request and \$25 million above last year.

This bill takes a strong stand against government overreach by prohibiting changes to the definitions of the "waters of the United States" and "fill material."

The bill also provides \$11.361 billion for the automatic security, nonproliferation, and naval reactors programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, a \$154 million increase from fiscal year 2014.

This bill is clear about our concerns with Russia's recent activities in Eastern Europe. It eliminates all new funding for nonproliferation funding in

Russia and requires that, before the Secretary of Energy funds any activity in Russia, he must certify that the activity is in our national security interests.

Madam Chairman, Russia's activities in Ukraine have shown once again how important our nuclear security umbrella is to our allies. We have also seen how Russia has used Ukraine's reliance on natural gas to put pressure on its new leadership. The movements by insurgents to occupy Iraq threaten to drive oil prices through the roof.

Our country has abundant natural energy resources, and it is our national security and economic interest to ensure that they are fully and responsibly used. That is why this bill makes a strong, balanced investment in our energy sector to ensure that our constituents continue to have reliable, affordable energy.

Fossil energy, which provided more than 71 percent of our electricity production in 2013, receives \$593 million, a \$31 million increase above fiscal year 2014. Nuclear energy is increased by \$10 million above last year. Energy efficiency and renewable energy is slightly reduced by \$113 million from last year. This balanced investment prioritizes improvements to energy sources that we rely upon today while making long-term investments in alternative energy sources.

I appreciate the full committee's attention to this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2015 (H.R. 4923)  
(Amounts in thousands)

|   | FY 2014<br>Enacted       | FY 2015<br>Request       | Bill                     | Bill vs.<br>Enacted  | Bill vs.<br>Request    |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| <b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL</b>                          |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| <b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>   |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| <b>Corps of Engineers - Civil</b>                                       |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| Investigations.....   | 125,000                  | 80,000                   | 115,000                  | -10,000              | +35,000                |
| Construction.....   | 1,656,000                | 1,125,000                | 1,704,499                | +48,499              | +579,499               |
| Mississippi River and Tributaries.....                                  | 307,000                  | 245,000                  | 260,000                  | -47,000              | +15,000                |
| Operations and Maintenance.....   | 2,861,000                | 2,600,000                | 2,905,000                | +44,000              | +305,000               |
| Regulatory Program.....   | 200,000                  | 200,000                  | 200,000                  | ---                  | ---                    |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program<br>(FUSRAP).....        | 103,499                  | 100,000                  | 100,000                  | -3,499               | ---                    |
| Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies.....                              | 28,000                   | 28,000                   | 28,000                   | ---                  | ---                    |
| Expenses.....   | 182,000                  | 178,000                  | 178,000                  | -4,000               | ---                    |
| Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil<br>Works).....         | 5,000                    | 5,000                    | 2,000                    | -3,000               | -3,000                 |
| Rescission.....   | ---                      | -28,000                  | ---                      | ---                  | +28,000                |
|   | =====                    | =====                    | =====                    | =====                | =====                  |
| Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil...<br>Appropriations..... | 5,467,499<br>(5,467,499) | 4,533,000<br>(4,561,000) | 5,492,499<br>(5,492,499) | +25,000<br>(+25,000) | +959,499<br>(+931,499) |
| Rescissions.....  | ---                      | (-28,000)                | ---                      | ---                  | (+28,000)              |
| <b>TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>                            |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| <b>Central Utah Project Completion Account</b>                          |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account.....<br>Bureau of Reclamation   | 8,725                    | ---                      | 9,874                    | +1,149               | +9,874                 |
| Water and Related Resources.....  | 954,085                  | 760,700                  | 856,351                  | -97,734              | +95,651                |
| Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.....                            | 53,288                   | 56,995                   | 56,995                   | +3,707               | ---                    |
| California Bay-Delta Restoration.....                                   | 37,000                   | 37,000                   | 37,000                   | ---                  | ---                    |
| Policy and Administration.....  | 60,000                   | 59,500                   | 53,849                   | -6,151               | -5,651                 |
| Indian Water Rights Settlements.....                                    | ---                      | 90,000                   | ---                      | ---                  | -90,000                |
| San Joaquin River Restoration Fund.....                                 | ---                      | 32,000                   | ---                      | ---                  | -32,000                |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account.....                            | ---                      | 7,300                    | ---                      | ---                  | -7,300                 |
| Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account<br>(Rescission).....         | ---                      | -500                     | -500                     | -500                 | ---                    |
|   | -----                    | -----                    | -----                    | -----                | -----                  |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....                                       | 1,104,373                | 1,042,995                | 1,003,695                | -100,678             | -39,300                |
|   | =====                    | =====                    | =====                    | =====                | =====                  |
| Total, title II, Department of the Interior....<br>Appropriations.....  | 1,113,098<br>(1,113,098) | 1,042,995<br>(1,043,495) | 1,013,569<br>(1,014,069) | -99,529<br>(-99,029) | -29,426<br>(-29,426)   |
| Rescissions.....  | ---                      | (-500)                   | (-500)                   | (-500)               | ---                    |
| <b>TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>                                 |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| <b>Energy Programs</b>  |                          |                          |                          |                      |                        |
| Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.....                             | 1,912,104                | 2,316,749                | 1,789,000                | -123,104             | -527,749               |
| Rescission.....   | -10,418                  | ---                      | ---                      | +10,418              | ---                    |
|   | -----                    | -----                    | -----                    | -----                | -----                  |
| Subtotal, Energy efficiency.....  | 1,901,686                | 2,316,749                | 1,789,000                | -112,686             | -527,749               |
| Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.....                        | 139,306                  | 180,000                  | 160,000                  | +20,694              | -20,000                |
| Defense function.....   | 8,000                    | ---                      | ---                      | -8,000               | ---                    |
|   | -----                    | -----                    | -----                    | -----                | -----                  |
| Subtotal.....   | 147,306                  | 180,000                  | 160,000                  | +12,694              | -20,000                |
| Nuclear Energy.....   | 795,190                  | 753,386                  | 795,000                  | -190                 | +41,614                |
| Defense function.....   | 94,000                   | 110,000                  | 104,000                  | +10,000              | -6,000                 |
|   | -----                    | -----                    | -----                    | -----                | -----                  |
| Subtotal.....   | 889,190                  | 863,386                  | 899,000                  | +9,810               | +35,614                |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development.....                             | 562,065                  | 475,500                  | 593,000                  | +30,935              | +117,500               |
| Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves.....                             | 20,000                   | 19,950                   | 19,950                   | -50                  | ---                    |
| Elk Hills School Lands Fund.....  | ---                      | 15,580                   | 15,580                   | +15,580              | ---                    |

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2015 (H.R. 4923)  
(Amounts in thousands)

|   | FY 2014<br>Enacted | FY 2015<br>Request | Bill       | Bill vs.<br>Enacted | Bill vs<br>Reques |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strategic Petroleum Reserve.....  | 189,400            | 205,000            | 205,000    | +15,600             | ---               |
| Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.....   | 8,000              | 1,600              | 7,600      | -400                | +6,000            |
| Rescission.....   | ---                | ---                | -6,000     | -6,000              | -6,000            |
| Subtotal.....   | 8,000              | 1,600              | 1,600      | -6,400              | ---               |
| Energy Information Administration.....  | 117,000            | 122,500            | 120,000    | +3,000              | -2,500            |
| Non-defense Environmental Cleanup.....  | 231,765            | 226,174            | 241,174    | +9,409              | +15,000           |
| Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning<br>Fund.....                     | 598,823            | 530,976            | 585,976    | -12,847             | +55,000           |
| Science.....  | 5,071,000          | 5,111,155          | 5,071,000  | ---                 | -40,155           |
| Nuclear Waste Disposal.....   | ---                | ---                | 150,000    | +150,000            | +150,000          |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy.....   | 280,000            | 325,000            | 280,000    | ---                 | -45,000           |
| Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs.....  | ---                | 16,000             | ---        | ---                 | -16,000           |
| Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program.<br>Offsetting collection.....    | 42,000             | 42,000             | 42,000     | ---                 | ---               |
| ---   | -22,000            | -25,000            | -25,000    | -3,000              | ---               |
| Subtotal.....   | 20,000             | 17,000             | 17,000     | -3,000              | ---               |
| Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans<br>program.....                        | 6,000              | 4,000              | 4,000      | -2,000              | ---               |
| Clean Coal Technology (Rescission).....   | ---                | -6,600             | -6,600     | -6,600              | ---               |
| Departmental Administration.....  | 234,637            | 248,223            | 255,171    | +20,534             | +6,948            |
| Miscellaneous revenues.....   | -108,188           | -119,171           | -119,171   | -10,983             | ---               |
| Net appropriation.....  | 126,449            | 129,052            | 136,000    | +9,551              | +6,948            |
| Office of the Inspector General.....  | 42,120             | 39,868             | 42,120     | ---                 | +2,252            |
| Total, Energy programs.....   | 10,210,804         | 10,592,890         | 10,323,800 | +112,996            | -269,090          |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities  |                    |                    |            |                     |                   |
| National Nuclear Security Administration  |                    |                    |            |                     |                   |
| Weapons Activities.....   | 7,845,000          | 8,314,902          | 8,204,209  | +359,209            | -110,693          |
| Rescission.....   | -64,000            | ---                | ---        | +64,000             | ---               |
| Subtotal.....   | 7,781,000          | 8,314,902          | 8,204,209  | +423,209            | -110,693          |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.....   | 1,954,000          | 1,555,156          | 1,592,156  | -361,844            | +37,000           |
| Rescission.....   | ---                | ---                | -37,000    | -37,000             | -37,000           |
| Subtotal.....   | 1,954,000          | 1,555,156          | 1,555,156  | -398,844            | ---               |
| Naval Reactors.....   | 1,095,000          | 1,377,100          | 1,215,342  | +120,342            | -161,758          |
| Office of the Administrator.....  | 377,000            | 410,842            | 386,863    | +9,863              | -23,979           |
| Total, National Nuclear Security<br>Administration.....                                 | 11,207,000         | 11,658,000         | 11,361,570 | +154,570            | -296,430          |
| Environmental and Other Defense Activities  |                    |                    |            |                     |                   |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup.....  | 5,000,000          | 4,864,538          | 4,801,280  | -198,720            | -63,258           |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup (legislative proposal)..<br>Other Defense Activities..... | ---                | 463,000            | ---        | ---                 | -463,000          |
| ---   | 755,000            | 753,000            | 754,000    | -1,000              | +1,000            |
| Total, Environmental and Other Defense<br>Activities.....                               | 5,755,000          | 6,080,538          | 5,555,280  | -199,720            | -525,258          |
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....  | 16,962,000         | 17,738,538         | 16,916,850 | -45,150             | -821,688          |
| Power Marketing Administrations /1  |                    |                    |            |                     |                   |
| Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power<br>Administration.....                    | 7,750              | 7,220              | 7,220      | -530                | ---               |
| Offsetting collections.....   | -7,750             | -7,220             | -7,220     | +530                | ---               |
| Subtotal.....   | ---                | ---                | ---        | ---                 | ---               |

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2015 (H.R. 4923)  
(Amounts in thousands)

|  | FY 2014<br>Enacted | FY 2015<br>Request | Bill         | Bill vs.<br>Enacted | Bill vs.<br>Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power</b>   |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Administration.....  | 45,456             | 46,240             | 46,240       | +784                | ---                 |
| Offsetting collections.....  | -33,564            | -34,840            | -34,840      | -1,276              | ---                 |
| Subtotal.....  | 11,892             | 11,400             | 11,400       | -492                | ---                 |
| <b>Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....</b> |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Administration.....  | 299,919            | 304,402            | 304,402      | +4,483              | ---                 |
| Offsetting collections.....  | -203,989           | -211,030           | -211,030     | -7,041              | ---                 |
| Subtotal.....  | 95,930             | 93,372             | 93,372       | -2,558              | ---                 |
| <b>Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund.....</b>  |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Administration.....  | 5,331              | 4,727              | 4,727        | -604                | ---                 |
| Offsetting collections.....  | -4,911             | -4,499             | -4,499       | +412                | ---                 |
| Subtotal.....  | 420                | 228                | 228          | -192                | ---                 |
| Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....  | 108,242            | 105,000            | 105,000      | -3,242              | ---                 |
| <b>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b>  |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 304,600            | 327,277            | 304,389      | -211                | -22,888             |
| Revenues applied.....  | -304,600           | -327,277           | -304,389     | +211                | +22,888             |
| <b>General Provisions</b>  |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| <b>Sec. 309 Rescissions:</b>   |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| <b>Department of Energy:</b>   |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Energy Efficiency and Energy Reliability.....  | ---                | ---                | -18,111      | -18,111             | -18,111             |
| Science.....   | ---                | ---                | -5,257       | -5,257              | -5,257              |
| Nuclear Energy.....  | ---                | ---                | -1,046       | -1,046              | -1,046              |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development.....  | ---                | ---                | -8,243       | -8,243              | -8,243              |
| Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.....   | ---                | ---                | -4,809       | -4,809              | -4,809              |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy.....  | ---                | ---                | -619         | -619                | -619                |
| Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration..           | ---                | ---                | -1,720       | -1,720              | -1,720              |
| Subtotal.....  | ---                | ---                | -39,805      | -39,805             | -39,805             |
| =====  |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Total, title III, Department of Energy.....  | 27,281,046         | 28,436,428         | 27,305,845   | +24,799             | -1,130,583          |
| Appropriations.....  | (27,355,464)       | (28,443,028)       | (27,395,250) | (+39,786)           | (-1,047,778)        |
| Rescissions.....   | (-74,418)          | (-6,600)           | (-89,405)    | (-14,987)           | (-82,805)           |
| =====  |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| <b>TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>   |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Appalachian Regional Commission.....   | 80,317             | 68,200             | 80,317       | ---                 | +12,117             |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....   | 28,000             | 30,150             | 29,150       | +1,150              | -1,000              |
| Delta Regional Authority.....  | 12,000             | 12,319             | 12,000       | ---                 | -319                |
| Denali Commission.....   | 10,000             | 7,396              | 10,000       | ---                 | +2,604              |
| Northern Border Regional Commission.....   | 5,000              | 3,000              | 3,000        | -2,000              | ---                 |
| Southeast Crescent Regional Commission.....  | 250                | ---                | 250          | ---                 | +250                |
| <b>Nuclear Regulatory Commission:</b>  |                    |                    |              |                     |                     |
| Salaries and expenses.....   | 1,043,937          | 1,047,433          | 1,052,433    | +8,496              | +5,000              |
| Revenues.....  | -920,721           | -925,155           | -880,155     | +40,566             | +45,000             |
| Subtotal.....  | 123,216            | 122,278            | 172,278      | +49,062             | +50,000             |
| Office of Inspector General.....   | 11,955             | 12,071             | 12,071       | +116                | ---                 |
| Revenues.....  | -9,994             | -10,099            | -10,099      | -105                | ---                 |
| Subtotal.....  | 1,961              | 1,972              | 1,972        | +11                 | ---                 |
| Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.....  | 125,177            | 124,250            | 174,250      | +49,073             | +50,000             |

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2015 (H.R. 4923)  
 (Amounts in thousands)

|  | FY 2014<br>Enacted | FY 2015<br>Request | Bill         | Bill vs.<br>Enacted | Bill vs.<br>Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....  | 3,400              | 3,400              | 3,400        | ---                 | ---                 |
| Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural<br>Gas Transportation Projects..... | 1,000              | ---                | ---          | -1,000              | ---                 |
|  | =====              | =====              | =====        | =====               | =====               |
| Total, title IV, Independent agencies.....   | 265,144            | 248,715            | 312,367      | +47,223             | +63,652             |
| Appropriations.....  | (265,144)          | (248,715)          | (312,367)    | (+47,223)           | (+63,652)           |
|  | =====              | =====              | =====        | =====               | =====               |
|  | =====              | =====              | =====        | =====               | =====               |
| Grand total.....   | 34,126,787         | 34,261,138         | 34,124,280   | -2,507              | -136,858            |
| Appropriations.....  | (34,201,205)       | (34,296,238)       | (34,214,185) | (+12,980)           | (-82,053)           |
| Rescissions.....   | (-74,418)          | (-35,100)          | (-89,905)    | (-15,487)           | (-54,805)           |
|  | =====              | =====              | =====        | =====               | =====               |

1/ Totals adjusted to net out alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting collection totals only reflect funds collected for annual expenses, excluding power purchase wheeling

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON for his leadership.

This energy, water, and nuclear security bill is liberty's business. It is about national nuclear security, about energy security, about jobs and economic growth here at home through upgrading our ports, preventing flooding, assuring fresh water from coast to coast, and inventing the new energy technologies required to reposition America for energy security in our homeland for a new century. Bottom line: our bill is about the business of ensuring liberty for our country.

The United States entered this 21st century with a net reliance on foreign oil. Renewed conflicts in Iraq, Ukraine's Crimea, and Syria once again warn us that U.S. energy dependence on imported product remains our chief strategic vulnerability. Throughout the last century, American reliance on foreign oil grew dangerously. Our share of imports in the Nation's total energy supply rose from 42 percent in 1990 to more than 50 percent by 1998 and, frankly, keeps bobbing between 40 and 50 percent now. It consumes over half of the trade deficit we hold with the world. This energy dependence seriously weakens America.

As Michael Klare states in his book, "Blood and Oil":

Every economic recession since World War II has come on the heels of a petroleum shortage.

I would add, the millions of lost jobs associated with those recessions has harmed America gravely.

Just since 2003, the United States has spent \$2.3 trillion—trillion—importing foreign petroleum. At a price per barrel of \$100, the total bill for America importing oil over the next 25 years could cost us over \$10 trillion. That is \$10 trillion of hemorrhage of U.S. wealth, millions of lost jobs, and the economic muscle that goes with it.

If you want to understand why our middle class is shrinking and more people are falling into poverty, just look at the energy trade deficit this country endures and has endured for a quarter century. Those numbers clearly demonstrate the lost energy opportunity inside our own Nation. We are ceding wealth, jobs, economic power, and our national security. If you really want to understand why America has developed a horrendous budget deficit, you had best take a look at the energy trade deficit as a major cause of our condition as we have ceded our wealth elsewhere. In fact, the entirety of our committee bill at \$34 billion cannot begin to compensate for the over \$200 billion in imported foreign oil that will pour into our country this year alone—eight times more than the value of our bill.

Recent natural gas discoveries and added domestic oil drilling provide our Nation with some breathing room, but only for a while, as these supplies are not endless—they are precious—to help us as we transition to a broad, diversi-

fied energy portfolio that captures the energy wealth here for our Nation.

Congress must lead our Nation to restore energy security and greater prosperity for our Nation through the innovation that this bill incentivizes. The horizontal drilling technologies that are creating a boom in domestic natural gas discoveries were made possible by research done through our bill at the Department of Energy.

America must invest in our own energy future across all energy sectors. We must restore some of our lost economic luster. Alternatively, if we cede our future to China, Russia, and Singapore, we will have missed the call of our generation.

A focus on high-impact energy research at the Department through renewable technologies, advanced energy, and applied energy are critical, as well as funding for the Advanced Manufacturing Office to lead us to a new era of energy and job creation.

Further, the increased allocation for the Corps of Engineers is vital to restore our infrastructure, supporting thousands of jobs in economic growth as we upgrade our fresh water systems while our Nation adapts to climate change and more parched places as deserts grow in places we thought were easily habitable.

Though our bill provides \$5.492 billion to support the Corps, keep in mind there are no new starts in it, and there are over \$60 billion worth of project requests that are backlogged that we simply can't address. Imagine what potential job creation could be induced coast to coast by meeting this massive Corps backlog.

The bill before us today takes a modest step forward in diversifying America's energy sources. Frankly, based on the challenge facing our Nation for almost a third of a century now, this bill's bottom line should be tripled to get us faster to a solution for liberty and security. We know with energy conservation and additional innovation we can meet our goal, but our imperative must be sooner rather than later. Our generation should make it easier for the next generation, not hand the problem to them.

I do have concerns with amounts provided to certain accounts within the nonproliferation activities of the National Security Agency and the Defense Environmental Cleanup account, where, despite the chairman's best efforts, the subcommittee's allocation was simply insufficient to address the many competing needs.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield myself an additional 10 seconds.

I look forward to the debate and working with Chairman SIMPSON, a gracious chairman, to complete the task before us to strengthen liberty as she encounters the challenges of a new era.

I want to thank Rob Blair and Taunja Berquam, our able staff, for moving us to this point.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I now yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a balanced bill. It makes important investments in our Nation's nuclear defense capabilities, as well as the water infrastructure and energy resources that keep the economy moving. It does so in a fiscally sound manner, finding ways to save taxpayer dollars wherever possible.

First and foremost, this legislation prioritizes national security by increasing funding for nuclear weapons programs above last year's level to support the safety and readiness of our nuclear stockpiles. Maintaining this Nation's nuclear deterrence posture remains critical to our safety, particularly during a time of global instability and increasing risks of future nuclear threats.

Next, this bill includes investments in our water infrastructure that will also help grow our economy, facilitate trade and commerce, and ensure the well-being of the Nation. Recognizing the importance of what the Army Corps of Engineers does, we have rejected the administration's proposed cuts to these programs, providing nearly \$1 billion more than requested and \$25 million above last year's levels. That funding will allow the Corps to continue its important work performing flood mitigation, updating dam safety, and improving our waterways to facilitate increased import and export capability.

Within the Department of Energy, the bill prioritizes funding for programs that encourage economic competitiveness and energy independence and that help promote an all-of-the-above solution to the Nation's energy needs. By making sound investments in coal, natural gas, and other fossil energy sources, we are moving our Nation closer to a balanced energy portfolio, as well as keeping down energy costs for hardworking Americans across the country.

To make these important investments, the bill targets lower priority programs for cuts. For example, renewable energy programs with the Department of Energy are cut by \$113 million from last year's levels. By implementing these types of savings and including stringent oversight requirements for the DOE, the Army Corps, and other Federal agencies, we have produced a bill that will support economic growth and security, while encouraging the government to act with greater efficiency.

The legislation also puts the brakes on the administration's destructive and misguided regulatory agenda that threatens our Nation's small businesses and other industries. For example, within this bill, we have included a

provision prohibiting the unnecessary expansion of Federal jurisdiction over our Nation's waterways.

At one of the subcommittee's many hearings about the Federal budget just a few weeks ago, the Assistant Secretary for the Corps could not provide clear answers as to how much these regulations would cost the American taxpayer, how many man-hours it would take to implement, and how such a change would affect this struggling economy. Since the Corps plainly has no idea what it is doing with this rule, it would be irresponsible, if not disastrous, to allow such a change to move forward.

The bill also stops the administration from changing the definition of "fill material," an action that could drastically alter Federal regulations and could effectively shut down coal and other mining operations throughout the country. While this proposal is very troubling on many levels, I am most concerned about the unknown costs of this large-scale, invasive change. This is the type of overzealous, unneeded regulation that will harm, not help, the economy in this very sensitive time.

Madam Chairwoman, before I close, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON—this is his maiden voyage as chair of this subcommittee—and Ranking Member KAPTUR and all of the subcommittee and the staff for their hard work on the bill, and I want to commend Chairman SIMPSON for a job well done on his first bill as chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee.

This is a good bill. It reflects smart budget decisions to invest tax dollars in effective, necessary programs that will help keep our Nation safe and our economy growing. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of our full committee.

□ 1345

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, whose bipartisan cooperation and hard work are evident in the bill before us.

This bill invests in a number of important programs that have strong Democratic backing. It underscores the constraints of virtually flat discretionary spending.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, underinvestment in our marine ports and inland waterways endangers more than 1 million U.S. jobs and \$270 billion in U.S. exports by 2020.

While the Corps of Engineers would be given a slight increase above this year's level, budget caps won't help the Corps make a dent in its \$60 billion project backlog, forcing them once again to put off vital projects that would protect homes, businesses, and communities.

We are also missing an opportunity to ramp up investments in science and

technology. Research and development spending has fueled our economic growth for the last 60 years, and dramatic increases in this area are needed to sustain our economic recovery.

Flat funding for ARPA-E and the Office of Science is particularly problematic, given that other countries, including China, Russia, Germany, and Singapore, are increasing investments in these fields. We cannot permit an innovation deficit. We must ensure that tomorrow's breakthroughs occur in American labs and universities.

Given, however, the subcommittee's allocation, I am pleased that these critical accounts were mostly protected from cuts or slightly increased, but we could do better.

There are a number of shortcomings I would like to mention.

First is the continued safeguarding of Federal spending that benefits Big Oil and fossil fuel companies instead of supporting investments in emerging renewable technologies.

I strongly disagree with the \$113 million cut to the energy efficiency and renewable energy account and the decision to fund the fossil energy account at \$117.5 million above the President's request. Our country is home to a robust fossil fuels industrial base that makes over \$100 billion annually in profits and actively invests in robust private sector R&D spending to advance its interests. With such a tight allocation, we should invest in creating green jobs of the future instead of backing an industry which already benefits from billions in tax breaks.

Second, the bill includes unnecessary riders related to navigable waters and the definition of fill materials under the Clean Water Act. The Corps of Engineers and EPA recently released a proposed rule regarding navigable waters, and their work needs to move forward in order to address the ambiguity created by Supreme Court rulings in 2001 and 2006.

Despite strong disagreements regarding the merits of the proposed rule, these issues should be resolved through the rulemaking process, not in this bill. By preemptively stopping any efforts to update the definition of fill materials, this bill ensures that communities in coal country will continue to live with public health threats and the environmental consequences of mountaintop removal mining.

Lastly, this bill does not do nearly enough to address the incredibly damaging effects of climate change. Rising sea levels and increased flooding from torrential downpours and hurricanes demonstrate the overwhelming need to invest in new water infrastructure to safeguard our communities. Yet the subcommittee can't invest in new projects because its allocation is dwarfed by the growing backlog of ongoing projects, which includes projects that were authorized decades ago.

Clinging to outdated fossil fuels instead of doubling down on the promise of renewable energy slows future job

growth that saves lives by lessening the impact of climate change.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank you for restoring a portion of the administration's proposed cut to the Richland Operations Office at Hanford in my district. I appreciate your willingness to work with me on funding, and I know the provisions on Yucca Mountain and MOX that are in this bill are also key to the Hanford cleanup success.

Madam Chair, the Richland Operations Office is responsible for many critical cleanup projects and legal commitments, and progress there has largely been a success. This represents a new model for cleanup. And it has been successful. It is nearing completion and will save taxpayers \$250 million.

I am encouraged that the \$235 million in this bill provided for cleanup for the River Corridor will focus on the 300 Area milestones under the River Corridor Closure Contract.

As the appropriations process continues, I look forward to working with you to ensure appropriate restoration for Richland, given the budget constraints that we have.

Mr. Chairman, this is my last Energy and Water bill, yet I am confident that Hanford has a friend and an advocate in your leadership.

When it comes to the other project at Hanford, the Office of River Protection, there are a number of challenges. Among other things, I am hopeful that DOE and the State of Washington will reach an agreement on an achievable path forward for WTP.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington for his continued advocacy of Hanford cleanup funding in the Energy and Water bill. His leadership on these issues will be sorely missed in the future.

I am pleased to support funding for the cleanup of the River Corridor, and I am hopeful that the Department of Energy will soon provide the necessary details for the Waste Treatment Plant project. WTP is a critical project, but Congress needs more answers and greater transparency.

I look forward to working with you to make sure adequate funding is available should a new agreement on the path forward be reached.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of the Agriculture, Budget, and Oversight Committees.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank my colleague for



yielding time, and I commend her and the chairman for their efforts to put together a bipartisan bill and bring it to the floor. I do have a couple of concerns with the bill that I am addressing today.

First, it provides additional funding for the Waste Isolation Pilot Project in southeastern New Mexico. I am pleased that the committee has seen the need to provide additional funding so that the causes of an incident that occurred earlier this year can be better understood and remedied, but I urge the committee to find a different source of funding for those efforts.

Altering the payment schedules for pension fund payments, I think, is bad fiscal policy. These pension plans face significant liabilities, and they simply cannot afford it.

I am also concerned about the way the bill deals with Laboratory Directed Research and Development, or the LDRD. LDRD is the primary source of funding for fundamental research at our national security laboratories, like Sandia National Laboratories, which is based in my district.

LDRD allows these critical facilities to sustain their mission-essential science and technology capabilities, anticipate and address emerging mission needs, and advance technologies in a wide range of areas critical to national security.

The provision in this bill, coupled with last year's cuts to LDRD, combine to decrease the funds available for this important program by over 20 percent and increase the labs' administrative burden.

In my view, these policy changes will have a negative impact on the labs' ability to conduct critical national security work, and I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman and the ranking member to address both of these issues as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the chance to speak on programs at the Nevada National Security Site that are critical to our Nation's ability to ensure the safety and performance of our nuclear weapons stockpile and for the excellent job you and the ranking member have done in managing the fiscal year 2015 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

However, the bill before us does not include the full amount requested for a new advanced radiography capability that will establish an integrated facility at the Nevada National Security Site to help us understand the effects of aging and manufacturing processes on proposed approaches to stockpile life-extension programs.

I appreciate that in this fiscal environment we must all make difficult choices. Yet, I am hopeful in conference there will be budget flexibility

to support the full request for advanced radiography.

Furthermore, going into conference, I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the fact that you would be open-minded to additional information from the Department of Energy on this proposed capability to better understand its strategic value to our nuclear weapons stockpile.

We stand ready, willing, and able to assist you in getting more transparency and more information from the Department of Energy regarding proposed plans for advanced radiography capability.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMODEI. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to working with you to making sure adequate funding is available to support the needs of our nuclear weapons stockpile and to receiving more information on the Department of Energy's proposal to construct this new capability.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. First, I would like to thank the ranking member and Chairman SIMPSON for bringing to the floor a bill that has incorporated interests from both parties within the limit of the Bipartisan Budget Act.

In particular, I want to thank the committee for increasing funding for a specific activity within the Department of Energy's fossil energy research and development. That is the risk-based data management system.

This activity supports the funding of a tool which is used by many States for public disclosure of hydraulic fracturing operations. It is called FracFocus. While this tool is intended to be easily usable by the public, it has been pointed out by a special Department of Energy task force that some improvements must be made to this government-funded database in order for it to be more accurate, accessible, and transparent.

That is why I was very pleased to hear from the chairman and the ranking member that a portion of the increased funding for the risk-based data management system is intended to help update the FracFocus database to meet modern data, usability, and public transparency standards.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue. I agree we should set our public transparency standards high when looking at taxpayer-funded projects. A portion of the risk-based data management activity is intended to be used for improving FracFocus, and as we move forward I will work with the gentleman to ensure

that our intent is included in the conference report language.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the ranking member, and I look forward to working with her in the future.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 15½ minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of the work the committee did in this bill to protect Americans from additional, unnecessary regulatory burdens. In particular, I want to thank them for protecting landowners in rural Kansas—and elsewhere across this Nation—from attempts by the Army Corps and the EPA to regulate, from Washington, every single drop of water that falls to the ground.

□ 1400

When it passed the Clean Water Act, Congress never contemplated and certainly never authorized a definition of "navigable waters" that covered roadside ditches, prairie potholes, water tanks, or farm ponds in Kansas or elsewhere.

This proposed rule by some bureaucrats in far-off Washington is a clear violation of the separation of powers within our Constitution. Ultimately, it is nothing more than a power grab of private property.

In practice, this rule would require Kansas farmers and ranchers to apply for costly permits—to apply for permission to perform routine farming activities like building a fence, fertilizing, or even plowing, and if our food producers have to pay more to comply with Washington's overregulations, Americans will see it in higher prices at the grocery store.

Madam Chairman, only in Washington would one try to define "standing water" in a ditch that is surrounded by prairie in Kansas as water that is capable of navigation. It is time for the administration to ditch this rule. Until then, this Congress should not spend a single penny in advancing this massive 370-page rule. I support the provisions in this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with Chairman SIMPSON, and I thank the chairman for including language in the committee's report, which would require that the Army Corps of Engineers also look to strategic seaport designations

when allocating funding for additional work.

However, the President's budget for FY 2015 proposes to cut the maintenance budget for the Sabine-Neches Waterway by 35 percent over last year. No other area of the country, at least that I have been able to identify, has seen such a dramatic cut to its maintenance resources in the President's budget. This simply does not make sense.

The Sabine-Neches Waterway is located between Texas and Louisiana. It is responsible for the third highest tonnage volume of foreign trade in the Nation and supplies 55 percent of our Nation's strategic petroleum reserves.

Refineries located there manufacture 60 percent of our Nation's commercial jet fuel and a significant majority of our military's jet fuel. It is also used by the U.S. military to transport cargo to and from overseas deployments via the Port of Beaumont and Port Arthur, which are located along the waterway and handle over 33 percent of military cargo.

Reducing resources to maintain waterways and harbors like this will restrict commerce, increase costs, and jeopardize safety at a time of increasing trade volume. I believe this cut is extremely shortsighted.

Will the chairman agree that Congress needs to hold the administration accountable in how it allocates precious taxpayer resources for economically significant national infrastructure? Will the chairman work with me and others to ensure that harbors and waterways that play a critical role for our economy and national security are a priority in the allocation of maintenance resources?

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Texas for highlighting the importance of allocating sufficient resources to the maintenance of our waterways and harbors.

It is for this very reason that he articulated that the bill being considered today increases funding for navigation maintenance by 18 percent above the budget request.

Madam Chair, I agree that Congress needs to hold the administration accountable in this regard, and I promise to work with the gentleman to ensure that we prioritize maintenance funding for all of our Nation's economically and strategically significant waterways and harbors.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chair, I am particularly pleased to see section 401 in this bill, which requires the Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—currently Allison Macfarlane—to no-

tify the other members of the Commission and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, within 1 day after the Chairwoman or Chairman begins using emergency powers.

This provision was included in the last Congress, and I am hopeful that the underlying policy can be put into permanent statute. In fact, over the last 2 years, Madam Chairman—two Congresses—I have had a bill to make these permanent changes. The bill is H.R. 3132.

For example, currently, no definition of an "emergency" exists, and no requirement of notice by the Chair to fellow Commissioners or to Congress exists.

That is why this language is so important in this bill, yet the current Chair, Ms. Macfarlane, opposes this language as "too burdensome." This follows on the heels of a former Chair—her immediate past Chair—who declared an emergency without telling anybody and used it for a political purpose.

There is obviously a need for this type of language, and we should make it permanent, instead of having to do this every year on the Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

I am glad to see that the current Commission is more collegial now, but it is incumbent upon us in the House and Senate to make sure that these changes are made permanent, so this abuse of power doesn't occur anymore.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the chairman.

Madam Chair, yesterday, we received a letter and white paper from the Chief of Naval Operations and the Director of the Naval Reactors program. I will include these documents and statement for the RECORD that I will be submitting shortly.

This eight-star letter from our Nation's most senior naval officer makes clear that the cuts made to the Naval Reactors' budget request over the last 4 years are endangering the safety and reliability of the Navy's nuclear fleet.

With the 12 percent reduction proposed by the bill before us today, Naval Reactors will have taken over \$600 million in cuts over 5 years.

The letter from the admiral is clear:

The persistent cuts have put Naval Reactors in the position of being unable to provide for a safe and reliable nuclear fleet, to design and test the nuclear reactor plant for the Ohio replacement program, and to safely and responsibly manage the aging infrastructure and the facilities for processing naval spent nuclear fuel. This approach is no longer sustainable.

Naval Reactors is a critical defense priority contained in this much larger

appropriations bill. I share the admiral's concern that, if sustained, these reductions will endanger national security and the Naval Reactors' unparalleled 60-year record of safe and reliable nuclear operations.

I urge the gentleman from Idaho to review these proposed reductions and their impacts as this bill progresses and to restore the Naval Reactors' funding to the budget request level in a conference or in a potential continuing resolution.

I and my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee stand ready to support these efforts.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, DC, July 7, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House  
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We write today to express our strong concern over proposed cuts to Naval Reactors' (NR's) portion of the FY15 National Nuclear Security Administration budget request.

Our Navy and our national security rely on a nuclear Fleet of 10 aircraft carriers and 73 submarines, including our 14 Ohio-Class ballistic missile submarines—over 40 percent of our major combatants. These warships form the backbone of our Navy, enabled by the 93 reactors that power them—reactors provided, operated, and regulated solely by NR. NR has been doing this for our nation for over 60 years, compiling over 166 million miles safely steamed on nuclear power—it is an unmatched record of safety and effectiveness.

The funding level proposed in H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, proposes reducing NR's funding below the request by \$162 million which places operation of that nuclear Fleet including sustained carrier operations and the nation's security at risk. If enacted, this would be the fifth consecutive year of significant marks to NR's requests for funding. To date, these reductions below requested levels have totaled over \$450 million; this bill would bring that total to well over \$600 million. These shortfalls have resulted in delaying the construction of needed facilities, effectively halting research and development, and deferring procurement of equipment needed to address emergent fleet issues. The persistent cuts have put NR in the position of being unable to provide for a safe and reliable nuclear fleet, design and test the reactor plant for the OHIO Replacement Program, and safely and responsibly manage aging infrastructure and the facilities for processing naval spent nuclear fuel. This approach is no longer sustainable.

Moreover, the bill includes a number of provisions on the use of funds, continuing a trend that reduces NR's ability to manage the Program consistent with the priorities of safe and reliable operation of the fleet.

As the Committee moves forward with H.R. 4923, we respectfully ask that you consider full funding for NR at the FY15 budget request and removal of restrictive provisions on the expenditure of funds. This is essential for continued operation of the nation's nuclear-powered fleet now and into the future.

An identical letter has been sent to Representatives Rogers, Frelinghuysen, and Simpson; and Senators Mikulski and Levin.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. RICHARDSON,  
Admiral, U.S. Navy,  
Director, Naval Nuclear  
Propulsion  
Program.

JONATHAN W. GREENERT,  
Admiral, U.S. Navy,  
Chief of Naval Operations.

FY15 HOUSE ENERGY & WATER  
APPROPRIATIONS REDUCTION IMPACTS

H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, reduced Naval Reactors funding by \$162 million. This cut, on top of multi-year reductions to Naval Reactors Operations and Infrastructure and Naval Reactors Development, places the Navy's nuclear-powered fleet at risk. These funding constraints impede Naval Reactors' ability to respond to emergent issues in the Fleet, maintain its operating nuclear power plants, and address issues associated with its aging facilities and infrastructure.

Naval Reactors Operations and Infrastructure (NOI) was funded \$44M below the FY 2015 budget request. This budget line funds operation and maintenance of Program research and training reactors, environmental compliance and protection activities, spent fuel handling including packaging for dry storage, environmental and radiological remediation, demolition of legacy facilities, and recapitalization of the nearly 60 year old aging infrastructure. This reduction will result in the following:

Planned disposal of radioactive waste equipment and materials in Pennsylvania and Idaho will be delayed. This will result in the loss of approximately 20 jobs in Idaho.

Planned decontamination and dismantlement (D&D) work in New York, inclusive of DIG prototype remediation, will be scaled back. Planned D&D in Idaho, such as removal of legacy Expended Core Facility water pool tunnel piping, will not be executed. Reductions in this work will cause the loss of approximately 20 jobs in New York and 60 jobs in Idaho.

Planned capital investment projects in Idaho, including replacement of the undersized storm water sewer system at the north end of the Naval Reactors Facility, will not be executed.

Planned infrastructure sustainment work in Idaho will be deferred. Potential examples include refurbishment of rail spurs necessary for receipt of naval spent nuclear fuel and replacement of a degrading, 50-year old, switchgear that provides power to critical loads across the Naval Reactors Facility.

Naval Reactors' infrastructure exists solely to support the nation's nuclear-powered fleet. Reductions to NOI jeopardize the operation of those facilities. If site operations are stalled, whether as a result of infrastructure failures or failure to meet regulatory requirements, the nuclear-powered fleet will be placed at risk. Naval Reactors continues to identify specific impacts as a result of the FY15 HEWD reduction, including possible loss of jobs comparable in size to those already identified. However, concerns about adverse impacts to worker and public safety, regulatory compliance, and court-enforceable commitments are impeding identification of practical alternatives.

Naval Reactors Development (NRD) was funded \$15M below the FY2015 budget request. Additionally, the HEWD directed that an additional \$2M of NRD funds be specifically directed toward the Advanced Test Reactor. The NRD funding line provides for the research, development, analysis, engineering, and testing required to support current Fleet operations, as well as future nuclear-powered warship technologies. Reductions to NRD continue to erode unique laboratory capabilities required solely for naval nuclear propulsion plants. Because NR will not compromise reactor safety, the impacts ultimately

manifest as impacts to cost, schedule, and operational availability of the Navy's nuclear-powered combatants. Among the ramifications of reduced NRD funding in FY15:

Inability to replace failing specialized analytical and chemical analysis equipment needed to characterize material properties of failed reactor plant components and weld surfaces. Common problems that require investigation include effects of materials under various manufacturing and operating environmental conditions (e.g., corrosion). Without the proper equipment to investigate these problems, our only safe response to problems in the Fleet is likely overly conservative and will include limitations on ship speed, reactor lifetime, or costly component replacements.

Inability to replace a specialized 30-year old heat treatment furnace that supports investigation of nuclear fuel material specimens and resolution of complex manufacturing problems that without timely resolution will delay our ability to deliver new and refueling reactor cores for existing and planned Fleet reactors.

Inability to replace a failed motor generator needed to conduct acoustic performance testing to ensure reactor components meet submarine stealth requirements.

Inability to begin refurbishment of the failing linear accelerator; the only facility in the US capable of providing the fundamental physics data needed to validate nuclear reactor performance assumptions and support nuclear criticality safety assessments.

Inability to fund advanced development innovation work—the type of work that has led in the past to our most successful cost savings and performance increasing initiatives such as higher energy density fuel and electric drive.

Inability to fund improvements aimed at reducing the cost of future reactor cores, consolidating test facilities and personnel, reduction of expensive large-scale prototypic thermal-hydraulic testing.

The proposed FY15 NRD reductions continue the gradual, cumulative effect of degrading Naval Reactors' facilities, capabilities and expertise. Maintaining the operational availability of today's nuclear fleet and ensuring that the future fleet meets military needs requires a sustained commitment. By continuing the process of diminishing the foundational technical excellence of the NR Program, the proposed budget reductions increase the risk of long-term damage to this premier national capability.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his continued advocacy for the important national security activities funded in the Energy and Water bill, which includes the Naval Reactors program.

Madam Chair, as the appropriations process continues, I look forward to working with him and his colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, to ensure that Naval Reactors receives the funding it requires to sustain, support, and to modernize the nuclear fleet.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at this time, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, for over 70 years, our national laboratories have worked to ensure the security of our Nation. We have a responsibility to be good stewards of the environment in relation to the historic and ongoing radiological work at these laboratories.

At Los Alamos, there are legal obligations, including the 3706 campaign to remove transuranic, or TRU, waste and the broader 2005 consent order between the DOE and the State of New Mexico to remediate legacy waste at Los Alamos.

Two major wildfires near Los Alamos National Lab have highlighted the importance of removing aboveground waste from this facility. The DOE was nearing its completion of the 3706 campaign when the Nation's only repository for TRU waste, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, experienced, first, a fire and then a radiological release.

As we work to restore WIPP operations, we must ensure that our national laboratories have the resources to meet their legal obligations for environmental remediation. We also must recognize our moral obligation to these communities that have served our great Nation.

It is with this intention that I request the chair to work with me and Representatives from other affected communities, as this bill moves forward to conference, to ensure that adequate and appropriate funds are available not only for the restoration operations of WIPP, but also for legally-mandated environmental remediation efforts at Los Alamos and at other affected national laboratories.

I thank you for this time to address this important issue. I look forward to working with you to find a solution, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his continued advocacy of the cleanup program at Los Alamos.

I look forward to working with you on ensuring that adequate funding is available to support the Department of Energy's cleanup program, including the cleanup work at Los Alamos and the restoration of operations at WIPP.

I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire if the gentleman is ready to close.

Mr. SIMPSON. I believe we have two more speakers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I am happy to see \$20 million included in this appropriations bill for the reimbursement of uranium and thorium cleanup.

I also want to highlight the language in the bill that directs the Department of Energy to provide sufficient resources in future budgets to eliminate the reimbursement backlog, which stands at \$54 million, and return to a more normal reimbursement schedule to ensure that a backlog doesn't occur again.

The current backlog of \$54 million grows year by year, with sites in Illinois, Colorado, Wyoming, Washington, South Dakota, and New Mexico.

The way this works out in my constituency is that, in the community of West Chicago, Illinois, it had an adverse situation years and years ago with thorium that was spread throughout the community. They have done a tremendous job in the cleanup, but the cleanup needs to continue.

I commend the chairman for his commitment, and I look forward to being part of this solution for the full remediation of this issue in West Chicago, Illinois, and in other places around the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, which makes important investments in our communities, our energy jobs, and our Nation's energy future.

This bill prioritizes using abundant coal reserves to produce clean, efficient energy. I am very pleased that the bill makes a strong investment in fossil energy research and development, including work on clean coal technologies. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing amendments that would strip this funding.

West Virginia is a leader in this technology, with the National Energy Technology Lab in Morgantown conducting much of this important research.

This administration has continued to attack coal and the people who rely on coal for energy and employment. This bill not only rejects the administration's 15 percent cut to fossil energy research, but sends a clear message: coal is, will be, and must be an important part of a national all-of-the-above strategy, and we will continue to invest in developing ways to make it more efficient and cleaner.

The Energy and Water Appropriations bill also rejects the Army Corps of Engineers' and the EPA's proposed rule to expand Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. Finally, this bill maintains funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission, un-

derscoring its importance to local communities.

My State of West Virginia is the only State that is entirely within the boundaries of the ARC, and the people of West Virginia have truly benefited from the ARC's proven record of spurring economic development and of improving access to health care and education in lower-income communities.

I want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, HAL ROGERS, and the chairman of the subcommittee, MIKE SIMPSON, for bringing this piece of legislation to the floor, which makes the right choices and sets the right priorities for our country's energy future.

With that, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

□ 1415

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would inform the gentlewoman that we have no more speakers, and if the gentlewoman is ready to close, I will close.

Ms. KAPTUR. I am prepared to close, Mr. Chairman, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, an energy-hungry world will continue to push up global energy prices and availability. America must not get caught in this ensuing juggernaut. Our liberty and economic security truly are at stake. The world is changing and so America must adapt, and adapt sooner rather than later.

Over a quarter century ago, President Jimmy Carter was not wrong when he equated the struggle for energy independence as the moral equivalent of war. America, since, has been engaged in plenty of fighting abroad in oil-rich, unstable regions of our world. Instead, we must refocus and draw forth the powers of our own land, performing something worthy to be remembered, as DANIEL WEBSTER reminds us every day. Energy security is such a calling.

Certainly, this bill leaves unmet opportunities on the table—too much, in my view—but its direction is clear. It aims at liberty. It looks forward to meeting that objective by moving this bill forward.

I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON, Rob Blair, Taunja Berquam, and our entire staff for their willingness to work together, for preparing a bill that is inclusive and pragmatic. I appreciate Chairman SIMPSON's gentlemanly reach out to our side of the aisle.

I also want to thank all the staff who helped. Their countless long hours, late nights during holidays and so forth, and their thoughtful insights have been critical to helping us prepare this legislation that is aimed at restoring liberty, creating jobs in America, re-assuming economic power here at home, strengthening our energy portfolio and water security for future generations, and, fundamentally, our national security.

I ask our colleagues as we move through the amendment process to

help us move this bill forward in America's interest.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her work on this bill. She has been a valuable partner in crafting a bill.

In trying to address the needs of all Members on both sides of the aisle, obviously you can never address all of them, but I think both the Republican and Democratic members of the committee and of the House ought to be proud of the bill that is before them and our efforts to try to address their desires and their needs.

With that, I would encourage all Members to support this legislation. I look forward to the debate on the amendments that are going to be coming up.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I often say, there are some in this Chamber who seem to know the cost of everything yet the value of nothing. Without question there are savings to be found in the federal government, but sometimes to realize those savings we have to invest a little money.

Let's take the federal government's energy consumption as a case in point.

Since coming into office in 2009, the Obama administration has made it a priority to make the federal government a leader in reducing energy consumption and increasing energy efficiency. The administration recognizes that as the nation's largest energy consumer, the federal government has a tremendous opportunity and a clear responsibility to lead by example in energy efficiency.

The federal government operates more than 500,000 buildings and other structures comprising more than 3 billion square feet, and it operates a fleet of more than 600,000 civilian and non-tactical military vehicles. The total cost of energy consumption to the Federal government was nearly \$25 billion in FY2012.

I am pleased the President has made energy efficiency in federal buildings a priority of his Climate Action Plan. The President's recent commitment of another \$2 billion in energy efficiency in federal buildings is a critical step in reducing both energy costs and carbon emissions.

As a result of these actions we have reduced energy use per square foot in federal buildings by more than 9 percent since FY2008, curbing pollution and reducing utility bills. The federal government also purchased more than 7% of its electricity from renewable sources such as solar and wind in 2013, exceeding statutory requirements and promoting homegrown energy industries. And we have reduced greenhouse gas emissions by more than 15 percent from 2008 levels—the equivalent of permanently taking 1.5 million cars off the road.

However, I fear cutting the Department of Energy's Federal Energy Management Program by almost 30% will jeopardize this progress.

FEMP is a critical component in enabling federal agencies to meet their energy-related and sustainability goals. FEMP helps other agencies to accomplish energy, water, and greenhouse gas improvements within their organizations by providing expertise in federal

energy project and policy implementation and coordination to enhance national efforts in energy management.

In addition, FEMP activities reduce the energy intensity at federal facilities, lowering their energy bills and providing environmental benefits through increased use of performance contracting which includes energy saving performance contracts, utility energy service contracts, and power purchase agreements. From 2009 to 2011, FEMP negotiated performance contracts that saved taxpayers more than \$3.5 billion in federal energy costs.

Through these and other efforts, FEMP strives to reduce the federal government's energy footprint by 30% by the end of 2015 compared to 2003 levels, reduce water consumption intensity by 16% by the end of 2015 relative to 2007 baseline, and increase renewable electricity energy equivalent to at least 5% of total federal facility electricity use.

FEMP plays other important roles both in interagency coordination to align federal government efforts related to federal energy management planning and legislation compliance, and in training federal agency managers about the latest energy requirements, best practices, and technologies available.

The savings FEMP has helped agencies achieve over the past 15 years is roughly equal to one year's worth of federal energy consumption, and it has produced more than a 2.5-to-1 return on investment. Mr. Speaker, we all want to find savings in the government, but let's not be blinded by short-term spending cuts that jeopardize this program that has proved it can save taxpayer dollars in the long run.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, let me thank the Chair and our Ranking Member LOWEY and of the subcommittee, Congresswoman KAPTUR for their very hard work on this bill.

This appropriations bill is intended to provide the Department of Energy, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other offices with the funds they need to safeguard our natural resources.

Unfortunately, instead of adequately funding these critical agencies, this bill has been turned into a vehicle for Republican efforts to cut protections that keep our drinking water safe, protect our rivers and oceans from toxic dumping, and to protect critical wildlife.

The Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act are proven public health tools to reduce dangerous pollution known to make people sick and cut short lives.

That is why I am opposed to the Republican policy riders included in this bill that are designed to block or weaken clean air protections, specifically the EPA's proposed limits on carbon pollution from existing power plants.

This bill also cuts Federal investment in innovative clean energy research and development (R&D) at a time of significant global competition and progress.

Mr. Chair, as a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, I know spending bills are difficult enough to pass without weighing them down with toxic policy riders.

We need to continue this Appropriations process in good faith, and I am disappointed that the bill in front of us today does not reflect that.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). All time for general debate has expired.

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

During consideration of the bill for amendment each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4923

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related efforts.

INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary where authorized by law for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related needs; for surveys and detailed studies, and plans and specifications of proposed river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, and aquatic ecosystem restoration, projects and related efforts prior to construction; for restudy of authorized projects; and for miscellaneous investigations, and, when authorized by law, surveys and detailed studies, and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, \$115,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For expenses necessary for the construction of river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related projects authorized by law; for conducting detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of such projects (including those involving participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such detailed studies, and plans and specifications, shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); \$1,704,499,000, to remain available until expended; of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of construction costs for facilities under the

Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as authorized by Public Law 104-303; and of which such sums as are necessary to cover one-half of the costs of construction, replacement, rehabilitation, and expansion of inland waterways projects shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, except as otherwise specifically provided for in law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide a \$500,000 increase for the Army Corps of Engineers Continuing Authorities Program, or CAP, and would pay for the increase with a small \$500,000 cut from the Department of Energy's departmental administration account. For small communities struggling to pay for \$25,000 projects, this minor amendment can be a major help around the country.

The CAP program allows for funding of small local projects without the lengthy study and authorization process typical of most larger Corps projects. The program funds projects dealing with issues like stream bank erosion, navigation improvements, and flood control, and it is incredibly important to local communities that cannot afford to fund these studies and projects on their own.

Two specific sections of the program are vitally important to my district: section 205, which deals with flood control, and section 14, which deals with stream bank erosion.

The city of Peru, Indiana, lives within an area designated as a floodplain because of a ditch that runs through it, but the ditch hasn't flooded in the entire time the city has been keeping records, which is more than 80 years. This floodplain designation has made insurance premiums so expensive, business developers are reluctant to locate to the area and residents are struggling to pay their premiums.

Corps engineers have been to the site, and they don't think the floodplain is correct either. The ditch hasn't flooded. So CAP funds are desperately needed in places like Peru, Indiana, so the Corps can conduct a study to determine whether the ditch really is ever likely to flood and, if so, what type of project could be done to prevent flooding and bring down flood insurance premiums.

In a place called Rochester, Indiana, the Tippecanoe River runs along a stretch of East County Road 350 North. The river is eroding soil from underneath the road, and over the last decade, the road has lost several feet of its

embankment. The situation has become so dangerous authorities have closed the road until it can be fixed. An examination is needed to determine how to stop this stream bank erosion, and then a project must be able to be done to fix it. County officials can't afford to conduct the study or repairs on their own.

The Army Corps of Engineers said they can conduct the examination and repairs, but CAP funds are needed. However, the Continuing Authorities Program is so popular with local communities like Peru and Rochester, the Corps of Engineers routinely receives many more projects than it can fund, and CAP funds for the year run out quickly.

Chairman SIMPSON and his staff have worked hard to address this problem and put together a great bill. President Obama's budget request only provided \$10 million for CAP and only funded four of the CAP sections, but Chairman SIMPSON rejected that devastating cut and has allocated \$56.8 million for eight CAP sections. My amendment would provide a small funding bump for CAP that would enable the Army Corps of Engineers to help dozens of communities making very small funding requests.

Some people will say that the Department of Energy can't afford another cut to its administrative funding, but that is simply not true. This year's bill provides \$255 million for the Department of Energy's departmental administration budget. This is \$20.5 million more than last year. My amendment would only cut \$500,000 from this amount. That is a 0.19 percent cut. Given the enormous importance of local infrastructure, I believe this is one very small cut that Congress should make.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment and thank the good lady for offering it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member. I appreciate the work that has gone into this bill, and I appreciate your willingness to accept my 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 Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

Mr. MURPHY 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:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 7, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the Murphy-Cleaver amendment to the underlying Energy and Water Appropriations bill to support the Army Corps' construction account by an additional \$1 million.

Supporting the Corps' ongoing construction efforts is crucial to the well-being of regions like the Treasure Coast and Palm Beach communities in Florida that I am so proud to represent. The restoration projects in our area are vital to restoring the natural flow of water south of Lake Okechobee, reducing the harm that is currently caused by discharges from the lake into our St. Lucie River and Indian River Lagoon. All these projects work together to improve the water quality throughout the system, with our local waterways being no exception.

The urgency to move these ongoing projects forward could not be more clear. The record rainfall in our area resulted in last year being dubbed the "lost summer," with major die-offs of important species in this unique ecosystem as well as health warnings that kept the public out of the water and harmed our local economy that relies so heavily on our waterways.

While \$1 million might not seem like a lot, this money could be used to help projects that are near completion cross the finish line. For example, the Kissimmee River Project just north of my district is 86 percent near completion, and this funding could be used to fund one of the final steps needed to complete this project. Once completed, this project will restore up to 20,000 acres of wetland, storing more water north of the lake, lessening the amount of harmful discharges that must be released to the east and west into our local estuaries, and cleaning the water before it flows into the already inundated waterways.

For Florida's 18th District, \$1 million can make a real difference in the fight to protect our waterways.

Mr. Chair, I now yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), my good friend. Mr. CLEAVER is a great champion of infrastructure projects such as these that invest in our future and come back to our economy in multiples.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, first, Mr. MURPHY, and to the chair, ranking member, and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment would transfer a modest amount, as Mr. MURPHY stated, \$1 million, from the Corps' expense account to the construction account. The boost in funding can help flood control projects that communities, including several in my district, are pushing in hopes that they can be completed.

The United States has, as I believe we all know, an aging water infrastructure system and a colossal \$80 billion backlog of Army Corps projects. Over 1,000 authorized projects vigorously compete for funding. This is understandable when you consider the fact that America's levees, dams, and inland waterways were given a grade of D by the American Society of Civil Engineers in their 2013 report card. How can we expect our economy to flourish when its bedrock is deteriorating?

Water infrastructure funding is vital to my district. It sits on the confluence of several rivers, and flood control projects protect thousands of lives and billions in economic investment.

One such project, Swope Park Industrial Area, lies within a 100-year floodplain. When it floods, access to and from the park is cut off, risking the lives of over 400 workers. Without a 7,000-foot floodwall and levee, those 400 workers and over \$61 million in manufacturing remain unprotected.

□ 1430

Another project in my district, Dodson Industrial Park, is ready to start its final phase. But until that final segment is completed and connected, the rest of the project, the investment \$250 million within the park, remain at risk.

Mr. Chairman, most Army Corps projects contain agreements between the Federal Government and local communities to share the funding and responsibilities for their construction. It is time for the Federal Government to hold up its end of the agreement, for us to step up to the plate, and fully invest in our water infrastructure.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) for his collaboration on this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for his support of this commonsense amendment and urge my colleagues to support this proposal that, as you have heard, has the potential to make a major difference in the well-being of communities from Florida to Missouri.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for their support of this amendment and for all of their hard work.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I wanted to thank the gentleman from the Lake Okeechobee region of Florida (Mr. MURPHY) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for the very effective manner in which they have handled themselves in bringing this to our attention. And I want to thank the chair for accepting this important amendment, which is so important to Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Again, I thank the chair and ranking member for their hard work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about setting priorities. The Army Corps of Engineers construction account has a serious backlog of over \$60 billion. According to a recent CRS report, there is a backlog of more than 1,000 authorized studies and construction projects.

The President's budget inadequately addresses this backlog, only allocating \$1.1 billion for these important infrastructure projects, a 32 percent reduction over fiscal year 2014-enacted levels.

Now, I applaud the committee for providing \$48 million more for Corps construction over the 2014-enacted levels, but more needs to be done. This is especially prevalent with the recent passage of the bipartisan water re-

sources conference report, which contained authorizations for existing projects, such as the Louisiana Coastal Area, and new projects, such as Morganza to the Gulf.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment transfers \$5 million out of the Department of Energy's administrative account and moves that money into the Corps of Engineers construction budget. The goal is to move more projects forward, to reduce the backlog, and to open up the door for projects across the country vital to our Nation's waterways, our economy, and our ability to export.

Louisiana, for example, contains 3 million acres of coastal wetlands. Louisiana's coast is home to over 2 million people, supporting vital ecosystems, national energy security, thousands of jobs, and a unique culture.

As you may know, our coastal wetlands are rapidly disappearing. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that if present land-loss trends continue, Louisiana will lose 2,400 square miles of land between 1932 and 2050. That is an area about 25 times that of Washington, D.C.

Morganza to the Gulf, which is one of five new projects authorized in WRRDA's hurricane and storm damage risk reduction subsection, is of immense importance to Louisiana's coastal restoration and protection efforts. The project's purpose is to protect the remaining fragile marsh and wetlands from hurricane storm surge. This is one of many projects around the country that needs funding and is vital to our Nation's infrastructure.

Taxpayers wish to see this backlog cleared out and other projects important to our Nation's economy moved forward. That is what this amendment intends to help achieve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman's passion for coastal restoration. I know it is a high priority for his district, his State, and, in fact, for the country.

The committee often hears complaints that projects take too long and cost too much to build, in large part attributed to inefficient funding. If that is true, then the only responsible way to allow for new starts is to finish understanding the impacts of the selected new starts on the Corps' future budget requirements and on the expected costs and timelines of ongoing projects. Unfortunately, we do not have that information, and the administration has shown no willingness to provide it.

The fiscal year 2014 act allowed for a limited number of new construction starts, with the requirement that the administration provide information to show that these projects would be affordable at reasonable construction account levels and that these new

projects would not unduly delay or increase the cost of ongoing projects.

To say that the so-called analysis from the administration was inadequate would be an understatement. And no information at all was provided for the new start proposed in the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

Additionally, the administration continues to propose budgets with significant cuts to the construction account, including a 32 percent cut for fiscal year 2015. In fact, several individual projects authorized in the recent WRRDA are each estimated to cost more than what the administration requested for the entire nationwide construction program. Clearly, as promising as some new projects may be, it would be fiscally irresponsible to initiate new projects with no information on the impact of doing so.

I understand that some Members with authorized projects in their districts are anxious to get construction underway. I also understand, however, that many Members with projects already under construction in their districts want to see those projects completed and to start realizing the benefits of these Federal, State, and local investments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Page 7, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise to amend the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to increase the construction account by \$15 million to ensure local governments like the city of Rio Rancho, the county of Bernalillo, and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District get reimbursed for work they have done in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers works with local governments in New Mexico to construct levees, implement flood control measures, and other important infrastructure for the safety of the public.

More specifically, the city of Rio Rancho entered into a reimbursement contract with the Army Corps of Engineers and has not been paid back for several years due to the lack of appropriations. The same goes for the county of Bernalillo, the Middle Rio Grande