



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2020

No. 134

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 29, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

### REALIZING AMERICA'S RACIST PAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation we just passed, the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys that was sponsored by my fellow Floridian, Congresswoman WILSON.

Slavery lasted for over 246 years in America, from 1619 to 1865. It is one of America's original sins. People think of the Civil War as ancient history, but

there are actually still even children of slaves alive today. They may be in their late eighties, early nineties, but it makes you realize it wasn't that long ago.

In the 13th through 15th Amendments, we saw a great change prohibiting slavery, creating citizenship, due process, and the right to vote for African Americans.

Then, you had the Reconstruction Era. It started out with promising potential. Federal troops helped ensure votes throughout the Nation. We elected African Americans to the House and Senate, and according to Sherman's promise, everyone would get 40 acres and a mule.

It all came tumbling down, though, starting with the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, and President Johnson began to dismantle Reconstruction. Then, President Hayes ended Reconstruction in 1877 as part of a corrupt deal to ensure his Presidency.

Those in the South, African Americans, were arrested and put on chain gangs, among other ways, to force them into indentured servitude. Those in the North and West faced discrimination, discrimination in jobs, housing, justice, education, healthcare, marriage. Even facilities became segregated.

It reached a fevered pitch with "The Birth of a Nation" in 1915, restarting the KKK and lynchings and renewed interest in the Confederacy, its leaders, and its symbols. It played upon every terrible stereotype of African-American men on the silver screen for an impressionable public to see.

But it didn't stop there. Financial segregation was generationally punishing. African-American troops fought in World War I and World War II in segregated units for a country that discriminated against them. Then, they came home and were shut out of the New Deal programs during the Great

Depression, shut out of VA student loans and home loans.

They missed out on the greatest expansion of the middle class during the 1950s, and it was then that their renewed civil rights fight was just beginning.

With the success of the Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act of the 1960s, we saw some improvement, victories fought hard by JOHN LEWIS, who we just lost.

Even with these advances, discrimination persisted in the systems of justice, finance, business, and other foundations of our society.

Add in the 1980 war on drugs and the 1994 crime bill, and the list of laws and rules to systematically break up Black families, especially the arrest of Black men, reverberates today as our Nation looks inward after the murder of George Floyd about our country's racist past and institutional bias against Black men and boys, as well as Black women and girls.

This is why the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, as well as the Justice in Policing Act, are so important.

There must be an investigation, a realization, and reckoning in America about the racist past of this country and generational theft. We must develop lasting solutions if we are to progress as one Nation where every American is created equal.

### DEMOCRAT INACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle have developed a habit of harping about how Republicans are incorrectly addressing the priorities of the American people during the pandemic.

This is a bold claim coming from them, seeing as they are the ones being

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3883

caught playing political games on multiple occasions. Every day, Democrats echo those same fatigued talking points, and you can't help but wonder if they realize that, in fact, they are the ones who have been wasting time all along.

Denial is a powerful thing, Mr. Speaker. At a time when the American people demand leadership and accountability from Congress, Democrats have leaned on their political playbook for answers.

At this point, are we really surprised? Let's recap what the Democrats have done to date.

They have passed the so-called HEROES Act, a \$3 trillion socialist wish list that was crafted behind closed doors without bipartisan collaboration.

They have undermined 200 years of precedent by implementing proxy voting.

They have held virtual hearings where their Members are not physically present in the Capitol, and even one of their Members decided to phone in his vote to the committee while he was on his boat.

Now, juxtapose that with the work we have taken up.

Republicans have fought for schools to reopen safely. We have placed a high priority on strengthening our Nation's economic recovery, and we have worked tirelessly to support frontline workers.

Let President Trump and the administration be an example as well.

Secretary Scalia of the Department of Labor recently came to my district to meet with frontline workers, educators, and members of the private sector to learn about North Carolina's progress.

Deputy Secretary Hargan of HHS visited Wake Forest Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem to see the work being done by medical professionals to treat and protect North Carolinians.

This week, President Trump traveled to North Carolina to meet with representatives of a biotechnology company that is currently manufacturing a promising coronavirus vaccine.

Mr. Speaker, the differences between the Republican approach and the Democrat approach are night and day. I have said this before, and I will say it again: Democrats are choosing posturing over progress. They have ample opportunities to work with us, but they are more interested in creating the newest media sound bite, further inflating the Federal bureaucracy and appeasing their far-left base.

This isn't an observation. This is a fact. When you think of progress, you think of frontline workers; you think of private-sector innovation; you think about the millions of children around the country safely returning to school; and you think of businesses reopening their doors to the public.

When Republicans think of progress, that is what we envision. Sadly, Democrats have become so entrenched in their own political narrative that they

have failed to recognize the true priorities of the American people. Republicans will continue to work on the pressing needs of our Nation without delay. We can only hope that our Democrat colleagues will come to their senses eventually.

#### THANKING CRAIG ROBERTS FOR HIS SERVICE AS CHIEF OF STAFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that being a chief of staff to a Member of Congress is one of the best jobs on the Hill.

It takes a special person to keep the staff performing at the high level required of them. Burnout could easily occur because of long hours, high stress, and low pay.

That is why I come to the floor to thank my chief of staff, Craig Roberts, for his 24 years of service to me, the people of Illinois, and the people of this country. Yes, you heard me right, Craig has been with me for 24 straight years. It really has to be some kind of record.

Craig was born and raised in the Alton-Godfrey area of Madison County. He was one of those kids who was drawn to politics as a young kid, volunteering for campaigns in high school.

While attending Western Illinois University, he continued his studies and political activities. He graduated with a degree in political science and was an active member of the College Republicans.

Craig easily was hired by the Republican House staff in Illinois. I may have met him then, but my first direct and consistent contact with Craig was back in 1991 when he worked for the secretary of state. He volunteered to take on the task of running my first congressional campaign against an entrenched incumbent.

Running for Congress is difficult. Running against an incumbent is even more difficult. Running against a powerful, well-entrenched incumbent is crazy. Well, I was a little crazy, and I am glad Craig was, too, as he started the task to win the race.

The district consisted of 19 counties. Neither of us had personal money, but we put a little bit of our own in. I paid for gas and my food. He ate the last month of his salary cost.

We lost in the Clinton landslide in Illinois, but Craig's involvement helped provide immediate legitimacy to the campaign and made it competitive.

In 1996, I ran again, and this time, Craig was involved as an unpaid adviser. This race, I won narrowly. Once I won, I knew I had to ask Craig to join me in D.C. and run my office.

I made many local Republicans mad by taking Craig away from Springfield. In his time there, he had become highly respected. That respect would be easily duplicated in D.C.

Craig's leadership style is uplifting and empowering. He softened my big-

hammer style and calmed the seas when storm Shimkus was billowing.

He is a mentor and a friend to all who come through his door. Team Shimkus staff members can be found all over D.C., from the executive branch to the Senate and the chief of staff of offices. They all stay in touch and reach out to Craig for advice.

I left the D.C. hiring decisions to Craig. My theory is, if you hire someone and it doesn't work out, you have to be the one to fire that person.

My office staff is known for being open, accessible, friendly—most of the time—hardworking, and knowledgeable. This is a tribute to Craig. Our limited turnover is also a tribute to him.

Craig is a father figure to a bipartisan group of chiefs of staff. Active in the Chief of Staff Association, he has helped Congress and Members work together. In the heat of Member battles, chiefs talking to chiefs can help work things out.

He is also a proud and active Republican. He is known for his knowledge, organization, and planning. He volunteers and is an active member of the Capitol Hill Club, which is a Republican club up here on the Hill.

But a good chief of staff has to be a confidential adviser to the Member. Members of Congress live in the governmental and the political worlds simultaneously. So does the chief of staff.

The chief of staff has to ensure that the ethical boundaries are known and obeyed. Action people take action and, many times, cross the line. Chiefs, and particularly Craig, pulls a Member—and that would be me—aside and keeps me away from the brink of doing something really stupid.

Craig was and is available 24/7, 365 days a year. Maybe upon my retirement, he can get some rest, but I doubt he will.

We both carry the political and governmental scars of 24 years of service. Some can be seen while others cannot be seen. It is those scars that will forever bind us together.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Craig for joining me in D.C., thank him for staying with me, and thank him for being the best chief of staff on the Hill.

#### DO NOT LET DEATH OF ENRIQUE ROMAN-MARTINEZ GO UNSOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to decry a tragedy that has pierced the heart of my community, a tragedy that continues to cut deeper with each passing day because we still don't know what happened. We still have no answers.

All we know is that one of our very best, one of our brightest, is dead. Our hearts are broken, and we demand answers. Army specialist Enrique Roman-Martinez was a Chino native who makes the whole Inland Empire proud.

□ 0915

He joined the Army before he was even old enough to vote. He begged his mother to sign the release forms. That is how committed he was to our country and to others.

He was stationed at Fort Bragg in North Carolina and went camping in the Outer Banks over Memorial Day weekend with seven other soldiers. We don't know what happened that night on May 22, but what we do know is it cost Enrique his life, and the seven people who would seemingly have a lot of explaining to do, remarkably, had nothing to say.

When a police officer walked up to their campsite the next day and asked those seven soldiers to move their illegally parked vehicles, not a single one thought it was important enough to mention that someone who had been camping with them, their friend and their fellow soldier, was missing from the night before. It took a full 17 hours before they spoke out and reported Enrique gone. When they did so, they said they were worried that Enrique was suicidal.

It is hard for me to imagine why anyone would hesitate to tell a police officer that their fellow camper, their friend, and their fellow soldier was missing if they thought he was suicidal.

A week later, Specialist Roman-Martinez's remains were found washed ashore not far away. The question of whether or not he was suicidal was settled by the simple fact that they only found a severed head—his head. That is it.

He was just 21 years old. He had just started out in life. He had dedicated his few short years as an adult to a cause much greater than himself. He was only 3 months away from completing his duty and coming home as a veteran. Someone like that deserves better than this. His family deserves better for the son and brother that they have loved and lost.

I would like to take a moment to talk about Enrique's family, his mother, Maria, and sister, Griselda, because one of the most solemn and sacred duties our military has is their commitment to leave no one behind on the battlefield. It is their duty to inform the family when something goes wrong.

Mr. Speaker, as the mother of an Air Force veteran, I can tell you the fear of receiving a notice like that was with me every single day my son served. It is an ongoing unease in the back of your mind that never goes away. It is something I can still feel today.

Now, imagine if Enrique were your son. The only thing worse than a conversation like that is if that conversation never happens—never. That is what happened to Maria and Griselda. The Army was so slow to inform the family that they learned through media reports their son had been mutilated—through media reports.

The medical examiner ruled Enrique's death a homicide on that

Monday, and it took the Army until Friday to reach out to the family. The lack of notice was bad enough, but the lack of answers is still far worse. It is time to hear more from the seven individuals. Their silence isn't acceptable. It is time to hear from the community in North Carolina. If they know something, say something.

As a mother, I plead with them, if it were their son, if they are the mother of one of those seven young soldiers, male or female, say something. They need to talk to their son or daughter and demand that they speak out.

Lawyering up is not enough. Lawyering up is not enough. They deserve to bury their son and brother.

#### NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize July as National Park and Recreation Month.

Our Nation is blessed with a robust park system across the country on the Federal, State, and local levels. Summer is a popular time to take advantage of all that our parks have to offer.

The coronavirus pandemic and the shelter-in-place orders that have followed have left many of us desperate for fresh air, and as many parks begin to reopen, there are plenty of beautiful landscapes and outdoor activities to enjoy at parks across the country.

As a lifelong resident of rural Pennsylvania, an avid outdoorsman, and someone who was a former recreational therapist at one point, I know firsthand the positive impact that our Nation's parks system can have on communities, and I am proud to be a strong supporter.

My district, Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, is home to countless parks and outdoor recreational facilities, including the Oil Region National Heritage Area and the Allegheny National Forest, just to name a few.

This month is an opportunity to underscore the role that parks play in our everyday lives and in the fabric of American culture. It is also an opportunity to recognize the hard work and contributions of our park employees. Our parks give us all an opportunity to connect with the nature around us. They create a sense of community, stimulate local economies by attracting businesses, jobs, and tourism, and increase the quality of life for all residents.

Mr. Speaker, public parks and recreational facilities foster a variety of activities that contribute to a healthier society. There is an undeniable connection between parks and public health. Studies show that Americans who live within a 10-minute walk of a park see increased physical activity and lower obesity rates.

Recreational programs at public parks provide children with a safe place to play, access to healthy foods, opportunities to be physically active, and enrichment activities that help prevent at-risk behavior such as drug use and gang involvement.

Just last week, the House passed the Great American Outdoors Act, legislation that will ensure our national parks are around for future generations to enjoy.

As summer continues, it is my hope that families across the country will find an opportunity to take advantage of our Nation's parks and recreation facilities. If considering a visit to one of our national parks, visit the National Park Service website at [nps.gov](https://www.nps.gov) to find an open park in your community.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of investing in programs that expand opportunities for every person in every corner of our Nation, including my district in California's San Joaquin Valley.

Just last week, we passed a spending bill that will benefit our farmers, repair aging water infrastructure, help food-insecure residents from going hungry, support revitalization efforts on our public lands, and combat the climate crisis by cleaning our air.

This week, we have an opportunity to make further investments in the future sustainability of our Nation.

Face it, Mr. Speaker, we are living off the investments our parents and grandparents made a generation ago.

The availability of a reliable supply of water is the foundation of the San Joaquin Valley's economy and, I might add, California and much of the West, which grows food that feeds the world. As we say, where water flows, food grows.

We also must ensure access to clean drinking water so our communities can thrive. No one should have to worry in the richest nation in the world of having access to clean water in their homes.

These bills will provide more than \$100 billion to help repair the aging valley canals, such as the Delta-Mendota Canal, the Friant-Kern Canal, and the California Aqueduct, which are critical to delivering water to not only our farmers but to our valley communities.

These bills would also make small, disadvantaged communities safer and healthier by providing nearly \$1 billion for infrastructure repairs, communities like Dos Palos, Livingston, Fairmead, and Los Banos in the San Joaquin Valley to name but a few. It also provides more than \$10 billion for clean water and drinking water State revolving funds, which are important. It matches funds and is the best use of money.

We have been living off these investments, as I said, for way too long. The

coronavirus pandemic has worsened Americans' food insecurity crisis as we have witnessed, but with this bill we have an opportunity to ensure hungry Americans, especially children and seniors, have access to nutritious food.

For more than 50 years, hungry Americans have relied on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP, to keep from going hungry. These are the working poor and young and old alike. Thirty-eight million Americans, including 25 percent of my constituents, depend on these programs.

Throughout my time in Congress, I fought to increase funding and expand eligibility for this program, which has come under constant attack from the administration, and I don't understand it. There has never been a right time to cut support for the most vulnerable residents in our country, and doing so now certainly is not righteous in dealing with this worldwide pandemic.

The package also includes significant funding for agriculture research programs to help mitigate crop diseases, eradicate invasive species like the navel orange worm, and also has cost billions of dollars in California's agriculture economy. In addition, we need to do more for farmworkers' safety, people who are working in partnership with farmers to, every day, put food on America's dinner table, as well as for our packing sheds and our food processing facilities.

The climate crisis is having an unquestionable impact on the planet. This bill makes significant investments to preserve America's landscapes and prevent the worst impacts of climate change.

California's San Joaquin Valley, unfortunately, has some of the worst air in the Nation. By providing \$450 billion in grant funding for the Diesel Emission Reduction Act, this bill will help replace and retrofit emission diesel fuels for cleaner burning options to help clean our air.

These DERA grants have already removed dozens of air-polluting vehicles from our valley roads, creating immediate and tangible results. I have worked for decades to improve our air quality and remain committed to finding resources to improve our environment and reduce pollution.

In California, sadly, we have wildfires that have caused incredible destruction and hardship to California's mountain communities. There are estimated to be more than 100 million dead trees in the State from multiple causes. This spending bill will provide nearly \$6 billion to help maintain our forests and fight deadly fires. We must do more to manage our fires and prevent devastating fires. This bill will help us do just that. That is why these appropriations bills are so important.

Finally, it makes strong investments in our nature preservation, wildlife conservation, and ecological protections by providing \$500 million to support areas like San Luis National Wild-

life Refuge near Los Banos, the important refuge area for the Pacific Flyway between Canada and Mexico, an important wildlife refuge.

This spending bill prioritizes public health and safety, invests in our aging infrastructure, protects the environment, and prepares us for a brighter future. I am proud to vote for it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same in a bipartisan fashion.

Finally, we must also pass a bipartisan version of the HEROES Act for all the right reasons, which is contained in that legislation: for our States, for our counties, for our cities, for those who work there, for our healthcare workers, for further testing, and to create a safety net for American agriculture.

I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to do that as well. We must work together during this pandemic that is affecting all of our country and the entire world.

#### EXCEPTIONS TO POSSE COMITATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the Insurrection Act was passed in 1807 and signed into law by Thomas Jefferson as a delegation by the Congress to the President of the power granted under Article I, Section 8, Clause 15 of the Constitution to call forth U.S. Armed Forces, number one, to execute the laws; number two, suppress insurrections; and, number three, repeal invasions.

In 1827, the President's power to do so was upheld by the Supreme Court in *Martin v. Mott*.

In 1861, it was amended to add a section empowering the President to use the Armed Forces against the will of the Governor of a State in the case of a rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States.

In 1871, it was amended again to allow the President to use U.S. Armed Forces to enforce the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment and protect Black people from the Ku Klux Klan. President Grant used it three times.

To get Democrat support for President Rutherford Hayes in this House during the aftermath of the disputed 1876 Presidential election, Hayes agreed to remove Federal troops from the South, which ended Reconstruction.

The Posse Comitatus Act was passed in 1878 to limit the use of U.S. Armed Forces in domestic matters, thus codifying the compromise.

□ 0930

The Insurrection Act provisions are construed as specified exceptions to the Posse Comitatus Act. As such, it has been used by Democrat Presidents, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, JOHN KENNEDY, and Lyndon Johnson.

Roosevelt used it to put an end to a Detroit race riot during which 25 Black people were killed, and over 400 were injured.

President Eisenhower used it to desegregate Little Rock schools.

Kennedy used it to end the race riot at the University of Mississippi in 1962, after James Meredith, a Black man, was enrolled there. He used it again in my home State when Democratic Governor, George Wallace, disgracefully tried to block the enrollment of Vivian Malone and James Hood, both Black people, at the University of Alabama. He also used it to enforce the desegregation of public schools in Alabama in reaction to the hate-filled environment around the State Wallace encouraged.

In 1989, it was used by George H.W. Bush in St. Croix in the aftermath of Hurricane Hugo; and again in 1992, when the Governor of California asked for assistance in the riots which followed the beating of Rodney King.

It has not been used since. Nor did President Trump use it earlier this summer here in Washington. All military personnel used here this year were National Guard, the authorization of which was not needed under the Insurrection Act in this Federal city.

Nonetheless, last week this House approved an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act to substantially weaken the operations of the military under the Insurrection Act.

Let me be clear: Over the last 200 years, this law has only been used sparingly and only under extreme circumstances, which is only appropriate in a country which highly values the civilian control of our military. Our Armed Services have a primary mission to protect us from enemies without our country. They should rarely be used to do so with people within our country.

This unwise House amendment forbids our military when they are called out under the Insurrection Act from participating in search, seizure, arrest, or "other similar activity," unless "otherwise expressly authorized by law."

Mr. Speaker, the Insurrection Act is the primary provision that is expressly authorized by law. This amendment would effectively make the Insurrection Act toothless.

Imagine General Grant cleaning out the Ku Klux Klan in South Carolina with the limiting language of the amendment.

Imagine Franklin Roosevelt quelling the Detroit race riot and protecting innocent Black people with that limitation.

How about President Kennedy protecting Black students just trying to attend their State universities in Mississippi and Alabama in the face of violent racists and the Ku Klux Klan.

What is this House thinking? I submit, in this instance, the House didn't think. It just reacted, as it has these last 2 years, with blind indignation against President Trump. I say "blind"

because I don't believe many would have voted for such language if Hillary Clinton was President. Thank God the Senate didn't include this language in their version of the NDAA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the conferees from both Houses and both parties to reject this rash amendment and for all of us to return to our senses. Insurrections are rare but ugly things. Let's not tie a future President's hands at a time when our people may need his, and our military's, protection here at home.

#### CITIZENS UNITE FOR PEACEFUL PROTESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to express the extent to which I am proud of my constituents in southwestern Connecticut in Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District, but also to observe that just as in this country we have work to do in addressing the racial disparities that exists in all of our institutions, we have work to do in Connecticut's Fourth District.

Mr. Speaker, I was enormously proud that after we began to bend the curve on coronavirus—thanks to the leadership of our Governor, Ned Lamont—just as we saw those numbers begin to decline, like the rest of the country, my constituents were appalled by the brutal murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis. Nobody was unaffected by what we saw that day.

To the great credit of my constituents, people rose up in the broad diversity of my constituency. My constituency includes some of the wealthiest, small, and—yes—very White towns in the country: Towns like New Canaan and Darien. It also includes diverse cities that struggle with the issues of urban poverty: Bridgeport, Norwalk, and Stamford.

But as one, my constituents rose up—young, old, poor, wealthy, Black, White, straight, LGBTQ—and demanded progress and change, and they did it peacefully. They did it side by side with the leaders of the Police Department of Stamford, of Wilton, of New Canaan—police chiefs standing side by side with Black Lives Matter protestors. That was a good thing. That was an example of how we come together in the face of something awful.

But I also rise because there is no room for complacency. I remind my fellow citizens of Connecticut, while we are a progressive State, and while we did come together in all of our communities, it could happen here. I remind my constituents that Connecticut was actually the last State in New England in 1848 to eliminate slavery. That is just a few years before Abraham Lincoln did so in the South and around the country. So there is no place for complacency amongst my constituents.

And the truth is, as I have observed and many have observed, what hap-

pened to George Floyd is the pinnacle atop a structure of four centuries of racism and discrimination. Of course, George Floyd is not alone. The names echo in the chamber of shame in this country.

Breonna Taylor. Tamir Rice. Ahmaud Arbery. The names echo, and they go on and on.

But those Black Americans who have been killed unjustly sit atop a structure of the denial of equal access to opportunity. And that is in our systems of housing, our systems of education, and in the private sector.

So even as I celebrate and express my pride in my constituents, we need to be there for the broader struggle. We need to be there as we consider how we make one of the more segregated parts—at least with respect to housing in the United States—more fair. We need to be there when we contemplate the fact that too many of our Black and Brown brothers and sisters don't have the access to the extraordinary educational institutions in the State of Connecticut and around the country.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be there. It is good to show up and protest peacefully when a Black man is murdered at the hands of the police, but it is not enough because that act sits atop an edifice—a four-century long edifice—of discrimination, the effects of which still echo through every aspect of our society.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just my constituents. It is this Chamber and this Congress that must get serious about addressing the unequal distribution of opportunity in this country. That is our mission. I just said goodbye, with so many of my colleagues, to JOHN LEWIS. I know that is what John would have us do, and I know that he would have us do it with grace and with dignity and humility.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I charge my constituents with, and that is what I hope this Congress will address, in the memory of JOHN LEWIS, who just left us this morning.

#### CLIFTY FALLS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Clifty Falls State Park for its 100th anniversary. Located in beautiful Madison, Indiana, Clifty Falls gives its visitors an experience that you can't get anywhere else.

For 100 years, Hoosiers and Americans across the Nation have enjoyed beautiful hiking trails and waterfalls in Clifty Falls. I congratulate Clifty Falls State Park for its 100-year anniversary. Indiana is lucky to have such a beautiful place.

#### KEEP AMERICA SAFE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to challenge mayors, Governors, leaders of this country to stand up and shut down the rioting we are witnessing in

communities across our Nation. Anarchists are destroying homes, businesses, and whole communities. These people are not peaceful protestors. They are violent agitators.

The leaders of these cities need to get their act together and end this violence. American citizens are getting hurt and, yes, even killed, and it is time to stop this madness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in calling to end this lawlessness and to help keep all of our communities safe across this country.

#### REOPEN OUR SCHOOLS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for reopening schools across our Nation. I have been talking to parents in my district, Indiana's Sixth District, and the consensus is in: Let's get our kids back to school.

The science is on our side. Both the CDC and Academy of Pediatrics agree it is safe to reopen our schools. In fact, it would be unsafe to keep our schools closed. The emotional scarring, unreported abuse, and learning deficits of keeping our kids stuck inside staring at a screen and away from socialization is far too great. Working parents doing everything they can to put food on the table, they need our support.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let an entire generation fall behind in education. We must find a safe way to reopen our schools.

#### SUPPORT PRESIDENT TRUMP

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for President Donald J. Trump.

Perseverance in the face of lies from the media and his political opponents shows fearless leadership and should be admired.

The D.C. swamp continues to attack him relentlessly, stopping at nothing to take him down. The collateral damage in this grotesque war against our President is the American people.

President Trump created an economy where minorities were thriving, workers and families had good-paying jobs, and businesses were finally flourishing. When Democrats and the media do everything in their power to halt Trump's work, they are actually attacking the very American way of life that we hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to continue to support President Donald Trump and his agenda to make the American people stronger than ever.

#### MENTAL HEALTH OF OUR NATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the mental health crisis our Nation faces as we navigate the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic and the resulting economic crisis have resulted in a mental health and substance abuse crisis like we have never seen before.

Veterans, students, families, and Americans with a history of mental illness or addiction are really suffering. To continue to shut down our country does not make scientific sense, economic sense, or common sense. It is

imperative we reopen our country and get Americans back to work, back to school, and back to a healthy lifestyle.

#### NORTH CAROLINA'S ROLE IN PRODUCING CORONAVIRUS VACCINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the amazing work being done to produce a vaccine for the coronavirus. Some of the best work in our country is coming from FUJIFILM Diosynth Biotechnologies' Innovation Center in my home State of North Carolina.

On Monday, July 27, President Trump visited the Morrisville laboratories and touted the progress that has been made in Operation Warp Speed toward producing an effective vaccine in historic time. The Morrisville laboratories play a crucial role in that effort because they are working on a bulk drug substance for one of the possible vaccines.

It is impossible to overstate how important a vaccine will be for our Nation, and I am proud that North Carolina is on the front lines of that research.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the President for highlighting these facilities' exciting work, and especially thank the researchers, the doctors, and the scientists for their tireless work, and wish them every success possible.

#### RESTORING LAW AND ORDER

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for law and order and safety and security in our country.

In an era where some in the opposition party advocate for defunding the police, violent crime and rioting has swept across the Nation. No city has endured more violence and less government action than Portland, Oregon.

For 60 days, local officials have refused to protect the fundamental rights of their citizens, mainly the right to life, to liberty, and to personal property. I believe that if State and local officials won't secure these rights for their fellow Americans, then the Federal Government should do it for them at the direction of the President. I fully support the President's deployment of Federal officers to restore law and order and safety and security on the streets of Portland.

One of the most heartbreaking episodes of the violent crime that has occurred recently occurred in Kansas City, Missouri, where a four-year-old, LeGend Taliferro, was shot and killed while he was asleep in his own bed. It was just a month ago on June 29.

Mr. Speaker, the only way to deal with violent criminals is to meet them with strength. And that is what the President is doing by initiating a Federal law enforcement operation, appropriately named Operation Legend. Very simply, this operation will focus on putting more cops on the streets in

high-crime cities, making more funding available for local police departments, and use Federal officers when local officials refuse to act.

Mr. Speaker, we are never going to defund the police. Instead, we are going to empower them to stop this crime surge that is terrorizing our American brothers and sisters.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 10 a.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Lord God, thank You for giving us another day.

Please excuse us for coming to You, day after day, asking for Your blessing and grace as the coronavirus plague continues to ravage our Nation. We struggle, still, to address the crisis in any way that slows this deadly advance. Lord, have mercy.

Bless the Members of this people's House with wisdom and a purpose of cooperation in addressing so many dangers facing us, from health to financial threats. Bless the Senate, too, and the administration, that together our Nation might move forward with hope and confidence. Lord, have mercy.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCADAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### GUN VIOLENCE IN OUR STREETS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, illegally obtained guns are pouring over the streets of communities across the country, including in my community of Buffalo, New York.

These illegal guns are responsible for tragic deaths. Last year, 30,000 Americans, including 262 children, were killed by gun violence.

The number of slain Americans are more than just statistics; they are real people: fathers, mothers, grandparents, sons, daughters, and grandkids. They had dreams, they had aspirations, and they had their whole lives ahead of them.

This is an urgent call to action against gun violence. Members of my community are coming together and they are calling on Congress to repeal provisions that prohibit our government from knowing if firearms have been lost or stolen.

Mr. Speaker, I support this call to action and urge this body to continue to work to make our communities safer for all. Those whose lives were lost would still be with us today if legislation this House passed, commonsense gun reforms, universal background checks, and a ban on assault weapons, were enacted into law.

We must do better. Repeal the Tiahrt amendment now.

#### CENSORING BY SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring attention to an alarming trend: the censorship of Americans by American companies, particularly those in the social media sector.

Over and over, we hear about social media platforms silencing conservatives and their views, only to turn around and ask this Congress for continued liability protections.

If social media companies expect such legal protection, they must recognize the fundamental free speech of their users. To be clear, I am not referring to hate speech or calls for violence. I am referring to political views that differ from those who own and manage these companies.

As this Congress considers and debates the regulation of these companies into the 21st century, we should take this political censorship into account. No American, no matter what their affiliation or opinions, should ever be prevented from lawfully exercising their constitutional rights, whether online or in person.

Social media, for sure, has done wonders to connect people, but it has also

been used as a tool to further a specific political agenda, all the while expecting Government's protection, and that must end.

#### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY HAS RECENTLY BEEN DECLARED A CORONAVIRUS HOTSPOT

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the COVID-19 pandemic continues to take its toll on communities throughout the country, and my region is one of the latest to be declared a hotspot.

In San Joaquin County, more than 10,000 have been diagnosed and 110 have lost their lives to this disease. Our hospitals have less than 14 percent availability in the ICUs, and my district, like many others, is in dire need of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, over 2 months ago, the House of Representatives passed the HEROES Act, but this critical legislation is still sitting in the Senate majority leader's desk being ignored by Senate Republicans. This week, Senator McConnell announced his alternative to the HEROES Act, which falls way short, leaving individuals, cities, and States without the resources they need to survive this crisis.

My district deserves better, the American people deserve better, and the House Democrats have offered better. It is time for the Republican-controlled Senate to join us and meet this challenge head-on.

#### RECOGNIZING SHIRLEY LOVE

(Mrs. MILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend and former colleague Mr. Shirley Love, who passed away on July 17, 2020.

Born in May 1933 to Earl and Winona Love, Shirley was named after the popular West Virginia newspaper columnist, Shirley Donnelly. Unbeknownst at the time, he was also destined for media greatness.

For 45 years, Shirley worked at WOAY-TV station entertaining and informing many. He is known for becoming one of southern West Virginia's first nightly TV news anchors, and with his terrific voice, Shirley was a welcomed radio presence in households throughout the region, ultimately landing him in the West Virginia Broadcasting Hall of Fame.

After retiring from WOAY, he selflessly represented Fayette County in the State legislature for 16 years. Appointed by Governor Caperton to the senate, Shirley eventually moved to the house of delegates, where I had the honor to work alongside him.

Shirley constantly lived up to his reputation of integrity and honesty. He will always be remembered by his fam-

ily, friends, and countless people he impacted throughout his life.

I send my sincerest condolences to his wife, Audrey, his children, and his grandchildren.

May God bless Shirley Love.

#### HONORING UTAH HEALTHCARE WORKERS

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

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Speaker, in March, I was infected with COVID-19 and spent 8 days in the hospital struggling to breathe and too exhausted to get out of bed. The dedicated doctors, nurses, and hospital staff were my allies in the fight against the virus, putting their own health at risk to care for me. It gave me an up-close and personal perspective of what our healthcare workers have been up against since the start of this pandemic.

So dedicated are Utah's healthcare heroes that, when the call went out from New York for help, 100 volunteers responded, giving the exhausted doctors, nurses, and respiratory therapists much-needed backup. They spent 14 days assisting New York area hospitals, working day and night to care for desperately sick people, people who were not even allowed to have family members at their bedside.

Utah healthcare heroes are not just found at hospitals; they are in our long-term care facilities, our veterans' homes, and in parking lots, standing in the heat to collect test samples for hours at a time. They are found in blood banks and laboratories, searching for the treatments and working on drug trials to offer relief and hope to patients now and in the future.

No summer vacations or even holiday weekends for these extraordinary caregivers, their own families must take a backseat. The fight against the virus and the demand on their skill continues for the months ahead.

They gave me my health back and returned me safely to loved ones. Mr. Speaker, I thank them for their help.

#### REMEMBERING CATHY MARCHEL

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember one of Texas' finest servants, Cathy Marchel.

Cathy went home to be with the Lord in January after serving our Cleburne community for almost two decades with strength, grace, and unmatched character. She took all of the gifts she possessed and used them in powerful ways to improve her world and those around her.

She radiated joy with her beaming smile and gracious attitude. She was a leader and a fighter and someone we all looked up to for guidance. No one

worked harder for their constituents than she did, and her impact will be felt for decades to come.

Our community has lost a selfless, devoted servant, and many of us have lost a dear friend. There is most certainly a void in her absence, but we find hope in the promise that she is now with our savior, and we look forward to the day when we all will be reunited.

May God bless the entire Cleburne community and the Marchel family.

In God we trust.

#### OUR NATION STILL LACKS A NATIONAL TESTING STRATEGY

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, we are halfway through this year and 6 months into this pandemic, and our Nation still lacks a national testing strategy.

The President claimed that he was a wartime President, but with 150,000 Americans dead, this administration has not given this the wartime seriousness it deserves.

The administration must get serious about this virus. Invoke our full powers through the Defense Production Act and urge the Senate to pass the testing resources the House has made available in the HEROES Act. Protect American citizens across this Nation.

Our Nation needs a national strategy. It needs results, not long waiting times making it impossible to manage and mitigate the pandemic. In my district alone, people are waiting for 10 days or more to receive their results. That is simply unacceptable. And while they wait, they may be going out, putting others at risk.

Mr. Speaker, it is dangerously irresponsible to have such inadequate testing in the United States of America, where our resources are so vast. I urge this administration to summon our vast resources and the courage to command a national testing strategy.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF ERADICATING THE SPOTTED LANTERNFLY IN PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of researching, combating, and eradicating the spotted lanternfly. This invasive pest is native to China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam, but has been wreaking havoc in Pennsylvania since 2014.

The spotted lanternfly is a relentless menace that continues to harm Pennsylvania's agricultural sector, damaging trees, and destroying crop yields. These insects lay egg masses on trees, causing oozing sap, mold growth, and more.



While the spotted lanternfly is harmless to humans, it can seriously impact our surroundings. The Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture estimates the potential damage in lost revenue from the spotted lanternfly could amount to \$18 billion per year, statewide.

I have been pleased to work with my colleague, Congresswoman HOULAHAN, to stress the importance of ridding the Commonwealth of this pest. It will take continued support to eradicate the spotted lanternfly and prevent further harm to our environment and economy.

I would like to encourage any Pennsylvanian who encounters a spotted lanternfly to get rid of it and to report an infestation to the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.

#### HONORING THE LEGACY OF FRED CERULLO, JR.

(Mr. ROSE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Fred Cerullo, Jr., a family man, a business owner, and a fellow Army vet.

For more than 40 years, Mr. Cerullo welcomed friends and neighbors to Owl's Head Service Center, the business his father established in Bay Ridge in 1956. He treated everyone who stopped by this neighborhood landmark as if they were family, so much so that even those who did not own a car would stop by to visit Fred.

After serving in the Army at Fort Dix, Fred passed his devotion on to his children, to include his son, Fred, my dear friend, who served New York City as a four-term city councilman and in several other roles in city government.

Today, my heart goes out to Fred Cerullo's family and to everyone whom he touched in such a wonderful way. May he rest in peace. We will never forget Fred's incredible legacy.

□ 1015

#### HONORING FRANCES COLEMAN

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize retiring Mississippi State University Dean of Libraries, Frances Coleman, for her outstanding contributions to Mississippi's higher education and to the Starkville community. Over the course of her career, Dean Coleman championed unprecedented expansions of facilities, technologies, and programming throughout the MSU library system. She was instrumental in the transfer of the Ulysses S. Grant collection to Mississippi State's Mitchell Memorial Library, which established the university as one of only six campuses to hold a Presidential library.

Dean Coleman has received numerous recognitions for her service to our State, including the G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery Excellence in Leadership Award, and the lifetime achievement honor bestowed by the Mississippi legislature.

In addition to her professional achievements, she is also active in her community through the Rotary Club, the Starkville Chamber of Commerce, and the Aldersgate United Methodist Church.

Please join me in recognizing Dean Frances Coleman for her significant contributions to the great State of Mississippi.

#### WISHING GARRY AND JACKIE SMALL A HAPPY 65TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish a happy 65th anniversary to Garry and Jackie Small of Chico. The couple wed in 1955 after meeting as students at Chico State University, but that is not where the close ties to the university stop.

Garry was a lifelong administrator, with titles ranging from director of plant operations to associate vice president for administration. Jackie worked at the bookstore working her way up, and eventually retiring from the Meriam Library on campus.

The Smalls have three daughters, Kari, Julie, and Lynn, and two grandsons, Keaton and Tyler.

Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate Garry and Jackie on 65 years and send them my best wishes and blessings for many years to come.

#### REMEMBERING ANDY QUINNEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor my friend, Andy Eugene Quinney, of Georgia's First Congressional District who passed away at the age of 64.

Mr. Quinney was born in Savannah, Georgia, and graduated from Robert W. Groves High School.

Andy was a dedicated insurance agent, serving Chatham County and the Lowcountry of South Carolina for over 4 decades, most recently working with Jimmy Swain of James M. Swain & Associates.

Andy took his leadership skills to new heights when he was the mayor of Garden City, Georgia, from 2002 to 2009.

One of his goals as mayor was to "put the garden back in Garden City," and that he did. He was blessed with a green thumb and could bring any plant or city back to life.

Garden City thrived thanks to his devout leadership and commitment to

improving the lives of its citizens. Andy was pivotal in making it the success it is today.

Andy was a pillar for the Masonic Lodge through his service as Worshipful Master and was one of the founders of the Band of Brothers.

Andy loved music, reading, and gardening, and he used all those gifts he was given for God's glory.

Everyone who encountered him would be met with an infectious smile, and it was evident that the joy of the Lord was his strength.

My thoughts and prayers will continue to be with my brother in Christ's friends and family during this most difficult time.

#### 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 28, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM 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 28, 2020, at 10:14 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 881.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 105.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 106.

Appointment:

Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
*Clerk.*

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7617, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1067 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1067

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7617) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-60, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to



final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. During consideration of the amendments described in sections 2 and 3 of this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1067, providing for consideration of H.R. 7617, the Defense, Commerce, Justice, Science, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General

Government, Homeland Security, Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2021.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7617 under a structured rule, with 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman LOWEY. It makes in order 340 amendments and provides that the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee may offer amendments en bloc, which will be debatable for 30 minutes. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the measure before us is what it looks like when you don't take an ax to our priorities, as the President has advocated, but instead, you invest in what is important to the American people. This is what it looks like when we actually lay the groundwork for a real recovery from the coronavirus pandemic, instead of just wishing it away as this President has done.

There are billions and billions of dollars in emergency funding here to build and repair water projects, to modernize energy infrastructure, and rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure in this time of COVID-19. These projects will help get Americans back to work and kick-start our economy.

The bills included in this underlying package also make long-term investments in our Nation: In food safety, curbing tobacco use, and combating domestic abuse and sexual assault; all at levels that exceed the President's budget request.

There is also landmark grant funding to carry out police reform efforts, and, yes, even funding to address the health impacts of climate change because, Mr. Speaker, this majority believes in science, and we believe in facts.

This bill also includes provisions to stop costly, endless wars by sunseting the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force, the AUMF, repealing the 2002 AUMF, and prohibiting funds for the use of force against Iran.

Just as important as what this measure does is what it ensures this administration cannot do: Like steal money for President Trump's ineffective border wall, implement its dangerous plan to restart explosive nuclear testing, or launch another endless war using the 2001 AUMF.

This is about addressing our Nation's emergency needs during this pandemic today, while building a strong foundation for the future.

Thinking that this pandemic will magically vanish, as this President has suggested, is not a plan. Hoping that COVID-19 just goes away without a vaccine, as this President has done, is not a plan.

Real resources like those in this bill, especially when taken with those in the HEROES Act that passed this

House over 2 months ago, will enable us to confront this virus and build a true recovery.

340 amendments were made in order under this rule, many of which will make this bill even stronger.

Among them is an amendment I authored to provide more money for radon testing and mitigation. A national investigation recently uncovered this harmful chemical in public housing units across the country, including in my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts.

This administration, and HUD in particular, has an obligation to act. This language will help ensure more funding is there to help protect people's health and safety.

I am also proud that the underlying bill sets aside \$10 million to create a new nationwide pilot program to help the many grandparents who are raising their grandchildren today. This funding will provide more access to safe, affordable, and appropriate housing.

Mr. Speaker, there are two policy ideas put forward during this process that I especially want to highlight.

The first was an effort led by my good friend, Congressman BOBBY RUSH, to create a more 21st century approach toward Cuba. This President has taken us back to a failed Cold War policy that held our country back for more than 50 years, a policy that hurts the Cuban people, and a policy that denies American farmers and American businesses the opportunity to engage with their counterparts in Cuba. In short, our policy, Mr. Speaker, is an embarrassment.

The gentleman from Illinois wanted to mitigate some of the pain U.S. policies impose on the Cuban people by providing easier access to food and medicine and by making it easier for families in the United States to send support to their relatives still on the island, especially during this pandemic.

Now, although the gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn his amendments, I want to recognize him for his leadership. He has shined a bright light on a failed policy that badly hurts the Cuban people, and it urgently needs to change.

Mr. Speaker, we have to change our policy. We must and we will change our policy, and I look forward to being part of that effort. If we can trade with China and Russia and Vietnam, we certainly can trade with Cuba. If Americans can travel virtually to any country in the world, we ought to be able to travel to Cuba without restriction. And if we really care about human rights and human suffering, then we ought to recognize that the American blockade on Cuba is causing tremendous suffering to the Cuban people.

□ 1030

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will in short order take a fresh look at our policy and move to a more mature, sensible, thoughtful approach to dealing with Cuba.

I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY, along with Representatives LEE, OCASIO-CORTEZ, SCHAKOWSKY, CHU, DEGETTE, TLAIB, OMAR, POCAN, and SPEIER.

Together they led an important effort to repeal the Hyde Amendment. This disastrous policy prevents so many, particularly low-income women and women of color from deciding their own future.

Constitutional rights should not belong to just the wealthy or the privileged. They belong to every single American, regardless of where they get their health insurance.

And although this amendment wasn't able to be made in order here because of several budgetary points of order, I want to say loud and clear here today that they are right. We need to end this discriminatory policy, and I look forward to working with them to do just that. This is a fight that we must have.

Mr. Speaker, getting this broad package here today was a herculean effort by so many in this Chamber, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying measure. Let's get our communities the resources they need, and let's get our economy back on its feet.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is on a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7617, which contains 6 of the 12 annual appropriations bills recently reported by the House Appropriations Committee. These six bills include the two largest, Defense, and Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, as well as the titles covering Commerce, Justice, Science, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, and finally, Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, it is always encouraging to see the appropriations process moving forward. Passing these 12 bills is one of the biggest responsibilities we have as Members of Congress; to fund the government and keep it open and operating for our constituents.

Despite that great responsibility, I am disappointed by the partisan approach taken by the majority in crafting the bills in this package, and I cannot support them at this time.

I single out the majority in my comments because the 12 bills that were reported out of committee this year were all written to satisfy the concerns and wishes of one party, the Democratic party. While that is often how the appropriations process begins, it is ultimately

never where it ends. At the end of the day, for us to pass 12 full-year fiscal year 2021 appropriations bills, in an era of divided government, it will require Members on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress to reach consensus. That ultimately means that the partisan bills like those we are considering today are non-starters and cannot become law.

During markup on these measures in the Appropriations Committee and again yesterday in the Rules Committee, Republicans rightfully raised several reasons why these bills cannot become law and should not pass the House. Those objections were ignored. Consequently, today's bill will have very little, if any, Republican support. That means these bills are effectively dead on arrival in the United States Senate and would never be signed by a Republican President, and there are a lot of reasons for that.

First, all 12 appropriations bills are marked at 302(b) allocation numbers that violate the fiscal year 2021 total spending limit negotiated in the current budget agreement just last year.

□ 1030

Indeed, I remind my friends, Congress is lawfully bound to uphold that agreement.

Instead of abiding by the negotiated numbers that were agreed to in both Houses of Congress by both parties and by the President, the majority has used a huge amount of emergency-designated funds as a workaround scheme to break that good faith budget agreement.

In this bill alone, there is well over \$200 billion in so-called emergency spending. That violates the budget agreement. This will make it much more difficult to negotiate final bills with the Senate that can actually become law.

But what is more disappointing than the widespread use of budget gimmicks is the prolific use of partisan policy riders throughout the appropriations bills, including these six. These riders are simply unacceptable, and they must come out before bipartisan agreement can be reached.

Consider the bill that I am most familiar with, which came out of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, where I am the ranking member. The text of that bill includes a wide variety of harmful riders.

In the first instance, the bill includes partisan policy prescriptions that will tie the hands of the administration with respect to Title X family planning. Most notably, the riders would force the administration to resume grants awarded to controversial groups that provide abortions, such as Planned Parenthood, and it would prevent the administration from granting waivers that protect deeply held religious beliefs of institutions, organizations, and individuals that provide vital services funded in the bill.

The Labor, Health and Human Services title includes riders that would undo the Department of Labor's rule clarifying the so-called joint employer standard. If this policy rider were enacted, it would cause chaos for thousands of businesses and millions of employees, leaving them uncertain about the nature of their employment relationship.

Not to be outdone, the bill also includes riders micromanaging and second-guessing how Health and Human Services administers the Unaccompanied Alien Children Program, which will ensure that the individuals devoting their energies to assisting such unaccompanied minors will find themselves devoting their energy, becoming wrapped up in evermore deeply and congressionally mandated red tape.

The same can be said for the other divisions in this package. Throughout this minibus, the majority has inserted policy riders that tie the hands of the administration.

They have limited the ability of the administration to reprogram funds even when necessary. They have inserted rider after rider aimed at preventing the President from spending money on barriers and security measures at the southern border. And they have removed countless bipartisan policy revisions that have been routinely carried in previous years' bills.

Let me say it again: Partisan riders like these must come out before a bipartisan agreement can be reached.

On top of this, while I understand we are living through unprecedented times and have had to rightly limit our physical interactions, I have serious concerns about considering these bills in a six-division, trillion-dollar spending bill.

Debating these measures together as one shuts out the ability of most rank-and-file Members to have their ideas heard on the floor, or limits them to having their amendments included in massive all-or-nothing en bloc packages, and places many Members in an untenable all-or-nothing vote on both the en bloc packages and ultimately final passage of the bill.

We can do better than that, Mr. Speaker, and we must do better than that.

Mr. Speaker, I am still hopeful that we can reach a bipartisan appropriations deal for the full year. If we can get the prolific emergency spending and budget gimmicks out of these bills, and if we can eliminate all partisan policy riders, then I think the majority in the House will have a workable starting point to begin negotiations with the Senate toward a bipartisan deal.

Under such circumstances, they would still not be the bills I would have written, but they would be a reasonable basis on which to begin negotiations. But until then, these bills are going absolutely nowhere. They will not pass the Senate, and they will not be signed by the President into law.

Frankly, I do not believe they should be passed by this House, either.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's comments. And I acknowledge, I think we all acknowledge, that we are living in an unusual moment, dealing with a health pandemic that has already claimed the lives of 150,000 of our fellow citizens, that has infected millions of our other fellow citizens, and we are trying to do our best to operate and to get the people's business done amidst this pandemic.

So, we have given committee chairs en bloc authority to try to consider amendments en bloc so we can consider more ideas.

In the package that we are bringing before the House today, there are 341 amendments in order. Some of them will require separate votes on amendments because, quite frankly, there isn't a consensus on some of them. But many of them are good ideas that can be put in an en bloc amendment and be incorporated into this bill.

I just say that because the alternative in the middle of this pandemic is to have fewer amendments, and I don't think that that is something that Members would want to see happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 7617, the second appropriations package.

The funding included in this bill will advance crucial priorities like increased broadband access, advancing medical research, and supporting police reform. These investments are necessary as we continue to combat the spread of COVID-19 and encourage economic recovery.

By providing \$61 billion in emergency funding to the FCC, we can expand internet access to unserved and underserved households. As schools continue to adjust to distance learning, I believe every student, regardless of their family's ZIP Code or income bracket, deserves a reliable internet connection to participate in the modern classroom.

The rule also provides consideration of my amendment to advance breakthroughs in medical research. My amendment directs an additional \$4.5 million to DOD's Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program. This program funds high-impact projects, including medical research for rare diseases like bone marrow failure.

Some of you remember we lost my late husband, Bob Matsui, to MDS, a bone marrow failure disease. Countless other families across the country rely on the Defense program's work to discover and develop new therapies and cures, especially for rare diseases.

I am also very glad that this program dedicates \$400 million in grant funding

to help implement needed police reform. This includes pattern and practice analyses and independent investigations of law enforcement departments across the country.

While there is still much work to be done, this funding will move us closer to an America where all are treated equally under the law.

This is a strong comprehensive bill, and I look forward to supporting it on the floor soon.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond quickly to my friend.

While we appreciate the number of amendments made in order, let's just look at the statistics. Twenty percent of all the amendments in this bill are Republican, 60 percent are Democrat, 20 percent are bipartisan.

Frankly, I am pleased to have hit 20 percent, because for the year, we are down at about 17 percent of the amendments.

So while we appreciate the difficult conditions, I also remind my friend that in the last Congress, when we held the majority, they actually always had more amendments than the Republicans did. So let's not get carried away with the difficulties of the situation or the fairness of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), my good friend, a distinguished Member, and an outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

We should at least comply with the law. I would think that a law-writing body, Congress, and the Appropriations Committee should at least follow the law.

Well, again, this rule doesn't do that, and this bill doesn't do that. Let me explain what I am talking about.

Spent nuclear fuel and defense waste is at 121 sites in 39 States across this country. The DOE, Department of Energy, was supposed to take title to this spent fuel and this defense waste in 1998.

Appropriators will like to hear this number. We spend unbudgeted out of the Judgment Fund \$2.2 million every day—\$2.2 million unbudgeted—unappropriated through legal action because we are not complying with the law.

□ 1045

The Nuclear Waste Fund currently is booked as having \$40 billion in it, Mr. Speaker, and that \$40 billion comes from ratepayers, not even Federal money. It is people whose States have nuclear power. They pay into this fund to find a safe disposal site.

Over the past 30 years, \$15 billion has been spent. I brought examples of that \$15 billion. Mr. Speaker, this is one box of five of the Department of Energy's scientific analysis of the safety of Yucca Mountain, the long-term repository. They finished that, and then they turned over all of their science.

Let me tell you who was part of this billions of dollars of research by eight national labs, which comes through this appropriation bill. Eight labs, the U.S. Geological Survey, and many universities helped do this research. Then, they sent this research to our independent nuclear safety agency called the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and they issued a five-volume report.

This is the fifth volume of that, which says: Using Yucca Mountain as a long-term geological repository would be safe for a million years, not 10,000 years, not 100,000 years, not 500,000 years, a million years.

Now, who did this research? Well, you had experts in geochemistry, hydrology, climatology, structural geology, volcanology, seismology, and health physics, as well as chemical, civilian, mechanical, nuclear, mining materials, and geological engineering.

If we want to use science, want to talk about science, science from the Department of Energy, science reviewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission says Yucca Mountain will be safe for a million years for long-term storage of not just spent fuel but also of our defense waste.

So, what happens when we legally block the final portion of the law? And the final portion would be: Let's get money to allow Nevada to argue the science. That is what they always say: Let's argue the science. Well, this bill, like other bills coming out of the Appropriations Committee, has zero money to debate the science and do the adjudication.

So if it had money, and this is part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, if the adjudication were to resume, one or more boards would hear evidence and issue decisions on approximately 300 admitted issues contesting DOE's application or the NRC's staff decision to adopt the DOE environmental impact statement.

If we would finish the last portion of this debate and have the—it is actually called the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel. They would look at the science. They would hear Nevada's complaints, and they would render judgment. That is why we go to courts and stuff to resolve conflict.

If they don't like that decision, Nevada can appeal the Board's decision to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. If they don't like the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's final decision, they can go to the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Now, let's address a few things about the State of Nevada. I include in the RECORD Nye County Resolution No. 2020-11, which passed this year. I will read a few portions of it. The title is: "A Resolution of the Nye County Board of County Commissioners Supporting the Efforts to Complete the Yucca Mountain Licensing Process and Resolve the Nuclear Waste Issue."

Here is one of the whereases. "Whereas, almost 1,000 nuclear devices were detonated on the Nevada test site."

“Whereas, Nye County and eight other Nevada counties have passed resolutions supporting the completion of the Yucca Mountain licensing process by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to determine if Yucca Mountain is safe.”

So, that is nine Nevada counties that say we should move forward.

“Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Nye County Board of Commissioners does hereby continue to support the efforts to complete the Yucca Mountain licensing process and resolve the nuclear waste issue.”

So, that is Nye County, which has the site of Yucca Mountain.

NYE COUNTY RESOLUTION No. 2020-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE NYE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SUPPORTING THE EFFORTS TO COMPLETE THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN LICENSING PROCESS AND RESOLVE THE NUCLEAR WASTE ISSUE

Whereas, Nye County Nevada is the third largest county in the continental United States comprising over 11 million acres; and

Whereas, almost 98 percent of this land is under either management or control of various agencies of the federal government; and

Whereas, Department of Defense and Department of Energy have withdrawn approximately 4 million acres from public access and restricted this land to defense, nuclear and other related government uses; and

Whereas, almost 1000 nuclear devices were detonated on the Nevada Test Site; and

Whereas, the 1987 Nuclear Waste Policy Act amendment selected Yucca Mountain as the single site to be studied, and in 2002 Congress approved the site for development of a repository; and

Whereas, Nuclear energy is needed to integrate with renewable energy to significantly reduce CO2 emissions; and

Whereas, the United States has over 80,000 tons of Spent Nuclear Fuel and large quantities of High-Level Waste and other radioactive waste that will require isolation in geologic repositories; and

Whereas, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act directs the Department of Energy to pursue a licensing proceeding to determine if Yucca Mountain is a safe site to house a repository for Spent Fuel and High-Level nuclear waste; and

Whereas, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is directed by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act to adjudicate if Yucca Mountain is safe to house a nuclear waste repository; and

Whereas, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act has never been repealed and remains the law of the land; and

Whereas, this waste is currently located in temporary storage facilities at over 100 sites in 39 states; and

Whereas, reprocessing of spent fuel and fast reactors have the potential to reduce the amount of waste generated in the future, there will always be large quantities of radioactive waste for geologic disposal; and

Whereas, Nye County and 8 other Nevada counties have passed resolutions supporting the completion of the Yucca Mountain licensing process by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to determine if Yucca Mountain is safe; and

Whereas, the Nye County Board of County Commissioners have approved multiple resolutions and letters to the federal government asking for negotiations with Nye County and the State of Nevada to identify a package that includes mitigation and benefits for Nevada residents; and

Whereas, the federal government has made no serious efforts to negotiate with State

and local leaders or offer benefits to residents of Nevada; and now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Nye County Board of Commissioners does hereby continue to support the efforts to complete the Yucca Mountain licensing process and resolve the nuclear waste issue; and be it further

*Resolved*, That as part of that effort, Nye County supports the use of innovative technologies to minimize the amount of nuclear waste. The research and investments for these technologies should be done in Nevada creating jobs and enhancing Nevada's Universities; and be it further

*Resolved*, That pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, Nye County encourages the Trump Administration and Congress to develop a benefit package that offers jobs, educational benefits and with potential revenue for services to residents and visitors of Nye County and the State of Nevada.

Passed, Adopted, and Approved the 7th day of April, 2020.

Ayes: Koenig, Strickland, Wichman, Cox, Blundo.

Absent: None.

Nayes: None.

Nye County Board of County Commissioners: John Koenig, *Chairman*.

Attest: Kelly Sidman; Sandra L. Merlino, Nye County Clerk, and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Board.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, what if we don't do this? Here is a chart. Here is Yucca Mountain, secure, in the desert, underneath a mountain, 90 miles from Las Vegas.

Right here in this Chamber, we are 44 miles from the nearest nuclear power plant. It just happens to be Calvert Cliffs. It is on the Chesapeake Bay, and so it is close.

The State of Nevada will argue it will hurt our tourism. Well, let me tell you, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City have more tourists than Las Vegas and are closer to spent nuclear fuel than any other place.

Again, it is a travesty that we spend \$2.2 million every day for not complying with the law. This bill does not help us comply with the law. In fact, I would say this bill breaks the law, which is another example for the great American public to observe how dysfunctional we are in this day and age in the people's House. It saddens me.

I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to respond to my good friend, Mr. COLE, who I have great, great admiration for, but the gentleman said that more Democratic amendments were made in order. Well, let's kind of put that into context. More Democratic amendments were submitted, period. Actually, more than half of the amendments were Democratic.

Let me put it this way: Twice as many Democratic amendments were offered as Republican amendments, and there was a big chunk of bipartisan amendments that were made in order.

I don't like to compare our record to their record because the gentleman wasn't chair of the Rules Committee when the Republicans were in charge. But I just want to throw this little tid-

bit out there so that people can have this: We have made in order 25 percent more amendments this month than were made in order in all of 2018 under the Republican control of the House.

Again, I know my friend wasn't the chair at the time, but I just wanted to point that out for the RECORD because I think it is a nice statistic.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of my amendments to H.R. 7617. My amendment would provide additional resources to the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. The CDC reports that from 2001 to 2017, the Nation saw a 31 percent increase in the suicide rate. It is now the second leading cause of death among Americans ages 15 to 24 and the leading cause of death for Utahns in this age group.

The lifeline is a nationally accessible service that supports people in crisis and connects them to the help that they need. The lifeline has had great success, but it is also under strain as its funding has not kept pace with its caseload, particularly amid the pandemic's effects.

I want my amendment to speak clearly to Americans in crisis: There is help; there is hope; and we are fighting for you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of two amendments to protect children's safety and well-being.

First, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children has reported staggering increases in online child sex abuse material, commonly called child pornography. The Federal Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program supports task forces in every State to investigate such online exploitation and abuse of children and bring perpetrators to justice. My amendment enhances this grant program to support State and locally driven efforts to protect our children.

Second, child advocacy centers are an incredible tool to support child survivors of abuse. These centers bring together specialized child welfare and law enforcement professionals to provide holistic services to children and to seek justice against abusers. COVID-19 has put many kids at risk, and my amendment provides additional resources for centers to meet this demand.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments to protect, heal, and give hope to Americans.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up S. 939, the CONFUCIUS Act, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent a month and a half ago.

If enacted into law, S. 939 will address China's influence on American

colleges and universities through Confucius Institutes, which are cultural institutes directly or indirectly funded by the Chinese Government.

Specifically, colleges and universities receiving Federal funds will be required to certify that the institution ensures that any contract or agreement between the institution and a Confucius Institute includes clear provisions that protect academic freedom at the institution, prohibits the application of any foreign law, and ensures the institution retains full managerial authority over the Confucius Institute.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, Confucius Institutes have become commonplace among higher-education campuses. While ostensibly high-minded, these organizations are funded by the Government of the People's Republic of China and focus on a Beijing-approved view of Chinese history. They are noted for presenting Chinese Communist Party propaganda, ignoring human rights abuses in Tibet and among the Uighurs, and insisting that Taiwan belongs to mainland China.

What is worse, Chinese influence on American campuses comes at a time in which China is engaged in ongoing efforts to steal American intellectual property and research, particularly in research institutions like those located on our higher education campuses.

It is inarguable that Chinese espionage efforts like these pose a clear threat to national security. Passage of the CONFUCIUS Act would help close an open loophole on our college campuses currently being exploited by the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me remind my colleagues what the previous question vote is all about. It really isn't about substance. It is about turning control of the House over to my friends on the Republican side.

As the chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China who is very, very concerned about these Confucius Institutes and about China's continuing escalation of activities within our country, I am happy to sit down with the gentleman and anyone else to try to bring legislation to the floor.

We brought a lot of legislation to the floor to check China's growing power in the world. But this is really not about the Confucius Institute. This is about turning power over to my friends on the other side of the aisle.

If they were to succeed, they could bring up whatever they want to within

the rules of the House. And based on some of the statements in recent weeks by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle about some of their priorities, it could be some pretty, in my opinion, awful stuff.

So, I would urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's plea here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support passage of the House's second package of appropriations bill for fiscal year 2021 as a proud member of the Appropriations Committee and chair of an appropriations subcommittee.

The defense division of the bill will safeguard our national security and give our troops a much-needed pay raise.

I appreciate the inclusion of language to expedite replacement of PFAS fire-fighting foams and funding to study their health implications.

The bill also supports research for metastatic cancer and encourages clinical trials that affect the demographics of our population.

□ 1100

The Commerce-Justice-Science division includes language from my PACE Act, which I introduced with Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS. Our legislation seeks to disrupt the distrust and improve communication between police and communities of color.

I am also proud that my colleague, Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE, and I secured \$8 million for the Matthew Shepard hate crime investigation and prosecution grant program that was previously authorized and will now be funded for the first time.

The bill addresses the growing problem of online child exploitation by carving out \$40 million for Internet Crimes Against Children task forces.

Funding is also included to research coral reef disease and harmful algal blooms, two significant problems for sea life in the State of Florida.

I am particularly proud of the Energy and Water division, as a member of that subcommittee. The bill funds Everglades restoration projects at a historic \$250 million, a major bipartisan achievement. I am also grateful for the inclusion of a fix to cut red tape that has delayed Everglades restoration projects and will allow them to begin. To protect our investment, the bill includes language that I wrote to block oil drilling in the Florida Everglades.

I am encouraged that this bill provides increases for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and ARPA-E.

I am glad that the Financial Services division includes \$500 million for election security grants for States to fight foreign intervention because, apparently, the President isn't interested in doing that.

The report also includes language to improve postal security, which affected

my office as well as the offices of Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and numerous other leaders after a failed bombing attempt, an incident that raised serious postal security concerns.

I am also pleased that the bill includes funding for pool safety grants that address swimming pool drownings, the number one cause of accidental death for young children in this country.

Next, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education division includes vital funding for EARLY Act activities, an initiative I passed to promote breast cancer awareness for young and at-risk women. I was diagnosed with breast cancer at 41 years old, and I am proud to say that I am now approaching my 13th year as a survivor, and I appreciate the opportunity to make sure we can educate more young women and women at higher risk of their risk of breast cancer so they pay attention to their breast health.

Additionally, the bill includes support for Holocaust survivors, who face countless obstacles as they age.

Further, the bill protects unaccompanied migrant children by ensuring Members of Congress can visit child detention facilities with no prior notice—important accountability provisions. Language similar to my Families, Not Facilities Act was included to help unaccompanied migrant youth find sponsors.

Finally, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development division provides investments in our transportation infrastructure and housing programs. I am glad to see \$60 million for housing homeless veterans who have given so much for this country.

I applaud the inclusion of provisions throughout the minibus to assert our authority as a coequal branch of government by prohibiting funds from being stolen by the President to pay for any border wall, which would be grossly irresponsible.

I thank my fellow subcommittee chairs and, once again, thank Chairwoman LOWEY as she retires from the Appropriations Committee, and their intrepid staff for the hard work that went into producing this minibus that takes care of the many needs people of all backgrounds face in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond quickly to the overall thrust of what is in these bills. There is no question, as my friend from Florida said, there are a lot of good things in these bills.

My friend from Florida is actually a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, one whom I have had the opportunity to work with on many occasions. We don't object to those. But what is undeniable is there is roughly \$40 billion more in spending than my friends agreed to only last year. Now, that is a budget cap imposed by law.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, you have reason to do emergencies. We are living through an emergency right now. But if you need emergency spending, you negotiate that with the other side. There was no negotiation here with Republicans in the House. You certainly negotiate with the other Chamber, Mr. Speaker, particularly when it is controlled by the other party. There was no negotiation with the other Chamber. And you certainly negotiate with the President of the United States—no negotiation with him either. It is just a number made up out of whole cloth to keep my friends from having to make some tough budgetary decisions that they agreed to make and passed into law only last year.

The second thing, as I mentioned, is these bills are chock-full of partisan riders. That is just the reality. Now my friends know none of these riders are going to remain in these bills or the bills will never pass the United States Senate and never be signed by a Republican President, so I suppose they were put in there for some internal reason.

I hope they are not put in there to keep us from going past the September 30 deadline, which all these bills should be finished by, into later this year or, goodness knows, next year, when my friends might think they might have a more politically favorable environment. That is a disservice.

This Congress ought to get its job done. It can't get its job done when one side decides to break its agreement, add almost a quarter of a trillion dollars in new spending, and add dozens of new policy provisions that they know are unacceptable.

We can have those debates. They are good debates to have, but they don't belong in the middle of appropriations bills. I am not naive enough to say that both sides don't do this. We certainly did it when we were in the majority on some occasions. But when we did do it, it always slowed down the process and made agreement more difficult.

Last year, 2019, the President, the Speaker, the minority leader, the Senate majority leader, and the Senate minority leader sat down and negotiated a deal. They said that these are going to be the spending limits, and we are not going to put any extraneous things in these bills.

To my friends' credit, last year they actually did that. They stayed within the limit that we had set, and they did not put extraneous things in the bill. Consequently, all those bills passed; they all got enacted into law; we have had no government shutdowns; and we have had regular order.

Why they decided this year to abandon the agreement that they actually committed to last year and launch spending initiatives and policy initiatives that they said they would not do is beyond me, but I do remind them it will make it much more difficult to come to agreement.

So, given that, and given the fact that my friends have not kept the

agreement that they agreed to last year, assented to last year, I am going to oppose the rule and urge rejection of the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time on my side. I would just say to my colleagues before I yield to the gentleman for his closing remarks that I think these are good bills that will help us not only get through this pandemic, but help set the stage for the economic recovery that we need.

While we are all here talking, I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are picking up the phone and calling their Senate counterparts and calling the White House and urging them to get serious about a coronavirus relief package that we desperately need.

Schools in some districts are about to open up, and there is no Federal aid to help with what they may need to keep our children and our teachers safe. There is no money going to our cities and towns that are financially strapped because of our economy having shut down, no money to protect people so we can have safe elections, nothing—not anything—to help the millions of people in this country who are hungry.

The Senate proposal, which I am not even sure it is a proposal anymore, has no money in it for SNAP. The most vulnerable people in this country get nothing when it comes to putting food on the table. They have reduced unemployment benefits, and then they sneak in money for an FBI building and money for defense contractors while they shortchange everybody else.

We are in a healthcare crisis, we are in an economic crisis, and we need to respond. These appropriations bills, again, are a way to help us get back on our feet; but, in the immediate term, we need to get the Senate to get serious and respond, as the House did over 2 months ago, and extend a lifeline to the American people.

This is serious. Mr. Speaker, I don't care whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. I hear from constituents of all political persuasions who are begging us to do something to help teachers and superintendents.

Where is the help? Mayors, town managers, and city managers are asking: Where is the help?

The House acted over 2 months ago—nothing from the Senate. So I think these appropriations bills are good, but we need to get something else done even before these become enacted.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by telling my good friend that I have many of the same concerns he does about the coronavirus crisis and the need to act on another bill.

That is not what is before us today, but I look forward to when that time

comes and we have a negotiated product to working with my friend and seeing if we can find the necessary support to make sure that is enacted into law. Indeed, the Senate is involved in doing that right now.

What is before us today is the work of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, not coronavirus legislation per se, although there are certainly elements in this bill that deal with that.

Let me again reiterate what I said just a few minutes ago: There are a lot of good things in these appropriations bills. Appropriators work hard and quite a few often work together. We have an excellent chairman and an excellent ranking member, and so we cooperate. So there are many good things in these bills. But what makes them fundamentally unacceptable is, first, a decision to insert almost a quarter of a trillion dollars of emergency spending that violates the budget agreement that my friends signed only last year.

Mr. Speaker, if you need an emergency measure—that happens—then you sit down and negotiate with the other side about what the amount is and what the nature of the response is. There was no effort to negotiate with Republicans on this emergency spending—not in the House, not with the Republican-dominated United States Senate, and not with the Republican President. So these are just numbers willy-nilly sort of thrown in there, and they are not going anywhere. In that sense, we have wasted a lot of time.

Second, my friends agreed, also, last year to no riders, no policy provisions in the bills. We will just have straight government funding bills. Last year, they did that. They kept that agreement last year. They kept to the top line numbers, and they kept to their agreements in terms of policy. We passed all 12 bills in a bipartisan manner. The President signed them, and we have enjoyed the benefit of that this year. We have had no government shutdown and we have had no crises. The work was done in a timely fashion.

Why my friends abandoned a formula and an agreement that worked last year to do this is beyond me. Frankly, it smacks a little bit of election-year politics; but, regardless, the purpose is to fund the government and to keep the government working for all of our citizens, providing basic services.

These bills won't do that because they violated an agreement last year and they contain things that my friends recognized a year ago that, if we do that, then we are not going to get to any agreement on spending. The same thing is true today. The political constellation hasn't changed. It won't change for the balance of this fiscal year, and it won't change for the balance of the calendar year.

If we were serious about legislating, we would write real bills that adhere to the agreements that both sides make, not add additional hundreds of billions of dollars of spending and add additional policy provisions that we know



the other side will not accept. Unfortunately, that is what is being done here.

So I regret that. I hope my friends at some point will decide to come back and bargain. I suspect they will. They usually do. But we are wasting precious time now. We could have completed all these bills.

Frankly, I will chastise the Senate here, too, because they are not moving very fast on the basic necessity of these bills. They have a tougher process. They can't just get a majority and ram things through the way my friends have the ability to do when they are in the majority and we have the ability to do when we are in the majority. It is a little bit different in the Senate of the United States. I recognize that.

But we should make a contribution. We should have stuck to our agreement. We need emergency spending, which I think we do. That should come outside the confines of this legislation in standalone, emergency legislation agreed to by both sides negotiating in good faith. We have done that four times this year already. We are pretty good at it. If we would do it again for a fifth—and they are trying to do it now in the Senate—then I think we could deal with those other items that are in these bills that, quite frankly, belong in a standalone supplemental dealing with coronavirus.

So, with that, I want to thank my friend for the time, and I want to thank him for the debate. As always, I look forward to working with him; but, for the moment, I urge the rejection of the rule and urge the rejection of the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the Rules Committee staff and members for all of their incredible work during the last few weeks. We have processed thousands of amendments. We have had hours and hours and hours of hearings. We have listened to countless Members testify, and we were able to get through it all.

But, again, I want people to appreciate especially the work of the staff. I say that in a bipartisan way that the Democratic staff and the Republican staff of the Rules Committee worked incredibly hard. I don't think most people even know it, but they ought to know it because this is a lot of work.

I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma who is my friend, we don't always agree on everything, but I am very fortunate to have him as a ranking member because I think he respects this institution and he fights very hard for his beliefs. I fight hard for my beliefs. But even when we disagree, it is not in a personal way. We can disagree without being disagreeable, and I appreciate him for that, and my other colleagues as well.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, this rule is about moving forward to consider a measure to

get annual and emergency funding moving to help put people back to work, to reinvigorate our public health system, to rebuild our aging roads and bridges, and to put an important check on this administration. This rule also is about whether we should debate hundreds and hundreds of amendments from Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, this is ultimately about whether we fulfill one of our most fundamental responsibilities. I urge all of my colleagues to come together in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. Let's ensure this Congress continues to provide the leadership the American people are demanding.

The material previously preferred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1067

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (S. 939) to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 939.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

#### CHILD CARE IS ESSENTIAL ACT

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1053, I call up the bill (H.R. 7027) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-58 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7027

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

*The following sums in this Act are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

*For an additional amount for "Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant", \$50,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses to carry out the Child Care Stabilization Fund grants program, as authorized by section 1 of this Act: Provided, That such funds shall be available without regard to the requirements in subparagraphs (C) through (E) of section 658E(c)(3) or section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading in this Act may be made available to restore amounts, either directly or through reimbursement, for obligations incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act for the purposes provided herein: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress.*

##### CHILD CARE STABILIZATION FUND

SEC. 1. (a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CCDBG TERMS.—The terms "eligible child care provider", "Indian tribe", "lead agency", "tribal organization", "Secretary", and "State" have the meanings given the terms in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n) except as otherwise provided in this section.

(2) COVID-19 PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.—The term "COVID-19 public health emergency" means the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d) on January 31, 2020, with respect to COVID-19, including any renewal of the declaration.

(b) GRANTS.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section and under the authority of section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m) and this section, the Secretary shall award child care stabilization grants to the lead agency of each State (as defined in that section 658O), territory described in subsection (a)(1) of such section, Indian tribe, and tribal organization from allotments and payments made under subsection (c)(2), not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) SECRETARIAL RESERVATION AND ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 1 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for the Federal administration of grants described in subsection (b).

(2) ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall use the remainder of the funds appropriated to carry out this section to award allotments to States, as defined in section 658O of the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m), and payments to territories, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and subsection (b), of section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m).

(d) STATE RESERVATIONS AND SUBGRANTS.—



(1) **RESERVATION.**—A lead agency for a State that receives a child care stabilization grant pursuant to subsection (b) shall reserve not more than 10 percent of such grant funds—

(A) to administer subgrants made to qualified child care providers under paragraph (2), including to carry out data systems building and other activities that enable the disbursement of payments of such subgrants;

(B) to provide technical assistance and support in applying for and accessing the subgrant opportunity under paragraph (2), to eligible child care providers (including to family child care providers, group home child care providers, and other non-center-based child care providers and providers with limited administrative capacity), either directly or through resource and referral agencies or staffed family child care networks;

(C) to publicize the availability of subgrants under this section and conduct widespread outreach to eligible child care providers, including family child care providers, group home child care providers, and other non-center-based child care providers and providers with limited administrative capacity, either directly or through resource and referral agencies or staffed family child care networks, to ensure eligible child care providers are aware of the subgrants available under this section;

(D) to carry out the reporting requirements described in subsection (f); and

(E) to carry out activities to improve the supply and quality of child care during and after the COVID-19 public health emergency, such as conducting community needs assessments, carrying out child care cost modeling, making improvements to child care facilities, increasing access to licensure or participation in the State's tiered quality rating system, and carrying out other activities described in section 658G(b) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858e(b)), to the extent that the lead agency can carry out activities described in this subparagraph without preventing the lead agency from fully conducting the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(2) **SUBGRANTS TO QUALIFIED CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The lead agency shall use the remainder of the grant funds awarded pursuant to subsection (b) to make subgrants to qualified child care providers described in subparagraph (B), to support the stability of the child care sector during and after the COVID-19 public health emergency. The lead agency shall provide the subgrant funds in advance of provider expenditures for costs described in subsection (e), except as provided in subsection (e)(2).

(B) **QUALIFIED CHILD CARE PROVIDER.**—To be qualified to receive a subgrant under this paragraph, a provider shall be an eligible child care provider that—

(i) was providing child care services on or before March 1, 2020; and

(ii) on the date of submission of an application for the subgrant, was either—

(I) open and available to provide child care services; or

(II) closed due to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

(C) **SUBGRANT AMOUNT.**—The lead agency shall make subgrants, from amounts awarded pursuant to subsection (b), to qualified child care providers, and the amount of such a subgrant to such a provider shall—

(i) be based on the provider's stated average operating expenses during the period (of not longer than 6 months) before March 1, 2020 and at minimum cover such operating expenses for the intended length of the subgrant;

(ii) account for increased costs of providing or preparing to provide child care as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency, such as provider and employee compensation and existing benefits (existing as of March 1, 2020) and

the implementation of new practices related to sanitization, group size limits, and social distancing;

(iii) be adjusted for payments or reimbursements made to an eligible child care provider to carry out the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) or the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.); and

(iv) be adjusted for payments or reimbursements made to an eligible child care provider through the Paycheck Protection Program set forth in section 7(a)(36) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)), as added by section 1102 of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136).

(D) **APPLICATION.**—

(i) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive a subgrant under this paragraph, a child care provider shall submit an application to a lead agency at such time and in such manner as the lead agency may require. Such application shall include—

(I) a good-faith certification that the ongoing operations of the child care provider have been impacted as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency;

(II) for a provider described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(I), an assurance that, for the duration of the COVID-19 public health emergency—

(aa) the provider will give priority for available slots (including slots that are only temporarily available) to—

(AA) children of essential workers (such as health care sector employees, emergency responders, sanitation workers, farmworkers, child care employees, and other workers determined to be essential during the response to coronavirus by public officials), children of workers whose places of employment require their attendance, children experiencing homelessness, children with disabilities, children at risk of child abuse or neglect, and children in foster care, in States where stay-at-home or related orders are in effect; or

(BB) children of workers whose places of employment require their attendance, children experiencing homelessness, children with disabilities, children at risk of child abuse or neglect, children in foster care, and children whose parents are in school or a training program, in States where stay-at-home or related orders are not in effect;

(bb) the provider will implement policies in line with guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the corresponding State and local authorities, and in accordance with State and local orders, for child care providers that remain open, including guidance on sanitization practices, group size limits, and social distancing;

(cc) for each employee, the provider will pay the full compensation described in subsection (e)(1)(C), including any benefits, that was provided to the employee as of March 1, 2020 (referred to in this clause as “full compensation”), and will not take any action that reduces the weekly amount of the employee's compensation below the weekly amount of full compensation, or that reduces the employee's rate of compensation below the rate of full compensation; and

(dd) the provider will provide relief from copayments and tuition payments for the families enrolled in the provider's program and prioritize such relief for families struggling to make either type of payments;

(III) for a provider described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II), an assurance that—

(aa) for the duration of the provider's closure due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, for each employee, the provider will pay full compensation, and will not take any action that reduces the weekly amount of the employee's compensation below the weekly amount of full compensation, or that reduces the employee's rate of compensation below the rate of full compensation;

(bb) children enrolled as of March 1, 2020, will maintain their slots, unless their families choose to disenroll the children;

(cc) for the duration of the provider's closure due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, the provider will provide relief from copayments and tuition payments for the families enrolled in the provider's program and prioritize such relief for families struggling to make either type of payments; and

(dd) the provider will resume operations when the provider is able to safely implement policies in line with guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the corresponding State and local authorities, and in accordance with State and local orders;

(IV) information about the child care provider's—

(aa) program characteristics sufficient to allow the lead agency to establish the child care provider's priority status, as described in subparagraph (F);

(bb) program operational status on the date of submission of the application;

(cc) type of program, including whether the program is a center-based child care, family child care, group home child care, or other non-center-based child care type program;

(dd) total enrollment on the date of submission of the application and total capacity as allowed by the State; and

(ee) receipt of assistance, and amount of assistance, through a payment or reimbursement described in subparagraph (C)(iv), and the time period for which the assistance was made;

(V) information necessary to determine the amount of the subgrant, such as information about the provider's stated average operating expenses over the period before March 1, 2020, described in subparagraph (C)(i); and

(VI) such other limited information as the lead agency shall determine to be necessary to make subgrants to qualified child care providers.

(ii) **FREQUENCY.**—The lead agency shall accept and process applications submitted under this subparagraph on a rolling basis.

(iii) **UPDATES.**—The lead agency shall—

(I) at least once a month, verify by obtaining a self-attestation from each qualified child care provider that received such a subgrant from the agency, whether the provider is open and available to provide child care services or is closed due to the COVID-19 public health emergency;

(II) allow the qualified child care provider to update the information provided in a prior application; and

(III) adjust the qualified child care provider's subgrant award as necessary, based on changes to the application information, including changes to the provider's operational status.

(iv) **EXISTING APPLICATIONS.**—If a lead agency has established and implemented a grant program for child care providers that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and an eligible child care provider has already submitted an application for such a grant to the lead agency containing the information specified in clause (i), the lead agency shall treat that application as an application submitted under this subparagraph. If an eligible child care provider has already submitted such an application containing part of the information specified in clause (i), the provider may submit to the lead agency an abbreviated application that contains the remaining information, and the lead agency shall treat the 2 applications as an application submitted under this subparagraph.

(E) **MATERIALS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The lead agency shall provide the materials and other resources related to such subgrants, including a notification of subgrant opportunities and application materials, to qualified child care providers in the most commonly spoken languages in the State.

(ii) **APPLICATION.**—The application shall be accessible on the website of the lead agency within 30 days after the lead agency receives

grant funds awarded pursuant to subsection (b) and shall be accessible to all eligible child care providers, including family child care providers, group home child care providers, and other non-center-based child care providers and providers with limited administrative capacity.

(F) **PRIORITY.**—In making subgrants under this section, the lead agency shall give priority to qualified child care providers that, prior to or on March 1, 2020—

(i) provided child care during nontraditional hours;

(ii) served dual language learners, children with disabilities, children experiencing homelessness, children in foster care, children from low-income families, or infants and toddlers;

(iii) served a high proportion of children whose families received subsidies under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) for the child care; or

(iv) operated in communities, including rural communities, with a low supply of child care.

(G) **PROVIDERS RECEIVING OTHER ASSISTANCE.**—The lead agency, in determining whether a provider is a qualified child care provider, shall not take into consideration receipt of a payment or reimbursement described in subparagraph (C)(iii) or subparagraph (C)(iv).

(H) **AWARDS.**—The lead agency shall equitably make subgrants under this paragraph to center-based child care providers, family child care providers, group home child care providers, and other non-center-based child care providers, such that qualified child care providers are able to access the subgrant opportunity under this paragraph regardless of the providers' setting, size, or administrative capacity.

(I) **OBLIGATION.**—The lead agency shall obligate at least 50 percent of funds available to carry out this section for subgrants described in this paragraph, by December 31, 2020.

(e) **USES OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A qualified child care provider that receives funds through such a subgrant may use the funds for the costs of—

(A) payroll;

(B) employee benefits, including group health plan benefits during periods of paid sick, medical, or family leave, and insurance premiums;

(C) employee salaries or similar compensation, including any income or other compensation to a sole proprietor or independent contractor that is a wage, commission, income, net earnings from self-employment, or similar compensation;

(D) payment on any mortgage obligation;

(E) rent (including rent under a lease agreement);

(F) utilities;

(G) insurance;

(H) providing premium pay for child care providers and other employees who provide services during the COVID-19 public health emergency;

(I) sanitization and other costs associated with cleaning;

(J) personal protective equipment and other equipment necessary to carry out the functions of the child care provider;

(K) training and professional development related to health and safety practices, including the proper implementation of policies in line with guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the corresponding State and local authorities, and in accordance with State and local orders;

(L) modifications to child care services as a result of the COVID-19 public health emergency, such as limiting group sizes, adjusting staff-to-child ratios, and implementing other heightened health and safety measures;

(M) mental health supports for children and employees; and

(N) other goods and services necessary to maintain or resume operation of the child care program, or to maintain the viability of the child care provider as a going concern during and after the COVID-19 public health emergency.

(2) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—The qualified child care provider may use the subgrant funds to reim-

burse the provider for sums obligated or expended before the date of enactment of this Act for the cost of a good or service described in paragraph (1) to respond to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

(f) **REPORTING.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—A lead agency receiving a grant under this section shall, within 60 days after making the agency's first subgrant under subsection (d)(2) to a qualified child care provider, submit a report to the Secretary that includes—

(A) data on qualified child care providers that applied for subgrants and qualified child care providers that received such subgrants, including—

(i) the number of such applicants and the number of such recipients;

(ii) the number and proportion of such applicants and recipients that received priority and the characteristic or characteristics of such applicants and recipients associated with the priority;

(iii) the number and proportion of such applicants and recipients that are—

(I) center-based child care providers;

(II) family child care providers;

(III) group home child care providers; or

(IV) other non-center-based child care providers; and

(iv) within each of the groups listed in clause (iii), the number of such applicants and recipients that are, on the date of submission of the application—

(I) open and available to provide child care services; or

(II) closed due to the COVID-19 public health emergency;

(B) the total capacity of child care providers that are licensed, regulated, or registered in the State on the date of the submission of the report;

(C) a description of—

(i) the efforts of the lead agency to publicize the availability of subgrants under this section and conduct widespread outreach to eligible child care providers about such subgrants, including efforts to make materials available in languages other than English;

(ii) the lead agency's methodology for determining amounts of subgrants under subsection (d)(2);

(iii) the lead agency's timeline for disbursing the subgrant funds; and

(iv) the lead agency's plan for ensuring that qualified child care providers that receive funding through such a subgrant comply with assurances described in subsection (d)(2)(D) and use funds in compliance with subsection (e); and

(D) such other limited information as the Secretary may require.

(2) **QUARTERLY REPORT.**—The lead agency shall, following the submission of such initial report, submit to the Secretary a report that contains the information described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D) of paragraph (1) once a quarter until all funds allotted for activities authorized under this section are expended.

(3) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after a lead agency receiving a grant under this section has obligated all of the grant funds (including funds received under subsection (h)), the lead agency shall submit a report to the Secretary, in such manner as the Secretary may require, that includes—

(A) the total number of eligible child care providers who were providing child care services on or before March 1, 2020, in the State and the number of such providers that submitted an application under subsection (d)(2)(D);

(B) the number of qualified child care providers in the State that received funds through the grant;

(C) the lead agency's methodology for determining amounts of subgrants under subsection (d)(2);

(D) the average and range of the subgrant amounts by provider type (center-based child

care, family child care, group home child care, or other non-center-based child care provider);

(E) the percentages of the child care providers that received such a subgrant, that, on or before March 1, 2020—

(i) provided child care during nontraditional hours;

(ii) served dual language learners, children with disabilities, children experiencing homelessness, children in foster care, children from low-income families, or infants and toddlers;

(iii) served a high proportion of children whose families received subsidies under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) for the child care; and

(iv) operated in communities, including rural communities, with a low supply of child care;

(F) the number of children served by the child care providers that received such a subgrant, for the duration of the subgrant;

(G) the percentages, of the child care providers that received such a subgrant, that are—

(i) center-based child care providers;

(ii) family child care providers;

(iii) group home child care providers; or

(iv) other non-center-based child care providers;

(H) the percentages, of the child care providers listed in subparagraph (G) that are, on the date of submission of the application—

(i) open and available to provide child care services; or

(ii) closed due to the COVID-19 public health emergency;

(I) information about how child care providers used the funds received under such a subgrant;

(J) information about how the lead agency used funds reserved under subsection (d)(1); and

(K) information about how the subgrants helped to stabilize the child care sector.

(4) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

(A) **FINDINGS FROM INITIAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 60 days after receiving all reports required to be submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, summarizing the findings from the reports received under paragraph (1).

(B) **FINDINGS FROM FINAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, summarizing the findings from the reports received under paragraph (3).

(g) **SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**—Amounts made available to carry out this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended to provide child care services for eligible individuals, including funds provided under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) and State child care programs.

(h) **REALLOTMENT OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.**—

(1) **UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.**—A State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization shall return to the Secretary any grant funds received under this section that the State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization does not obligate by September 30, 2021.

(2) **REALLOTMENT.**—The Secretary shall award new allotments and payments, in accordance with subsection (c)(2), to covered States, Indian tribes, or tribal organizations from funds that are returned under paragraph (1) within 60 days of receiving such funds. Funds made available through the new allotments and payments shall remain available to each covered State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization until September 30, 2022.

(3) COVERED STATE, INDIAN TRIBE, OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of paragraph (2), a covered State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization is a State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization that received an allotment or payment under this section and was not required to return grant funds under paragraph (1).

(i) EXCEPTIONS.—The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.), excluding requirements in subparagraphs (C) through (E) of section 658E(c)(3), section 658G, and section 658J(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)(3), 9858e, 9858h(c)), shall apply to child care services provided under this section to the extent the application of such Act does not conflict with the provisions of this section. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a State to submit an application, other than the application described in section 658E or 658O(c) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c, 9858m(c)), to receive a grant under this Act.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$50,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.

(2) APPLICATION.—In carrying out the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 with funds other than the funds appropriated under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall calculate the amounts of appropriated funds described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 658O of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9858m) by excluding funds appropriated under paragraph (1).

SEC. 2. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 3. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2020.

This Act may be cited as the “Child Care Is Essential Act”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of my bill to save the childcare industry: The Child Care Is Essential Act.

Let me recognize my colleagues who join me here this morning, especially the Chair of the Committee on Education and Labor, Chairman BOBBY SCOTT.

To make clear our fight and our purpose, I quote The Washington Post from July 4.

The title of the piece: “Lack of childcare slowing recovery. Working Parents Swamped At Home. Productivity slump pinned on school, center closures.”

“The childcare crunch triggered by the pandemic has rapidly become a cri-

sis for many workers and companies that is hindering the economic recovery, disproportionately harming women and threatening to leave deep scars for years to come.”

The Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee has been central to our response to this pandemic and has provided much-needed funding to deal with the crisis—providing \$3.5 billion for childcare in the CARES Act, and \$7 billion in the House-passed HEROES Act.

But, to be frank, \$7 billion in the HEROES Act is not enough to save the childcare sector. It could take at least \$9.6 billion per month to keep current childcare providers in business. This is a crisis. More than half of childcare programs could close if we do not act quickly.

The biggest worry of the providers in my State of Connecticut are the loss of revenue, how to pay non-payroll business expenses, and they are concerned that families will not return after the public health emergency. Affordable childcare was a significant and a severe issue before the pandemic and will be after this pandemic is over.

This is not about going back to normal. We cannot afford to do that either. If we cannot make families feel safe that their kids are going to be in a safe and secure environment, we are not going to get our economy back on track. Parents are not going to send their children to unsafe places or they have no place to send them.

Mr. Speaker, the Childcare Is Essential Act creates a \$50 billion childcare stabilization fund within the existing Childcare and Development Block Grant Program. The bill provides grant funding to childcare providers to stabilize the sector and support providers so that they can be safely reopening and running.

This legislation helps childcare providers and working families by:

Ensuring that the grants adequately support providers’ operating expenses and funding gets to them quickly;

Requires that providers continue to pay their staff;

Providing tuition and copayment relief for working families;

Promote health and safety through compliance with public health guidance;

Prioritize providers that serve underserved populations;

Ensuring grants are awarded equitably across childcare settings; and

Conducting oversight through robust reporting requirements.

Mr. Speaker, we bailed out the airlines—almost \$60 billion—and we thought that that was necessary to do for our economy.

Corporations have received \$522 billion for PPP loans, and we knew that that was important to undergird our economy.

Hedge fund managers and real estate developers got a \$135 billion tax break completely unrelated to the pandemic. We did not need that.

We need to save the childcare industry. It is a matter of values, of right and wrong, and it is a matter of the values of who we believe needs to be protected: Our children? Our families? Or special interests?

It is a matter of economic security for women and families, and lack of childcare has been cited as a reason why women are still highly reflected in the unemployment rolls.

Small businesses are concerned. One half of all essential workers in this country are women. Who are the essential workers? Grocery store workers, public transport, cleaning and sanitation, healthcare, retail workers. They have to go to work. Where do they put their kids?

And it is a matter of addressing racial disparities, which this virus has further exposed, particularly when providers in communities of color continue to struggle to access small business loans, like those through the PPP because of systemic discrimination in banking practices, the wealth gap, higher debt. We must help now.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I say: Let us move boldly in this historic moment for women, for families, for children, for small businesses, for communities of color. Let us stabilize the childcare sector. Childcare is essential. There is no reopening of our economy without it. So let us provide that \$50 billion today.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 7027. As the country navigates the ongoing reality of the coronavirus pandemic, childcare is one of the most important issues we have to resolve. Congress must put childcare solutions in place to help working families address their needs, but this bill before us is not the answer.

This bill would appropriate \$50 billion for the childcare industry—more than its entire annual revenue. Overly burdensome and complicated application requirements would accompany those funds. This means providers would spend their time on applications and reporting requirements rather than caring for the children and keeping them safe. The bill creates unnecessary confusion by requiring providers to follow CDC guidance and that of their State and local governments even when those requirements may conflict.

The Committee on Appropriations has had no hearings or markups to consider this bill. There has been no input from the minority, and there is no opportunity today for amendments. Unfortunately, the majority has yet again used this crisis as an opportunity to push through partisan policy proposals instead of working together to address the very real challenges we face. We can and we must do better than the bills we are considering today.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman DELAURO for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today not just as a representative of New Jersey's 11th District, but also as a working mom with four children—a mom who knows how important childcare is for our families, our businesses, and our communities.

I have long said it is critical to have women serving in Congress to legislate on these important issues, and it has been my own experience—as I try to ensure that my children are doing their schoolwork while I am attending Zoom meetings, conference calls, and working to serve the families throughout the 11th District—that has led me to call experts to discuss the challenges to providing safe childcare during the pandemic.

It is my experience now, as I try to piece together childcare between my husband and my two sisters and myself, and trying to come down to Washington to vote, that informs my understanding of what is going on across the Nation.

Before the pandemic, 5 million children and their families relied on childcare. How we address this childcare crisis will have deep reverberations throughout our economy and on the health and safety of our families and our workers. Without the proper support for childcare to open safely and effectively, there will be no real reopening for much of the workforce.

Without proper childcare options, that means childcare facilities that have the money to implement health and safety precautions necessary to protect children and workers, women will be forced to choose between staying home or going back to work. If childcare is scarce or feels unsafe, moms will be staying home in the vast majority of cases.

In fact, an economist at Northwestern University who studies the gendered impact of the pandemic, noted that 19 million children live in single-parent households, 70 percent of which are led by single moms. If women have to leave the workforce or cut back hours, these decisions will have long-lasting impacts on the future of their careers, salary, promotions, equitable pay, and the economic security of their families.

I have heard from leaders in research institutions who have said that while men are submitting research papers at a faster clip than ever, their female

counterparts have not. They attribute this to the burden of childcare that rests on women without access to childcare services.

□ 1130

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today for the Child Care Is Essential Act.

As a working mom, I know that finding quality, affordable childcare is not easy even under the best of circumstances, but the strain of COVID-19 has pushed the childcare industry to the brink of collapse.

Nearly half of all childcare providers have closed at some point during this pandemic, and those that have reopened are facing increased costs to implement new safety measures, including reduced capacity, intense and frequent disinfecting and cleaning, and the purchase of PPE for providers. Without immediate financial support, many are at risk of closing permanently.

Congress and this administration must recognize there cannot be a strong and full economic recovery without access to quality, affordable childcare for working families.

This important bill will create a \$50 billion childcare stabilization fund and invest in childcare across our country to ensure that providers have the resources they need to safely reopen. The Child Care Is Essential Act would bring an estimated \$985 million to my home State of Virginia to keep childcare providers open and their employees on payroll.

Parents simply cannot return to work if they can't find childcare. We are facing a crisis, and Congress must take decisive action on behalf of the working families and parents in America.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Care Is Essential Act, a bill that will help childcare centers stay open through this pandemic and help us reopen our economy.

For almost 5 months now, families have struggled to balance work and childcare. Meanwhile, essential workers, including farmworkers, healthcare workers, police, and firefighters, rely on childcare for their families and for them to do their jobs.

But as this pandemic continues, it gets more difficult for childcare providers to keep their doors open. Just 29 percent of childcare and education centers in Monterey County in my district

are currently open and operating. Without help from the Federal Government, our childcare centers will have to close, and our essential workers will be unable to serve our communities.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote for the Child Care Is Essential Act, because, with these grants to childcare providers, they can stay open and safely operate during this pandemic but also play a critical part in our Nation's rebuilding and recovery.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire about the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 5 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 13½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinary time in our Nation's history. We are watching families today who are in the most serious economic and healthcare crises of their lives. What this pandemic has exposed are the serious, serious inequities that exist, the racial inequities that exist.

What is becoming clear, from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is that there are two classes of people. We have essential workers, who I pointed out are the grocery workers, the transit workers, the sanitation people, the retail workers who clock in and out every single day and who have to be on the job, and they have been told if they don't show up, they don't get paid. But they have kids; they have families.

What is the main responsibility of a parent? The pride you take in making sure that your children are safe, that they are secure, that you are doing all you can for them to be able to survive.

So, what is your choice? Leave your kid by themselves? You can't take them to work. You know, I had a lengthy conversation, almost 2 hours, on the phone with farmworkers in our country. Know what they do without access to childcare? They leave their kids home alone, or they take them to the fields.

Who are we? This is the United States of America. Where are our values? What do we care most about?

Let me just tell you about that \$135 billion that is in the CARES bill. I will just say that the Democrats took it out in the HEROES bill. But as I see the bill that our Republican colleagues put forward in the last 24 hours, it is still in there. It is a tax break for 43,000 people in this country, and they get a \$1.6 million tax cut. They claw back to 2018, 2019. No one knew the word "coronavirus" in 2018 and 2019. It has nothing to do with this pandemic.

I will mention those essential workers again to you today because there are 17.9 million children under the age of 13. Their parents are frontline workers, as I have laid out.

I will also add, in full disclosure, that two-thirds of these children do not require emergency care because they

have another parent. They have a family member or an adult caregiver available to them. But this implies that we have 6 million kids who need emergency care at 45 hours per week.

There are 6 million children who need to be in childcare. The providers that remain open are providing emergency care to these workers, and they are incurring costs, including paid premiums for staff, substitute workers for staff who are out on paid sick or family leave, higher prices for food and materials, including recommended personal protective and sanitation equipment and supplies.

You know, public safety demands that each center or home-based provider serves fewer children than they normally do. Why? For safety reasons.

Understand, people want to talk about the economy reopening. Are parents going to send their kids to—first of all, we are talking about schools where the CDC has said that the worst situation is 5-day, in-person. Yet, what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to do is to tie their education funds to whether they do that, which is outrageous to begin with, and now they do not want to provide any funding for childcare providers.

In the HEROES bill, it is \$5 million and \$10 million in grants. The National Women's Law Center has told us it will be about \$9.6 billion a month to deal with this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable. All I can say is, if we can bail out the airlines, if we can bail out the business community, we should be done with the \$135 billion. Let's move forward: \$50 billion for childcare legislation today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARNETT.) The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the Committee on Appropriations has expired.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 15 minutes.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for this legislation.

I salute Congresswoman DELAUNO for her leadership over the years, constant, persistent, dissatisfied, and relentless, in terms of looking out for our children.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chair of the Education and Labor Committee, for his leadership throughout all of this. I think he knows this issue, chapter and verse, over the years, and so I am so happy that we are coming to the floor for this.

In our community, there is such a need for childcare. It is endless. We

don't even come close. We have been thinking incrementally. We have to think transformatively.

Even little children know. In our community, we have T-shirts, "Children Learning, Parents Earning," the direct connection between quality childcare, where children are given a good start on where they are going.

I rise during this devastating time for America, as the health and economic crisis of COVID-19 hurtles further out of control. Ten weeks ago, the Democrats delivered a solution by defeating the virus and safely opening the economy with the HEROES Act—it was actually 10 weeks ago today—supporting our heroes, crushing the virus, and putting money in America's pocket. Yet, for 10 weeks, we haven't had the action that we need on that.

So, here we are. For all the statements that were made over time about need for childcare, this virus has really shown a bright spotlight on why it is so important. Parents know; children know; we all know. But this virus has been an instructor, because if parents are forced to go to work as essential workers, who is going to take care of the children if their schools cannot open actually and some are virtual?

Again, when I ran for Congress, over 30 years ago, people said to me: "Who is taking care of your children?" My children were big. Four of them were already in college and one a senior in high school. But that was the question: Who is taking care of the children? And that is a question for our Nation: Who is taking care of the children?

In order for us to succeed with this, we have to meet the needs of the children, their families, and childcare workers. Our childcare workers are the workforce behind the workforce, risking their health and safety on the front lines to ensure that parents can go to work.

But they face a devastating situation. The childcare system needs at least \$50 billion in the next 6 months in order to survive. Just one in five childcare programs believes that they can stay open for more than a year without Federal support.

This is essential. An estimated 326,000 workers, nearly one-third of the sector nationwide, have lost their jobs since February—326,000 since February.

□ 1145

Half of the providers have closed, and those that are open to serve children of essential workers are risking their health, too often without PPE, and parents are paying the price. We can't get people back to work until we have widespread access to safe, quality, and affordable childcare.

Here is the situation in the childcare workers' own words. Terry from Wisconsin said: I have gone from 81 kids a day to two. I can't stay open with two, we are considered essential, but how can I stay open without the help needed? I love my kids, staff, and families, but to ask me to go under because all

of a sudden I am essential—really? This is what we say: People are essential. We have to treat them as if they are essential.

Traci from Pennsylvania says: We are a nonprofit center, mainly funded by families who pay out of pocket. We need a way to maintain payroll of staff so that they can be ready to return when we are allowed to reopen. We need help paying our rent and health insurance costs. We will need help understanding how to stay open safely and how to adjust to new regulations, how to afford related training, and what to do if our families can't afford to return.

And Mary in New York says: Since COVID, my childcare center has gone from 89 percent to about 10 percent. Fifteen employees will lose their jobs. We are the only center in a 1-mile radius in a very low-income area. We are the only voice for our parents and children. Please help us be heard.

And so action is needed now, which is why I am proud to support two bills that will be a lifeline for childcare workers and for the economy, while keeping our children safe and helping them and helping parents go back to work:

H.R. 7027, the Child Care Is Essential Act, creating a \$50 billion childcare stabilization fund to provide funding to childcare providers over the next 6 months and helping them safely reopen and operate during and after the COVID-19 crisis; and

H.R. 7327, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act, expanding access to quality childcare to help workers safely return to their jobs and stimulate the economy with Federal investments and tax subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman NITA LOWEY, a maestro of the legislative process, who has advanced immeasurable progress for generations of Americans.

I thank RICHARD NEAL for his leadership on the tax credit and Federal investments work.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Congresswoman ROSA DELAUNO, chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and the godmother of much of the work for families and children that we do in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Chairman BOBBY SCOTT and Senator PATTY MURRAY, ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, for their leadership on this bill. Thank you, Mr. SCOTT, for every day reminding us and leading us on how we can help our children.

And I thank and recognize the outside organizers who have been relentless, persistent, and dissatisfied, as is Rosa, as they have fought for the strong investments in the childcare sector that our children and workers need.

When people ask me, "What are the three most important issues facing the Congress?" I always say the same thing

and have for over 30 years. The three most important issues facing the Congress are our children, our children, our children: their health, their education, the economic security of their families, a safe environment in which they can thrive, a world at peace in which they can reach their fulfillment, and my motivation for even coming to Congress was one in five children in America who lives in poverty.

But it isn't only families in poverty who are affected by this childcare issue; it is our entire society and entire economy, and that is why we have to think transformatively about this.

As we observe the 100th anniversary of women having the right to vote, as we observe the fact that we have over 100 women in Congress, many of them moms of small children, we do have to recognize that, for our economy to thrive, we have to have the full participation and leadership of women, because we do believe, when women succeed, America succeeds, for that to happen. And dads have this responsibility, too, so we want them to succeed as well.

But for all of that to happen, we have to make sure that we know who is taking care of the children, and the role that we play is to facilitate all of that to make sure it is of the highest quality and safety for the children and ensure that they are served by the legislation that we are considering.

For the sake of the children, their health, their safety, and our children's future, as we recover from COVID but learn from it, I urge our colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7027, Democrats' partisan Child Care Is Essential Act, which, based off its troublesome provisions, would be better titled as the no care for children act.

Republicans and Democrats agree that there is a critical need that exists in our country today: the need to help childcare providers reopen their businesses safely.

Childcare is the cornerstone of the American workforce. If parents do not have a safe place to send their children, they cannot work. If our Nation is going to recover swiftly and successfully from the COVID-19 pandemic, childcare providers must be an integral part of the solution to getting America reopened and back to work.

Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today, H.R. 7027, is just another messaging bill for House Democrats, who are more interested in political posturing than enacting meaningful solutions.

Before I get into the lowlights of this legislation, I would like to point out that childcare falls under the jurisdiction of the House Education and Labor Committee. However, our committee did not hold a single hearing or a single markup on today's bill. This is becom-

ing a recurring theme in Speaker PELOSI's House of Representatives.

The fact that Chairman SCOTT allowed Speaker PELOSI to make the opening comments on this bill is a further indication that this is Speaker PELOSI's bill. The blatant disregard for congressional precedent and proper way of doing our job is appalling. Too many pieces of legislation are being written behind closed doors in the Speaker's office. This type of backroom horse trading is not how the Nation's deliberative body should operate.

On top of this, House Democrats are casting votes and conducting legislative business from the comfort of their own homes or, in some cases, their fishing boat, and bringing partisan messaging bills to the House floor without going through the legislative process, all while collecting a taxpayer-funded paycheck.

We have gone from a representative Republic to an autocracy. Members of Congress were elected to represent Americans here in Washington, yet Speaker PELOSI seems set on silencing those voices. This is downright shameful and indicative of Speaker PELOSI's out-of-touch politics-over-progress agenda.

Back to the flawed legislation at hand.

We all agree that Congress should help childcare providers reopen safely; however, we cannot spend taxpayer dollars recklessly while layering on additional burdens when childcare providers on the ground are already facing burdensome red tape.

The Democrats' flawed, one-sided bill appropriates \$50 billion, which is higher than the entire annual revenue of the childcare industry and substantially more than Democrats felt was necessary to include in their so-called HEROES Act.

We know the Democrats preferred solution for any problem is to throw more taxpayer money at it, but the Bipartisan Policy Center estimated that the industry would need about half of the amount included in H.R. 7027 to recover.

Additionally, H.R. 7027 places burdensome requirements on childcare providers, which could lead to providers spending more time and money applying for and reporting on the funds rather than doing what is most important: serving children.

Providers already have to figure out how to implement new and necessary health and safety rules, from social distancing and limits on group size to increased cleaning protocols. As if this isn't already weighing heavily on childcare professionals, Democrats now want to enact even more cumbersome requirements for them to deal with.

This legislation also tries to dictate from the Federal level how providers run their businesses, which can hamper their ability to reopen safely and stay open.

This ill-advised bill also denies support for certain eligible providers, such

as churches and public recreation camps who are licensed-exempt, operating legally in a State, and meeting all State and local requirements.

H.R. 7027 fails to address the barriers many new providers face, an issue that can increase cost and limit slots for children.

Mr. Speaker, the no care for children act will drive up costs substantially, tie many providers' hands unnecessarily, and shift the focus away from serving children and supporting parents returning to work.

It is worth repeating that Republicans and Democrats wholeheartedly agree on the overarching goal of this debate we are having today. A lack of childcare options could seriously delay our Nation's economic recovery. That is why it is extremely disappointing that we are spending our time debating another partisan messaging bill from House Democrats rather than focusing on common ground and working in a bipartisan fashion to solve our differences on this issue and deliver for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on H.R. 7027, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the distinguished ranking member that we did have a hearing in February and, actually, a briefing in May that the minority party decided not to participate in.

And insofar as the Speaker, she was here. If I had opened, she would have had to listen to me and to you and would have been here waiting all that time. The Speaker is busy, so I called on the Speaker so she could speak and return to her busy schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, the childcare industry has suffered tremendous losses since the start of this pandemic. Centers are facing increased operating costs and are working overtime to provide adequate PPE and sanitation materials to keep our children safe.

Countless American families rely on the childcare industry, and we must provide them with the materials and equipment that they need to give our children the best possible care. To help small businesses grow, support hardworking Georgians, and uplift our economy, parents must have a safe place to send their children.

□ 1200

Truly, the childcare industry helps give our kids the foundation for their future, and it needs our help.

Hardworking families deserve our support, and the Child Care Is Essential Act would give providers the funding and resources they need to nurture the next generation.



I thank Representative DELAURO for her leadership and Chairman SCOTT for his leadership.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Everyone in this Chamber can agree that access to childcare will be vital to the continued reopening of our economy, especially as more and more parents return to work. However, this legislation is not the answer. It would cost an astronomical \$50 billion, an amount higher than the total revenue of the childcare industry in the United States, and twice as high as the Bipartisan Policy Center reports that childcare providers actually need.

Further, this legislation places so many reporting requirements on agencies that \$5 billion of that money, a whopping 10 percent, will go to administrative expenses, rather than helping children get the care that they need. This is not where the red tape is, by the way. The bill places additional and unneeded regulatory burdens on childcare centers that would increase their costs and require them to follow State and CDC guidelines on operations, even when those guidelines may directly contradict each other. The Child Care Is Essential Act also unfairly limits access to these funds. Licensed-exempt facilities like at many churches will be prohibited from accessing these funds.

Childcare is essential as parents begin returning to the workplace, however, this bill spends too much taxpayer money and places an undue and unworkable regulatory burden on facilities, Federal agencies, and yes, on families.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation, and I ask my Democratic colleagues to actually come to the table on a bipartisan solution to this issue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Child Care Is Essential Act. This bill is badly needed to clear a massive roadblock on our Nation’s path to economic recovery. The choice is clear. Without assistance, only 18 percent of existing childcare programs will remain open a year from today.

Last month, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, not known as a strong supporter of social services, announced its support for emergency aid for childcare providers, declaring that “for millions of Americans, returning to work is not just contingent on the lifting of stay-at-home orders . . . but on securing care for their children.” This aid is critical because childcare providers are small businesses and have been operating at reduced capacity and much

higher costs, if they are open at all. This situation is not sustainable. Every month more centers are closing as costs exceed revenues. Some estimates predict that we may lose as many as 4.5 million slots nationwide unless Congress acts and acts fast.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has long undervalued the role that childcare plays in enabling our workforce, and the COVID-19 pandemic has exposed that deplorable lack of investment. Making sure the childcare industry survives, as the Chamber testified, will shorten the recession by getting parents back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and neighbor, ROSA DELAURO and Chairman SCOTT for their work on this bill and I urge a “yes” vote.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation continues to respond, recover, and reopen our economy following the outbreak of COVID-19, we can all agree that childcare is necessary in getting Americans back to work.

No parent will return to work if they do not have a safe place for their child, which is another reason why schools safely reopening should be a priority of my Democratic colleagues.

However, Democrats are pushing a partisan proposal that carelessly over-spends taxpayer dollars and further burdens our childcare providers, who already face bureaucratic red tape, with more mandates, like overly extensive application requirements that will cost them more time and money when their time is better spent caring for our children.

These mandates will prevent new providers from entering the industry, ultimately increasing costs and limiting the amount of available slots for children.

This again is a one-size-fits-all, top-down government program. How much of this money will actually get there to take care of a child?

H.R. 7027 appropriates \$50 billion, which is higher than the entire annual revenue of the childcare industry—think about that—and twice the amount that the Bipartisan Policy Center estimated the industry would need. Is it going to cost another \$25 billion to administrate this thing for all the burdensome red tape that goes along with it?

Once again, the Democrats’ solution is more government control, more regulation, and more taxpayer dollars wasted with burdensome strings attached. When are the American people going to wake up?

It denies support for certain eligible providers, such as churches and public recreation camps, who are license-exempt and operating legally in a State that meet all State and local requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that, rather than finding common ground, my colleagues across the aisle are moving forward with a bill that will only hurt families who want to return to work and need access to childcare.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and let’s all go back to the drawing board so that we can find support for our working families.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Resources.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Childcare is one of the most urgent and stressful issues facing families during this pandemic and stabilizing it will be a key factor in opening our communities safely.

I recently spoke about this issue with Oregonians who are struggling, parents, early child educators, and small business owners. I released a report urging support for the childcare industry. As one mom told me: “if childcare crumbles, if it even gets a fraction more difficult to find, then our collective ability to work crumbles too.”

The childcare crisis disproportionately affects women, who, because of entrenched gender roles, continue to take on the majority of childcare and household responsibilities.

A lack of affordable childcare reduces the ability of women to work outside the home and extends the gender pay gap. This is also an issue of racial justice. Many childcare workers are women of color.

I am grateful for previous stimulus efforts, but it is not enough. The Child Care Is Essential Act will provide immediate relief through \$50 billion, which I will note is less than the amount that went to the Nation’s airlines in coronavirus legislation. This is in direct grant funding to help childcare providers cover operating expenses, purchase PPE and cleaning supplies, pay providers through the pandemic and beyond, and importantly, give parents the relief they need from high copayments and tuition.

Investing in our children now has long-term benefits for our families, for our communities, and for our economy.

I thank Congresswoman DELAURO and Chairman SCOTT for their leadership, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise me how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 10 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).



Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, parents can't go back to earning until their children can go back to learning. The topic of reopening schools has been top of mind in recent weeks. We also need safe care for our young ones though, because their parents need to work, too.

Childcare is essential, for parents and children. Many childcare providers have closed during this pandemic, some for safety, some for financial reasons.

But childcare isn't just about parents' jobs. High quality early childhood education is the single best way to close the opportunity gap and give disadvantaged children a strong start. Every dollar invested in early childhood education pays back \$7 down the road, and that is a phenomenal investment.

The Child Care Is Essential Act provides financial assistance so providers can reopen safely.

By passing this bill, we support children, working families, and childcare providers; all worthy of our investment.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Politico wrote recently, "A lack of safe and affordable childcare amid the coronavirus pandemic is keeping many working parents from returning to the office as more companies call employees back to their jobs, threatening to extend the economic crisis and erode decades of gains for women in the workplace."

In fact, the Bipartisan Policy Center found that at the height of the COVID-19 outbreak, 60 percent of childcare centers closed, and one-third of the childcare workforce lost their jobs.

The topic of today's debate is an issue that both Republicans and Democrats agree must be addressed. Unfortunately, the legislation being pushed by Democrats spends taxpayer dollars recklessly and layers on additional burdensome requirements.

That is why my Republican colleagues have introduced the Back to Work Child Care Grants Act of 2020, which is led by Senator ERNST and Senator ALEXANDER in the Senate and Representative REED in the House.

Unlike the Democrat bill we are considering today, the Back to Work Child Care Grants Act will offer childcare providers solutions and resources, not burdensome red tape. The GOP-led initiative would support childcare providers by offering short-term financial assistance, critical resources to reopen and stay open, all while holding providers accountable to State and local health and safety guidelines.

Regrettably, the Democrats' childcare bill picks winners and losers by denying help to many providers who are license-exempt and operating legally, such as churches and public recreation camps. The Back to Work Child Care Grants Act of 2020, on the other hand, ensures all providers in need of support have access to funding.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7027, the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Failing to solve this childcare crisis will set women back in the workforce for generations.

We know that if we let our childcare industry collapse, the burden will fall heavily on women.

I saw firsthand the challenges childcare providers face when I visited the Building Blocks Learning Academy in Batavia, Illinois earlier this month.

They are doing heroic work, but they need support.

If Congress doesn't act, thousands of childcare providers will close, and millions of childcare slots will disappear.

I am proud that Illinois has been a model for how States can respond to support childcare providers, but they still need the Federal help that this bill delivers, and we must pass it today.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Child Care Is Essential Act.

From the beginning, this pandemic has exacerbated the existing inequities in society and revealed the cracks that we have always known existed in our childcare system.

The stress on this economy has left it teetering on the edge of total collapse. The tone from parents and providers who call my office about this issue have become increasingly more desperate.

Providers in Connecticut tell me stories about being behind on rent payments, having to furlough workers, having to dip into their own savings to stay solvent, and trying to figure out if there is a way to safely open without continuing to mount debt.

We may lose over half of licensed childcare providers in my State.

Even before coronavirus, the childcare industry and families in Connecticut were struggling. We often hear that there is dignity in work, and without childcare, work can't happen for many people.

I am a working mother. I rely on before and aftercare, and right now, like many of my constituents, I am struggling. We live in a country where women contribute to the economy, where women contribute to societies, where families are struggling to go back to work.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, that is why I am excited to be here today with my colleagues, voting on legislation that will provide immediate relief to community providers and inject stability into the childcare industry.

This bill would keep the workers that help our children learn, grow, and thrive employed. It would keep small businesses afloat and respond to the crisis at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Child Care Is Essential Act and put their money where their mouths are.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we need more childcare slots, but rather than opening more doors, H.R. 7027 denies support for certain eligible providers such as churches and public recreation camps who are operating legally, and fails to address the barriers to entry new providers face, an issue that can increase costs and limit slots for children.

Given the capacity issue of existing centers, legislative proposals should allow for more slots and reduce the barriers to entry for new providers. This bill does the opposite.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, we have a childcare crisis in America.

In Michigan, when our auto manufacturers had to stop producing to address the impacts of COVID-19 and we saw production orders go to zero, with that, our daycare centers witnessed and experienced a dramatic drop in participation. Today, 40 percent of daycare providers in Michigan are at risk of imminent closure.

We say, "Let's get back to work. We are ready to get back to work. We want to get back to work safely," but we need our daycare centers. We need the Child Care Is Essential Act because of the very fact that childcare is essential in America.

This is too much of an impediment for the hardworking people in Michigan and across this country, and it is a long overdue and realized endeavor that we must take on to address the coronavirus pandemic and what we need to do to get back to work safely in America.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Without additional Federal assistance, half the childcare capacity in

California and across the country is at risk of disappearing. This bill would provide much-needed relief for these facilities in my State and support working families.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DELAURO for her leadership on this issue and for working with my friend, Representative BACON, and me to include language from our bill in this package.

My bipartisan bill ensures childcare providers can pay for cleaning supplies and safety equipment to protect children and childcare workers from the coronavirus.

According to a nationwide survey, 91 percent of childcare centers are incurring additional costs for cleaning supplies. We must provide the necessary resources to protect the health and safety of our children and childcare workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this bill to ensure childcare facilities nationwide can continue to serve our families.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for allowing me to speak on this critical issue.

I rise in strong support of the Child Care Is Essential Act and am grateful for the inclusion of my bill, the Children's Mental Health Care Access Act.

Quality, affordable childcare is critical, not only for children and families across the country, but investing in the physical health and safety of our children as well as the mental health of our children is critical.

After months of social isolation, disrupted schedules, and an environment that has created stress, uncertainty, and anxiety for families, children are included in this. I introduced the Children's Mental Health Care Access Act to provide mental health services at childcare facilities through the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, a 2019 study showed that 16.5 percent of American children experience mental health issues, and fewer than half receive treatment. My bill ensures that caregivers have a support system and are prepared with evidence-based and trauma-informed solutions to help our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful my bill is included, and I urge support of the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able Chairman SCOTT for allowing

me this 1 minute, and I congratulate him on this legislation, also to Chairwoman LOWEY on a related bill, and Chairwoman DELAURO.

I rise in support of the Child Care Is Essential Act and the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

Parents in our communities want and need quality, affordable childcare. Since the Childcare and Development Block Grant's enactment in 1990, the program has been the largest source of financial assistance to families struggling to afford childcare.

Today, the need for childcare assistance in this country has never been greater, and coronavirus has made the situation so much worse. In Ohio, the average annual cost of infant care is \$9,697 a year. That is a staggering \$808 a month, which is unattainable for the majority of families in Ohio.

With the ongoing pandemic, there could not be a better time for Congress to make investments in stabilizing the childcare sector to support providers, workers, and families they serve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

The Child Care for Economic Recovery Act adds to and modifies tax provisions allowing for an increase and refundable child and dependent care tax credit, allows employers payroll tax credits, while also increasing the general funding for childcare entitlement under the Social Security Act.

Furthermore, the Child Care Is Essential Act allows providers to use stabilization grants to support personnel pay and benefits, sanitization and PPE, training and professional development, and mental health services. According to the Economic Policy Institute, investing in children could increase economic recovery by \$5.6 billion in new economic activity in Ohio alone.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these important bills.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Congress should provide childcare centers nationwide with resources that will allow them to recover from the many challenges they have endured over the last few months. Unfortunately, this body has yet again missed an opportunity to come together in a bipartisan manner, solve our differences, and tackle an issue we all

agree needs to be addressed. Instead, we have more partisanship, more political posturing, and more one-sided legislation on the House floor absent of any committee consideration.

Mr. Speaker, American families and childcare providers across the Nation deserve better than the legislation before us. I strongly urge a "no" vote on the Democrats' no care for children act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, for her work in support of children, families, and childcare providers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Child Care Is Essential Act.

Access to affordable childcare is critical to working families in helping our economy recover from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Without childcare, parents cannot return to work, businesses cannot reopen, and young children cannot access invaluable early learning opportunities.

At this moment, the childcare industry stands at the brink of collapse. Childcare providers already struggled financially before the pandemic. Now, dramatically low revenue and increased operating costs are pushing providers towards permanent closures.

In fact, the COVID-19 pandemic has already cost the jobs of roughly one in four childcare workers, and researchers estimate that we could permanently lose up to 4.5 million childcare slots. The pandemic has already impacted the lives of parents, 13 percent of whom have had to lower their work hours or quit their jobs entirely due to difficulties in childcare.

Our constituents are calling us to take action. A recent survey found that more than 8 in 10 voters across the political spectrums favor a substantial Federal investment in childcare. We must save the childcare system, which is critical for working families, our economy, and the healthy development of our Nation's children. We can do that by voting in favor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 7027, the Child Care Is Essential Act, a critical effort that I have proudly cosponsored, as child care providers have been among the hardest hit by the economic turmoil caused by this public health emergency. At least half of all providers have been forced to close at some point during this pandemic, and almost a quarter of child care staff have lost their jobs.

The Child Care Is Essential Act will establish and provide \$50 billion for the Child Care Stabilization Fund, so that grants can be awarded to child care providers during and after this COVID-19 pandemic. Child care providers that are currently open or temporarily closed due to this pandemic are eligible to receive this funding, which will be calculated by

the provider's operating costs before COVID-19 and adjusted for the increased costs of providing child care now. These providers will be able to use this stabilization funding for numerous activities, including personnel costs, personal protection equipment, training for health and safety practices, mental health supports for children and staff, and fixed costs.

As a Congress, we must stabilize our critical child care infrastructure, as they play a critical role in ensuring that our working families are not forced to make difficult decisions regarding reduction in work hours or loss of employment. For our nation to recover economically from this pandemic, we must strengthen the child care providers that enable our economy to function.

In Texas, our providers, families, and communities deserve this federal support. The Center for American Progress has estimated that my state will lose 54% of its child care supply and 483,632 licensed child care slots without adequate federal assistance, and this loss will be monumental in its impact. If this Congress can push the Child Care is Essential Act into law, Texas will receive an estimated amount of \$5,372,096,736 from the \$50 billion Child Care Stabilization Fund through allocations to my state.

As representatives of Americans from all corners of our country, we have a responsibility to protect the livelihood and well-being of our families and communities, especially during this moment of national upheaval caused by this novel coronavirus. On behalf of my home state of Texas, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7027.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Rodgers of Washington moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 7027) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1(d)(2)(B) of the bill, strike "that—" and all that follows through "(ii)" and insert "that", and redesignate subparagraphs (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii).

In section 1(d)(2)(D)(i) of the bill, redesignate subclauses (V) and (VI) as subclauses (VI) and (VII), and insert the following after subclause (IV):

(V) an assurance the eligible provider will provide professional development to new and returning employees on safety protocols, including any updates to protocols or best practices due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, that shall include educating such staff on how to recognize social and emotional concerns of children in their care and

the families of such children and how to identify and report child abuse in light of new protocols for interacting with such children;

In section 1(d)(2)(F) of the bill,—

(1) insert " , or for new providers" after "2020",

(2) in clause (i) insert " , or plan to provide," after "provided",

(3) in clause (ii) insert " , or plan to serve," after "served",

(4) in clause (iii) insert " , or plan to serve," after "served", and

(5) in clause (iv) insert " , or plan to operate," after "operated".

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as we heard in the debate today, we all agree keeping children safe and healthy is our top priority.

For people to get back to work, parents need childcare; they need safe options and more flexibility for the care of their children. That is why Republicans have introduced sensible legislation that supports all childcare providers so that we can expand access to childcare to pre-COVID levels and beyond.

However, unlike our solution, there are problems with the majority's underlying bill that limits parents' ability to find care.

The underlying bill won't help businesses start up new childcare options; it won't help smaller childcare providers, often women- and minority-owned businesses, reopen or finally accomplish their dream of starting their own business.

As a result, this bill will prevent more providers from opening. That is a serious problem, especially in places where shutdowns and stay-home orders force providers to permanently close. That means parents will have nowhere to turn if new options aren't available, if they want a smaller setting for childcare, or if large childcare centers hit caps on enrollment.

To fix this, my motion helps a new childcare business start and increases the number of available childcare slots for children. It would amend the underlying text to ensure that all providers are able to access funding, including those that have recently opened to support working parents.

Republicans weren't provided the chance to debate adding these provisions to the bill because the majority seems to be more interested in scoring political points these days than actually working together to solve problems.

Another issue they didn't address today is child safety. While we talked

about adhering to new recommended sanitation and social distancing requirements—all critical—there was no discussion of keeping children safe from abuse, neglect, and violence. My motion will ensure we are focused on recognizing and addressing child abuse and neglect.

Many of us in this Chamber have raised the alarm that the stress, the isolation, the fear caused by COVID-19 has increased the threat of abuse and domestic violence. The numbers are alarming.

□ 1230

This amendment to the underlying bill requires anyone receiving funding in this program to provide an assurance that all their employees have completed education on safety protocols and know how to recognize child abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I am a mom of three school-aged kids, and this spring was difficult for them and their mom and dad. I am speaking every day with hardworking men and women who want to keep their families healthy, who are eager to get back to work and eager to get their kids back in school and in daycare.

There is a lot of fear about children losing an entire year of their education if we don't get back on track. There are concerns about parents, parents in Pend Oreille County in my district, where 14,000 people live and work in industries like mining, timber, tourism, and healthcare. Even before coronavirus hit, there was only one childcare provider in the entire county—just one.

While there have been less than 40 cases of coronavirus in Pend Oreille, they have been hit hard by economic shutdowns and stay-at-home orders. This community deserves every chance to come back stronger than before.

For counties like Pend Oreille, and for places that have been hit hardest by the virus, we can't afford to be limiting parents' choices. We need to give parents more control and the ability to navigate this new future, a future where we have the confidence to provide for our families and the courage to dream again because our kids are safe, healthy, and learning.

For more options in child safety, this amendment should have been part of the underlying bill. I ask the majority to recognize that they missed this critical issue. Now is the time to correct them.

I urge bipartisan support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, let me first start by saying that licensed providers already receive this training, that licensed providers already are equipped for identifying abuse and reporting abuse. Now is not the time to focus on startups.

Today, I ask my colleagues to support childcare providers who need help now, to not allow these pillars in our community to go bankrupt, to prevent our most vulnerable children from becoming disconnected from their childcare providers and centers.

Every working parent in this room and around the country knows the feeling of vulnerability that comes with trusting your children in the hands of someone in order to support your family.

Every working parent in this room and around the country knows the sense of helplessness that comes when that critical care is in jeopardy and your family is left scrambling for an alternative. That feeling of helplessness is what parents across the country are facing right now in the middle of a global pandemic as childcare centers have closed their doors, many of them permanently.

Coronavirus has had a devastating effect on childcare providers. Since March, almost a quarter of providers have lost their jobs, and as many as two out of five centers have recently indicated that they will go out of business without financial support. 4.5 million childcare slots are at risk of disappearing, including over 46,000 in my own home State of Connecticut. That is 4.5 million working families who will be left behind without childcare.

It is frustrating to see my colleagues acting in such bad faith here today, attempting to sabotage a commonsense plan that would help Americans get back to work, that would help working parents and children in their States as well as mine.

Let us talk about what the bill actually does. The Child Care Is Essential Act provides \$50 billion in grant funding within CCDBG for providers to reopen and stay open safely. As part of receiving these grants, the bill requires all providers to commit to employ and pay their employees at pre-COVID-19 levels and to provide families with relief in the cost of care.

H.R. 7027 requires providers to follow the CDC guidance and local authorities to keep children and staff safe.

Yes, follow the science to keep children safe.

Childcare is not a partisan issue, or it should not be. Nine out of 10 Americans support a relief package like the Child Care Is Essential Act. Our childcare industry enables millions of Americans to go back to work and will help millions of parents fully return to the workforce when the pandemic passes.

We cannot calculate the revenue of this industry without considering the impact it has on the total overall economy.

As a body, and in a bipartisan way, we supported \$50 billion in relief to the airline industry. As a body, in a bipartisan way, we supported \$670 billion, without restrictions, to the restaurant industry to save those businesses.

In all of these relief packages, childcare workers and providers were

left behind. We all talk about the need to reopen the economy, but that can't happen without the necessary funding to ensure the sustainability of childcare providers.

As the pandemic continues to race through this country due to this administration's failed response, parents who are called back to work have to make a difficult decision: either send their child back to a childcare center or stay home and lose wages or potentially their jobs.

Show me your budget, and I will show you your values. That is something that I often say. If we will not make childcare resources a line item in our budget, we cannot claim it is our national priority.

My colleagues have a habit of saying they agree with the Democratic proposal on the issue of childcare. But when it is time to make any investments, they retreat. "It is not a good use of taxpayer dollars," is what they often say.

I remind you here today that the American families who are asking for this help are the taxpayers.

In case there is any doubt here today, Republicans have made it abundantly clear to the American people that they would rather use taxpayer dollars to bail out private industry than support America's working families and their children.

House Democrats are here to work for the people, here today to address the childcare crisis in this country, something that my colleagues should get serious about fast.

I encourage you all to join us in investing in high-quality childcare and the industry that helps to make that happen.

Even as a high school teacher, it was always evident to me which students attended high-quality childcare centers. Their language, socialization skills, problem-solving skills, and increased parental involvement were always evident. We have to support childcare. It is essential.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER Pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

#### CHILD CARE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1053, I call up the bill (H.R. 7327) making addi-

tional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRESSLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7327

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Care for Economic Recovery Act".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to "this Act" contained in any division of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

#### DIVISION A—EMERGENCY CHILD CARE SUPPORT APPROPRIATIONS

The following sums in this Act are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, namely:

##### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

###### INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICES TAXPAYER SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Taxpayer Services", \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, for making grants under the Community Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Matching Grants Program established under section 7526A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: *Provided*, That the matching funds requirement in section 7526A(b)(2) shall not apply to funds made available under this heading in this Act: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

##### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

###### ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For an additional amount for "Social Services Block Grant", \$850,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for making grants to States pursuant to section 2002 of the Social Security Act: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this heading in this Act shall be used for necessary expenses for family care for essential workers, pursuant to section 409 of division B this Act: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

###### CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

For an additional amount for "Child Care and Development Fund", \$10,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, for necessary expenses for infrastructure grants to improve child care safety, including needs assessments, pursuant to section 418A of Part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, as added by division B of this Act: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading in this Act may be used for grants for the construction, alteration, or renovation of non-federally owned facilities to improve child care safety: *Provided further*, That all construction, alteration, or renovation work, carried out in whole or in part with funds appropriated under this heading in this Act,

shall be subject to the requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Davis-Bacon Act”): *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS DIVISION

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2020.

SEC. 304. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 305. Any amount appropriated by this Act, designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently so designated by the President, and transferred pursuant to transfer authorities provided by this Act shall retain such designation.

#### BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 306. (a) **STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of division B shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of division B shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) **CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of division B shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

This division may be cited as the “Emergency Child Care Support Appropriations Act, 2020”.

#### DIVISION B—WORKER ACCESS TO CHILD AND FAMILY CARE

##### SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Worker Access to Child and Family Care Act”.

##### SEC. 402. REFUNDABILITY AND ENHANCEMENT OF CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.

(a) **TREATMENT OF CREDIT AS REFUNDABLE.**—Section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) **TREATMENT OF CREDIT AS REFUNDABLE.**—In the case of an individual other

than a nonresident alien, the credit allowed under subsection (a) shall be treated as a credit allowed under subpart C (and not allowed under this subpart).”.

(b) **INCREASE IN APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.**—Section 21(a)(2) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “35 percent” and inserting “50 percent”, and

(2) by striking “\$15,000” and inserting “\$120,000”.

(c) **INCREASE IN DOLLAR LIMIT ON AMOUNT CREDITABLE.**—Section 21(c) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$3,000” in paragraph (1) and inserting “\$6,000”, and

(2) by striking “\$6,000” in paragraph (2) and inserting “twice the amount in effect under paragraph (1)”.

(d) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—Section 21(e) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2020, the \$120,000 amount in subsection (a)(2) and the \$6,000 amount in subsection (c)(1) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘2019’ for ‘2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any increase determined under this paragraph is not a multiple of \$100, such increase shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$100.”.

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1324(b)(2) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “21 (by reason of subsection (g) thereof),” before “25A”.

(f) **COORDINATION WITH POSSESSION TAX SYSTEMS.**—Section 21(g)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall not apply to any person—

(1) to whom a credit is allowed against taxes imposed by a possession with a mirror code tax system by reason of the application of section 21 of such Code in such possession for such taxable year, or

(2) to whom a credit would be allowed against taxes imposed by a possession which does not have a mirror code tax system if the provisions of section 21 of such Code had been in effect in such possession for such taxable year.

(g) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

##### SEC. 403. INCREASE IN EXCLUSION FOR EMPLOYER-PROVIDED DEPENDENT CARE ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 129(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$5,000 (\$2,500)” and inserting “\$10,500 (half such dollar amount)”.

(b) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—Section 129(a)(2) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2020, the \$10,500 amount in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘2019’ for ‘2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

Any increase determined under the preceding sentence which is not a multiple of \$50, shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$50.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

(d) **PLAN AMENDMENTS.**—A plan or other arrangement that otherwise satisfies all appli-

cable requirements of sections 106, 125, and 129 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (including any rules or regulations thereunder) shall not fail to be treated as a cafeteria plan or dependent care flexible spending arrangement merely because such plan or arrangement is amended pursuant to the amendments made by this section and such amendment is retroactive, if—

(1) such amendment is adopted no later than the last day of the first plan year beginning after December 31, 2019, and

(2) the plan or arrangement is operated consistent with the terms of such amendment during the period beginning on the effective date of the amendment and ending on the date the amendment is adopted.

##### SEC. 404. PAYROLL CREDIT FOR CERTAIN FIXED EXPENSES OF CHILD CARE FACILITIES SUBJECT TO CLOSURE BY REASON OF COVID-19.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an eligible employer, there shall be allowed as a credit against applicable employment taxes for each calendar quarter an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified fixed expenses paid or incurred by such employer during such calendar quarter.

(b) **LIMITATIONS AND REFUNDABILITY.**—

(1) **OVERALL QUARTERLY DOLLAR LIMITATION.**—The qualified fixed expenses which may be taken into account under subsection (a) (determined after the application of paragraph (2)) by any eligible employer for any calendar quarter shall not exceed the least of—

(A) the qualified fixed expenses paid by the eligible employer in the same calendar quarter of calendar year 2019,

(B) \$25,000,000, or

(C) the greater of—

(i) 25 percent of the wages paid with respect to the employment of all the employees of the eligible employer for such calendar quarter, or

(ii) 6.25 percent of the gross receipts of the eligible employer for calendar year 2019.

(2) **PER FACILITY QUARTERLY DOLLAR LIMITATION.**—The qualified fixed expenses which may be taken into account under subsection (a) by any eligible employer for any calendar quarter with respect to any facility of such employer shall not exceed \$50,000.

(3) **CREDIT LIMITED TO CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT TAXES.**—The credit allowed by subsection (a) with respect to any calendar quarter shall not exceed the applicable employment taxes for such calendar quarter (reduced by any credits allowed under subsections (e) and (f) of section 3111 of such Code, sections 7001 and 7003 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, and section 2301 of the CARES Act, for such quarter) on the wages paid with respect to the employment of all the employees of the eligible employer for such calendar quarter.

(4) **REFUNDABILITY OF EXCESS CREDIT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the amount of the credit under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation of paragraph (3) for any calendar quarter, such excess shall be treated as an overpayment that shall be refunded under sections 6402(a) and 6413(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.**—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, any amounts due to an employer under this paragraph shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) **APPLICABLE EMPLOYMENT TAXES.**—The term “applicable employment taxes” means the following:

(A) The taxes imposed under section 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) So much of the taxes imposed under section 3221(a) of such Code as are attributable to the rate in effect under section 3111(a) of such Code.

(2) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “eligible employer” means any employer—

(i) which was carrying on a trade or business engaged in the provision of child care assistance at a qualified child care facility (within the meaning of section 45F(c)(2)(A) of such Code without regard to the last sentence thereof) at any time during calendar year 2020, and

(ii) with respect to any calendar quarter, for which—

(I) the operation of the trade or business described in clause (i) is fully or partially suspended during the calendar quarter due to orders from an appropriate governmental authority limiting commerce, travel, or group meetings (for commercial, social, religious, or other purposes) due to the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), or

(II) such calendar quarter is within the period described in subparagraph (B).

(B) SIGNIFICANT DECLINE IN GROSS RECEIPTS.—The period described in this subparagraph is the period—

(i) beginning with the first calendar quarter beginning after December 31, 2019, for which gross receipts (within the meaning of section 448(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for the calendar quarter are less than 90 percent of gross receipts for the same calendar quarter in the prior year, and

(ii) ending with the calendar quarter following the first calendar quarter beginning after a calendar quarter described in clause (i) for which gross receipts of such employer are greater than 90 percent of gross receipts for the same calendar quarter in the prior year.

(C) TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of an organization which is described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code—

(i) any reference in this section to a trade or business shall be treated as a reference to the operations of such organization which are related to the provision of child care assistance (within the meaning of subparagraph (A)(i)), and

(ii) any reference in this section to gross receipts shall be treated as a reference to gross receipts within the meaning of section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(D) PHASE-IN OF CREDIT WHERE BUSINESS NOT SUSPENDED AND REDUCTION IN GROSS RECEIPTS LESS THAN 50 PERCENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar quarter with respect to which an eligible employer would not be an eligible employer if subparagraph (B)(i) were applied by substituting “50 percent” for “90 percent”, the amount of the credit allowed under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such credit (determined without regard to this subparagraph) as—

(I) the excess gross receipts percentage point amount, bears to

(II) 40 percentage points.

(ii) EXCESS GROSS RECEIPTS PERCENTAGE POINT AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “excess gross receipts percentage point amount” means, with respect to any calendar quarter, the excess of—

(I) the lowest of the gross receipts percentage point amounts determined with respect to any calendar quarter during the period ending with such calendar quarter and beginning with the first calendar quarter during the period described in subparagraph (B), over

(II) 50 percentage points.

(iii) GROSS RECEIPTS PERCENTAGE POINT AMOUNTS.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “gross receipts percentage point amount” means, with respect to any calendar quarter, the percentage (expressed as a number of percentage points) obtained by dividing—

(I) the gross receipts (within the meaning of subparagraph (B)) for such calendar quarter, by

(II) the gross receipts for the same calendar quarter in calendar year 2019.

(3) QUALIFIED FIXED EXPENSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “qualified fixed expenses” means the payment or accrual, in the ordinary course of the eligible employer's trade or business, of any covered mortgage obligation, covered rent obligation, or covered utility payment. Such term shall not include the prepayment of any obligation for a period in excess of a month unless the payment for such period is customarily due in advance. Such term shall not include any payment or accrual of any obligation or payment which is with respect to property which is not located in the United States or any possession of the United States.

(B) APPLICATION OF DEFINITIONS.—The terms “covered mortgage obligation”, “covered rent obligation”, and “covered utility payment” shall each have the same meaning as when used in section 1106 of the CARES Act.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(5) WAGES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “wages” means wages (as defined in section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) and compensation (as defined in section 3231(e) of such Code). For purposes of the preceding sentence (other than for purposes of subsection (b)(2)), wages as defined in section 3121(a) of such Code shall be determined without regard to paragraphs (1), (8), (10), (13), (18), (19), and (22) of section 3121(b) of such Code.

(B) ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN HEALTH PLAN EXPENSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Such term shall include amounts paid or incurred by the eligible employer to provide and maintain a group health plan (as defined in section 5000(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), but only to the extent that such amounts are excluded from the gross income of employees by reason of section 106(a) of such Code.

(ii) ALLOCATION RULES.—For purposes of this section, amounts treated as wages under clause (i) shall be treated as paid with respect to any employee (and with respect to any period) to the extent that such amounts are properly allocable to such employee (and to such period) in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, such allocation shall be treated as properly made if made on the basis of being pro rata among periods of coverage.

(6) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer” means any employer (as defined in section 3401(d) of such Code) of at least one employee on any day in calendar year 2020.

(7) OTHER TERMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any term used in this section which is also used in chapter 21 or 22 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall have the same meaning as when used in such chapter.

(d) AGGREGATION RULE.—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 of such Code, shall be treated as one employer for purposes of this section.

(e) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—For purposes of chapter 1 of such Code, the gross income of any eligible employer, for the tax-

able year which includes the last day of any calendar quarter with respect to which a credit is allowed under this section, shall be increased by the amount of such credit.

(f) CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The credit under this section shall not be allowed to the Federal Government, the government of any State, of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, any tribal government, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any organization described in section 501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(g) ELECTION NOT TO HAVE SECTION APPLY.—This section shall not apply with respect to any eligible employer for any calendar quarter if such employer elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe) not to have this section apply.

(h) TRANSFERS TO CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS.—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) and the Social Security Equivalent Benefit Account established under section 15A(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231n-1(a)) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of this section (without regard to this subsection). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund or Account had this section not been enacted.

(i) TREATMENT OF DEPOSITS.—The Secretary shall waive any penalty under section 6656 of such Code for any failure to make a deposit of applicable employment taxes if the Secretary determines that such failure was due to the anticipation of the credit allowed under this section.

(j) THIRD-PARTY PAYORS.—Any credit allowed under this section shall be treated as a credit described in section 3511(d)(2) of such Code.

(k) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue such forms, instructions, regulations, and guidance as are necessary—

(1) to allow the advance payment of the credit under subsection (a), subject to the limitations provided in this section, based on such information as the Secretary shall require.

(2) regulations or other guidance to provide for the reconciliation of such advance payment with the amount of the credit at the time of filing the return of tax for the applicable quarter or taxable year.

(3) with respect to the application of the credit under subsection (a) to third-party payors (including professional employer organizations, certified professional employer organizations, or agents under section 3504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), including regulations or guidance allowing such payors to submit documentation necessary to substantiate the eligible employer status of employers that use such payors.

(4) for application of subsection (b)(1)(A) and subparagraphs (A)(ii)(II) and (B) of subsection (c)(2) in the case of any employer which was not carrying on a trade or business for all or part of the same calendar quarter in the prior year, and

(5) for recapturing the benefit of credits determined under this section in cases where there is a subsequent adjustment to the credit determined under subsection (a).

(l) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—This section shall apply only to qualified fixed expenses



paid or accrued in calendar quarters beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and before January 1, 2021.

**SEC. 405. PAYROLL CREDIT FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEE DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES PAID BY EMPLOYERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an employer, there shall be allowed as a credit against applicable employment taxes for each calendar quarter an amount equal to 30 percent of the qualified employee dependent care expenses paid by such employer with respect to such calendar quarter.

(b) **LIMITATIONS AND REFUNDABILITY.**—

(1) **DOLLAR LIMITATION PER EMPLOYEE.**—The qualified employee dependent care expenses which may be taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to any employee for any calendar quarter shall not exceed \$2,500.

(2) **CREDIT LIMITED TO CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT TAXES.**—The credit allowed by subsection (a) with respect to any calendar quarter shall not exceed the applicable employment taxes for such calendar quarter (reduced by any credits allowed under subsections (e) and (f) of section 3111 of such Code, sections 7001 and 7003 of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, section 2301 of the CARES Act, and section 4 of this Act, for such quarter) on the wages paid with respect to the employment of all the employees of the employer for such calendar quarter.

(3) **REFUNDABILITY OF EXCESS CREDIT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the amount of the credit under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation of paragraph (2) for any calendar quarter, such excess shall be treated as an overpayment that shall be refunded under sections 6402(a) and 6413(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.**—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, any amounts due to an employer under this paragraph shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(4) **COORDINATION WITH GOVERNMENT GRANTS.**—The qualified employee dependent care expenses taken into account under this section by any employer shall be reduced by any amounts provided by any Federal, State, or local government for purposes of making or reimbursing such expenses.

(c) **QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES.**—For purposes of this section, the term “qualified employee dependent care expenses” means any amount paid to or for the benefit of an employee in the employment of the employer if—

(1) such amount is dependent care assistance (as defined in section 129(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), and

(2) the employer elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) to treat such amount as a qualified employee dependent care expense.

(d) **SPECIAL RULES; OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—

(1) **APPLICATION OF CERTAIN NON-DISCRIMINATION RULES.**—No credit shall be allowed under this section to any employer for any calendar quarter if qualified employee dependent care expenses are provided by such employer to employees for such calendar quarter in a manner which discriminates in favor of highly compensated individuals (within the meaning of section 125) as to eligibility for, or the amount of, such benefit expenses.

(2) **DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.**—For purposes of chapter 1 of such Code, no deduction or credit (other than the credit allowed under this section) shall be allowed for so much of qualified employee dependent care expenses as is equal to the credit allowed under this section.

(3) **THIRD-PARTY PAYORS.**—Any credit allowed under this section shall be treated as

a credit described in section 3511(d)(2) of such Code.

(4) **APPLICABLE EMPLOYMENT TAXES.**—For purposes of this section, the term “applicable employment taxes” means the following:

(A) The taxes imposed under section 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) So much of the taxes imposed under section 3221(a) of such Code as are attributable to the rate in effect under section 3111(a) of such Code.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—For purposes of this section, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegate.

(6) **CERTAIN TERMS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any term used in this section which is also used in chapter 21 or 22 of such Code shall have the same meaning as when used in such chapter (as the case may be).

(B) **CERTAIN PROVISIONS NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT EXCEPT FOR PURPOSES OF LIMITING CREDIT TO EMPLOYMENT TAXES.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A) (other than with respect to subsection (b)(2)), section 3121(b) of such Code shall be applied without regard to paragraphs (1), (5), (6), (7), (8), (10), (13), (18), (19), and (22) thereof (except with respect to services performed in a penal institution by an inmate thereof) and section 3231(e)(1) shall be applied without regard to the sentence that begins “Such term does not include remuneration”.

(c) **CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The credit under this section shall not be allowed to the Federal Government or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any organization described in section 501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(f) **TREATMENT OF DEPOSITS.**—The Secretary shall waive any penalty under section 6656 of such Code for any failure to make a deposit of applicable employment taxes if the Secretary determines that such failure was due to the anticipation of the credit allowed under this section.

(g) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations or other guidance—

(1) to allow the advance payment of the credit determined under subsection (a), subject to the limitations provided in this section, based on such information as the Secretary shall require,

(2) to provide for the reconciliation of such advance payment with the amount of the credit at the time of filing the return of tax for the applicable quarter or taxable year,

(3) for recapturing the benefit of credits determined under this section in cases where there is a subsequent adjustment to the credit determined under subsection (a), and

(4) with respect to the application of the credit to third party payors (including professional employer organizations, certified professional employer organizations, or agents under section 3504 of such Code), including to allow such payors to submit documentation necessary to substantiate eligibility for, and the amount of, the credit allowed under this section.

(h) **APPLICATION OF SECTION.**—This section shall apply only to qualified employee dependent care expenses paid in calendar quarters beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and before January 1, 2021.

(i) **TRANSFERS TO CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS.**—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust

Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) and the Social Security Equivalent Benefit Account established under section 15A(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231n-1(a)) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of this section (without regard to this subsection). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund or Account had this section not been enacted.

**SEC. 406. FLEXIBILITY FOR DEPENDENT CARE FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.**

(a) **CARRYOVER OF UNUSED BENEFITS.**—A plan or other arrangement that otherwise satisfies all applicable requirements of sections 106, 125, and 129 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (including any rules or regulations thereunder) shall not fail to be treated as a cafeteria plan or dependent care flexible spending arrangement merely because such plan or arrangement permits participants to carry over (under rules similar to the rules applicable to health flexible spending arrangements) an amount, not in excess of the amount in effect under section 129(a)(2)(A) of such Code, of unused benefits or contributions remaining in a dependent care flexible spending arrangement from the plan year ending in 2020 to the plan year ending in 2021.

(b) **EXTENSION OF GRACE PERIODS.**—A plan or other arrangement that otherwise satisfies all applicable requirements of sections 106, 125, or 129 of the Internal Revenue Code (including any rules or regulations thereunder) shall not fail to be treated as a cafeteria plan or dependent care flexible spending arrangement merely because such plan or arrangement extends the grace period for the plan year ending in 2020 to 12 months after the end of such plan year, with respect to unused benefits or contributions remaining in a dependent care flexible spending arrangement.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—Any term used in this section which is also used in section 106, 125, or 129 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or the rules or regulations thereunder shall have the same meaning as when used in such section or rules or regulations.

(d) **PLAN AMENDMENTS.**—A plan or other arrangement that otherwise satisfies all applicable requirements of sections 106, 125, and 129 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (including any rules or regulations thereunder) shall not fail to be treated as a cafeteria plan or dependent care flexible spending arrangement merely because such plan or arrangement is amended pursuant to a provision under this section and such amendment is retroactive, if—

(1) such amendment is adopted no later than the last day of the plan year in which the amendment is effective, and

(2) the plan or arrangement is operated consistent with the terms of such amendment during the period beginning on the effective date of the amendment and ending on the date the amendment is adopted.

**SEC. 407. EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT ALLOWED WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT OF DOMESTIC WORKERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2301(c)(2) of the CARES Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **EMPLOYERS OF DOMESTIC WORKERS.**—In the case of an employer with one or more employees who perform domestic service (within the meaning of section 3121(a)(7) of such Code) in the private home of such employer, with respect to such employees—

“(i) subparagraph (A) shall be applied—

“(I) by substituting ‘employing an employee who performs domestic service in the



private home of such employer' for 'carrying on a trade or business' in clause (i) thereof, and

"(II) by substituting 'such employment' for 'the operation of the trade or business' in clause (ii)(I) thereof,

"(ii) subclause (II) of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall not apply, and

"(iii) such employer shall be treated as a large employer."

(b) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Section 2301(h)(2) of the CARES Act is amended—

(1) by striking "shall not be taken into account for purposes of" and inserting "shall not be taken into account—

"(A) for purposes of",

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ", and", and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) if such wages are paid for domestic service described in subsection (c)(2)(E), as employment-related expenses for purposes of section 21 of such Code.

In the case of any individual who pays wages for domestic service described in subsection (c)(2)(E) and receives a reimbursement for such wages which is excludible from gross income under section 129 of such Code, such wages shall not be treated as qualified wages for purposes of this section."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 2301 of the CARES Act.

#### SEC. 408. CHILD CARE STABILIZATION FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 418(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 618(a)(3)) is amended by striking "\$2,917,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018" and inserting "\$10,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024".

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDS NOT SUBJECT TO STATE MATCH REQUIREMENT.—With respect to the amounts appropriated in section 418(a)(3) of the Social Security Act in excess of \$2,917,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, section 418(a)(2)(C) of such Act shall be applied and administered with respect to any State that is entitled to receive the entire amount that would be allotted to the State under section 418(a)(2)(B) of such Act for the fiscal year in the absence of this section, as if the Federal medical assistance percentage for the State for the fiscal year were 100 percent.

#### SEC. 409. FAMILY CARE FOR ESSENTIAL WORKERS.

(a) INCREASE IN FUNDING.—The amount specified in subsection (c) of section 2003 of the Social Security Act for purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of such section is deemed to be \$2,550,000,000 for fiscal year 2020, of which \$850,000,000 shall be obligated by States during calendar year 2020 in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.

(b) RULES GOVERNING USE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds are used in accordance with this subsection if—

(A) the funds are used for—

(i) child care services for a child of an essential worker; or

(ii) daytime care services or other adult protective services for an individual who—

(I) is a dependent, or a member of the household of, an essential worker; and

(II) requires the services;

(B) the funds are provided to reimburse an essential worker for the cost of obtaining the services (including child and adult care services obtained on or after the date the Secretary of Health and Human Services declared a public health emergency pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act on January 31, 2020, entitled "Determination that a Public Health Emergency Exists Nationwide as the Result of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus"), to a provider of child

or adult care services, or to establish a temporary child care facility operated by a State or local government;

(C) eligibility for the funds or services, and the amount of funds or services provided, is not conditioned on a means test;

(D) the funds are used in consultation with the lead agency designated pursuant to section 658D(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 by the State involved and subject to the limitations in section 2005 of the Social Security Act, except that, for purposes of this subparagraph—

(i) paragraphs (3), (5), and (8) of section 2005(a) of such Act shall not apply; and

(ii) (I) the limitation in section 2005(a)(7) of such Act shall not apply with respect to any standard which the State involved determines would impede the ability of the State to provide emergency temporary care to a child, dependent, or household member referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph if the emergency temporary care would not endanger the health, safety, or development of children who received the care and care would otherwise not be available to support the immediate, short-term family care needs of essential workers; and

(II) if the State determines that such a standard would be so impeding, the State shall report the determination to the Secretary, including a description of how exempting standards that may impede the ability of the State to provide emergency temporary care did not endanger the health, safety, or development of children who received emergency temporary care, separately from the annual report to the Secretary by the State;

(E) the funds are used to supplement, not supplant, State general revenue funds for child care assistance; and

(F) the funds are not used for child care costs that are—

(i) covered by funds provided under the Head Start Act, a preschool development grant under section 9121 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 note), the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, section 418 of the Social Security Act, or another federally funded dependent care program; or

(ii) reimbursable by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) ESSENTIAL WORKER DEFINED.—In paragraph (1), the term "essential worker" means—

(A) a health sector employee;

(B) an emergency response worker;

(C) a child care worker;

(D) a sanitation worker;

(E) a worker at a business which a State or local government official has determined must remain open to serve the public during the emergency referred to in paragraph (1)(B); and

(F) any other worker who cannot telework, and whom the State deems to be essential during the emergency referred to in paragraph (1)(B).

#### SEC. 410. INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS TO IMPROVE CHILD CARE SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 418 the following:

##### "SEC. 418A. INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS TO IMPROVE CHILD CARE SAFETY.

"(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the 'Infrastructure Grants To Improve Child Care Safety Act of 2020'.

"(b) NEEDS ASSESSMENTS.—

"(1) IMMEDIATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an immediate needs assessment of the condition of child care facilities throughout

the United States (with priority given to child care facilities that receive Federal funds), that—

"(i) determines the extent to which the COVID-19 pandemic has created immediate infrastructure needs, including infrastructure-related health and safety needs, which must be addressed for child care facilities to operate in compliance with public health guidelines;

"(ii) considers the effects of the pandemic on a variety of child care centers, including home-based centers; and

"(iii) considers how the pandemic has impacted specific metrics, such as—

"(I) capacity;

"(II) investments in infrastructure changes;

"(III) the types of infrastructure changes centers need to implement and their associated costs;

"(IV) the price of tuition; and

"(V) any changes or anticipated changes in the number and demographic of children attending.

"(B) TIMING.—The immediate needs assessment should occur simultaneously with the first grant-making cycle under subsection (c).

"(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report containing the result of the needs assessment conducted under subparagraph (A), and make the assessment publicly available.

"(2) LONG-TERM NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a long-term assessment of the condition of child care facilities throughout the United States (with priority given to child care facilities that receive Federal funds). The assessment may be conducted through representative random sampling.

"(B) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report containing the results of the needs assessment conducted under subparagraph (A), and make the assessment publicly available.

"(c) CHILD CARE FACILITIES GRANTS.—

"(1) GRANTS TO STATES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants to States for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, renovating, or improving child care facilities, including adapting, reconfiguring, or expanding facilities to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic.

"(B) PRIORITIZED FACILITIES.—The Secretary may not award a grant to a State under subparagraph (A) unless the State involved agrees, with respect to the use of grant funds, to prioritize—

"(i) child care facilities primarily serving low-income populations;

"(ii) child care facilities primarily serving children who have not attained the age of 5 years;

"(iii) child care facilities that closed during the COVID-19 pandemic and are unable to open without making modifications to the facility that would otherwise be required to ensure the health and safety of children and staff; and

"(iv) child care facilities that serve the children of parents classified as essential workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

"(C) DURATION OF GRANTS.—A grant under this subsection shall be awarded for a period of not more than 5 years.

"(D) APPLICATION.—To seek a grant under this subsection, a State shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which information shall—

"(i) be disaggregated as the Secretary may require; and

“(ii) include a plan to use a portion of the grant funds to report back to the Secretary on the impact of using the grant funds to improve child care facilities.

“(E) PRIORITY.—In selecting States for grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall prioritize States that—

“(i) plan to improve center-based and home-based child care programs, which may include a combination of child care and early Head Start or Head Start programs;

“(ii) aim to meet specific needs across urban, suburban, or rural areas as determined by the State; and

“(iii) show evidence of collaboration with—

“(I) local government officials;

“(II) other State agencies;

“(III) nongovernmental organizations, such as—

“(aa) organizations within the philanthropic community;

“(bb) certified community development financial institutions as defined in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702) that have been certified by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (12 U.S.C. 4703); and

“(cc) organizations that have demonstrated experience in—

“(AA) providing technical or financial assistance for the acquisition, construction, renovation, or improvement of child care facilities;

“(BB) providing technical, financial, or managerial assistance to child care providers; and

“(CC) securing private sources of capital financing for child care facilities or other low-income community development projects; and

“(IV) local community organizations, such as—

“(aa) child care providers;

“(bb) community care agencies;

“(cc) resource and referral agencies; and

“(dd) unions.

“(F) CONSIDERATION.—In selecting States for grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider—

“(i) whether the applicant—

“(I) has or is developing a plan to address child care facility needs; and

“(II) demonstrates the capacity to execute such a plan; and

“(ii) after the date the report required by subsection (b)(1)(C) is submitted to the Congress, the needs of the applicants based on the results of the assessment.

“(G) DIVERSITY OF AWARDS.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give equal consideration to States with varying capacities under subparagraph (F).

“(H) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—As a condition for the receipt of a grant under subparagraph (A), a State that is not an Indian tribe shall agree to make available (directly or through donations from public or private entities) contributions with respect to the cost of the activities to be carried out pursuant to subparagraph (A), which may be provided in cash or in kind, in an amount equal to 10 percent of the funds provided through the grant.

“(ii) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED.—Contributions required by clause (i) may include—

“(I) amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government; or

“(II) philanthropic or private-sector funds.

“(I) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the last day of the grant period, a State receiving a grant under this paragraph shall submit a report to the Secretary as described in subparagraph (D)—

“(i) to determine the effects of the grant in constructing, renovating, or improving child care facilities, including any changes in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and any effects on access to and quality of child care; and

“(ii) to provide such other information as the Secretary may require.

“(J) AMOUNT LIMIT.—The annual amount of a grant under this paragraph may not exceed \$35,000,000.

“(2) GRANTS TO INTERMEDIARY ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants to intermediary organizations, such as certified community development financial institutions, tribal organizations, or other organizations with demonstrated experience in child care facilities financing, for the purpose of providing technical assistance, capacity building, and financial products to develop or finance child care facilities.

“(B) APPLICATION.—A grant under this paragraph may be made only to intermediary organizations that submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(C) PRIORITY.—In selecting intermediary organizations for grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall prioritize intermediary organizations that—

“(i) demonstrate experience in child care facility financing or related community facility financing;

“(ii) demonstrate the capacity to assist States and local governments in developing child care facilities and programs;

“(iii) demonstrate the ability to leverage grant funding to support financing tools to build the capacity of child care providers, such as through credit enhancements;

“(iv) propose to meet a diversity of needs across States and across urban, suburban, and rural areas at varying types of center-based, home-based, and other child care settings, including early care programs located in freestanding buildings or in mixed-use properties; and

“(v) propose to focus on child care facilities primarily serving low-income populations and children who have not attained the age of 5 years.

“(D) AMOUNT LIMIT.—The amount of a grant under this paragraph may not exceed \$10,000,000.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than the end of fiscal year 2024, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the effects of the grants provided under this subsection, and make the report publically accessible.

“(d) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2020, which shall remain available through fiscal year 2024.

“(2) RESERVATIONS OF FUNDS.—

“(A) INDIAN TRIBES.—The Secretary shall reserve 3 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this section, for payments to Indian tribes.

“(B) TERRITORIES.—The Secretary shall reserve 3 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this section, for payments to territories.

“(3) GRANTS FOR INTERMEDIARY ORGANIZATIONS.—Not less than 10 percent and not more than 15 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this section may be used to carry out subsection (c)(2).

“(4) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR NEEDS ASSESSMENTS.—Not more than \$5,000,000 of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used to carry out subsection (b).

“(e) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this section, the term ‘State’ has the meaning provided in section 419, except that it includes the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and any Indian tribe.”

(b) EXEMPTION OF TERRITORY GRANTS FROM LIMITATION ON TOTAL PAYMENTS TO THE TERRITORIES.—Section 1108(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “418A(c),” after “413(f).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to offer H.R. 7327, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act, which I introduced with our exceptional Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee chairwoman, Rosa DeLauro; our esteemed Appropriations Committee colleague, Congresswoman CLARK; and our Ways and Means colleagues, Chairman NEAL, Chairman DAVIS, and Congresswoman SANCHEZ.

It is no secret, with quality childcare, children enter kindergarten ready to learn; hardworking families have better job security, knowing their children are healthy and safe; and our communities thrive.

But even before COVID-19, millions of hardworking families, disproportionately families of color, struggled to find and afford quality care that matched their work hours and ZIP Codes.

At the height of the pandemic, more than half of childcare providers—many of them women, minority-owned small businesses operating on razor-thin margins—closed their doors. We risk losing more permanently.

Every single industry counts on childcare. In order to save our economy, we need to save childcare.

□ 1245

The Child Care for Economic Recovery Act would:

More than triple mandatory funds for the childcare entitlement to States;

Invest \$10 billion in new infrastructure grants so providers have the resources to address hazardous conditions like broken heaters, mold, and lead paint, as well as necessary modifications to protect our children and caretakers from the risk of coronavirus;

Reimburse child and dependent care costs incurred by essential workers who have sacrificed so much to keep us safe;

Make the child and dependent care tax credit fully refundable for the first time; keep the lights on and doors open with a new tax credit for childcare providers to help cover costs for rent, mortgages, and utilities; and

Recognize childcare workers as essential.

What is good for our babies is good for our budget. With this bill, we can do what is good for our babies and the budget.

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

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 7327.

American parents want and need reliable and safe childcare options for their children while they are at work. Access to childcare is especially important for those on the front lines addressing the coronavirus. Providers face many new challenges during this pandemic as they seek to understand new regulations and provide a healthy environment for the children in their care.

Unfortunately, instead of helping American families and childcare providers, this bill misses the mark. The bill includes an increase of more than \$7 billion in childcare funds, even though we know the CARES Act funding still has not been made to some providers who need it.

There are also no safeguards to accompany the changes that are made to the child and dependent care tax credit. We saw with the rollout of the Paycheck Protection Program just how important it is to ensure programs are targeted and tailored to help those who need it most.

Finally, programs for children have had a long history of bipartisan support, so I am disappointed to see that end today. We need to take a step back and ensure that any bill we pass addresses the problem without creating more bureaucratic red tape for the childcare industry.

We must support parents and childcare providers so that they can get our economy up and running again. Instead of passing partisan bills made behind closed doors, we should be working together with the administration on a proposal that can be signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, childcare is a vital part of economic recovery.

I know what it is like to struggle to make ends meet as a parent. I raised my daughter, Somah, on my own. And as a single mother working my way through law school, it was very hard to find childcare. In fact, I could never afford childcare.

When she was 2, I found a preschool where I could volunteer in exchange for lower tuition so that she would have a place to learn while I worked. It was helpful and shows just how much New Mexicans are willing to support each other. But that should not be the reality for parents and kids across the country.

During the pandemic, our State has helped childcare providers stay open by paying licensed providers a premium, but many of them still had to lay off employees because fewer children were showing up.

As we look to a future when more parents get back to working outside their home, the childcare industry needs Federal support to safely adapt to the new normal and welcome families and employees back. That is why I am supporting the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

This bill funds upgrades in childcare centers that are needed to meet new health and safety measures for the pandemic; it provides refundable tax credits for parents to return to their jobs; and, most importantly, it ensures a satisfactory, affordable, and guaranteed future for the childcare industry.

Madam Speaker, by investing in the childcare industry, we invest in our economic future. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman LOWEY for her leadership on this important piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, already in this country, the skyrocketing cost of childcare was solidifying deep economic and racial inequities that have plagued us for decades.

Already, many childcare workers were living in poverty because astronomical tuition rates are not enough to pay teachers the salary that they deserve.

Already, working moms and dads pause promising careers because their wages didn't match the cost of childcare.

Already, inability to find childcare locked many parents out of the workforce altogether.

And already, children were denied access to high-quality early learning programs because of a broken childcare system.

Then COVID-19 completely obliterated a faulty system for parents, for childcare providers, for educators, and for children.

Providers are going out of business completely, which will make it even harder for parents to find the childcare that they need. Costs will skyrocket as class sizes shrink. State budgets that are already stretched thin will undoubtedly decide childcare is dispensable, despite big talk about how essential it is to our economic recovery.

Madam Speaker, we will look back at this moment and regret that we are not doing more because, ultimately, this decision will leave families with young children behind. This is a decision to hollow out an entire generation of parents' employment stability and economic opportunity.

We have a decision as to whether to widen the achievement gap, because our children will not be going to preschool programs that set them up to thrive over the long term. It is a decision to perpetuate systemic racism, because it is Black and Latinx women who are suffering the most from our failure to act decisively.

Madam Speaker, we need to pass this bill, and then we need universal childcare.

I want to thank the chair for her leadership.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I am enthusiastically supporting this bill. Childcare is essential for every woman who has ever raised children with the struggling days that she manages to work and take care of the children, so I am a very strong supporter of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the Committee on Appropriations has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Madam Speaker, we are considering H.R. 7327, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act, which I introduced with my friend and colleague Chairwoman LOWEY, as well as Representatives DAVIS, CLARK, DELAUNO, and SANCHEZ.

This legislation is particularly important as our country continues to face a national emergency. All around America, our constituents, are struggling to cope with the consequences of the pandemic, consequences made worse because of the policies of this current administration.

People have lost loved ones and livelihoods. Many faced obstacles to working: pandemic restrictions and health conditions that make them vulnerable to COVID and, for millions of families, a lack of reasonable childcare options.

Today, we have the opportunity to help Americans overcome one of the hurdles to work. By supporting meaningful childcare relief, we can go a long way.

Even before the onset of the coronavirus pandemic, our Nation's childcare system was strained. Millions of families had trouble finding quality dependent care, and when they did manage to locate it, they often discovered long waiting lists and out-of-reach prices.

As it has with so many other pre-existing challenges, the pandemic has greatly intensified the stress on our childcare system. Now, daycare facilities are closing.

In April, the National Association for the Education of Young Children conducted a survey of more than 5,000 providers and learned that nearly half had completely closed. The Center for American Progress estimates that, without Federal support, the pandemic could result in the loss of 4.5 million childcare slots, which is almost half the national capacity.

Last week, I spoke with a group of working mothers. One told me that she fears we are at risk of losing a generation of working parents. Others emphasized how terrifying their situations are and how they lack choices that are needed to continue their careers and protect their children. Their words echo what we have heard from constituents all over this country.

Today's bill tackles these problems through a combination of tax relief for parents and childcare providers, grants to States, and support for essential workers and their childcare needs.

Specifically, it will double the child and dependent care tax credit and, for the first time, make it fully refundable so that low-income parents can access it like everyone else. It also establishes a refundable tax credit to help childcare providers cover their fixed costs.

It will help parents carry over their dependent care flexible spending account contributions to next year and expand the employee retention tax credit, which is so important to help employers of domestic workers retain those employees.

This bill triples the guaranteed Federal childcare funding from \$2.9 billion to \$10 billion a year for the next 5 years. It suspends State match requirements and will also help more low- and middle-income families afford care.

In sum, I want to say to the parents of this country: We have heard you loudly and clearly. This childcare crisis is untenable, and it is pushing many of you to the breaking point. Nothing cuts deeper than worry over kids' safety and well-being, and the choices you face are simply too hard. You need and deserve help accessing safe and affordable care for your kids, and your ability to obtain it is an essential precondition of helping the economy move forward and helping it to grow in the future.

This bill provides unprecedented Federal support for childcare because we are all in this together, and we have got your back.

Madam Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support this important leg-

islation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, we agree. Families need access to childcare. It is key to making America's recovery stronger. Childcare is an economic, education, and public health issue that demands our full attention, particularly now that millions of Americans want to return to work.

Unfortunately, this crisis has hit childcare providers across the country especially hard. Many are facing an acute set of financial challenges. We must address this problem in a bipartisan manner if we are to ensure our Nation's children and the working families that support them are not left behind during this crisis.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle today have decided to throw bipartisanship out the window, knowing that by doing so they are dooming their own legislation. They have once again shut us out of the process and crafted a bill that is out of touch with America's needs. This is no more than a copy-paste of various Democratic childcare proposals superficially edited to link to the pandemic.

This bill contains six childcare tax provisions that, combined, would cost more than \$100 billion. Simply throwing as much money as you can at the problem with no thought into the actual policy itself won't work. These provisions haven't been through our regular order in the committee of jurisdiction. This package has not been the subject of a single committee hearing, let alone, a committee markup.

It is abundantly clear, Democrats were so eager to achieve a messaging victory, they felt they could skip the whole policymaking process that is fundamental to how Congress is supposed to work. We have been down this road before. In multiple States, the additional childcare funding we have already provided through the CARES Act still has not made its way down to childcare providers on the ground.

In my home State of New York, one of my constituents, Beth Starks, testified in front of the New York State Assembly on childcare issues. She highlighted that of the \$164.6 million in Childcare Development Block Grants for New York State, less than half have gone out to the communities and providers who needed it yesterday.

Her testimony also underscores the negative impact State leaders, like our Governor, have had by withholding Federal grants to families and providers.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of her testimony.

TESTIMONY OF BETH STARKS, FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CHAUTAUQUA LAKE CHILD CARE CENTER

Before The NYS Assembly, Standing Committee on Small Business, Standing Committee on Ways and Means, Standing Committee on Agriculture, Standing Committee on Banks, Office of State-Federal Relations, Task Force on Food, Farm & Nutrition Policy

Good morning! Thank you for inviting me to testify today. I am Beth Starks, the founder and Executive Director of Chautauqua Lake Child Care Center.

I am a third-generation Early Childhood Educator and have experience in everything from infant rooms all the way up through higher education. I am proud to serve on both the Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council and the Child Care Availability Task Force. I come to you today to speak about child care as a small business. Below, in my written testimony, you will find links to a lot of statistics and additional information on the topics that I will be discussing today.

I know that time is of the essence and I am making an appeal to all of you. I come to you as the founder of a non-profit child care center and a supporter of public education. I come to you as a leader, a public servant and a voice for children and families. Other small businesses, and families need your help now by supporting childcare providers. Our small businesses are especially strained right now when it comes to their workforce. Workers need child care to do their jobs. I implore you to ensure more decisive steps are taken in NYS to assist families in paying for child care and to safeguard the safety and health of child care providers and the families they serve. We need you to ensure that New York's child care providers are ready and able to play their vital role in restarting the economy as we emerge from this pandemic. In the past months, I have listened to our Governor and to many other leaders talk about the reality of this situation. We know this is a situation like no other, and there was nothing we could have planned for. We are building the plane as we fly it and we have true budgetary constraints. I do understand that NYS has had the most cases and the most deaths. The health and medical crisis and the medical decisions needed to come first. I understand that the decisions involving child care needed to come a little bit later. Yet child care providers are essential and have been on the front-line providing care for children of essential workers so that they can do their jobs—as nurses, doctors, law enforcement, and so on. Child care providers have allowed essential workers to work every day knowing that their children are healthy, safe and happy. I come to you today frustrated, heartbroken, sad, exhausted, scared, discouraged and so close to giving up. I am frustrated at the lack of support, the lack of supplies and the lack of financial resources. I am heartbroken. Heartbroken for the child care facilities that have already closed, most never to reopen. I am heartbroken for the mom of the 9-week-old who just started in my care on Good Friday as she had to return to work as an essential worker. I'm sad for the staff that I have lost, for the parents crying in my office because they can't afford child care. I am scared for my business of 14 years that I am trying to keep afloat and I am scared for every child care provider and for our industry. I am discouraged at the lack of acknowledgement and awareness of the importance of Early Childhood and the lack of investment in children.

First of all, I want all of you to understand that child care is a business that supports all

other small businesses. We are an essential business that has remained open throughout the COVID-19 emergency. By doing so, we have allowed all other small businesses (as well as all other industries) to remain open and now to re-open. So, all of your medical providers, restaurant workers, hospital staff and even farm workers have child care (& workers) thanks to our centers. As mentioned by our previous speaker, a farm needs workers in order to operate, there are child care centers that specifically serve migrant workers. Child care is an industry that is different from other small businesses because we enable other small businesses to operate.

I chose to begin my verbal testimony by telling a few stories. The things that I told included: why I started my child care facility, the problems that child care had pre-COVID and what we've gone through during this COVID-19 Pandemic. I founded my center as a non-profit 14 years ago while I was working at SUNY Fredonia in the Education Department. While I was there, I had my first son (who just turned 16) and could not find child care for him. I brought him with me to Fredonia every day and I found an incredible in-home child care provider for him. Soon, I decided to stop working at the college and became a licensed in-home child care provider myself. In NYS, an in-home licensed day care facility is also a small business and there are a lot of them in WNY and across the state. After having my in-home facility for two years, realizing the need for child care in Mayville was so great, I then became incorporated and opened my center. Chautauqua Lake Child Care Center (CLCCC) provides care and education for over 100 children ages 6 weeks to 12 years. CLCCC is a non-profit child care center leasing space inside Chautauqua Lake Central School. The partnership with the public school allows families to drop off & pick up their children all in one place. We provide full time care, part time care, UPK, before school and after school programming as well as a full day summer camp for school aged children. We also employ 11 full time staff and 10-15 part time staff, depending on the time of year.

I've also been a part of a lot of initiatives in our County and across NYS. I serve on our Education Coalition here in Chautauqua County where we focus on bringing together educators & industries to meet the needs of the County. I lead the K-readiness subgroup where we focus on young children specifically. Our Education Coalition has had a lot of efforts county-wide to try to support child care. We started an initiative in the City of Dunkirk, as there are no licensed child care centers in the City of Dunkirk. Initially, Mayor Willie Rosas called together a Business Roundtable, focused on child care. It was his most well attended roundtable discussion, which demonstrates the need for child care in the area. Our County Executive at the time, George Borrello, now a NYS Senator, made child care a county-wide priority. He recognized how important child care is as an industry and how interconnected it is to businesses and economic development. Last year, then-County Executive Borrello (in collaboration with the City of Dunkirk, private sector business, the County Chamber, and the County Planning office and also with the help and support of Assemblyman Andrew Goodell) was able to apply for some funding through the Governor's Workforce Development Initiative/Economic Development Council to work on obtaining additional funding for child care. Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful in obtaining funding, even though it was greatly needed. My point is that child care was in a crisis situation here, preventing people from going to work, pre-COVID. We are in what's called a child care desert because there isn't

enough child care here in Chautauqua County (or in much of NYS). According to the Center for American Progress, 64 percent of New Yorkers lived in a child care desert (before the Pandemic), which means that there are more than 50 children under the age of 5 in a census tract that contains either no child care providers or so few options that there are more than three times as many children as licensed child care slots.

The past 3 months, the situation has gotten much worse. Over 50% of my colleagues in Chautauqua County have closed their doors. Nationally, it is estimated that about 1/2 of them will never open again. We cannot re-open our county or NY without child care because there is nowhere for children to go and that includes children from infants all the way up through the teenage years.

We're an industry that needs financial support. My colleagues will tell you that they stayed open during COVID because it was what was right for children and families. I will tell you that we all made poor business decisions because we operated our businesses by leading with our hearts, instead of making financially-based decisions. We are all fulfilling our mission in serving children and families. We remained open serving on the front lines, but every single day we are open we continue to lose money and there is very little support. I was fortunate enough to be able to get the PPP (Paycheck Protection Plan) and I will tell you my story in being able to do so. I had to find the only lender in Chautauqua County that was able to allow me to apply for a PPP loan; there was only one. I searched all weekend to find the lender and it was KeyBank. The manager let me call her on a Sunday and come to meet with her first thing on a Monday morning to open an account with her. None of the other lenders would let me apply and/or open an account with them. Once I was able to open an account, we were able to apply for the PPP and were thankfully approved. If you look at child care centers statewide, I was told that only 10% received the PPP, and that's just for the centers. None of the in-home providers were eligible because they are sole proprietors. So, the PPP money has only helped a few of us. The EIDL (Economic Injury Disaster Loan) money I was able to apply for, but I was denied. I don't know the rationale behind it, but we just received the email that told us we were not eligible for that funding. As far as federal funding, there was CARES Act money that was set aside for child care federally and we were really excited because we were told we would receive \$164.6 million in NYS specifically for child care, but we have yet to receive that funding. Of that \$164.6 million in CARES funding, only \$30 million was allocated, \$20 million was designated for scholarships for families (the scholarship only assists families making up to 300% of the poverty level and luckily in Chautauqua County we were already serving that population. So, very few families here were able to take advantage of this money.) and \$8 million for supplies. We are so thankful for the supplies, which just came this past Saturday. Beyond that there has been no help directly to child care facilities. The biggest need is purely financial. We need working capital. Most of the remaining providers in Chautauqua County literally have weeks left until they too close their doors.

We cannot look at supporting childcare as a "subsidy". It is truly an investment in economic development and infrastructure. We cannot rebuild our economy without an investment in something as critical as childcare.

In closing, I will tell you that there are also bright spots. In the beginning, I spoke about feeling frustrated, heartbroken, exhausted, scared, discouraged and so close to

giving up. Well, I also come to you energized, inspired, hopeful and encouraged and determined to never to give up. I am energized by my insightful colleagues, in my community, across the state and across the nation. I am energized by my staff who are incredible and dedicated and selfless. I am energized by my students who are the future educators. I am inspired by my community coming together in a way that it never has and bridging divides. I am hopeful for our future and a chance to fix all of this. I am encouraged by the hard-working families, the families struggling to go to work every day to provide the best opportunities for their children. I am encouraged by the child I sat with yesterday talking about the people he loves and I am encouraged with the knowledge that he is healthy, happy and safe in our care.

This issue to me is not political. It is very much bipartisan and I believe that we have to all come together to support children and families. In doing so, we support our economic infrastructure and the future of our state. If we aren't making decisions based on what is best for our youngest citizens, then we are doing a disservice to our entire population.

So, I offer to you my assistance as part of the solution. I trust your leadership. I trust your judgement. Families and providers need to be heard. They need your support and they need it now. I recognize the need for funding and the CARES Act allows emergency federal funds to be used to provide child care to the essential worker keeping us safe and to every other worker trying to go back to work. We need to follow the lead of many other states around the country and use that funding immediately to assist families and providers. We need additional funding for child care in the next round of CARES relief from the federal government. There are also so many other sources of funding that could be used for child care in our state. We need to do innovative things like use FEMA dollars, community development block grant funds, and economic development money to invest in child care. We have to try to find other funding sources and make NYS the leader in early childhood education during this time and in the future.

I will always believe every challenge is an opportunity and we have the opportunity now to do the right thing for our current workforce and for our state's youngest citizens, our future.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, up until now, Republicans and Democrats have consistently worked together to provide additional support for childcare. Again, this is an issue we fundamentally all agree on.

On the Committee on Ways and Means, we have demonstrated time and time again our commitment to improving access to high quality childcare. That is why we are disappointed today. Today's vote is a wasted opportunity.

I started today by saying we all care deeply about childcare. As COVID continues to disrupt American life, that focus has only grown. As co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, I can tell you we are committed to reaching across the aisle and actively looking for issues where we can come together to find common ground.

Leader MCCARTHY has further made clear his support for prioritizing childcare as part of COVID relief and more than 40 Republican Members, including myself, echoed that support in a letter to leadership.

In addition, Republicans have introduced a number of bills that include smart provisions, such as the bills introduced by my colleagues, Representative WALORSKI of Indiana and Mr. WENSTRUP of Ohio.

Earlier this week, we led the introduction of a bill called the Back to Work Child Care Grants Act of 2020 to support working families, advance our Nation's economic recovery, and help those parents who want to go back to work. The bill provides a framework for childcare providers to access the resources they need to reopen and stay open. We are proud that we were able to make this bill bipartisan because we care about getting results, not headlines.

Thanks to the leadership of folks like Senator ERNST and Senator ALEXANDER in the U.S. Senate, this proposal has a real chance of moving forward.

Clearly, there is some common ground and shared goals among us, but Democrats have skipped regular order and any semblance of meaningful bipartisan discussion and compromise. There is an important role for Congress to play in alleviating the economic stress COVID has placed on American families. To the reasonable Members of my colleagues across the aisle, come work with us. Our door is always open. Until you do, Congress will continue to waste these good opportunities of good will to bring the American people together.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, in the spirit of bipartisanship, the RECORD should note that the second to the gentleman's request came from the Democratic side.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), chairman of the Worker and Family Support Subcommittee, and original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I sincerely believe that the best way to evaluate the effectiveness and greatness of a society is by how well it treats its old, how well it treats its young, and what it does for those who have difficulty caring for themselves.

Childcare is one of the most essential needs that exists in our community. And I have just heard my colleague say \$100 billion helps to put childcare on the map. I know individuals who work in the childcare industry who cannot put their own children in the programs that they work for because they earn so little.

Madam Speaker, if we are to move America as we confront the pandemic, as we deal with racism, as we deal with structures that have kept disadvantaged people and communities disadvantaged, nothing would do it better than making sure that every individual who needs childcare will have it available.

Madam Speaker, events of the past few months have shown the need for policies to

strengthen child well-being as thousands of youth across America marched and demonstrated as they challenged our systems of social, educational and economic justice.

Child care powers both family economic well-being and our national economic growth. Prior to the pandemic, federal funding only provided child care for one in six eligible children. And parents in communities weighed down by poverty and systemic racism experienced a shortage of high-quality, affordable child care.

Today, we face a global pandemic that has disproportionately infected and killed people in these same struggling communities, and the child care crisis we had before is now much, much worse. Now, parents have lost millions of additional child care options, and providers confront new costs to keep children and workers safe, risking financial losses for businesses already operating on the knife's edge of profitability.

In Illinois, nearly half of all previously available child care slots are at risk of disappearing altogether due to the pandemic, and sixty percent of child care programs are fully-closed. In Chicago, we did not have much to lose. Pre-pandemic, five out of six Chicago children lived in a "child care desert" where children outnumbered child care slots by 3 to 1, or more.

The high cost of quality child care disproportionately affects Black families because Black children are disproportionately likely to live in homes with only working parents, but Black working parents earn 40 percent less, on average, than white working parents. For workers with low wages, work is impossible without child care subsidies, and difficult even with assistance. Latinx and Black workers are more likely to work nonstandard schedules than their peers, which often makes child care harder to find and more expensive. Moreover, people of color are disproportionately represented in the child care workforce. About 40 percent of the child care workforce are people of color who are concentrated in low-level positions with lower credential requirements and relatively low pay. The child care workforce alone is 94% female and 40% persons of color. Latinas—who represent 15% of all workers—comprise 21% of child care workers, and Black women represent 15% of all child care workers. These data demonstrate that protecting the child care industry is key to both economic priority and racial equity.

As states lift stay-at-home orders and other economic restrictions, more parents are returning to work, if they can. Quality, affordable child care is a cornerstone of parents' ability to work and move up the economic ladder. I know essential workers who couldn't work because they had no one to watch their kids. I know parents who have lost so much income that they can't afford child care to work.

As a Black man living in Chicago, I have grieved at far too many funerals for friends lost to COVID-19, and I know far too many parents who legitimately fear for their family's health when they return to work and their children go back to child care. When I see the devastation caused by this pandemic and the barriers to working due to child care, I am offended by claims that people will refuse to work because of the availability of supplemental unemployment benefits. This charge is simplistic, insulting, and refuted by data showing that low-wage workers stay at work and

return to work even when faced with unsafe working conditions and inadequate wages.

As our nation grapples with structural racism, policymakers need to enact policies that support workers and address the barriers they face, taking care not to penalize communities weighed down by poverty and racism. Big challenges call for big solutions. Now is the time for this Committee and this Congress to take meaningful action to ensure that high-quality child care is available to all who need it.

The two bills before us today demonstrate Democratic commitment to growing our workforce and our economy by investing in families and in our child care infrastructure—both the people and the buildings. I am extremely proud to co-lead the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act and to cosponsor the Child Care is Essential Act. Together, these bills parents afford and help businesses provide safe, quality child care.

In addition to increasing the guaranteed investment in child care via the Child Care Entitlement to States funds to states from \$2.9 billion to \$10 billion for the next 5 years, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act helps ensure states can use these funds by waiving the requirement that states match the funds for the first two years. The bill includes critical investments in child care infrastructure to help states and providers adapt, expand, and reconfigure child care facilities and infrastructure in response to coronavirus. Further, it helps qualified child care facilities weather the pandemic with targeted tax benefits to help cover rent, mortgage, and utility costs.

The bill also includes two bills I have championed to substantially help families afford child care. One centers on providing targeted support to essential workers who need care for children or adults so they can work, and the other modernizes the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit to provide tens of billions of dollars to help working family cover child care costs. Specifically, there is an additional \$850 million in funding for the Social Services Block Grant to help essential workers pay for family care. Importantly, states can use the funding to support child care for any group of workers they deem essential for in-person work, including sanitation and public safety workers, grocery store employees and other workers designated by the state. Further, the bill makes the full amount of the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit available to more families by raising the current phase-out of \$15,000 to \$120,000, almost triples the maximum credit from \$1,050 to \$3,000 per child, and it ensures that families with the greatest need benefit by making the credit fully refundable.

The Child Care is Essential Act creates a \$50 billion Child Care Stabilization Fund to help stabilize the child care sector and help providers reopen and operate safely. These grants will support providers' ability to maintain employee benefits and salaries; follow Center for Disease Control and Prevention health and safety guidelines in the classroom; train employees on health and safety standards; make mortgage, rent, and utility payments; and modify child care services as needed as a result of the pandemic.

Substantively investing in child care is the right thing for our economy, the right thing for our children, and the right way to give everyone a fair shot in America.



Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I do have to say that I am disappointed and, frankly, saddened to stand here today to point out my disappointment that we are debating a bill that I think many would consider to be unrealistic and certainly highly unlikely to become designated as a solution or even achieved to be a solution to the issues we are facing today.

Madam Speaker, as my colleague from New York already pointed out, no Republican input was sought on this—zero. Zilch. And it is unfortunate, especially at a time such as this where our country is wanting us to come together to form solutions that are effective and can positively impact our country.

We, on the Republican side, stand ready on a bipartisan basis to accomplish our goals of safely reopening schools, safely reopening childcare centers so that our children can learn, grow, develop, and their parents can return to work. We agree. Access to safe, affordable childcare is essential to getting Americans back to work and a strong economic recovery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, the bill we are considering today is not a path forward. It is a rehash of partisan ideas. We can do better. The American people expect us to do better. Republicans have constructive ideas to offer with demonstrated bipartisan support.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, childcare is so very neglected—a neglect that has been amplified by this pandemic. Without adequate care, parents simply cannot go back to work. Always essential for economic development, adequately funded, quality childcare is more than daycare, more than babysitting. It should play a key role in educating the next generation.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children has estimated that without adequate Federal support, over 4 million American children will lose their childcare this year.

In Texas, with Governor Abbott offering inadequate State support, and temporarily, but recklessly, suspending facility safety precautions, like taking temperatures, the lives of children and their families have been endangered with coronavirus infections at more than 1,400 childcare facilities.

Our two-pronged legislative approach today cannot undo such ineptness, but it does offer much-needed resources for both childcare providers and parents in making one of their most important investments. This is the first of many steps needed to build an early learning system truly worthy of our youngest children.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the great gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7237 and H.R. 7027.

As a father of three, I understand how important it is that our children are cared for in a nurturing, loving environment. For many working parents, that means utilizing quality, affordable daycare for all or part of the week. My wife and I utilized daycare for our children when they were younger. It provided a beneficial, educational experience for them.

Republicans in the House know that when it comes to childcare, we have to get this right and we have to do it together. In that spirit, we have been working with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle during the past 5 years to pass meaningful legislation, like doubling the Childcare and Development Block Grant funding, and including support for childcare providers in the CARES Act.

Yet, now, when our country needs us to put politics aside and focus on the actual needs of families, we are debating partisan bills that do not go through regular order, had no input from Republicans, put future taxpayers on the line for billions of dollars without addressing the childcare needs of today and have no safeguards to prevent wealthy Americans from hiring maids and butlers instead of helping everyday families.

Madam Speaker, that is right. My colleagues on the left are more interested in throwing money at a problem to score political points rather than making sure hurting families and childcare facilities receive needed assistance. But it doesn't have to be that way. Instead of debating another political messaging bill, we should be working together on commonsense measures, like the Back to Work Child Care Grants Act, which provides 9 months financial assistance to providers to safely open, disburses more funds quickly without administrative red tape, and requires providers receiving support to follow State and local safety guidelines.

Democrats and Republicans have common ground here. We want to provide relief to childcare facilities and families during this healthcare crisis. Unfortunately, the bills we are debating today don't rise to the challenge we face. We can and must do better.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject these partisan bills and pursue bipartisan legislation, like the Back to Work Child Care Grants Act. Our families deserve it.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, as communities across our country continue to battle COVID-19 and as school districts around the country continue to plan for virtual-only education, it is more

important than ever for parents, healthcare professionals, essential workers, and our children to have access to quality, affordable childcare.

This bill helps families by making the childcare tax credit fully refundable and offers new assistance to childcare facilities to help them weather the storm and continue providing the vital services our children need.

Every Member of this House has heard from constituents who are grappling with this challenge. Americans need our help.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone to vote for this important bill.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in thoughtful opposition to H.R. 7327.

Everyone in this Chamber agrees that protecting our children is our top priority and that childcare is one of the most critical pieces of the equation in getting our economy back to the record levels that we had achieved earlier this year.

I have talked to parents across my district in Ohio who want to go back to work but don't have reliable care options available for their children. It is about more than just returning to work. Children need to be able to grow socially and emotionally by interacting with their peers regularly.

Instead of rushed partisan legislation, we need bipartisan solutions, like my Family Savings Flexibility Act that I introduced with Representatives KELLY and AXNE. Our bill allows parents to increase the contribution limit to their Dependent Care Flexible Spending Accounts, as well as roll over the funds from the 2020 plan year—a huge help to working parents.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with us on finding bipartisan solutions, and I oppose this bill.

□ 1315

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, as I applaud his leadership.

Under his leadership, the Ways and Means Committee has been in the middle of the recovery efforts. There are many of these elements that we are proud of, but none is more significant than what we are doing here today to strengthen the opportunities for childcare.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle lament the fact that they feel, well, this is not going to go anywhere; they would like to work with us. Well, work with us. The Senate is moving in our direction, as they have with the major package. If you would come work with us, move this forward, we would be able to accomplish it.



Putting at risk half our childcare slots is unacceptable. This is essential if we are going to recover, protect our families, move forward. Childcare is an essential service for workers today, for families tomorrow, for children for generations to come.

I am proud to lend my support. I appreciate what our Ways and Means Committee has done, and I anticipate we have got more in store.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), who is an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act. I want to thank Chairman NEAL, Chairwoman LOWEY, Chairman DAVIS, Chairwoman DELAURO, and Vice Chair CLARK for working with me on this critical bill.

Access to quality, affordable childcare was out of reach for many parents before the COVID pandemic, and now our childcare crisis is far worse.

Families juggling full-time jobs and caring for their kids at home desperately need our help. And millions of healthcare, grocery store, and other essential workers who cannot work from home are out of options.

Thankfully, this package includes a bill I coauthored with Chairman DAVIS to help States provide childcare for essential workers. It also provides long-term support to help working families afford childcare. Finally, it invests in facilities to help them adapt to serve families safely.

This pandemic is nowhere near under control, and it isn't safe for many to return to work. But parents must have access to safe and affordable childcare before our economy can reopen.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and, again, I thank those involved with the writing of it.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7327, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

In my State of Alabama, 52 percent of the supply of childcare is projected to be lost as a result of this pandemic. This is a crisis that is not only dire today but may hold lasting damage in our communities without bold actions.

We know, Madam Speaker, that the pandemic has disproportionately affected African-American communities and that so often Black workers are on the front lines of being essential workers, especially Black women. They are in greater need of safe, affordable childcare.

At the same time, there are many more that are likely to live in underserved and rural communities that simply do not have childcare options.

I am proud that this bill will make important investments in our childcare system, including making the child care tax credit fully refundable, expanding funds for the Child Care Entitlement to States program, and expanding childcare tax incentives. These bold investments are critical for the well-being of working parents and their children, especially in underserved communities that I represent.

I urge the passage of this bill. Let's protect our children by making sure they have adequate childcare.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I stand today in support of the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

As families juggle working from home and childcare, this pandemic has made it clear just how vital childcare is to our economy. If we want to prioritize economic growth and improve outcomes moving forward, we will have to make investments that improve quality and access today.

Even before the COVID-19 crisis, many families of color were not able to access childcare. In fact, only 3 percent of federally eligible Asian children, 6 percent Latinx children, and 15 percent of Black children were able to access childcare based on Federal eligibility.

This bill helps by adding billions of dollars to our childcare infrastructure. It also makes the child and dependent care tax credit refundable so families could receive a childcare credit of up to \$6,000.

Finally, the bill ensures that essential workers have access to safe care for their children while they are providing invaluable services to our communities.

Without investments in childcare, our economy cannot recover.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the Bible tells us: "Raise up a child in the way they should go, and they will not depart from it."

As a parent, I have sometimes, if not always, reflected that that seems to be the case. But it surely is the case that we need to provide our families and our children with safe and positive places so that we can raise them up in the way they should go.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bills on the floor today to protect childcare workers from losing their jobs and to help more families afford the cost of childcare. They build on provisions that we had in the HEROES Act.

First, the Child Care Is Essential Act would create a \$50 billion childcare stabilization fund to keep childcare providers from going out of business.

I want to thank Chairwoman DELAURO of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, as well as Chairman BOBBY SCOTT of the Education and Labor Committee.

Secondly, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act takes a long-term approach by improving infrastructure and designating childcare providers as essential and providing tax credits to help more families qualify for and afford safe and accessible childcare.

I want to thank Chairwoman LOWEY of the Appropriations Committee and my dear friend Chairman NEAL, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for sponsoring this legislation.

As noted yesterday, in an editorial by The Washington Post: "The childcare industry is collapsing under pandemic-inflicted financial pressure." They went on to say: "Without swift action from Congress, childcare centers are at risk of permanent closures that could severely undermine the country's economic recovery."

Madam Speaker, I am the father of three daughters and a granddaughter who has four children, my four great-grandchildren. She is fortunate that she is able to stay home with those children. Three of them are in school.

I have two other daughters who are now older, and their children are older. But when they had children at a young age, childcare was critical and very difficult to obtain and very expensive. Dad and mom helped out. But there are so many millions who don't have a dad or mom or a grandfather or grandmother to help out. And when we don't help them, the cost is to everybody.

Governor Agnew was elected Governor the same year I was elected in the State of Maryland. I remember a line from his inaugural address: "The cost of failure far exceeds the price of progress." Failure to bring up these children in the way they should go and have them in safe childcare settings will result in a cost far higher than providing that service.

If the Congress fails to take actions like those, like the House is taking today, we risk our economic recovery by forcing parents to drop out of the workforce or lose work hours due to the demands of dependent care. It would place a substantial burden on working families with young children or elderly parents to care for, and it would disproportionately hurt minority workers and their families because, as The Washington Post editorial further pointed out, minority parents "are more likely than White parents to experience job disruptions due to childcare."

That is not good for them; it is not good for their children.

Madam Speaker, it is not good for America.

House Democrats are determined to help families get through this public health and economic crisis, but we must have a longer vision, as Chairman NEAL pointed out, because it is not just

the pandemic that caused this problem. It has been a problem that has been with us for a long period of time.

We refuse to do what some have suggested, again and again, for the past decade, which is to tell the American people: You are on your own.

"You are on your own" is not a moral stance. It is not. Am I my brother's keeper? The answer to that is yes, I am my brother's keeper because I want my brother healthy; I want my brother educated; and I want my brother well-housed. Why? Because my brother affects my life and my children's lives and my grandchildren's lives and my great-grandchildren's lives.

If you are going to make America great, you need to make all our people great. So, I am here in support of this legislation. It is critical legislation for our country—yes, for the children, yes, for the families, but for our country.

I hope all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, will join us in passing these bills. Let's do that today to keep childcare providers open, expand the availability of childcare for working families, and help workers return to their jobs when it is safe to do so.

Vote "yes" for America's families and for America.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

Even before the pandemic, childcare in Pennsylvania cost twice what is considered affordable, and working families struggled with a shortage of quality care. Now, Pennsylvania could lose half of its childcare supply due to the pandemic.

This bill funds improvements to help childcare centers reopen and operate safely and addresses longstanding barriers to help families secure quality care.

We should invest now to upgrade childcare facilities of all sizes and ensure children have a safe place to be.

We must act to protect children and the providers who care for them.

I would like to close by thanking all the childcare workers who provide essential services to American families. Now, let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of two important bills, H.R. 7027, the Child Care Is Essential Act, and H.R. 7327, the Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the gaps in America's childcare system. Even before the current crisis, America faced a dire shortage of quality, affordable childcare.

Now, with daycares closed, schools out, and many working from home, parents are struggling between fully attending to their kids' needs and focusing on their jobs.

These two bills will lend a hand to working parents. The Child Care for Economic Recovery Act will help ensure parents have quality childcare within their reach. The Child Care Is Essential Act will provide necessary emergency funding for childcare providers, the majority of which are small businesses.

Adequate, quality childcare for every working family is critical to successfully opening our economy. Passing these bills will help our children, our working parents, and the countless businesses dependent on their talents.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

□ 1330

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of these important pieces of legislation.

The coronavirus pandemic has highlighted the challenges that working families have always faced in the American economy: that the economy is not structured around the needs of working families and that the solutions that do exist, like childcare, are not sufficiently funded.

As such, our Nation's lack of support for affordable childcare forces many working families to make an impossible choice: either go to work to support your family to put a roof over their head, food on their table, or clothes on their backs, or not in order to stay at home to make sure that they are safe and well taken care of.

Unfortunately, parents don't face an even playing field when it comes to childcare. For example, Latino and Asian children are most likely to have a lack of childcare options in their communities and face long waits and long lines to get a spot.

Despite the fact that quality childcare is a cost-effective way to reduce poverty, funding for childcare is simply not enough. I am proud to support this important piece of legislation and these two pieces of legislation. It is a way forward, and I look forward to voting on it later today.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I am ready to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I was prepared to close after Mr. REED.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no time remaining.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I would inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 5¾ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, to restart the economy in the wake of COVID-19, parents will need sufficient childcare to return to the workplace. A lack of childcare options could keep parents from returning to work or could force parents to cut back the amount of time spent at work. Either of these scenarios would cripple our households' finances and a healthy economic recovery.

New requirements for childcare providers in schools, including smaller class sizes, enhanced cleaning requirements, new and likely evolving teacher education on new protocols, and liability risks, will also increase costs. Policy interventions are needed to increase both the supply of affordable childcare and working families' demand for childcare.

As you have heard from my colleagues here today, Republicans share concerns about the impact of the pandemic on the childcare industry and lives of working families across the country.

We have bipartisan, feasible, commonsense solutions to address this problem. Whether it is tax relief for families and businesses to purchase childcare or additional support to keep existing childcare providers in business, our solutions would have an immediate impact on the industry and parents.

Successful childcare solutions have received bipartisan support in the past, and they will moving forward. It is a shame we can cooperate in good times but not in the midst of a global pandemic. Our families and children deserve better.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge all my colleagues to oppose this bill, and let's come together to pass a bill that will help the American people in a true bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I spoke with a group of working mothers. One told me that she fears we are at risk of losing a generation of working parents. Others emphasized how terrifying their situations are and how they lacked choices that will allow them to continue their careers and protect their children.

Parents all across the country have been doing the hard work of holding their families together while the White House ignores the plight and exacerbates the public health crisis. We owe it to these parents to show that we in Congress hear them and that we are going to do something about it.

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

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary, Homeland, and Budget Committees, and Founding Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I rise

in strong support of H.R. 7327, the “Child Care for Economic Recovery Act”, which expands the availability of quality child care, helps workers return to their jobs when it is safe, and enables America’s economy to recover from the COVID–19 recession.

The Child Care for Economic Recovery Act creates a new tax credit that helps employees access quality, affordable child care, and by expanding the employee retention tax credit, it incentivizes employers to keep child care workers on payroll.

Further, this bill provides \$850 million to states, the District of Columbia, and all U.S. territories to fill in the gaps in dependent care for essential workers during the COVID–19 pandemic as well as invests \$10 billion in infrastructure to improve child care safety.

Madam Speaker, just last week, the United States reached a historic and unfortunate milestone with over 4,000,000 confirmed coronavirus cases.

Today, there are over 4,400,000 cases nationwide and 151,000 deaths.

In my home state of Texas, a current hotspot, there are over 413,000 cases and 6,500 deaths.

At the county level, Harris County, which includes my district, has approximately 67,660 cases and 1,127 deaths.

As we seek to regain control over this virus and poise our economy to rebound from the effects of the coronavirus, we must take the necessary steps to address the cracks and disparities that have come to light by way of the pandemic.

The child care industry has served as a crucial backbone to the United States’ economy for many years, and it too continues to be rocked by the coronavirus.

Child care facilities provide an immense and unquestionable public value.

This was demonstrated by the key role child care centers had as they continued to provide child care for essential workers who continued to work at the beginning of the pandemic.

According to the Washington Post, before the coronavirus pandemic, approximately one-third of all children under 5 attended a paid care facility, day-care center, preschool or pre-kindergarten.

Workers in every industry rely on child care centers to provide capable care for their children, helping them juggle both parenting and employment responsibilities.

The child care industry is even more essential to single parent households.

In 2019, 15.76 million children lived with a single mother and approximately 3.23 million children lived with a single father.

For these millions of families, child care is a lifeline.

However, as millions of businesses continue to feel the economic effects of the coronavirus and fight for survival, the child care industry is facing its own crisis.

Nationwide, an estimated 1.5 million childcare workers have lost their jobs.

Before the pandemic, Texas had more than 11,000 child care operations.

Yet, as a result of this disease, there were only 883 facilities still operating in the state as of early this month, according to CNN.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, voicing my support for H.R. 7327 because it serves as a vital component to our nation’s economic reopening strategy.

The federal government must do everything in its power to ensure that the child care in-

dustry remains available to all who need it, and that means voting yes on this bill.

By enacting this piece of legislation, Congress commits to ensuring the long-term success of the child care industry by investing \$10 billion over the 2020–2024 period to improve child care facilities and infrastructure.

Doing so will address longstanding inadequacies of child care facilities as well as respond to the immediate infrastructure needs that the COVID–19 pandemic has caused, including structural changes to facilitate social distancing and improve sanitation.

Madam Speaker, this legislation also requires the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to conduct a first-ever comprehensive inventory of the structural challenges facing child care in the United States and its territories.

For far too long, the child care industry has been overlooked and undervalued, and it is no coincidence that this industry is comprised of 94 percent women, a majority of whom are women of color.

But child care is not just a woman’s issue. Everyone has a stake in ensuring the viability of the child care industry.

I have been a long-standing advocate for the child care industry because I understand the challenges many working families face when it comes to obtaining reliable, affordable, and quality child care.

Prior to the pandemic, HHS considered childcare affordable if no more than 10 percent of a family’s income was put towards it, but parents were ultimately spending much more, on average.

However, because of the coronavirus and the economic devastation it has caused, what was once deemed affordable is bound to change.

By passing H.R. 7327, we have the opportunity to bring much-needed relief to financially struggling child care providers, to families who need child care in order to return to work, and to the U.S. economy.

With this legislation, we will expand access to care and ease the financial burdens placed on parents and employers, so that we can reopen and recover from this public health crisis without leaving kids, parents, and businesses behind.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 7327, the “Child Care for Economic Recovery Act.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

#### SAMI’S LAW

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4686) to amend title 23, United States Code, to compel States to require illuminated signs and other measures on ride-hailing vehicles, to prohibit the sale of such signs, to require ride-hailing companies to implement an electronic access system on ride-hailing vehicles, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4686

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as “Sami’s Law”.

#### SEC. 2. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR RIDE-HAILING VEHICLES AND RIDE-HAILING COMPANIES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR TNC PLATFORMS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each transportation network company shall establish and implement a system and policy within the transportation network company’s TNC platform that shall make available to each passenger a digital method to verify that the driver with whom the passenger has been matched through the transportation network company’s TNC platform has been authorized by the transportation network company to accept the passenger’s trip request prior to the beginning of the trip. Such system shall include—

(1)(A) an initial notification sent to the passenger’s personal mobile device, or otherwise communicated to the passenger, containing verifiable information specific to the TNC driver or TNC vehicle with which the passenger has been matched;

(B) the ability for the passenger, driver, and TNC platform to confirm the verifiable information matching the passenger to the authorized TNC driver or TNC vehicle prior to the beginning of the trip;

(C) a TNC platform restriction on a TNC driver from commencing a trip via the TNC platform until both the passenger and the TNC driver verify the other’s identity using the system; and

(D) a way for a passenger to use a non-visual arrangement to verify the TNC driver under the system used in accordance with this subparagraph; or

(2) as an alternative to implementing the system required under paragraph (1), a transportation network company may implement any successor technology-based system that enables verification that the driver with whom the passenger has been matched through the transportation network company’s TNC platform has been authorized by the transportation network company to accept the passenger’s trip requests received through its digital network prior to the beginning of the trip.

(b) OPT OUT.—A transportation network company may offer a passenger an option

not to use the system that the transportation network company has implemented under subsection (a). Any trip completed by a passenger who opts not to use the system shall not be a violation of this section.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to any trips in which—

(1) a third party, including any third-party business, non-profit, or government entity, facilitates the trip for the individual who is transported in the TNC vehicle; or

(2) compliance with subsection (a) is impracticable due to circumstances beyond a transportation network company's control, including instances where a passenger's personal mobile device has failed to operate or there is degraded, reduced, or otherwise insufficient cellular connectivity in order for the system to properly operate.

### SEC. 3. SUCCESSOR TECHNOLOGY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

(1) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the "SAMI's Law Council" pursuant to section 4, such Council shall recommend to the Secretary of Transportation performance standards for the successor technology-based systems permitted under section 2(a)(2) and the Secretary shall thereafter issue performance standards consistent with the Council's recommendations and provide a reasonable time for a TNC to comply. Such standards shall require, at a minimum, that—

(A) any successor technology-based system that enables the verification that the driver with whom the passenger has been matched through the TNC platform has been authorized by the transportation network company to accept the passenger's trip request received through its TNC platform prior to the beginning of the trip;

(B) confirmation protocols are visually and non-visually accessible; and

(C) a transportation network company implement a system incorporating a driver education and public awareness program related to the use of its successor technology and its required verifiable information.

(2) UPDATING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—Six months after the establishment of the performance standards required by this section, and, at a minimum, annually thereafter, the Secretary shall solicit input from the SAMI's Law Council, established under section 4, about whether the performance standards need to be updated or expanded to incorporate new technological developments. The Secretary may amend the performance standards to account for new technological developments.

(3) INTERIM STANDARDS.—Prior to the adoption of performance standards, a transportation network company may adopt and deploy any other successor technology-based system that enables a passenger to verify that the driver with whom the passenger has been matched through the transportation network company's platform has been authorized by the transportation network company to accept the passenger's trip requests received through its platform prior to the beginning of the trip. A successor technology-based system deployed under this subparagraph shall be considered to fulfill the requirements of section 2(a). A successor technology-based system adopted under this section shall be presumed to meet such requirements unless the Secretary determines otherwise. If the Secretary makes such a determination, a reasonable time to cure shall be provided.

(4) REPORTS.—Upon first issuing performance standards under paragraph (1), and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce of the Senate detailing the perform-

ance standards recommended by the SAMI's Law Council, established under section 4, and issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1), including any updates to such standards and explaining the rationale for issuing such performance standards.

### SEC. 4. SAFETY ACTIONS FOR MATCHING AND IDENTIFYING RIDE SHARE CUSTOMERS ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the Safety Actions for Matching and Identifying Ride Share Customers' Council (hereinafter referred to as the "SAMI's Law Council"), an advisory council for the purpose of developing recommended performance standards for successor technology that will protect TNC passengers and TNC drivers, as permitted under sections 2(a)(2) and authorized under section 3.

(b) COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The advisory council shall be composed of the following members:

(1) The Secretary of Transportation shall designate a representative from paragraph (2), who shall serve as Council Chair.

(2) One representative, to be appointed by the Secretary of Transportation, from each of the following:

(A) The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

(B) The Federal Highway Administration.

(C) The National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(D) The Federal Trade Commission.

(E) The Federal Aviation Administration.

(F) An association or trade group that represents technology companies, whose membership includes at least one transportation network company.

(G) An organization of and for TNC drivers and present in at least two States.

(3) Two representatives, to be appointed by the Secretary of Transportation, from each of the following:

(A) Transportation network companies.

(B) Law enforcement agencies.

(C) National organizations of and for people with disabilities.

(D) Ride-haling victims advocacy groups.

(c) TERMS.—Members of the Council shall serve for a term of 3 consecutive years.

(d) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Council shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment for the position being vacated. The vacancy shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the duties of the Council.

(e) DUTIES.—The Council shall gather and analyze data, provide technical advice, and develop and present best practices or recommendations supported by the majority of members of the Council to the Secretary of Transportation regarding performance standards the Secretary may adopt regarding any successor technology-based system described in section 2(a)(2).

(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On request of the Council, the Secretary shall provide such technical assistance to the Council as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the Council's duties.

(g) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—On the request of the Council, the Secretary may detail, with or without reimbursement, any employee of the Department of Transportation to the Council to assist the Council in carrying out its duties. The detail of any such employee shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the employee.

(h) PAYMENT AND EXPENSES.—Members of the Council shall serve without pay, except travel and per diem will be paid to each member for meetings called by the Secretary.

(i) REVIEW.—Twelve years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review, and solicit public input, as to whether it is necessary for the Council to remain in existence. The Secretary shall thereafter have the authority to terminate the Council if the Secretary determines that the Council is no longer necessary. If the Secretary terminates the Council, the Secretary shall maintain the authority to update performance standards related to successor technology.

### SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON SALE OF RIDE-HAILING SIGNAGE.

It shall be unlawful for any person to sell or offer for sale any signage that is designed to help a passenger identify a transportation network company vehicle and—

(1) contains a transportation network company's proprietary trademark or logo, or

(2) purports to be that of a transportation network company, unless such person is the transportation network company associated with such proprietary trademark or logo or authorized by the transportation network company to sell or offer for sale such signage.

### SEC. 6. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 2.—The Secretary is authorized to issue a penalty to a transportation network company of up to \$5,000 per each day of non-compliance with section 2 and a penalty of up to \$20,000 per each day of non-compliance with section 2 when such non-compliance is knowing and willful. With regards to a violation relating to any successor technology-based system used by a transportation network company permitted under section 2(1)(5), the Secretary shall rely on whether such system meets the performance standards issued under section 3.

(b) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 5.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A violation of section 5 shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)). The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act. Any person who violates section 5 shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(2) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Federal Trade Commission under any other provision of law.

### SEC. 7. G.A.O. STUDY ON THE INCIDENCE OF ASSAULT AND ABUSE OF PASSENGERS AND DRIVERS OF TNC VEHICLES, TAXICABS, AND OTHER FOR-HIRE VEHICLES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the incidence of assault and abuse perpetrated on drivers by passengers of TNC vehicles, taxicabs, and other for-hire vehicles, and on such passengers by drivers of TNC vehicles, taxicabs, and other for-hire vehicles. The Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act. The report shall also examine—

(1) the nature and specifics of any background checks conducted on prospective drivers of TNC vehicles, taxicabs, and other for-hire vehicles, including any State and local laws which may require such background checks;

(2) incidences where individuals who are not TNC drivers, taxicab drivers, or other

for-hire vehicle drivers try to pose as TNC drivers, taxicab drivers, or other for-hire vehicle drivers;

(3) incidences of passengers entering the wrong vehicle, whether or not the vehicle was a TNC vehicle, taxicab, and other for-hire vehicle; and

(4) efforts by transportation network companies, taxicab companies, or for-hire vehicle companies to implement additional safety measures and practices and of State and local governments requiring such measures, and the efficacy of those efforts, practices, and requirements.

#### SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the terms “non-visual” and “non-visually accessible”, with regards to the system required under sections 2(a)(1)(D) and 3(1)(B) mean digital content that—

(A) meets the success criteria of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0, Level AA, and any successor to or revision of such guidelines that has been incorporated into the Section 508 standards issued by the United States Access Board, including, to the extent applicable, the Web Accessibility Initiative - Accessible Rich Internet Applications (WAI-ARIA); or

(B) allows a blind or visually impaired passenger to access the same information, and utilize the same system offered to other passengers as required under Sections 2(a)(1)(D) and 3(1)(B) in a way that provides a comparable level of privacy, independence and substantially equivalent ease of use to the passenger;

(2) the term “passenger” means an individual who is matched with a TNC driver by using a TNC platform;

(3) the term “personal mobile device” means any mobile device that an individual uses to connect to a TNC platform;

(4) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Transportation;

(5) the term “TNC driver” means an individual who contracts with a transportation network company and provides transportation services to passengers;

(6) the term “TNC platform” means an online-enabled application or digital network made available by a transportation network company to connect riders to TNC drivers for the purpose of providing pre-arranged transportation services;

(7) the term “TNC vehicle” means a vehicle owned, leased, or otherwise authorized for use by TNC driver that the TNC driver uses to provide pre-arranged transportation services, also known as a ride-hailing vehicle; and

(8) the term “transportation network company”—

(A) means a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or other entity, that makes available an online-enabled application or digital network to connect passengers to TNC drivers in order for the driver to transport the passenger using a vehicle owned, leased, or otherwise authorized for use by the driver to a point chosen by the passenger; and

(B) does not include a shared-expense carpool or vanpool arrangement that is not intended to generate profit for the driver; and

(9) the term “verifiable information” means data shared between a TNC platform, TNC driver, and passenger that includes a personal authentication number confirmation system, a license plate confirmation system, or a successor technology system.

#### SEC. 9. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement

titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to require ride-hailing companies to implement an enhanced digital system to verify passengers with their authorized ride-hailing vehicles and drivers.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 4686, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4686, Sami's Law. This legislation marks the first step in Federal oversight of the safety of transportation network companies.

I particularly applaud the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative SMITH, and the gentleman from New York, Representative SUOZZI, for introducing legislation on this subject and tenaciously working through many iterations of the bill in order to bring it to the floor of the House with strong support.

Mobility and transportation patterns in cities have been upended in recent years by companies that, through transformative technology platforms, have revolutionized how we travel. In a very short time, many people have come to rely on TNCs as a regular transportation option. These services, however, have operated with little transportation safety or regulatory oversight.

There are many aspects of TNCs that the Committee on Transportation has examined, including their impacts on congestion, their impacts on wages, their impacts on public transportation use. We held a hearing last October in which a range of troubling aspects of the TNC model were brought to light. We had hoped at that hearing to explore the safety issues, but neither Uber nor Lyft would come to the hearing.

The committee included provisions in H.R. 2, as passed by the House earlier this month, that focused on how to put some guardrails around this new “mobility on demand” model to ensure these services supplement, rather than compete, with transit services.

But today, in this legislation, we focus on the most critical and chal-

lenging policy aspect of the TNC model: how to ensure the safety of passengers and drivers who utilize a ride-hailing platform.

This bill is known as Sami's Law in honor of Samantha Josephson, a 21-year-old college student who was brutally murdered after she entered a car which was mistakenly identified as the Uber she had hailed.

I met with her parents, Seymour and Marci Josephson, and heard their heart-wrenching story firsthand of how this split-second decision to enter that vehicle cost their daughter her life. They have worked tirelessly on the legislation before us today so that millions of other ride-hailing services users can do so with safety protections in place.

It is appalling that it took this tragedy for TNCs to admit that developing an app connecting passengers and drivers through technology and hoping for the best is woefully insufficient as a safety protocol. I am glad that Uber and Lyft were finally willing to come to the table and agree to the basic safety precautions contained in H.R. 4686.

This bill requires TNCs, within 90 days of enactment, to establish and implement a digital means for passengers to verify that the driver has been authorized by the TNC to accept the passenger's trip request prior to the start of the trip or the person entering the car.

Such a system must include the ability for the passenger, the driver, and the TNC platform to confirm the information matching the passenger and the authorized TNC driver or TNC vehicle and the ability to restrict the trip from commencing until both the passenger and TNC driver verify the other's identity using the system.

The bill further ensures that TNCs will be able to continue to improve and innovate ways to maximize passenger and driver safety by establishing a process for the Secretary of Transportation to issue performance standards for successor verification technologies.

The bill also establishes an advisory council of Federal officials, representatives of TNCs, TNC drivers, law enforcement, victims' advocacy groups, and individuals with disabilities to develop recommendations on successor technologies.

The bill further prohibits the sale of any signage that is designed to help a passenger identify a TNC vehicle and contains a TNC's proprietary trademark or logo, unless authorized by the TNC.

During our hearing last fall, I just went on to Amazon and I found I could have had delivered by Prime, in 2 days, a lighted sign to put on my dashboard that I would plug into the cigarette lighter saying I was an Uber or Lyft driver. That has got to stop.

Finally, the bill directs the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on the incidence of assaults on TNC passengers, TNC drivers, and

background checks conducted on prospective drivers of TNC vehicles, including State and local laws which may require such background checks.

I have been focused on the potential danger of pairing passengers with poorly vetted drivers for years. In 2015, I wrote to then-Uber CEO Travis Kalanick urging the company to conduct fingerprint-based background checks.

□ 1345

In my district, dozens of applicants with serious criminal convictions, including a convicted murderer, a registered sex offender, and 10 people with serious DUIs, were cleared, they were cleared through Uber and Lyft's screening process, and they were driving people around. It wasn't until the local police department in my State—we are the only State who hasn't been preempted by Uber and Lyft from going further than their very cursory background checks—the police conducted the same background checks that they would conduct for taxi drivers in the city, and then they found the murderer, the sex offender, and the others, and those people were removed from service. That just shouldn't ever happen.

Strong and thorough vetting of potential drivers is the first line of defense to ensure passenger safety. While the study initiated by this bill will yield important data, I believe we will ultimately have to do more to truly protect the ride-hailing community. It will do little good to verify that you have the right driver if that driver has a history and the desire to do harm to passengers.

Lawmakers at the State, Federal, and local level need to think beyond whether ride-hailing gets people from point A to point B, and work to ensure that TNCs deliver a public service equitably and safely, and it is not a race to the bottom by exploiting drivers. This bill is an important step in setting an appropriate regulatory floor.

I thank those I mentioned earlier for bringing this legislation before the House, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 27, 2020.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: I write concerning H.R. 4686, "Sami's Law," which was additionally referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Committee).

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 4686, the Committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and

involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 4686.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 27, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy & Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PALLONE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4686, Sami's Law. I appreciate your decision to waive formal consideration of the bill.

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

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

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,  
Chair.

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

I rise today to thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, and all who have worked hard in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to get this legislation to the floor known as "Sami's Law." I, too, support this legislation. I also want to applaud the dedication and the hard work of the sponsor of Sami's Law, and that is none other than my good friend, the Representative from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH.

I met with Sami's parents at the urging of Mr. SMITH a few months ago. Marci and Seymour Josephson, your government today will show you that it is working for you and for all Americans, and that is because you have a tireless advocate, somebody who I have never seen work harder on an issue that is so important to so many young people in this country than Mr. SMITH did. There has been no one in my time in Congress who has come to me on this floor advocating for a single issue that can mean so much to kids like my daughter who is in college, like my sons who are in college that is going to have an impact on their generation as much as the advocacy of Congressman CHRIS SMITH because this bill is going to pass today. We are one step closer to making Sami's Law law.

As we know, this law is going create minimum standards and requirements

for safety for passengers who utilize ridesharing platforms. We want to make sure that digitally they know that the driver they have reserved is the driver who is rolling up next to them to pick them up. This verification process is essential in making sure tragedies that took Sami's life don't happen to other families.

This bill also creates an advisory council, Sami's Law Council, to make safety-related performance standards and recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation.

Also a very important point: To keep bad actors out of this arena, we are also going to ban something that I learned about, again, from Congressman SMITH, that there are bad actors that were able to purchase Uber and Lyft stickers, put them on their car, and they were able to do it on Amazon, and they had zero experience and zero intention of ever legally getting the clearance to participate in those rideshare programs.

This is going to save people in America. I support this legislation.

And my last message to Marci and Seymour Josephson: Sami's legacy lives on after we pass this bill in the House of Representatives today. Thank you for your tireless advocacy, Marci and Seymour, and thank you for sending such a tireless advocate to the House of Representatives in Congressman CHRIS SMITH.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me begin by thanking my friends Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SUOZZI, for bringing forth this bipartisan bill.

In March 2019 Samantha Josephson, a 21-year-old native of New Jersey, was finishing her senior year at the University of South Carolina in my congressional district. She was a great student and had earned a full scholarship to study at Drexel University School of Law to pursue her dream of practicing international law. Sami, as she was known to her family and friends, did not get a chance to fulfill those dreams.

After an evening out with friends, she decided to order a rideshare home. Video captured her getting into a black car that she assumed was her ride. Instead of being her ride, the unmarked car was driven by a predator who kidnapped and killed her.

Today, we will vote on Sami's Law to put protections in place to prevent similar tragedies.

This legislation makes it illegal for anyone other than rideshare companies to sell rideshare vehicle signs so predators can't impersonate an authorized driver. It also institutes the additional safeguard of a new code system that will allow the passenger to verify that



the vehicle is their ride before they get into the car.

Finally, the bill sets up a new council at the Department of Transportation to develop performance standards for rideshare technologies to ensure that our safety protocols keep up with the pace of technology.

I thank, once again, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, my Republican colleague from Sami's New Jersey hometown, for his sponsorship of this bipartisan bill.

I have met with Sami's parents, and I want to thank them for their strength and commitment to ensuring this legislation becomes law.

I thank my colleagues in advance of their votes, hopefully, in favor of this legislation that will honor Sami's legacy and enacts important safeguards to protect rideshare users from predatory behavior.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), another tireless advocate for Sami's Law and the ranking member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4686, Sami's Law, as well.

I commend my colleagues who have been down here today talking about this law and the tragedy around it and the tragedy around the loss of Sami. And while she may never have gotten the opportunity to become a lawyer, she will have a law. And the advocacy of her parents to get this law in place is a lifetime statutory memorial for her for an incredible tragedy that should never have existed in the first place, the kidnapping and murder.

We think about our kids, and we think about all we do to protect them and to encourage them to do the right things. And you think about convincing them to take a rideshare, don't drive, whatever, and then to have this happen is truly horrible.

So this legislation that is brought before us today is extraordinarily important. I thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his tireless leadership on this and Mr. SUOZZI as well and everyone who has worked on it.

You should, as a rider, have the opportunity to know that you are safe when you get in that vehicle and that you don't risk your life the way Sami did and lost it.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can all rally around this bill and help get this into law and have a memorial for Sami and a safeguard for all others.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), who was a key person in getting this legislation moving through the House of Representatives.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Sami's Law. Congressman SMITH and I introduced this

legislation to address passenger safety issues with the transportation network companies, TNCs, such as Uber and Lyft.

I thank Congressman SMITH again for his tireless advocacy on this issue, and I also thank Chairman DEFAZIO. There is no way this would have made it to the floor unless he had worked together with House leadership to get this bipartisan and commonsense legislation on the floor.

It is a tremendous challenge to determine what policies are necessary to ensure that the new industry of transportation network companies, TNCs, provide safe, efficient, and cost-effective solutions to consumers and employees.

Earlier this year, when news reports surfaced about the tragic, horrific death of Sami Josephson, a friend of mine, who is also a friend and neighbor of the Josephson family, contacted me to work on legislation to ensure that no other parent would experience the devastating loss of a child in the way that the Josephsons did.

I later discovered that Congressman SMITH, who represents the Josephsons, was also working on the issue.

Sami Josephson called for an Uber, entered the wrong car, and was murdered.

The Smith/Suoizzi legislation provides consumers with a level of safety before entering a vehicle. Our bill's safety provisions are commonsense and easy to implement, including the following requirements:

One, requiring companies like Uber and Lyft to connect with passengers and drivers to positively establish their identities before the trip starts.

Two, prohibiting the unauthorized sale of ride-hailing signs and spells out the civil penalties of violating the law.

Three, establishing an advisory council comprised of representatives from Federal agencies, TNCs, law enforcement, disability and advocacy groups to recommend standards for positive identification systems.

As we began researching this issue, I was surprised to learn that TNCs, a relatively new business model, are regulated differently across States and local borders.

While some States and cities, such as New York City, have implemented new rules, such as creating a new license category for high-volume for-hire services, TNCs have been mostly left to create their own policies for preventing and tracking violence or abuse to their passengers.

We have all heard about the horrific reports of assault and abuse incidents involving both TNC passengers and drivers. That is why our bill also requires a Government Accountability Office study on the prevalence of assault and abuse perpetrated on riders by TNC drivers of ride-hailing vehicles and on TNC drivers by passengers.

This data will be instrumental in determining any other safety procedures that may be necessary to ensure the safety of everyone who uses a ride-sharing app.

There is no way to describe the sadness, the horror, the pain that Sami's death caused for her family and to her community. She lived a vibrant and loving life. She had her whole life ahead of her. She planned to study law. She had hopes. She had dreams. We must do everything we can to prevent what happened to Sami and so many others from happening to anyone else.

I encourage my colleagues to support this critical, commonsense legislation.

□ 1400

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I don't know if I can say anything more about my colleague.

I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee for yielding. I thank him for his leadership. I thank Chairman DEFAZIO so very, very much for his championing this legislation. I thank my good friend, TOM SUOZZI. We have partnered before on human rights legislation, particularly as it relates to China. It is great to be working with him so closely again today. I thank Ranking Member GRAVES. I will get to some further thank yous in a few moments.

Madam Speaker, in late March of 2019, University of South Carolina senior Samantha, or Sami, Josephson left a late night outing with her friends alone because she had to work in the morning.

The extraordinarily talented student, who had recently earned a full scholarship to Drexel University Law, ordered an Uber.

In a congested part of Columbia known as Five Points, a predator pretending to be her Uber driver took her in his car and brutally murdered her.

Less than 24 hours later, Sami was found in a field. The alleged murderer, Nathaniel Rowland, was caught, jailed, and awaits trial. Last month, a judge rightly denied bond.

Almost immediately after her death and notwithstanding their excruciating agony over the loss of their precious daughter Sami, her parents, Seymour and Marci, began pushing for comprehensive new protection policies at Uber and Lyft and legislation to ensure that no one else ever loses his or her life or gets assaulted by a rideshare driver or a predator who pretends to be one.

They created the #WHATSMYNAME Foundation in "honor of their daughter to educate the world on rideshare safety. . . . Samantha may be gone," they write, "but our goal for the rest of our time on Earth is to share her story and make a lasting change."

For over a year, especially given the pain due to the unimaginable loss of their daughter, Seymour and Marci have been heroic, tenacious, and extraordinarily persuasive. They have been a critically important part of the often intense negotiations with multiple stakeholders, including Uber and

Lyft, on both the substance and the text of Sami's Law.

Marci and Seymour made frequent trips to the Capitol to meet lawmakers and staff on both sides of the aisle, including Speaker PELOSI and Leader MCCARTHY, as well as Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, and Mr. DAVIS and Chairwoman NORTON, all of whom welcomed them with such compassion and empathy.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially grateful to the Speaker for her strong personal commitment to this cause and for bringing Sami's Law to the floor today and who, like KEVIN MCCARTHY and others, also welcomed them with such deep respect, with kindness, and empathy. "How can we help?," was the question I heard over and over again, and Sami's Law is what has been produced as a result of that.

Mr. Speaker, underscoring the need for Sami's Law, in addition to the fake Uber driver that murdered her, last year declaring that, "We don't believe corporate secrecy will make anyone safer," Uber released its first safety report. Uber found that over a 2-year period, 2017 to 2018, the company received 5,981 allegations of serious sexual assault in the United States, and 19 people were killed in physical assaults during or soon after an Uber ride. They also found that data shows that drivers report assaults at roughly the same rate as riders.

Sami's Law is designed to protect both, passengers and drivers.

Uber supports Sami's Law.

Danielle Burr, head of Uber Federal Affairs, said, "The tragic death of Samantha Josephson left the rideshare community heartbroken and devastated. Passage of 'Sami's Law' is another step in the ongoing work to help improve safety on rideshare by leveraging education and technology. We are grateful for . . . the support and the collaboration of the Josephson Family."

They have talked to the Uber folks, especially Danielle, over and over and over again and really have made a really, really lasting impression and difference.

Again underscoring the need, CNN reported last December that Lyft has been hit with more driver rape, sexual assault allegations: "Twenty more people are suing Lyft over alleged sexual assault, sexual misconduct or rape by drivers while using its service. . . . The lawsuit comes on the heels of a similar lawsuit filed . . . on behalf of 14 anonymous women, in addition to numerous other individual suits that have been filed in recent months."

Dan Katz, Senior Director, Public Policy, Lyft, said: "The Josephson family and Congressman Smith have worked tirelessly to champion Sami's Law. Their determination has led to today's passage in the U.S. House of Representatives. We have and will continue to prioritize safety within the Lyft community."

Mr. Speaker, Sami's Law requires each transportation network company like Uber and Lyft to establish and im-

plement a system that makes available to each passenger a digital method to verify that the driver with whom the passenger has been matched has been authorized by the TNC prior, I say again, prior to beginning the trip.

The bill stipulates in pertinent part that "Such a system shall include an initial notification sent to the passenger's mobile, or otherwise communicated to the passenger, containing verifiable information specific to the TNC driver or TNC vehicle with which the passenger has been matched."

That also puts into this whole system much more accountability. Everybody knows who is driving that car or that vehicle.

All TNC companies that wish to continue operating in the U.S. must establish such a system within 90 days of enactment.

I note in the early days of this legislation, we discovered that we needed to make some changes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the National Federation of the Blind, who helped craft provisions to the bill to ensure that there was a way for a passenger to use a nonvisual arrangement to verify the authenticity of the TNC driver.

Sami's Law not only sets minimum safety requirements for today's technology. It also puts into effect a process for successor technology performance standards.

It also establishes a 15-member advisory council that reports to the Secretary of Transportation, known as SAMI's Council, comprised of Federal agency and public stakeholders to advance safety standards in the rideshare industry.

I was so glad when Chairman DEFAZIO at the hearing when we were talking about how you could just simply go on Amazon or Wal-Mart, anywhere, type in "Uber signage" or "signage," and you can buy a sign. It is an engraved invitation to a predator to act like, particularly at or near our college campuses, in proximity to, and then to impersonate an Uber driver.

I will never forget at the hearing after I mentioned the ease of buying an Uber sign in my testimony, the chairman pulled out his smartphone and then made a very, very, very good point about how easy it is to access that signage.

Sami's Law would make that unlawful.

It also requires, a GAO report on the incidents of assault and abuse on both passengers and drivers, and requires that the GAO also examine the nature and specifics on background checks conducted by companies and the various standards set by States regarding background checks.

We have got to know who is behind the wheel, and this certainly will help to do that.

Mr. Speaker, again, I have appreciated the chairman's focus on background checks for such a long time. This hopefully advances that concern.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me offer my profound gratitude to the professional

staff. We all know how important they are. They really make a huge difference. They sweat the details, work on text.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin. And this is not totally inclusive. I may have left somebody out, and I apologize. I thank Robert Edmonson, chief of staff to the Speaker; Emily Domenech and Will Durham, Republican Leader MCCARTHY's office; Helen Zyblikewycz, who is staff director, T&I Subcommittee on Transit and Highways; Michael Falencki, staff director of the minority side. I thank Brady Young, Office of Legislative Counsel, for his expert drafting and frequent redrafting of the text and insights he provided; Kelsey Griswold from my office; and my very, distinguished chief of staff, Mary McDermott Noonan.

Let's hope, God willing, this is on the President's desk ASAP.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO; Ranking Member GRAVES; all Members who worked on this bill; my good friend Mr. SUOZZI, who was here not too long ago, another cosponsor of Mr. SMITH's bill.

This is a day that we ought to remember here in Congress as getting back to bipartisan solutions.

As I said earlier, Sami Josephson, her life was tragically taken, but because of bipartisanship in this institution and good policy coming from good Members of Congress, her legacy will live on and protect many others like her from ever being put in the exact same position of getting in an Uber, a Lyft, or any other future ridesharing company's vehicle without knowing exactly if that car was coming to get her.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH again for his tireless advocacy. I thank all who worked on this. I look forward to seeing this bill pass unanimously, I hope. It should.

But in the end, I also thank the companies who worked with Members of Congress to put this good policy in place today that I urge everyone to support.

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

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

I think we have said what we needed to say here today on the floor. Nothing, nothing will ever totally heal Sami's parents and friends, but this bill in her name will hopefully prevent there being any future tragedies like her death.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4686, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to require ride-hailing companies to implement an enhanced digital system to verify passengers with their authorized ride-hailing vehicles and drivers.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME ON H.R. 7575, WATER RE- SOURCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2020

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7575 be extended to 1 hour at the request of the minority.

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

There was no objection.

#### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2020

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7575) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7575

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**  
(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Water Resources Development Act of 2020”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Secretary defined.

#### TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Budgetary treatment expansion and adjustment for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.
- Sec. 102. Funding for navigation.
- Sec. 103. Annual report to Congress on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.
- Sec. 104. Additional measures at donor ports and energy transfer ports.
- Sec. 105. Assumption of maintenance of a locally preferred plan.
- Sec. 106. Coast Guard anchorages.
- Sec. 107. State contribution of funds for certain operation and maintenance costs.
- Sec. 108. Inland waterway projects.
- Sec. 109. Implementation of water resources principles and requirements.
- Sec. 110. Resiliency planning assistance.
- Sec. 111. Project consultation.
- Sec. 112. Review of resiliency assessments.
- Sec. 113. Small flood control projects.
- Sec. 114. Conforming amendment.
- Sec. 115. Feasibility studies; review of natural and nature-based features.
- Sec. 116. Report on corrosion prevention activities.
- Sec. 117. Quantification of benefits for flood risk management projects in seismic zones.

- Sec. 118. Federal interest determination.
- Sec. 119. Economically disadvantaged community flood protection and hurricane and storm damage reduction study pilot program.
- Sec. 120. Permanent measures to reduce emergency flood fighting needs for communities subject to repetitive flooding.
- Sec. 121. Emergency response to natural disasters.
- Sec. 122. Study on natural infrastructure at Corps of Engineers projects.
- Sec. 123. Review of Corps of Engineers assets.
- Sec. 124. Sense of Congress on multipurpose projects.
- Sec. 125. Beneficial reuse of dredged material; dredged material management plans.
- Sec. 126. Aquatic ecosystem restoration for anadromous fish.
- Sec. 127. Annual report to Congress.
- Sec. 128. Harmful algal bloom demonstration program.
- Sec. 129. Update on Invasive Species Policy Guidance.
- Sec. 130. Report on debris removal.
- Sec. 131. Missouri River interception-rearing complex construction.
- Sec. 132. Cost and benefit feasibility assessment.
- Sec. 133. Materials, services, and funds for repair, restoration, or rehabilitation of projects.
- Sec. 134. Levee safety.
- Sec. 135. National Dam Safety Program.
- Sec. 136. Rehabilitation of Corps of Engineers constructed pump stations.
- Sec. 137. Non-Federal Project Implementation Pilot Program.
- Sec. 138. Definition of economically disadvantaged community.
- Sec. 139. Cost sharing provisions for territories and Indian Tribes.
- Sec. 140. Flood control and other purposes.
- Sec. 141. Review of contracting policies.
- Sec. 142. Buy America.
- Sec. 143. Annual report on status of feasibility studies.

#### TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

- Sec. 201. Authorization of proposed feasibility studies.
- Sec. 202. Expedited completions.
- Sec. 203. Feasibility study modifications.
- Sec. 204. Selma, Alabama.
- Sec. 205. Comprehensive study of the Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, California.
- Sec. 206. Lake Okeechobee regulation schedule, Florida.
- Sec. 207. Great Lakes Coastal Resiliency Study.
- Sec. 208. Rathbun Lake, Chariton River, Iowa.
- Sec. 209. Report on the status of restoration in the Louisiana coastal area.
- Sec. 210. Lower Mississippi River comprehensive study.
- Sec. 211. Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan.
- Sec. 212. Lower Missouri Basin Flood Risk and Resiliency Study, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri.
- Sec. 213. Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River and Rye Harbor, New Hampshire.
- Sec. 214. Cougar and Detroit Dams, Willamette River Basin, Oregon.
- Sec. 215. Port Orford, Oregon.
- Sec. 216. Wilson Creek and Sloan Creek, Fairview, Texas.
- Sec. 217. GAO study on mitigation for water resources development projects.
- Sec. 218. GAO study on application of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund expenditures.

- Sec. 219. GAO study on administration of environmental banks.
  - Sec. 220. Study on Corps of Engineers concessionaire agreements.
  - Sec. 221. Study on water supply and water conservation at water resources development projects.
  - Sec. 222. PFAS review and inventory at Corps facilities.
  - Sec. 223. Report on recreational facilities.
- #### TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS
- Sec. 301. Deauthorization of inactive projects.
  - Sec. 302. Abandoned and inactive noncoal mine restoration.
  - Sec. 303. Tribal partnership program.
  - Sec. 304. Lakes program.
  - Sec. 305. Watercraft inspection stations.
  - Sec. 306. Rehabilitation of Corps of Engineers constructed dams.
  - Sec. 307. Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program.
  - Sec. 308. Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.
  - Sec. 309. McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System.
  - Sec. 310. Ouachita-Black River Navigation Project, Arkansas.
  - Sec. 311. Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa, California.
  - Sec. 312. Lake Isabella, California.
  - Sec. 313. Lower San Joaquin River flood control project.
  - Sec. 314. San Diego River and Mission Bay, San Diego County, California.
  - Sec. 315. San Francisco, California, Waterfront Area.
  - Sec. 316. Western Pacific Interceptor Canal, Sacramento River, California.
  - Sec. 317. Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.
  - Sec. 318. New London Harbor Waterfront Channel, Connecticut.
  - Sec. 319. Washington Harbor, District of Columbia.
  - Sec. 320. Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation Water Conservation Plan, Florida.
  - Sec. 321. Central Everglades, Florida.
  - Sec. 322. Miami River, Florida.
  - Sec. 323. Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam, Moore Haven, Florida.
  - Sec. 324. Taylor Creek Reservoir and Levee L-73 (Section 1), Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida.
  - Sec. 325. Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.
  - Sec. 326. San Juan-Chama project; Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico.
  - Sec. 327. Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut.
  - Sec. 328. Harris County, Texas.
  - Sec. 329. Cap Sante Waterway, Washington.
  - Sec. 330. Regional sediment management.
  - Sec. 331. Additional assistance for critical projects.
  - Sec. 332. Project modification authorizations.
  - Sec. 333. Application of credit.
  - Sec. 334. Project reauthorizations.
  - Sec. 335. Conveyances.
  - Sec. 336. Repeals.

#### TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

- Sec. 401. Project authorizations.
- Sec. 402. Special rules.
- Sec. 403. Authorization of projects based on feasibility studies prepared by non-Federal interests.

#### TITLE V—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

- Sec. 501. Determination of Budgetary Effects.

**SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.**

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.

**TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS****SEC. 101. BUDGETARY TREATMENT EXPANSION AND ADJUSTMENT FOR THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14003 of division B of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 14003. Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) HARBOR MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for the Construction, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance accounts of the Corps of Engineers are enacted that are derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established under section 9505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that the Congress designates in statute as being for harbor operations and maintenance activities, then the adjustment for that fiscal year shall be the total of such appropriations that are derived from such Fund and designated as being for harbor operations and maintenance activities.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

**SEC. 102. FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION.**

(a) FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended, in the section heading, by striking “AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS” and inserting “FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION”.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HARBOR PROJECTS.—Section 210(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(c)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, of the funds made available under this section (including funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund), the Secretary shall make expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of the harbors and inland harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2), using—

“(A) not less than 20 percent of such funds for emerging harbor projects, to the extent there are identifiable operations and maintenance needs, including eligible breakwater and jetty needs, at such harbor projects;

“(B) not less than 12 percent of such funds for projects that are located within the Great Lakes Navigation System;

“(C) 10 percent of such funds for expanded uses carried out at donor ports, as such term is defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c); and

“(D) any remaining funds for operation and maintenance costs of any harbor or inland harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) based on an equitable allocation of such funds among such harbors and inland harbors.”;

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) ADDITIONAL USES AT EMERGING HARBORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than \$5,000,000 of funds designated for emerging harbor projects under paragraph (1)(A) to pay for the costs of up to 10 projects for maintenance dredging of a marina or berthing area, in an emerging harbor, that includes an area that is located adjacent to, or is accessible by, a Federal navigation project, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EMERGING HARBORS.—The Secretary may use funds as authorized under

subparagraph (A) at an emerging harbor that—

“(i) supports commercial activities, including commercial fishing operations, commercial fish processing operations, recreational and sport fishing, and commercial boat yards; or

“(ii) supports activities of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

“(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall require a non-Federal interest to contribute not less than 25 percent of the costs for maintenance dredging of that portion of a maintenance dredging project described in subparagraph (A) that is located outside of the Federal navigation project, which may be provided as an in-kind contribution, including through the use of dredge equipment owned by non-Federal interest to carry out such activities.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary from making an expenditure to pay for the operation and maintenance costs of a specific harbor or inland harbor, including the transfer of funding from the operation and maintenance of a separate project, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the action is necessary to address the navigation needs of a harbor or inland harbor where safe navigation has been severely restricted due to an unforeseen event; and

“(B) the Secretary provides within 90 days of the action notice and information on the need for the action to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

(c) PRIORITIZATION.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(d) ASSESSMENT OF HARBORS AND INLAND HARBORS.—Section 210(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “expanded uses at eligible harbors or inland harbors referred to in subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “uses described in paragraphs (1)(C) and (3) of subsection (c)”.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—Section 210(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (6) through (9);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively;

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) EMERGING HARBOR.—The term ‘emerging harbor’ means a harbor or inland harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) that transmits less than 1,000,000 tons of cargo annually.

“(3) EMERGING HARBOR PROJECT.—The term ‘emerging harbor project’ means a project that is assigned to an emerging harbor.”; and

(4) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) An in-water improvement, if the improvement—

“(i) is for the seismic reinforcement of a wharf or other berthing structure, or the repair or replacement of a deteriorating wharf or other berthing structure, at a port facility;

“(ii) benefits commercial navigation at the harbor; and

“(iii) is located in, or adjacent to, a berth that is accessible to a Federal navigation project.

“(D) An activity to maintain slope stability at a berth in a harbor that is accessible to a Federal navigation project if such activity benefits commercial navigation at the harbor.”.

**SEC. 103. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.**

Section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (26 U.S.C. 9505 note; 106 Stat. 4851) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “and annually thereafter,” and inserting “and annually thereafter concurrent with the submission of the President’s annual budget request to Congress,”; and

(B) by striking “Public Works and Transportation” and inserting “Transportation and Infrastructure”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) A description of the expected expenditures from the trust fund to meet the needs of navigation for the fiscal year of the budget request.”.

**SEC. 104. ADDITIONAL MEASURES AT DONOR PORTS AND ENERGY TRANSFER PORTS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2106(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) at which the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes collected (including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers) comprise not less than \$15,000,000 annually of the total funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in each of the previous 3 fiscal years;”;

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting “(including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers)” after “taxes collected”; and

(C) in clause (iv), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking “fiscal year 2012” each place it appears and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9) and inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.—The term ‘Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund’ means the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established by section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”; and

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) at which the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes collected (including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers) comprise annually more than \$5,000,000 but less than \$15,000,000 of the total funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in each of the previous 3 fiscal years;”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers)” after “taxes collected”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2020” and inserting “2030”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3).

**SEC. 105. ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE OF A LOCALLY PREFERRED PLAN.**

Section 204(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—

“(1) ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE.—Whenever a non-Federal interest carries out improvements to a federally authorized harbor or inland harbor, the Secretary shall be responsible for operation and maintenance in accordance with section 101(b) if—

“(A) before construction of the improvements—

“(i) the Secretary determines that the improvements are feasible and consistent with the purposes of this title; and

“(ii) the Secretary and the non-Federal interest execute a written agreement relating to operation and maintenance of the improvements;

“(B) the Secretary certifies that the project or separable element of the project is constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering and design standards; and

“(C) the Secretary does not find that the project or separable element is no longer feasible.

“(2) FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION IN THE COSTS OF A LOCALLY PREFERRED PLAN.—In the case of improvements determined by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(i) to deviate from the national economic development plan, the Secretary shall be responsible for all operation and maintenance costs of such improvements, as described in section 101(b), including costs in excess of the costs of the national economic development plan, if the Secretary determines that the improvements satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1).”

**SEC. 106. COAST GUARD ANCHORAGES.**

The Secretary is authorized to perform dredging at Federal expense within and adjacent to anchorages on the Columbia River established by the Coast Guard pursuant to section 7 of the Act of March 14, 1915 (33 U.S.C. 471), to provide safe anchorage for deep draft vessels commensurate with the authorized Federal navigation channel depth, including advanced maintenance.

**SEC. 107. STATE CONTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.**

In carrying out eligible operations and maintenance activities within the Great Lakes Navigation System pursuant to section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) in a State that has implemented any additional State limitation on the disposal of dredged material in the open waters of such State, the Secretary may, pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), receive from such State, and expend, such funds as may be contributed by the State to cover the additional costs for operations and maintenance activities for a harbor or inland harbor within such State that result from such limitation.

**SEC. 108. INLAND WATERWAY PROJECTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212), 35 percent of the costs of construction of any project for navigation on the inland waterways shall be paid from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund—

(1) during each of fiscal years 2021 through 2027; and

(2) for a project the construction of which is initiated during such period, in each fiscal year until such construction is complete.

(b) PRIORITIZATION.—In selecting projects described in subsection (a) for which to initiate construction during any of fiscal years

2021 through 2027, the Secretary shall prioritize projects that are included in the most recent 20-year program for making capital investments developed under section 302(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251(d)).

**SEC. 109. IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER RESOURCES PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue final agency-specific procedures necessary to implement the principles and requirements and the interagency guidelines.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The procedures required by subsection (a) shall ensure that the Secretary, in the formulation of future water resources development projects—

(1) develops such projects in accordance with—

(A) the guiding principles established by the principles and requirements; and

(B) the national water resources planning policy established by section 2031(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962-3(a)); and

(2) fully identifies and analyzes national economic development benefits, regional economic development benefits, environmental quality benefits, and other societal effects.

(c) REVIEW AND UPDATE.—Every 5 years, the Secretary shall review and, where appropriate, revise the procedures required by subsection (a).

(d) PUBLIC REVIEW, NOTICE, AND COMMENT.—In issuing, reviewing, and revising the procedures required by this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) provide notice to interested non-Federal stakeholders of the Secretary's intent to revise the procedures;

(2) provide opportunities for interested non-Federal stakeholders to engage with, and provide input and recommendations to, the Secretary on the revision of the procedures; and

(3) solicit and consider public and expert comments.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INTERAGENCY GUIDELINES.—The term “interagency guidelines” means the interagency guidelines contained in the document finalized by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962-3) in December 2014, to implement the principles and requirements.

(2) PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS.—The term “principles and requirements” means the principles and requirements contained in the document prepared by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962-3), entitled “Principles and Requirements for Federal Investments in Water Resources”, and dated March 2013.

**SEC. 110. RESILIENCY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 206(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(a)) is amended by inserting “, to avoid repetitive flooding impacts, to anticipate, prepare, and adapt to changing climatic conditions and extreme weather events, and to withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruption due to the flood hazards” after “in planning to ameliorate the flood hazard”.

(b) PRIORITIZING FLOOD RISK RESILIENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), the Secretary shall prioritize the provision of technical assist-

ance to support flood risk resiliency planning efforts of an economically disadvantaged community.

**SEC. 111. PROJECT CONSULTATION.**

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit the following reports:

(1) The report required under section 1214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3809).

(2) The report required under section 1120(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1643).

(b) CONSULTATION.—

(1) AGENCIES AND TRIBES.—The Secretary shall ensure that all covered community consultation policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers continue to be implemented, and that consultations with Federal and State agencies and Indian Tribes required for a water resources development project are carried out.

(2) COMMUNITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that any covered communities, including such communities identified in the reports submitted under subsection (a), that are found to be disproportionately or adversely affected are included in consultation policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers.

(3) PROJECT PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that covered communities are consulted in the development of water resources development project planning and construction, for the purposes of achieving environmental justice and addressing any disproportionate or adverse effects on such communities.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE UPDATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update any policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers related to achieving environmental justice for covered communities.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with a wide array of representatives of covered communities; and

(B) use the recommendations from the reports submitted under subsection (a).

(d) COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that in carrying out authorized water resources development projects in, and all other activities of the Corps of Engineers related to, covered communities, the Corps of Engineers—

(1) promotes the meaningful involvement of such communities in the project development and implementation, enforcement efforts, and other activities of the Corps of Engineers;

(2) provides guidance and technical assistance to such communities to increase understanding of the project development and implementation activities, regulations, and policies of the Corps of Engineers; and

(3) cooperates with State, Tribal, and local governments with respect to activities carried out pursuant to this subsection.

(e) TRIBAL LANDS AND CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that in carrying out authorized water resources development projects and in all other activities of the Corps of Engineers, that the Corps of Engineers—

(1)(A) consults with Indian Tribes specifically on any Tribal lands near or adjacent to any activities of the Corps of Engineers, for purposes of identifying lands of ancestral, cultural, or religious importance; and

(B) cooperates with Indian Tribes to avoid, or otherwise find alternate solutions with respect to, such lands; and

(2)(A) consults with Indian Tribes specifically on any Tribal areas near or adjacent to

any activities of the Corps of Engineers, for purposes of identifying lands, waters, and other resources critical to the livelihood of the Indian Tribes; and

(B) cooperates with Indian Tribes to avoid, or otherwise find alternate solutions with respect to, such areas.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNITY OF COLOR.—The term “community of color” means a community of individuals who are—

- (A) American Indian or Alaska Native;
- (B) Asian or Pacific Islander;
- (C) Black, not of Hispanic origin; or
- (D) Hispanic.

(2) COVERED COMMUNITY.—The term “covered community” means each of the following:

- (A) A community of color.
- (B) An economically disadvantaged community.
- (C) A rural community.
- (D) A Tribal or indigenous community.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each of the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

#### SEC. 112. REVIEW OF RESILIENCY ASSESSMENTS.

(a) RESILIENCY ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and in conjunction with the development of procedures under section 109 of this Act, the Secretary is directed to review, and where appropriate, revise the existing planning guidance documents and regulations on the assessment of the effects of sea level rise on future water resources development projects to ensure that such guidance documents and regulations are based on the best available, peer-reviewed science and data on the current and future effects of sea level rise on coastal communities.

(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) coordinate the review with the Engineer Research and Development Center, other Federal and State agencies, and other relevant entities; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, utilize data provided to the Secretary by such agencies.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF BENEFITS OF SEA LEVEL RISE RESILIENCY IN FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of a non-Federal interest, in carrying out a feasibility study for a project for flood risk mitigation, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, or ecosystem restoration under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), the Secretary shall consider whether the need for the project is predicated upon or exacerbated by conditions related to sea level rise.

(2) SEA LEVEL RISE RESILIENCY BENEFITS.—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out a study pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall document the potential effects of sea level rise on the project, and benefits of the project relating to sea level rise, during the 50-year period after the date of completion of the project.

#### SEC. 113. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended by inserting “, and projects that use natural features or nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))),” after “nonstructural projects”.

#### SEC. 114. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 103(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “NONSTRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS” and inserting “PROJECTS USING NON-

STRUCTURAL, NATURAL, OR NATURE-BASED FEATURES”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “nonstructural flood control measures” and inserting “a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction measure using a non-structural feature, or a natural feature or nature-based feature (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))),”; and

(B) by striking “cash during construction of the project” and inserting “cash during construction for a nonstructural feature if the costs of land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations for such feature are estimated to exceed 35 percent”.

#### SEC. 115. FEASIBILITY STUDIES; REVIEW OF NATURAL AND NATURE-BASED FEATURES.

(a) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 1149(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2282 note; 132 Stat. 3787) is amended by striking “natural infrastructure alternatives” and inserting “natural feature or nature-based feature alternatives (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (32 U.S.C. 2289a))”.

(b) SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall include in each feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) for a project that contains a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction element, a summary of the natural feature or nature-based feature alternatives that were evaluated in the development of the feasibility report, and, if such alternatives were not included in the recommended plan, an explanation of why such alternatives were not included into the recommended plan.

#### SEC. 116. REPORT ON CORROSION PREVENTION ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report that describes—

(1) the extent to which the Secretary has carried out section 1033 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2350);

(2) the extent to which the Secretary has incorporated corrosion prevention activities (as defined in such section) at water resources development projects constructed or maintained by the Secretary since the date of enactment of such section; and

(3) in instances where the Secretary has not incorporated corrosion prevention activities at such water resources development projects since such date, an explanation as to why such corrosion prevention activities have not been incorporated.

#### SEC. 117. QUANTIFICATION OF BENEFITS FOR FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECTS IN SEISMIC ZONES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the non-Federal interest for a flood risk management project in a seismic zone, the Secretary shall quantify the seismic hazard risk reduction benefits for the project if the non-Federal interest identifies, and the Secretary approves, an acceptable methodology to quantify such benefits.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary shall—

(1) include all associated seismic hazard risk reduction benefits approved by the Secretary in the calculation of the national economic development benefit-cost ratio for a

flood risk management project in a seismic hazard zone for purposes of plan formulation pursuant to section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986; and

(2) seek to maximize the combination of flood risk reduction and seismic hazard risk reduction benefits in the formulation of the national economic development alternative for such project.

#### SEC. 118. FEDERAL INTEREST DETERMINATION.

Section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) FEDERAL INTEREST DETERMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In preparing a feasibility report under subsection (a) for a study that will benefit an economically disadvantaged community, upon request by the non-Federal interest for the study, the Secretary shall first determine the Federal interest in carrying out the study and the projects that may be proposed in the study.

“(2) COST SHARE.—The costs of a determination under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be at Federal expense; and

“(B) shall not exceed \$200,000.

“(3) DEADLINE.—A determination under paragraph (1) shall be completed by not later than 120 days after the date on which funds are made available to the Secretary to carry out the determination.

“(4) TREATMENT.—

“(A) TIMING.—The period during which a determination is being completed under paragraph (1) for a study shall not be included for purposes of the deadline to complete a final feasibility report under section 1001(a)(1) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c(a)(1)).

“(B) COST.—The cost of a determination under paragraph (1) shall not be included for purposes of the maximum Federal cost under section 1001(a)(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c(a)(2)).

“(5) REPORT TO NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—If, based on a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that a study or project is not in the Federal interest because the project will not result, or is unlikely to result, in a recommended plan that will produce national economic development benefits greater than cost, but may result in a technically sound and environmentally acceptable plan that is otherwise consistent with section 904 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2281), the Secretary shall issue a report to the non-Federal interest with recommendations on how the non-Federal interest might modify the proposal such that the project could be in the Federal interest and feasible.”.

#### SEC. 119. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY FLOOD PROTECTION AND HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and implement a pilot program to evaluate opportunities to address the flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

(b) PARTICIPATION IN PILOT PROGRAM.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) publish a notice in the Federal Register that requests from non-Federal interests proposals for the potential feasibility study of a flood risk management project or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction project for an economically disadvantaged community;



(2) upon request of a non-Federal interest for such a project, provide technical assistance to such non-Federal interest in the formulation of a proposal for a potential feasibility study to be submitted to the Secretary under the pilot program; and

(3) review such proposals and select 10 feasibility studies for such projects to be carried out by the Secretary, in coordination with the non-Federal interest, under this pilot program.

(c) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—In selecting a feasibility study under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall consider whether—

(1) the percentage of people living in poverty in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the percentage of people living in poverty in the State, based on census bureau data;

(2) the percentage of families with income above the poverty threshold but below the average household income in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the percentage of the same for the State, based on census bureau data;

(3) the percentage of the population that identifies as belonging to a minority or indigenous group in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the average percentage in the State, based on census bureau data; and

(4) the project is addressing flooding or hurricane or storm damage effects that have a disproportionate impact on a rural community or a community of color (as such term is defined in section 111 of this Act), including Tribal or indigenous peoples.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 105(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215), the Federal share of the cost of a feasibility study carried out under the pilot program shall be 100 percent.

(e) **GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.**—When selecting feasibility studies under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall consider the geographic diversity among proposed projects.

(f) **STUDY REQUIREMENTS.**—Feasibility studies carried out under this subsection shall, to the maximum extent practical, incorporate natural features or nature-based features (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a)), or a combination of such features and nonstructural features, that avoid or reduce at least 50 percent of flood or storm damages in one or more of the alternatives included in the final alternatives evaluated.

(g) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of the selection of each feasibility study under the pilot program.

(h) **COMPLETION.**—Upon completion of a feasibility report for a feasibility study selected to be carried out under this section, the Secretary shall transmit the report to Congress for authorization, and shall include the report in the next annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d).

(i) **SUNSET.**—The authority to commence a feasibility study under this section shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) **REPORT.**—Not later than 5 years and 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public

Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report detailing the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, including—

(1) a description of proposals received from non-Federal interests pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

(2) a description of technical assistance provided to non-Federal interests under subsection (b)(2); and

(3) a description of proposals selected under subsection (b)(3) and criteria used to select such proposals.

(k) **STATE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each of the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

## **SEC. 120. PERMANENT MEASURES TO REDUCE EMERGENCY FLOOD FIGHTING NEEDS FOR COMMUNITIES SUBJECT TO REPETITIVE FLOODING.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AFFECTED COMMUNITY.**—The term “affected community” means a legally constituted public body (as that term is used in section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b))—

(A) with jurisdiction over an area that has been subject to flooding in two or more events in any 10-year period; and

(B) that has received emergency flood-fighting assistance, including construction of temporary barriers by the Secretary, under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n) with respect to such flood events.

(2) **NATURAL FEATURE; NATURE-BASED FEATURE.**—The terms “natural feature” and “nature-based feature” have the meanings given those terms in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a).

(b) **PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program to study, design, and construct water resources development projects through measures involving, among other things, strengthening, raising, extending, realigning, or otherwise modifying existing flood control works, designing new works, and incorporating natural features, nature-based features, or nonstructural features, as appropriate to provide flood and coastal storm risk management to affected communities.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practical, review and, where appropriate, incorporate natural features or nature-based features, or a combination of such features and nonstructural features, that avoid or reduce at least 50 percent of flood or storm damages in one or more of the alternatives included in the final alternatives evaluated.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out a project described in paragraph (1) without further congressional authorization if—

(i) the Secretary determines that the project—

(I) is advisable to reduce the risk of flooding for an affected community; and

(II) produces benefits that are in excess of the estimated costs; and

(ii) the Federal share of the cost of the construction does not exceed \$15,000,000.

(B) **SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION.**—If the Federal share of the cost of a project described in paragraph (1) exceeds \$15,000,000, the Secretary shall submit the project recommendation to Congress for authorization prior to construction, and shall include the project recommendation in the next annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

(C) **FINANCING.**—

(i) **CONTRIBUTIONS.**—If, based on a study carried out pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that a project described in paragraph (1) will not produce benefits greater than cost, the Secretary shall allow the affected community to pay, or provide contributions equal to, an amount sufficient to make the remaining costs of design and construction of the project equal to the estimated value of the benefits of the project.

(ii) **EFFECT ON NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—Amounts provided by an affected community under clause (i) shall be in addition to any payments or contributions the affected community is required to provide toward the remaining costs of design and construction of the project under section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

(4) **ABILITY TO PAY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any cost-sharing agreement for a project entered into pursuant to this section shall be subject to the ability of the affected community to pay.

(B) **DETERMINATION.**—The ability of any affected community to pay shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary.

(C) **EFFECT OF REDUCTION.**—Any reduction in the non-Federal share of the cost of a project described in paragraph (1) as a result of a determination under this paragraph shall not be included in the Federal share for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3).

## **SEC. 121. EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following—

“(5) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—

“(A) **DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 180 days after receiving, from a non-Federal sponsor of a project to repair or rehabilitate a flood control work described in paragraph (1), a request to initiate a feasibility study to further modify the relevant flood control work to provide for an increased level of protection, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal sponsor a written decision on whether the Secretary has the authority under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) to undertake the requested feasibility study.

“(B) **RECOMMENDATION.**—If the Secretary determines under subparagraph (B) that the Secretary does not have the authority to undertake the requested feasibility study, the Secretary shall include the request for a feasibility study in the annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “LEVEE OWNERS MANUAL” and inserting “ELIGIBILITY”;

(B) in paragraph (1), in the heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “LEVEE OWNER’S MANUAL”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **COMPLIANCE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding the status of compliance of a non-Federal interest with the requirements of a levee owner’s manual described in paragraph (1), or with any other eligibility requirement established by the Secretary related to the maintenance and upkeep responsibilities of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall consider the non-Federal interest to be eligible for repair and rehabilitation assistance under this section if the non-Federal interest—

“(i) enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that identifies any items of deferred or inadequate maintenance and upkeep identified by the Secretary prior to the natural disaster; and

“(ii) pays, during performance of the repair and rehabilitation work, all costs to address—

“(I) any items of deferred or inadequate maintenance and upkeep identified by the Secretary; and

“(II) any repair or rehabilitation work necessary to address damage the Secretary attributes to such deferred or inadequate maintenance or upkeep.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary may only enter into one agreement under subparagraph (A) with any non-Federal interest.

“(C) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into agreements under paragraph (2) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.”; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “this subsection” and inserting “paragraph (1)”.

#### SEC. 122. STUDY ON NATURAL INFRASTRUCTURE AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS.

(A) DEFINITION OF NATURAL FEATURE AND NATURE-BASED FEATURE.—In this section, the terms “natural feature” and “nature-based feature” have the meanings given those terms in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)).

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, a report on the results of a study on the consideration by the Secretary of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in the study of the feasibility of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of guidance or instructions issued, and other measures taken, by the Secretary to consider natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in project feasibility studies;

(2) an assessment, based on information from relevant Federal and non-Federal sources, of—

(A) the costs, benefits, and effects associated with natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features recommended by the Secretary for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration; and

(B) the effectiveness of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features;

(3) an analysis of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration that have incorporated natural infrastructure, natural features, or nature-based features to identify best practices, including for measuring project benefits and costs;

(4) a description of any statutory, fiscal, regulatory, or other policy barriers to the appropriate consideration and use of a full array of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in carrying out feasibility studies and projects; and

(5) any recommendations for changes to law, or to fiscal, regulatory, or other policies, to improve the use of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based

features by the Corps of Engineers in carrying out feasibility studies and projects.

#### SEC. 123. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

Section 6002 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1349) is amended to read as follows:

##### “SEC. 6002. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

“(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of projects constructed by the Secretary for which the Secretary continues to have financial or operational responsibility.

“(b) INVENTORY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, the Secretary shall, based on the assessment carried out under subsection (a), develop an inventory of projects or portions of projects—

“(1) that are not needed for the missions of the Corps of Engineers;

“(2) the modification of which, including though the use of natural features or nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)), could improve the sustainable operations of the project, or reduce operation and maintenance costs for the project; or

“(3) that are no longer having project purposes adequately met by the Corps of Engineers, because of deferment of maintenance or other challenges, and the divestment of which to a non-Federal entity could better meet the local and regional needs for operation and maintenance.

“(c) CRITERIA.—In conducting the assessment under subsection (a) and developing the inventory under subsection (b), the Secretary shall use the following criteria:

“(1) The extent to which the project aligns with the current missions of the Corps of Engineers.

“(2) The economic and environmental impacts of the project on existing communities in the vicinity of the project.

“(3) The extent to which the divestment or modification of the project could reduce operation and maintenance costs of the Corps of Engineers.

“(4) The extent to which the divestment or modification of the project is in the public interest.

“(5) The extent to which investment of additional Federal resources in the project proposed for divestment or modification, including investment needed to bring the project to a good state of repair, is in the public interest.

“(6) The extent to which the authorized purpose of the project is no longer being met.

“(d) RECOMMENDATIONS OF NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—A non-Federal interest for a project may recommend that the Secretary include such project in the assessment or inventory required under this section.

“(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon completion of the inventory required by subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available, a report containing the findings of the Secretary with respect to the assessment and inventory required under this section.

“(2) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall list in an appendix any recommendation of a non-Federal interest made with respect to a project under subsection (d) that the Secretary determines not to include in the inventory developed under subsection (b), based on the criteria in subsection (c), including information about the request and the reasons for the Secretary’s determination.”.

#### SEC. 124. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MULTIPURPOSE PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, in coordination with non-Federal interests, should maximize the development, evaluation, and recommendation of project alternatives for future water resources development projects that produce multiple project benefits, such as navigation, flood risk management, and ecosystem restoration benefits, including through the use of natural or nature-based features and the beneficial reuse of dredged material.

#### SEC. 125. BENEFICIAL REUSE OF DREDGED MATERIAL; DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(A) NATIONAL POLICY ON THE BENEFICIAL REUSE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States for the Corps of Engineers to maximize the beneficial reuse, in an environmentally acceptable manner, of suitable dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects.

(2) PLACEMENT OF DREDGED MATERIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating the placement of dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the suitability of the dredged material for a full range of beneficial uses; and

(ii) the economic and environmental benefits, efficiencies, and impacts (including the effects on living coral) of using the dredged material for beneficial uses, including, in the case of beneficial reuse activities that involve more than one water resources development project, the benefits, efficiencies, and impacts that result from the combined activities.

(B) CALCULATION OF FEDERAL STANDARD.—The economic benefits and efficiencies from the beneficial use of dredged material considered by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be included in any determination relating to the “Federal standard” by the Secretary under section 335.7 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations for the placement or disposal of such material.

(b) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM PROJECTS.—Section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking “20” and inserting “30”.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, in selecting projects for the beneficial reuse of dredged materials under section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note), should ensure the thorough evaluation of project submissions from rural, small, and economically disadvantaged communities.

(c) FIVE-YEAR REGIONAL DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the District Commander of each district of the Corps of Engineers that obtains dredged material through the construction or operation and maintenance of a water resources development project shall, at Federal expense, develop and submit to the Secretary a 5-year dredged material management plan in coordination with relevant State agencies and stakeholders.

(2) SCOPE.—Each plan developed under this subsection shall include—

(A) a dredged material budget for each watershed or littoral system within the district;

(B) an estimate of the amount of dredged material likely to be obtained through the

construction or operation and maintenance of all water resources development projects projected to be carried out within the district during the 5-year period following submission of the plan, and the estimated timing for obtaining such dredged material;

(C) an identification of potential water resources development projects projected to be carried out within the district during such 5-year period that are suitable for, or that require, the placement of dredged material, and an estimate of the amount of dredged material placement capacity of such projects;

(D) an evaluation of—

(i) the suitability of the dredged material for a full range of beneficial uses; and

(ii) the economic and environmental benefits, efficiencies, and impacts (including the effects on living coral) of using the dredged material for beneficial uses, including, in the case of beneficial reuse activities that involve more than one water resources development project, the benefits, efficiencies, and impacts that result from the combined activities; and

(E) the district-wide goals for beneficial reuse of the dredged material, including any expected cost savings from aligning and coordinating multiple projects (including projects across Corps districts) in the reuse of the dredged material.

(3) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—In developing each plan under this subsection, each District Commander shall provide notice and an opportunity for public comment.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Upon submission of each plan to the Secretary under this subsection, each District Commander shall make the plan publicly available, including on a publicly available website.

(d) **DREDGE PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **REVISIONS.**—Section 1111 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “for the operation and maintenance of harbors and inland harbors” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “for the operation and maintenance of—

“(1) harbors and inland harbors referred to in section 210(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)); or

“(2) inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “or inland harbors” and inserting “, inland harbors, or inland or intracoastal waterways”.

(2) **COORDINATION WITH EXISTING AUTHORITIES.**—The Secretary may carry out the dredge pilot program authorized by section 1111 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) in coordination with Federal regional dredge demonstration programs in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 126. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION FOR ANADROMOUS FISH.**

(a) **ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT AND PASSAGE.**—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ANADROMOUS FISH HABITAT AND PASSAGE.**—

“(A) **MEASURES.**—A project under this section may include measures to improve habitat or passage for anadromous fish, including—

“(i) installing fish bypass structures on small water diversions;

“(ii) modifying tide gates; and

“(iii) restoring or reconnecting floodplains and wetlands that are important for anadromous fish habitat or passage.

“(B) **BENEFITS.**—A project that includes measures under this paragraph shall be formulated to maximize benefits for the anadromous fish species benefitted by the project.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The Secretary shall give projects that include measures described in subsection (a)(3) equal priority for implementation as other projects under this section.”.

#### **SEC. 127. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

Section 7001(c)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d(c)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(3) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) the Secretary shall not include proposals in the appendix of the annual report that otherwise meet the criteria for inclusion in the annual report solely on the basis that the proposals are for the purposes of navigation, flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, or municipal or agricultural water supply; and”.

#### **SEC. 128. HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration program to determine the causes of, and implement measures to effectively detect, prevent, treat, and eliminate, harmful algal blooms associated with water resources development projects.

(b) **CONSULTATION; USE OF EXISTING DATA AND PROGRAM AUTHORITIES.**—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the heads of appropriate Federal and State agencies; and

(2) make maximum use of existing Federal and State data and ongoing programs and activities of Federal and State agencies, including the activities of the Secretary carried out through the Engineer Research and Development Center pursuant to section 1109 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 610 note).

(c) **FOCUS AREAS.**—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall undertake program activities related to harmful algal blooms in the Great Lakes, the tidal and inland waters of the State of New Jersey, the coastal and tidal waters of the State of Louisiana, the waterways of the counties that comprise the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, and Lake Okeechobee, Florida.

#### **SEC. 129. UPDATE ON INVASIVE SPECIES POLICY GUIDANCE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall periodically update the Invasive Species Policy Guidance, developed under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610) and the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), in accordance with the most recent National Invasive Species Council Management Plan developed pursuant to Executive Order 13112.

(b) **INCLUSION.**—The Secretary may include in the updated guidance invasive species specific efforts at federally authorized water resources development projects located in—

(1) high-altitude lakes; and

(2) the Tennessee and Cumberland River basins.

#### **SEC. 130. REPORT ON DEBRIS REMOVAL.**

Section 1210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3808) is amended to read as follows:

#### **“SEC. 1210. REPORT ON DEBRIS REMOVAL.**

“Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report that describes—

“(1) the extent to which, during the 10 fiscal years prior to such date of enactment, the Secretary has carried out section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a);

“(2) how the Secretary has evaluated potential work to be carried out under that section; and

“(3) the extent to which the Secretary plans to start, continue, or complete debris removal activities in the 3 years following submission of the report.”.

#### **SEC. 131. MISSOURI RIVER INTERCEPTION-REARING COMPLEX CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the effects of any interception-rearing complex constructed on the Missouri River on—

(1) flood risk management and navigation; and

(2) the population recovery of the pallid sturgeon, including baseline population counts.

(b) **NO ADDITIONAL IRC CONSTRUCTION.**—The Secretary may not authorize construction of an interception-rearing complex on the Missouri River until the Secretary—

(1) submits the report required by subsection (a);

(2) acting through the Engineer Research and Development Center, conducts further research on interception-rearing complex design, including any effects on existing flows, flood risk management, and navigation; and

(3) develops a plan—

(A) to repair dikes and revetments that are affecting flood risk and bank erosion; and

(B) to establish, repair, or improve water control structures at the headworks of constructed shallow water habitat side-channels.

(c) **FUTURE IRC CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for comment from the public and the Governor of each affected State on any proposals to construct an interception-rearing complex after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **PERIOD.**—The public comment period required by paragraph (1) shall be not less than 90 days for each proposal to construct an interception-rearing complex on the Missouri River.

#### **SEC. 132. COST AND BENEFIT FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(a)(2)(B) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(I), by inserting “, or provide contributions equal to,” after “pay”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “AND CONTRIBUTIONS” after “OF PAYMENTS”; and

(B) by inserting “or contributions” after “Non-Federal payments”; and

(C) by inserting “or contributions” after “non-Federal payments”.

(b) **CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.**—Section 1161(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 701n note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the “three fiscal years preceding” and inserting “five fiscal years preceding”; and

(B) by striking “last day of the third fiscal year” and inserting “last day of the fifth fiscal year”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, or provide contributions equal to,” before “an amount sufficient”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The Secretary determines that the damage to the structure was not as a result of negligent operation or maintenance.”

#### SEC. 133. MATERIALS, SERVICES, AND FUNDS FOR REPAIR, RESTORATION, OR REHABILITATION OF PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any area covered by an emergency or major disaster declaration declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Secretary is authorized to accept and use materials, services, and funds, during the period the declaration is in effect, from a non-Federal interest or private entity to repair, restore, or rehabilitate a federally authorized water resources development project, and to provide reimbursement to such non-Federal interest or private entity for such materials, services, and funds, in the Secretary's sole discretion, and subject to the availability of appropriations, if the Secretary determines that reimbursement is in the public interest.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may only reimburse for the use of materials or services accepted under this section if such materials or services meet the Secretary's specifications and comply with all applicable laws and regulations that would apply if such materials and services were acquired by the Secretary, including sections 3141 through 3148 and 3701 through 3708 of title 40, United States Code, section 8302 of title 41, United States Code, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

##### (c) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the acceptance of materials, services, or funds under this section, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest or private entity shall enter into an agreement that specifies—

(A) the non-Federal interest or private entity shall hold and save the United States free from any and all damages that arise from use of materials or services of the non-Federal interest or private entity, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors;

(B) the non-Federal interest or private entity shall certify that the materials or services comply with all applicable laws and regulations under subsection (b); and

(C) any other term or condition required by the Secretary.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If an agreement under paragraph (1) was not entered prior to materials or services being contributed, a non-Federal interest or private entity shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary that—

(A) specifies the value, as determined by the Secretary, of those materials or services contributed and eligible for reimbursement; and

(B) ensures that the materials or services comply with subsection (b) and paragraph (1).

#### SEC. 134. LEVEE SAFETY.

Section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “(d) IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each levee included in an inventory established under subsection (b) or for which the Secretary has conducted a review under subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

“(A) identify the specific engineering and maintenance deficiencies, if any; and

“(B) describe the recommended remedies to correct each deficiency identified under subparagraph (A), and, if requested by owner of a non-Federal levee, the associated costs of those remedies.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In identifying deficiencies and describing remedies for a levee under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with relevant non-Federal interests, including by providing an opportunity for comment by those non-Federal interests.”

#### SEC. 135. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) has an emergency action plan that—

“(I) is approved by the relevant State dam safety agency; or

“(II) is in conformance with State law and pending approval by the relevant State dam safety agency;”; and

(ii) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) fails to meet minimum dam safety standards of the State in which the dam is located, as determined by the State; and

“(v) poses an unacceptable risk to the public, as determined by the Administrator, in consultation with the Board.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting “under a hydropower project with an authorized installed capacity of greater than 1.5 megawatts” after “dam”; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR” and inserting “ELIGIBLE SUBRECIPIENT”; and

(B) by striking “The term ‘non-Federal sponsor’” and inserting “The term ‘eligible subrecipient’”.

(b) REHABILITATION OF HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL DAMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Section 8A(a) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(a)) is amended by striking “to non-Federal sponsors” and inserting “to States with dam safety programs”.

(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Section 8A(b) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(b)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “for a project may be used for” and inserting “to a State may be used by the State to award grants to eligible subrecipients for”.

(3) AWARD OF GRANTS.—Section 8A(c) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “State”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “an eligible high hazard potential dam to a non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “eligible high hazard potential dams to a State”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “PROJECT GRANT” and inserting “GRANT”; and

(II) by striking “project grant agreement with the non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “grant agreement with the State”; and

(III) by striking “project,” and inserting “projects for which the grant is awarded,”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) GRANT ASSURANCE.—As part of a grant agreement under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall require that each eligible subrecipient to which the State awards a grant under this section provides an assurance, with respect to the dam to be rehabilitated by the eligible subrecipient, that the dam owner will carry out a plan for maintenance of the dam during the expected life of the dam.”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “A grant provided under this section shall not exceed” and inserting “A State may not

award a grant to an eligible subrecipient under this section that exceeds, for any 1 dam.”.

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8A(d) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(d)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “to an eligible subrecipient” after “this section”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR” and inserting “ELIGIBLE SUBRECIPIENT”; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the non-Federal sponsor shall” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient shall, with respect to the dam to be rehabilitated by the eligible subrecipient”; and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) demonstrate that the community in which the dam is located participates in, and complies with, all applicable Federal flood insurance programs, including demonstrating that such community is participating in the National Flood Insurance Program, and is not on probation, suspended, or withdrawn from such Program;”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking “have” and inserting “beginning not later than 2 years after the date on which the Administrator publishes criteria for hazard mitigation plans under paragraph (3), demonstrate that the Tribal or local government with jurisdiction over the area in which the dam is located has”; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking “50-year period” and inserting “expected life of the dam”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN CRITERIA.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall publish criteria for hazard mitigation plans required under paragraph (2)(B).”.

(5) FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 8A(e) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years” each place it appears; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) PLAN CRITERIA AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall provide criteria, and may provide technical support, for the development and implementation of floodplain management plans prepared under this subsection.”.

(6) CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8A(i)(1) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f-2(i)(1)) is amended by striking “a non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient”.

#### SEC. 136. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED PUMP STATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PUMP STATION.—The term “eligible pump station” means a pump station—

(A) constructed, in whole or in part, by the Corps of Engineers for flood risk management purposes;

(B) that the Secretary has identified as having a major deficiency; and

(C) the failure of which the Secretary has determined would impair the function of a flood risk management project constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) REHABILITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “rehabilitation”, with respect to an eligible pump station, means to address a major deficiency of

the eligible pump station caused by long-term degradation of the foundation, construction materials, or engineering systems or components of the eligible pump station.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “rehabilitation”, with respect to an eligible pump station, includes—

(i) the incorporation into the eligible pump station of—

- (I) current design standards;
- (II) efficiency improvements; and
- (III) associated drainage; and

(ii) increasing the capacity of the eligible pump station, subject to the condition that the increase shall—

(I) significantly decrease the risk of loss of life and property damage; or

(II) decrease total lifecycle rehabilitation costs for the eligible pump station.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary may carry out rehabilitation of an eligible pump station, if the Secretary determines that the rehabilitation is feasible.

(c) **COST SHARING.**—The non-Federal interest for the eligible pump station shall—

(1) provide 35 percent of the cost of rehabilitation of an eligible pump station carried out under this section; and

(2) provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, and necessary relocations associated with the rehabilitation described in subparagraph (A), at no cost to the Federal Government.

(d) **AGREEMENT REQUIRED.**—The rehabilitation of an eligible pump station pursuant to this section shall be initiated only after a non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary—

(1) to pay the non-Federal share of the costs of rehabilitation under subsection (c); and

(2) to pay 100 percent of the operation and maintenance costs of the rehabilitated eligible pump station, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

(e) **TREATMENT.**—The rehabilitation of an eligible pump station pursuant to this section shall not be considered to be a separable element of the associated flood risk management project constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### **SEC. 137. NON-FEDERAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.**

Section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2026”;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “2023” and inserting “2026”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) **IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of the pilot program that, to the extent practicable, identifies—

“(i) the metrics for measuring the success of the pilot program;

“(ii) a process for identifying future projects to participate in the pilot program;

“(iii) measures to address the risks of a non-Federal interest constructing projects under the pilot program, including which entity bears the risk for projects that fail to meet the Corps of Engineers standards for design or quality;

“(iv) the laws and regulations that a non-Federal interest must follow in carrying out a project under the pilot program; and

“(v) which entity bears the risk in the event that a project carried out under the pilot program fails to be carried out in ac-

cordance with the project authorization or this subsection.

“(B) **NEW PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may not enter into a project partnership agreement under this subsection during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ending on the date on which the Secretary issues the guidance under subparagraph (A).”.

#### **SEC. 138. DEFINITION OF ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance defining the term “economically disadvantaged community” for the purposes of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In defining the term “economically disadvantaged community” under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the criteria under paragraphs (1) or (2) of section 301(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161), to the extent that such criteria are applicable in relation to the development of water resources development projects.

(c) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—In developing the guidance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide notice and an opportunity for public comment.

#### **SEC. 139. COST SHARING PROVISIONS FOR TERRITORIES AND INDIAN TRIBES.**

Section 1156(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310(b)) is amended by striking “for inflation” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “on an annual basis for inflation.”.

#### **SEC. 140. FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES.**

Section 103(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except as” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **RENEGOTIATION OF TERMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest may renegotiate the terms and conditions of an eligible deferred payment, including—

“(i) permitting the non-Federal contribution to be made without interest, pursuant to paragraph (1);

“(ii) recalculation of the interest rate;

“(iii) full or partial forgiveness of interest accrued during the period of construction; and

“(iv) a credit against construction interest for a non-Federal investment that benefits the completion or performance of the project or separable element.

“(B) **ELIGIBLE DEFERRED PAYMENT.**—An eligible deferred payment agreement under subparagraph (A) is an agreement for which—

“(i) the non-Federal contribution was made with interest;

“(ii) the period of project construction exceeds 10 years from the execution of a project partnership agreement or appropriation of funds; and

“(iii) the construction interest exceeds \$45,000,000.

“(C) **CREDIT FOR NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to credit any costs incurred by the non-Federal interest (including in-kind contributions) to remedy a design or construction deficiency of a covered project or separable element toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the covered project, if the Secretary determines the remedy to be integral to the

completion or performance of the covered project.

“(ii) **CREDIT OF COSTS.**—If the non-Federal interest incurs costs or in-kind contributions for a project to remedy a design or construction deficiency of a project or separable element which has a 100 percent Federal cost share, and the Secretary determines the remedy to be integral to the completion or performance of the project, the Secretary is authorized to credit such costs to any interest accrued on a deferred non-Federal contribution.”.

#### **SEC. 141. REVIEW OF CONTRACTING POLICIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall complete a review of the policies, guidelines, and regulations of the Corps of Engineers for the development of contractual agreements between the Secretary and non-Federal interests and utilities associated with the construction of water resources development projects.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after completing the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

(1) a summary of the results of the review; and

(2) public guidance on best practices for non-Federal interest to use when writing or developing contractual agreements with the Secretary and utilities.

(c) **PROVISION OF GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall provide the best practices guidance included under subsection (b)(2) to non-Federal interests prior to the development of contractual agreements.

#### **SEC. 142. BUY AMERICA.**

With respect to all Corps of Engineers construction and rehabilitation contracts to be awarded after the date of enactment of this Act, the steel components furnished and delivered under such contracts shall be manufactured or fabricated in whole or substantial part in the United States with steel produced or made in the United States, its territories, or possessions.

#### **SEC. 143. ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**

Concurrent with each report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works a report that provides for an accounting of all outstanding feasibility studies being conducted by the Secretary, including, for each such study, its length, cost, and expected completion date.

#### **TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS**

#### **SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development” submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress:

(1) **TONTO CREEK, GILA RIVER, ARIZONA.**—Project for flood risk management, Tonto Creek, Gila River, Arizona.

(2) **SULPHUR RIVER, ARKANSAS AND TEXAS.**—Project for ecosystem restoration, Sulphur River, Arkansas and Texas.

(3) **CABLE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—Project for flood risk management, water supply, and related benefits, Cable Creek, California.

(4) DEL MAR BLUFFS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for shoreline stabilization, Del Mar Bluffs, San Diego County, California.

(5) REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for water conservation and water supply, Redbank and Fancher Creeks, California.

(6) RIO HONDO CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Rio Hondo Channel, San Gabriel River, California.

(7) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for coastal storm damage reduction, Southern California.

(8) SHINGLE CREEK AND KISSIMMEE RIVER, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and water storage, Shingle Creek and Kissimmee River, Osceola County, Florida.

(9) ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND LAKE JESUP, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, St. John's River and Lake Jesup, Florida.

(10) WAIMEA RIVER, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management, Waimea River, Kauai, Hawaii.

(11) CHICAGO AREA WATERWAYS SYSTEM, ILLINOIS.—Project for ecosystem restoration, recreation, and other purposes, Illinois River, Chicago River, Calumet River, Grand Calumet River, Little Calumet River, and other waterways in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois.

(12) FOX RIVER, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood risk management, Fox River, Illinois.

(13) LOWER MISSOURI RIVER, KANSAS.—Project for bank stabilization and navigation, Lower Missouri River, Sioux City, Kansas.

(14) TANGIPAHOA PARISH, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood risk management, Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana.

(15) KENT NARROWS AND CHESTER RIVER, MARYLAND.—Project for navigation, Kent Narrows and Chester River, Queen Anne's County, Maryland.

(16) BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Boston, Massachusetts, pursuant to the comprehensive study authorized under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

(17) LOWER ST. CROIX RIVER, MINNESOTA.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Lower St. Croix River, Minnesota.

(18) ESCATAWPA RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Escatawpa River, Jackson County, Mississippi.

(19) LONG BEACH, BAY ST. LOUIS AND MISSISSIPPI SOUND, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and flood risk management, Long Beach, Bay St. Louis and Mississippi Sound, Mississippi.

(20) PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

(21) TALLAHOMA AND TALLAHALA CREEKS, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for flood risk management, Leaf River, Jones County, Mississippi.

(22) LOWER OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MISSOURI.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Osage River Basin, Missouri.

(23) UPPER BASIN AND STONY BROOK (GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN), RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY.—Reevaluation of the Upper Basin and Stony Brook portions of the project for flood control, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119), including the evaluation of nonstructural measures to achieve the project purpose.

(24) LAKE ONTARIO SHORELINE, NEW YORK.—Project for coastal storm resiliency, Lake Ontario shoreline, New York.

(25) WADING RIVER CREEK, NEW YORK.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, flood risk management, naviga-

tion, and ecosystem restoration, Wading River Creek, New York.

(26) REEL POINT PRESERVE, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation and shoreline stabilization, Reel Point Preserve, New York.

(27) GOLDSMITH INLET, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Goldsmith Inlet, New York.

(28) TUSCARAWAS RIVER BASIN, OHIO.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio.

(29) LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN (TURNING BASIN), OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—Project to improve and add turning basins for the project for navigation, Columbia River Channel, Oregon and Washington, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 280).

(30) WILLIAMSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood risk management and levee rehabilitation, greater Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

(31) CITY OF CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Project for tidal- and inland-related flood risk management, Charleston, South Carolina.

(32) TENNESSEE AND CUMBERLAND RIVER BASINS, TENNESSEE.—Project to deter, impede, or restrict the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species in the Tennessee and Cumberland River Basins, Tennessee.

(33) SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TEXAS.—Modification of the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Arthur and Orange County, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1184), and authorized as a separable element of the project for Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, authorized by item 3 of section 1401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3838), to reduce the risk of flooding through the construction of improvements to interior drainage.

(34) PORT OF VICTORIA, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, Port of Victoria, Texas.

(35) LOWER FOX RIVER BASIN, WISCONSIN.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Lower Fox River Basin, Wisconsin.

(36) UPPER FOX RIVER AND WOLF RIVER, WISCONSIN.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Upper Fox River and Wolf River, Wisconsin.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary shall consider any study carried out by the Secretary to formulate the modifications to the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Arthur and Orange County, Texas, identified in subsection (a)(33) to be a continuation of the study carried out for Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, Texas, authorized by a resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, approved June 23, 2004, and funded by title IV of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, under the heading “Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Construction” (Public Law 115-123; 132 Stat. 76).

#### SEC. 202. EXPEDITED COMPLETIONS.

(a) FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study for each of the following projects, and if the Secretary determines that the project is justified in a completed report, may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project:

(1) Project for navigation, St. George Harbor, Alaska.

(2) Project for shoreline stabilization, Aunu'u Harbor, American Samoa.

(3) Project for shoreline stabilization, Tutuila Island, American Samoa.

(4) Project for flood risk management, Lower Santa Cruz River, Arizona.

(5) Project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes, Coyote Valley Dam, California.

(6) Project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Del Rosa Channel, city of San Bernardino, California.

(7) Project for flood risk management, Lower Cache Creek, California.

(8) Project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Mission-Zanja Channel, cities of San Bernardino and Redlands, California.

(9) Project for shoreline protection, Ocean-side, California, authorized pursuant to section 414 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2636; 121 Stat. 1176).

(10) Project for flood risk management, Prado Basin, California.

(11) Project to modify the project for navigation, San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California.

(12) Project to modify the Seven Oaks Dam, California, portion of the project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113; 101 Stat. 1329-111; 104 Stat. 4611; 110 Stat. 3713; 121 Stat. 1115), to include water conservation as an authorized purpose.

(13) Project to modify the project for navigation, Delaware River Mainstem and Channel Deepening, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802; 113 Stat. 300; 114 Stat. 2602), to include the construction of a turning basin located near the Packer Avenue Marine Terminal.

(14) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project Canal 111 (C-111), South Dade County, Florida.

(15) Project for comprehensive hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Chicago, Illinois, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664; 113 Stat. 302).

(16) Project for flood risk management, Wheaton, DuPage County, Illinois.

(17) Project for flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Blue River Basin, Kansas City, Kansas, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on September 24, 2008 (docket number 2803).

(18) Project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries east of the Mississippi River, Louisiana.

(19) Project for coastal storm risk management, Upper Barataria Basin, Louisiana.

(20) Project to replace the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges, Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

(21) Project to deepen the project for navigation, Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4094).

(22) Project for flood risk management, Rahway River Basin, New Jersey.

(23) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Highlands, New Jersey.

(24) Project for navigation, Shark River, New Jersey.

(25) Project for flood risk management, Rondout Creek-Walkkill River Watershed, New York, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on May 2, 2007 (docket number 2776).

(26) Project for ecosystem restoration and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Spring Creek South (Howard Beach), Queens, New York.

(27) Project to resolve increased silting and shoaling adjacent to the Federal channel, Port of Bandon, Coquille River, Oregon.

(28) Project for flood control, 42nd Street Levee, Springfield, Oregon, being carried out



under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(29) Project for ecosystem restoration, Hood River at the confluence with the Columbia River, Oregon.

(30) Project for flood risk management, Rio Culebrinas, Puerto Rico.

(31) Project for flood risk management, Rio Grande de Manati, Puerto Rico.

(32) Project for flood risk management, Rio Guayanilla, Puerto Rico.

(33) Project for flood risk management, Dorchester County, South Carolina.

(34) Project for navigation, Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina.

(35) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina.

(36) Project to modify the projects for navigation and other purposes, Old Hickory Lock and Dam and the Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, Cumberland River, Tennessee, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636), to add flood risk management as an authorized purpose.

(37) Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and related purposes, Lower Rio Grande River, Cameron County, Texas, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on May 21, 2003 (docket number 2710).

(38) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Bolongo Bay, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(39) Project for flood risk management, Savan Gut Phase II, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(40) Project for flood risk management, Turpentine Run, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(41) Project for navigation, North Landing Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Virginia.

(b) **POST-AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall expedite completion of a post-authorization change report for the following projects:

(1) Project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona.

(2) Project for flood control, San Luis Rey River, California.

(3) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project Canal 111 (C-111), South Dade County, Florida.

(4) Project for ecosystem restoration, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Caloosahatchee River C-43, West Basin Storage Reservoir, Florida.

(5) Project for flood risk management, Des Moines Levee System, including Birdland Park Levee, Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Des Moines, Iowa.

(c) **WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.**—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of an assessment under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a), for the following:

(1) Kansas River Basin, Kansas.

(2) Merrimack River Basin, Massachusetts.

(d) **DISPOSITION STUDIES.**—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a disposition study, carried out under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), for the following:

(1) The disposition of the project for Salinas Reservoir (Santa Margarita Lake), California.

(2) The partial disposition of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock facility and surrounding real property, in accordance with the requirements of section 2010 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1270; 132 Stat. 3812).

#### SEC. 203. FEASIBILITY STUDY MODIFICATIONS.

(a) **SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA.**—Section 142 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2930) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, and along the ocean shoreline of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties,” after “Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers”;

(2) by inserting “and, with respect to the bay and ocean shorelines of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties, the feasibility of and the Federal interest in providing measures to adapt to rising sea levels” after “tidal and fluvial flooding”;

(3) by striking “investigation” and inserting in its place “investigations”; and

(4) by inserting after “San Francisco Bay region” the following: “and, with respect to the bay and ocean shorelines and streams running to the bay and ocean shorelines of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties, the effects of proposed measures or improvements on the local economy; habitat restoration, enhancement, or expansion efforts or opportunities; public infrastructure protection and improvement; stormwater runoff capacity and control measures, including those that may mitigate flooding; erosion of beaches and coasts; and any other measures or improvements relevant to adapting to rising sea levels”.

(b) **SACRAMENTO RIVER, SOUTHERN SUTTER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**—The study for flood control and allied purposes for the Sacramento River Basin, authorized by section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1197), is modified to authorize the Secretary to conduct a study for flood risk management, southern Sutter County between the Sacramento River and Sutter Bypass, California.

(c) **SALTON SEA, CALIFORNIA.**—In carrying out the program to implement projects to restore the Salton Sea, California, authorized by section 3032 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1113; 130 Stat. 1677), the Secretary is authorized to carry out a study for the construction of a perimeter lake, or a northern or southern subset thereof, for the Salton Sea, California.

(d) **NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR AND TRIBUTARIES, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.**—The study for flood and storm damage reduction for the New York and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries project, authorized by the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132), and being carried out pursuant to the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2), is modified to require the Secretary to—

(1) evaluate and address the impacts of low-frequency precipitation and sea-level rise on the study area;

(2) consult with affected communities; and

(3) ensure the study is carried out in accordance with section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c).

#### SEC. 204. SELMA, ALABAMA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

(1) provides an update on the study for flood risk management and riverbank stabilization, Selma, Alabama, authorized by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works and Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on June 7, 1961, and April 28, 1936, respectively, the completion of which the Secretary was required to expedite by section 1203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3803); and

(2) identifies project alternatives necessary to—

(A) assure the preservation of cultural and historic values associated with national historic landmarks within the study area; and

(B) provide flood risk management for economically disadvantaged communities within the study area.

#### SEC. 205. COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER, YOLO BYPASS, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Sacramento River in the vicinity of the Yolo Bypass System, California, to identify actions to be undertaken by the Secretary for the comprehensive management of the Yolo Bypass System for the purposes of flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation.

(b) **CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—

(1) **CONSULTATION.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with the Governor of the State of California, applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, non-Federal interests, the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Partnership, and other stakeholders.

(2) **USE OF EXISTING DATA AND PRIOR STUDIES.**—To the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, the Secretary may—

(A) make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by the entities identified in paragraph (1); and

(B) incorporate—

(i) relevant information from prior studies and projects carried out by the Secretary within the study area; and

(ii) the latest technical data and scientific approaches to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions.

(c) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary may develop a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Yolo Bypass System for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under paragraph (1)(D) shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive study authorized under subsection (a).

(d) **COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the results of the comprehensive study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations developed under subsection (c);

(2) any additional, site-specific areas within the Yolo Bypass System where additional study for flood risk management or ecosystem restoration projects is recommended by the Secretary; and

(3) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **YOLO BYPASS SYSTEM.**—The term “Yolo Bypass System” means the system of weirs,

levees, bypass structures, and other water resources development projects in California's Sacramento River Valley, extending from the Fremont Weir near Woodland, California, to the Sacramento River near Rio Vista, California, authorized pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144; 39 Stat. 949).

(2) **YOLO BYPASS AND CACHE CLOUGH PARTNERSHIP.**—The term “Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Partnership” means the group of parties to the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Memorandum of Understanding, effective May 2016, regarding collaboration and cooperation in the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough region.

**SEC. 206. LAKE OKEECHOBEE REGULATION SCHEDULE, FLORIDA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the review of the Lake Okeechobee regulation schedule pursuant to section 1106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3773), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the implications of prohibiting releases from Lake Okeechobee through the S-308 and S-80 lock and dam structures on the operation of the lake in accordance with unauthorized purposes and seek to minimize unnecessary releases to coastal estuaries; and

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the ongoing efforts of Federal and State agencies responsible for monitoring, forecasting, and notification of cyanobacteria levels in Lake Okeechobee.

(b) **MONTHLY REPORT.**—Each month, the Secretary shall make public a report, which may be based on the Water Management Daily Operational Reports, disclosing the volumes of water deliveries to or discharges from Lake Okeechobee & Vicinity, Water Conservation Area I, Water Conservation Area II, Water Conservation Area III, East Coast Canals, and the South Dade Conveyance. Such report shall be aggregated and reported in a format designed for the general public, using maps or other widely understood communication tools.

(c) **EFFECT.**—In carrying out the evaluation under subsection (a)(1), nothing shall be construed to authorize any new purpose for the management of Lake Okeechobee or authorize the Secretary to affect any existing authorized purpose, including flood protection and management of Lake Okeechobee to provide water supply for all authorized users.

**SEC. 207. GREAT LAKES COASTAL RESILIENCY STUDY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the comprehensive assessment of water resources needs for the Great Lakes System under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a), as required by section 1219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811), the Secretary shall—

(1) taking into account recent high lake levels within the Great Lakes, assess and make recommendations to Congress on—

(A) coastal storm and flood risk management measures, including measures that use natural features and nature-based features, as those terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a);

(B) operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes Navigation System, as such term is defined in section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238);

(C) ecosystem protection and restoration;

(D) the prevention and control of invasive species and the effects of invasive species; and

(E) recreation associated with water resources development projects;

(2) prioritize actions necessary to protect critical public infrastructure, communities,

and critical natural or cultural resources; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, utilize existing data provided to the Secretary by Federal and State agencies, Indian Tribes, and other stakeholders, including data obtained through other Federal programs.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS; ADDITIONAL STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the comprehensive assessment described in subsection (a), the Secretary may make a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) such additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Great Lakes System for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under paragraph (1)(D) shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive assessment described in subsection (a).

(c) **EXEMPTION FROM MAXIMUM STUDY COST AND DURATION LIMITATIONS.**—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) shall not apply to any study recommended under subsection (b)(1)(D).

**SEC. 208. RATHBUN LAKE, CHARITON RIVER, IOWA.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that evaluates—

(1) the existing allocations of storage space for Rathbun Lake, authorized pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1262; 121 Stat. 1124), including the existing allocation for municipal water supply;

(2) the feasibility of expanding the existing allocation of storage for municipal water supply; and

(3) the affordability of future municipal water supply allocations from Rathbun Lake, for residential users of such future allocations, at projected future costs.

**SEC. 209. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF RESTORATION IN THE LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force established by section 7004 of Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1272) shall submit to Congress a report that summarizes the activities and recommendations of the task force, including—

(1) policies, strategies, plans, programs, projects, and activities undertaken for addressing conservation, protection, restoration, and maintenance of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem; and

(2) financial participation by each agency represented on the Task Force in conserving, protecting, restoring, and maintaining the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.

**SEC. 210. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.**

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Lower Mississippi River basin, from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, to the Gulf of Mexico,

to identify actions to be undertaken by the Secretary for the comprehensive management of the basin for the purposes of flood risk management, navigation, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation.

(2) **FOCUS AREAS.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall investigate projects, including—

(A) projects proposed in the comprehensive coastal protection master plan entitled “Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (including any subsequent amendments or revisions), including—

(i) Ama sediment diversion;

(ii) Union freshwater diversion;

(iii) increase Atchafalaya flow to Terrebonne; and

(iv) Manchac Landbridge diversion; and

(B) natural features and nature-based features, including levee setbacks and instream and floodplain restoration.

(b) **CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian Tribes, non-Federal interests, and other stakeholders, and, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by such parties.

(c) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary may develop a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) such additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Lower Mississippi River basin for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under this subsection shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive study required under subsection (a).

(d) **COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the results of the comprehensive study required by this section, including any recommendations developed under subsection (c); and

(2) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

**SEC. 211. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the water resources needs of the Upper Mississippi River under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a).

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall carry out the assessment under subsection (a) in accordance with the requirements in section 1206(b) of Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1686).

**SEC. 212. LOWER MISSOURI BASIN FLOOD RISK AND RESILIENCY STUDY, IOWA, KANSAS, NEBRASKA, AND MISSOURI.**

(a) **ADDITIONAL STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the request of the non-Federal interest for the Lower Missouri Basin study, the Secretary shall expand the scope of such study to investigate and provide recommendations relating to—

(A) modifications to projects in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri authorized under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9(b) of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 891)) and the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation project (authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 19)), including modifications to the authorized purposes of such projects to further flood risk management and resiliency; and

(B) modifications to non-Federal, publicly owned levees in the Lower Missouri River Basin.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—If the Secretary determines that expanding the scope of the Lower Missouri Basin study as provided in paragraph (1) is not practicable, and the non-Federal interest for such study concurs in such determination, the Secretary shall carry out such additional studies as are necessary to investigate the modifications described in paragraph (1).

(3) **CONTINUATION OF LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.**—The following studies shall be considered a continuation of the Lower Missouri Basin study:

(A) Any additional study carried out under paragraph (2).

(B) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers prepares for the Lower Missouri Basin study.

(C) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers prepares for an additional study carried out under paragraph (2).

(D) Any study spun off from the Lower Missouri Basin study before the completion of such study.

(E) Any study spun off from an additional study carried out under paragraph (2) before the completion of such additional study.

(4) **RELiance ON EXISTING INFORMATION.**—In carrying out any study described in or authorized by this section, the Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall rely on existing data and analysis, including data and analysis prepared under section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16).

(5) **CONSIDERATION; CONSULTATION.**—In developing recommendations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consider the use of—

(i) structural and nonstructural measures, including the setting back of levees and removing structures from areas of recurring flood vulnerability, where advantageous, to reduce flood risk and damages in the Lower Missouri River Basin; and

(ii) where such features are locally acceptable, natural features or nature-based features (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a); and

(B) consult with applicable Federal and State agencies, Indian Tribes, and other stakeholders within the Lower Missouri River Basin and solicit public comment on such recommendations.

(6) **EXEMPTION FROM MAXIMUM STUDY COST AND DURATION LIMITATIONS.**—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) shall not apply to the Lower Missouri Basin study or any study described in paragraph (3).

(7) **PRECONSTRUCTION, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN.**—Upon completion of a study authorized by this section, if the Secretary determines that a recommended project, or modification to a project described in paragraph (1), is justified, the Secretary may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project or modification.

(8) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For the provision of technical assistance to support small communities and economically disadvantaged communities in the planning and design of flood risk management and flood risk resiliency projects in the Lower Missouri River Basin, for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2026, there are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) \$2,000,000 to carry out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to carry out such section; and

(ii) \$2,000,000 to carry out section 22(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to carry out such section.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—

(i) **LIMITATIONS NOT APPLICABLE.**—The limitations on the use of funds in section 206(d) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 and section 22(c)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 shall not apply to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by subparagraph (A).

(ii) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph restricts the authority of the Secretary to use any funds otherwise appropriated to carry out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 or section 22(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 to provide technical assistance described in subparagraph (A).

(9) **COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(A) the results of the study authorized by this section;

(B) any additional, site-specific areas within the Lower Missouri River Basin for which additional study for flood risk management projects is recommended by the Secretary; and

(C) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.**—The term “Lower Missouri Basin study” means the Lower Missouri Basin Flood Risk and Resiliency Study, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri, authorized pursuant to section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a).

(2) **SMALL COMMUNITY.**—The term “small community” means a local government that serves a population of less than 15,000.

**SEC. 213. PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER AND RYE HARBOR, NEW HAMPSHIRE.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a written status update regarding—

(1) efforts to address the impacts of shoaling affecting the project for navigation, Rye Harbor, New Hampshire, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480); and

(2) the project for navigation, Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of

1962 (76 Stat. 1173), as required to be expedited under section 1317 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-270).

**SEC. 214. COUGAR AND DETROIT DAMS, WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OREGON.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report providing an initial analysis of deauthorizing hydropower as a project purpose at the Cougar and Detroit Dams project.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of the potential effects of deauthorizing hydropower as a project purpose at the Cougar and Detroit Dams project on—

(A) the operation of the project, including with respect to the other authorized purposes of the project;

(B) compliance of the project with the Endangered Species Act;

(C) costs that would be attributed to other authorized purposes of the project, including costs relating to compliance with such Act; and

(D) other ongoing studies in the Willamette River Basin; and

(2) identification of any further research needed.

(c) **PROJECT DEFINED.**—In this section, the terms “Cougar and Detroit Dams project” and “project” mean the Cougar Dam and Reservoir project and Detroit Dam and Reservoir project, Willamette River Basin, Oregon, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 179).

**SEC. 215. PORT ORFORD, OREGON.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, at Federal expense, submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a summary report on the research completed and data gathered by the date of enactment of this Act with regards to the configuration of a breakwater for the project for navigation, Port Orford, Oregon, authorized by section 117 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1822; 106 Stat. 4809), for the purposes of addressing shoaling issues to minimize long-term maintenance costs.

**SEC. 216. WILSON CREEK AND SLOAN CREEK, FAIRVIEW, TEXAS.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a written status update regarding efforts to address flooding along Wilson Creek and Sloan Creek in the City of Fairview, Texas.

**SEC. 217. GAO STUDY ON MITIGATION FOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the mitigation of the impact of water resources development projects, including the impact on fish and wildlife, consistent with the requirements of section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283), section 307(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2317(a)), and section 2036(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2283a), including—

(A) an evaluation of guidance or instructions issued, and other measures taken, by the Secretary to ensure successful mitigation of such impacts;

(B) a review of the methods of mitigation, including the use of in-lieu fees, mitigation banking, and permittee-responsible mitigation, and their long-term effectiveness of restoring or mitigating ecosystem services impacted by such projects;

(C) a review of how the use of the different mitigation methods for such projects varies across Corps of Engineers districts;

(D) an assessment of the backlog of mitigation projects, including the number of mitigation projects pending completion to address such impacts resulting from constructed water resources development projects;

(E) an evaluation of how the Secretary tracks compliance with the mitigation requirements across Corps of Engineers districts;

(F) a review of how the mitigation requirements for water resources development projects contributes to the resilience of water resources in the United States;

(G) an assessment of whether mitigation is being done prior to or contemporaneously with the construction of projects, as required by section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283);

(H) an evaluation of compliance with section 906(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)) for the development of specific mitigation plans for projects, whether such plans were successful in mitigating the designated impacts of the projects, and, in instances where such plans were not successful, what actions the Secretary is taking to modify the plans such that they will be successful; and

(I) an assessment of how the Secretary might take advantage of natural infrastructure in mitigation planning to reduce flood risks and flood recovery costs for some communities; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that—

(A) describes the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1);

(B) includes recommendations to ensure compliance with and successful implementation of mitigation requirements for water resources development projects; and

(C) includes recommendations to ensure existing programs and authorities include the use, to the maximum extent practicable, of natural infrastructure.

#### **SEC. 218. GAO STUDY ON APPLICATION OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND EXPENDITURES.**

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the operation and maintenance needs of federally authorized harbor and inland harbor projects, including—

(1) an inventory of all federally authorized harbor and inland harbor projects;

(2) an assessment of current uses of such projects (and, to the extent practicable, the national, regional, and local benefits of such uses), including the uses listed in section 210(d)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986;

(3) an assessment of the annual operation and maintenance needs associated with harbors and inland harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2) of section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238), including a breakdown of such needs for each of the following types of projects—

(A) emerging harbor projects (as defined in such section);

(B) moderate-use harbor projects (as defined in such section on the day before the date of enactment of this Act);

(C) high-use harbor projects (as defined in such section on the day before the date of enactment of this Act); and

(D) projects assigned to harbors and inland harbors within the Great Lakes Navigation System (as defined in such section);

(4) an assessment of any deferred operation and maintenance needs for such projects;

(5) an assessment of the annual funding level trends for moderate-use harbor projects (as defined in section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-121), excluding funds awarded to donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports (as such terms are defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201));

(6) an assessment of projected needs associated with donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports (as such terms are defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201)); and

(7) an itemization of expenditures provided to donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports under section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201).

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Upon completion of the report under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit such report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

#### **SEC. 219. GAO STUDY ON ADMINISTRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL BANKS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that analyzes the administration of section 309 of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act to establish an environmental bank (as defined in such section), such that the Secretary—

(1) achieves the objectives of the report of the Chief of Engineers for ecosystem restoration in the Louisiana Coastal Area or the objectives of the comprehensive coastal protection master plan entitled “Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (including any subsequent amendments or revisions);

(2) promotes ridge restoration, barrier island restoration, marsh creation, non-structural risk management, or any other projects authorized, funded, or undertaken, or proposed to be authorized, funded, or undertaken, pursuant to such comprehensive coastal protection master plan;

(3) allows for proactive investment in projects by a public or private entity seeking to generate credits to satisfy responsibilities associated with environmental compliance;

(4) allows for leveraging additional State, Parish, or Federal funds; and

(5) recommends methods for awarding additional credit for high-priority projects listed in the report and plan described in paragraph (1).

(b) **CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with the Secretary, the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force, the Governor of Louisiana (or an appointee), and other stakeholders, to the extent practicable.

#### **SEC. 220. STUDY ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONCESSIONAIRE AGREEMENTS.**

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Com-

troller General of the United States shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of, a study on commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of Corps of Engineers policies as they relate to the pricing of items sold by commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities, including commoditized goods such as fuel and food items;

(2) an assessment of the impact of gross revenue fees on—

(A) the sales of items described in paragraph (1);

(B) the total revenues collected by commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities; and

(C) the amounts of the moneys paid by such concessionaires to the United States—

(i) amounts equivalent to which are appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for operation and maintenance of recreational facilities; or

(ii) that are distributed to States and counties under section 7 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701c-3);

(3) an assessment of the potential impact of using a fixed revenue fee on the sales, revenues, and amounts described in paragraph (2);

(4) an analysis of Corps of Engineers policies related to the length of commercial concessionaire contracts;

(5) an assessment of the impacts of changing the length of commercial concessionaire contracts to a minimum of 25 years, including assessment of—

(A) the potential effects on monetary investment in Corps of Engineers properties by commercial concessionaires, including whether establishing such a minimum contract length would lead to increased investment; and

(B) whether establishing such a minimum contract length would reduce competition, or result in commercial concessionaires providing less value to the public or to water resources development projects; and

(6) an assessment of whether changes in the concessionaire fee structure or the minimum length of a commercial concessionaire contract is in the public interest.

#### **SEC. 221. STUDY ON WATER SUPPLY AND WATER CONSERVATION AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that analyzes the benefits and consequences of including municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers in carrying out water resources development projects.

(b) **INCLUSION.**—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of existing water resources development projects with municipal water supply or water conservation as authorized purposes, and the extent to which such projects are utilized for such purposes;

(2) a description of existing water resources development projects with respect to which—

(A) municipal water supply or water conservation could be added as a project purpose, including those with respect to which a

non-Federal interest has expressed an interest in adding municipal water supply or water conservation as a project purpose; and

(B) such a purpose could be accommodated while maintaining existing authorized purposes;

(3) a description of ongoing water resources development project studies the authorizations for which include authorization for the Secretary to study the feasibility of carrying out the project with a purpose of municipal water supply or water conservation;

(4) an analysis of how adding municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers would affect the ability of the Secretary to carry out future water resources development projects; and

(5) any recommendations of the Secretary relating to including municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers.

#### SEC. 222. PFAS REVIEW AND INVENTORY AT CORPS FACILITIES.

(a) INVENTORY OF PFAS AT CORPS FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter the Secretary shall complete an inventory of Corps of Engineers civil works facilities that are or may be contaminated, or could become contaminated, by PFAS.

(2) CONTENTS OF INVENTORY.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall review and identify—

(A) all facilities owned or operated by the Corps of Engineers, for which there is a civil works function, that are or may be contaminated, or could become contaminated, by PFAS;

(B) the nature and extent of any such contamination or potential for contamination, including any potential pathways for human exposure to PFAS;

(C) response measures taken to monitor, control, remove, or remediate PFAS, or otherwise reduce the risk of human exposure to PFAS;

(D) for facilities identified under subparagraph (A), the extent to which such facilities (or any such contamination or potential for contamination at such facilities) are related to the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers;

(E) the extent to which the Secretary, or other entities, may have responsibility for such contamination or potential for contamination; and

(F) for facilities identified under subparagraph (A), the costs to remediate and reduce the risk of human exposure to PFAS.

(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the actions taken under this subsection shall supplement and support work undertaken by other Federal agencies, including actions taken pursuant to the plan published by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, titled “EPA’s Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Action Plan” and dated February 2019.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the inventory under paragraph (1), and annually thereafter concurrent with the President’s annual budget request to Congress, the Secretary shall submit the inventory to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(b) PFAS TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.—

(1) RESEARCH SUPPORT.—The Secretary, acting through the Hazardous Waste Research Center located at the Engineer Research and Development Center, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, support the efforts of other Federal agencies in the devel-

opment of innovative technologies and methodologies for the detection, treatment, and cleanup of PFAS associated with Federal facilities, including groundwater associated with such facilities.

(2) DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to duplicate the activities undertaken by other Federal agencies as identified in subsection (a)(3).

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “PFAS” means a perfluoroalkyl substance or polyfluoroalkyl substance with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

#### SEC. 223. REPORT ON RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) an inventory of all recreational infrastructure and facilities associated with water resources development projects;

(2) an assessment of the annual operation and maintenance needs associated with such infrastructure and facilities;

(3) an assessment of deferred operation and maintenance needs for such infrastructure and facilities to operate safely at full capacity; and

(4) an assessment of the economic benefits of recreation to local and regional economies and benefits of sustaining and improving public access at recreational infrastructure and facilities.

### TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

#### SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to identify water resources development projects authorized by Congress that are no longer viable for construction due to—

(A) a lack of local support;

(B) a lack of available Federal or non-Federal resources; or

(C) an authorizing purpose that is no longer relevant or feasible;

(2) to create an expedited and definitive process for Congress to deauthorize water resources development projects that are no longer viable for construction; and

(3) to allow the continued authorization of water resources development projects that are viable for construction.

(b) PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(1) PRELIMINARY LIST OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a preliminary list of each water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction before November 8, 2007, for which—

(i) planning, design, or construction was not initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) planning, design, or construction was initiated before the date of enactment of this Act, but for which no funds, Federal or non-Federal, were obligated for planning, design, or construction of the project or separable element of the project during the current fiscal year or any of the 10 preceding fiscal years.

(B) USE OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE REPORT.—The Secretary may develop the preliminary list from the comprehensive construction backlog and operation and maintenance reports developed pursuant to section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a).

(2) PREPARATION OF PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(A) DEAUTHORIZATION AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall prepare a proposed list of projects for deauthorization comprised of a subset of projects and separable elements identified on the preliminary list developed under paragraph (1) that have, in the aggregate, an estimated Federal cost to complete that is at least \$10,000,000,000.

(B) DETERMINATION OF FEDERAL COST TO COMPLETE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the Federal cost to complete shall take into account any allowances authorized by section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), as applied to the most recent project schedule and cost estimate.

(C) INCLUSION OF DEAUTHORIZATION OF ANTIQUATED PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount identified for deauthorization under paragraph (2)(A) by an amount equivalent to the estimated current value of each project, or separable element of a project, that is deauthorized by subsection (f).

(3) SEQUENCING OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall identify projects and separable elements for inclusion on the proposed list of projects for deauthorization under paragraph (2) according to the order in which the projects and separable elements were authorized, beginning with the earliest authorized projects and separable elements and ending with the latest project or separable element necessary to meet the aggregate amount under paragraph (2)(A).

(B) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—The Secretary may identify projects and separable elements in an order other than that established by subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines, on a case-by-case basis, that a project or separable element is critical for interests of the United States, based on the possible impact of the project or separable element on public health and safety, the national economy, or the environment.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall solicit comments from the public and the Governors of each applicable State on the proposed deauthorization list prepared under paragraph (2)(A).

(B) COMMENT PERIOD.—The public comment period shall be 90 days.

(5) PREPARATION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a final deauthorization list by—

(i) considering any comments received under paragraph (4); and

(ii) revising the proposed deauthorization list prepared under paragraph (2)(A) as the Secretary determines necessary to respond to such comments.

(B) APPENDIX.—The Secretary shall include as part of the final deauthorization list an appendix that—

(i) identifies each project or separable element on the proposed deauthorization list that is not included on the final deauthorization list; and

(ii) describes the reasons why the project or separable element is not included on the final deauthorization list.

(c) SUBMISSION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST TO CONGRESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW; PUBLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the close of the comment period under subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall—

(A) submit the final deauthorization list and appendix prepared under subsection (b)(5) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

(B) publish the final deauthorization list and appendix in the Federal Register.

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The Secretary shall not include in the final deauthorization list submitted under paragraph (1) any project or separable element with respect to which Federal funds for planning, design, or construction are obligated after the development of the preliminary list under subsection (b)(1)(A) but prior to the submission of the final deauthorization list under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

(d) DEAUTHORIZATION; CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of publication of the final deauthorization list and appendix under subsection (c)(1)(B), a project or separable element of a project identified in the final deauthorization list is hereby deauthorized, unless Congress passes a joint resolution disapproving the final deauthorization list prior to the end of such period.

(2) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A project or separable element of a project identified in the final deauthorization list under subsection (c) shall not be deauthorized under this subsection if, before the expiration of the 2-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the non-Federal interest for the project or separable element of the project provides sufficient funds to complete the project or separable element of the project.

(B) TREATMENT OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), each project and separable element of a project identified in the final deauthorization list shall be treated as deauthorized for purposes of the aggregate deauthorization amount specified in subsection (b)(2)(A).

(3) PROJECTS IDENTIFIED IN APPENDIX.—A project or separable element of a project identified in the appendix to the final deauthorization list shall remain subject to future deauthorization by Congress.

(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) POST-AUTHORIZATION STUDIES.—A project or separable element of a project may not be identified on the proposed deauthorization list developed under subsection (b), or the final deauthorization list developed under subsection (c), if the project or separable element received funding for a post-authorization study during the current fiscal year or any of the 10 preceding fiscal years.

(2) TREATMENT OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—For purposes of this section, if an authorized water resources development project or separable element of the project has been modified by an Act of Congress, the date of the authorization of the project or separable element shall be deemed to be the date of the most recent such modification.

(f) DEAUTHORIZATION OF ANTIQUATED PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction prior to November 17, 1986, for which construction has not been initiated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or for which funds have not been obligated for construction in the 10-year period prior to the date of enactment of this Act, is hereby deauthorized.

(2) IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that identifies—

(A) the name of each project, or separable element of a project, deauthorized by paragraph (1); and

(B) the estimated current value of each such project or separable element of a project.

(g) ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF INACTIVE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary or the non-Federal interest may not carry out any authorized water resources development project, or separable element of such project, for which construction has not been initiated in the 20-year period following the date of the authorization of such project or separable element, until—

(1) the Secretary provides to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a post-authorization change report that updates the economic and environmental analysis of the project or separable element; and

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate take appropriate action to address any modifications to the economic and environmental analysis for the project or separable element of the project contained in the post-authorization change report.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) POST-AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORT.—The term “post-authorization change report” has the meaning given such term in section 1132(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2282e).

(2) POST-AUTHORIZATION STUDY.—The term “post-authorization study” means—

(A) a feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282);

(B) a feasibility study, as defined in section 105(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)); or

(C) a review conducted under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), including an initial appraisal that—

(i) demonstrates a Federal interest; and

(ii) requires additional analysis for the project or separable element.

(3) WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.—The term “water resources development project” includes an environmental infrastructure assistance project or program of the Corps of Engineers.

#### SEC. 302. ABANDONED AND INACTIVE NONCOAL MINE RESTORATION.

Section 560(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2336(f)) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$30,000,000”.

#### SEC. 303. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 203(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended by striking “\$12,500,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

#### SEC. 304. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662, 100 Stat. 4148; 110 Stat. 3758; 113 Stat. 295; 121 Stat. 1076) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) Ellis Pond and Guild Pond, Norwood, Massachusetts; and

“(30) Memorial Pond, Walpole, Massachusetts.”

#### SEC. 305. WATERCRAFT INSPECTION STATIONS.

Section 104(d)(1)(A) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking “Arizona River Basins,” and inserting “Arkansas River Basins; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) to protect the Russian River Basin, California.”

#### SEC. 306. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED DAMS.

Section 1177 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 467f-2 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”.

#### SEC. 307. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303, 110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202; 128 Stat. 1317) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) PROJECT CAP.—The total cost of a project carried out under this section may not exceed \$15,000,000.”; and

(2) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”.

(b) OUTREACH AND TRAINING.—The Secretary shall conduct public outreach and workshops for non-Federal interests to provide information on the Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program established under section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, including how to participate in the program.

#### SEC. 308. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 1103(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “\$22,750,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “\$10,420,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

#### SEC. 309. MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM.

Any Federal funds, regardless of the account from which the funds were provided, used to carry out construction of the modification to the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, authorized in section 136 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (117 Stat. 1842), shall be considered by the Secretary as initiating construction of the project such that future funds will not require a new investment decision.

#### SEC. 310. OUACHITA-BLACK RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, ARKANSAS.

The project for navigation, Ouachita-Black River, Arkansas, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645), is modified to include water supply as a project purpose, subject to completion by the Secretary of a feasibility study and any other review necessary for such modification.

#### SEC. 311. SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of project for flood control, Sacramento River, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144, 39 Stat. 949; 103 Stat. 649; 110 Stat. 3709; 112 Stat. 1841; 113 Stat. 299), consisting of a riverbed gradient restoration facility at the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Intake, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 312. LAKE ISABELLA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, when evaluating alternative locations for construction



of a permanent Isabella Lake Visitor Center by the Corps of Engineers to replace the facility impacted by the Isabella Dam safety modification project, should afford substantial weight to the site preference of the local community.

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may acquire such interests in real property as the Secretary determines necessary or advisable to support construction of the Isabella Dam safety modification project.

(c) **TRANSFER.**—The Secretary may transfer any real property interests acquired under subsection (b) to any other Federal agency or department without reimbursement.

(d) **ISABELLA DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION PROJECT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Isabella Dam safety modification project” means the dam safety modification project at the Isabella Reservoir in the San Joaquin Valley, California (authorized by Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 901)), including the component of the project relating to construction a visitor center facility.

**SEC. 313. LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT.**

The Secretary shall align the schedules of, and maximize complimentary efforts, minimize duplicative practices, and ensure coordination and information sharing with respect to—

(1) the project for flood risk management, Lower San Joaquin River, authorized by section 1401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3836); and

(2) the second phase of the feasibility study for the Lower San Joaquin River project for flood risk management, authorized for expedited completion by section 1203(a)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act 2018 (132 Stat. 3803).

**SEC. 314. SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**

The portion of the project for flood control and navigation, San Diego River and Mission Bay, San Diego County, California, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636), identified in the National Levee Database established under section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303) as the San Diego River 3 segment and consisting of a 785-foot-long segment of the right bank levee from Station 209+41.75 to its end at Station 217+26.75, as described in construction plans dated August 30, 1951, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 315. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 114 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 59h) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 114. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA.**

“(a) **AREA TO BE DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE.**—The following area is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States: All of that portion of the City and County of San Francisco, California, lying shoreward of a line beginning at the intersection of the southerly right of way line of Earl Street prolongation with the Pierhead United States Government Pierhead line, the Pierhead line as defined in the State of California Harbor and Navigation Code Section 1770, as amended in 1961; thence northerly along said Pierhead line to its intersection with a line parallel with and distant 10 feet easterly from, the existing easterly boundary line of Pier 30-32; thence northerly along said parallel line and its northerly prolongation, to a point of intersection with a line parallel with, and distant 10 feet northerly from, the existing northerly boundary of Pier 30-32; thence westerly along last said parallel line to its intersection with said

Pierhead line; thence northerly along said Pierhead line, to the intersection of the easterly right of way line of Van Ness Avenue, formerly Marlette Street, prolongation to the Pierhead line.

“(b) **REQUIREMENT THAT AREA BE IMPROVED.**—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) applies only to those parts of the area described in subsection (a) that are or will be bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied or covered by permanent structures and does not affect the applicability of any Federal statute or regulation that relates to filling of navigable waters or to other regulated activities within the area described in subsection (a), including sections 9 and 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401, 403), section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

“(c) **INCLUSION OF EMBARCADERO HISTORIC DISTRICT.**—Congress finds and declares that the area described in subsection (a) contains the seawall, piers, and wharves that comprise the Embarcadero Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places on May 12, 2006.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5052 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 59h-1) is repealed.

**SEC. 316. WESTERN PACIFIC INTERCEPTOR CANAL, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**

The portion of the project for flood protection on the Sacramento River, authorized by section 2 of the of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144, 39 Stat. 949; 45 Stat. 539; 50 Stat. 877; 55 Stat. 647; 80 Stat. 1422), consisting of the portion of the levee from GPS coordinate N2147673.584 E6690904.187 to N2147908.413 E6689057.060 associated with the Western Pacific Interceptor Canal, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 317. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.**

Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114, 121 Stat. 1213; 128 Stat. 1314) is amended by striking “2019” and inserting “2029”.

**SEC. 318. NEW LONDON HARBOR WATERFRONT CHANNEL, CONNECTICUT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The portion of the project for navigation, New London Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 13, 1902 (chapter 1079, 32 Stat. 333), described in subsection (b) is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **AREA DESCRIBED.**—The area referred to in subsection (a) is generally the portion between and around the 2 piers at the State Pier in New London, specifically the area—

(1) beginning at a point N691263.78, E1181259.26;

(2) running N 35°01'50.75" W about 955.59 feet to a point N692046.26, E1180710.74;

(3) running N 54°58'06.78" E about 100.00 feet to a point N692103.66, E1180792.62;

(4) running S 35°01'50.75" E about 989.8 feet to a point N691293.17, E1181360.78; and

(5) running S 73°51'15.45" W about 105.69 feet to the point described in paragraph (1).

**SEC. 319. WASHINGTON HARBOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Washington Harbor, District of Columbia, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1031), is modified to reduce, in part, the authorized dimensions of the project, such that the remaining authorized dimensions are as follows:

(1) A 200 foot wide, 15 foot deep channel with a center line beginning at a point East 1,317,064.30 and North 440,373.32, thence to a point East 1,316,474.30 and North 440,028.31,

thence to a point East 1,315,584.30 and North 439,388.30, thence to a point East 1,315,259.31 and North 438,908.30.

(2) A transition area 200 foot wide to 300 foot wide, 15 foot deep, with a center line beginning at a point East 1,315,259.31 and North 438,908.30 to a point East 1,315,044.31 and North 438,748.30.

(3) A 300 foot wide, 15 foot deep channel with a centerline beginning a point East 1,315,044.31 and North 438,748.30, thence to a point East 1,314,105.31 and North 438,124.79, thence to a point East 1,311,973.30 and North 438,807.78, thence to a point East 1,311,369.73 and North 438,577.42, thence to a point East 1,311,015.73 and North 438,197.57, thence to a point East 1,309,713.47 and North 435,678.91.

(4) A transition area 300 foot wide to 400 foot wide, 15 foot deep to 24 foot deep, with a center line beginning at a point East 1,309,713.47 and North 435,678.91 to a point East 1,307,709.33 and North 434,488.25.

(5) A 400 foot wide, 24 foot deep channel with a centerline beginning at a point East 1,307,709.33 and North 434,488.25, thence to a point East 1,307,459.33 and North 434,173.25, thence to a point East 1,306,476.82 and North 1,306,476.82, thence to a point East 1,306,209.79 and North 431,460.21, thence to a point at the end of the channel near Hains Point East 1,305,997.63 and North 429,978.31.

**SEC. 320. BIG CYPRESS SEMINOLE INDIAN RESERVATION WATER CONSERVATION PLAN, FLORIDA.**

The project for ecosystem restoration, Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation Water Conservation Plan, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 528 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3767), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 321. CENTRAL EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.**

The project for ecosystem restoration, Central Everglades, authorized by section 1401(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1713), is modified to include the project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida, Everglades Agricultural Area, authorized by section 1308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3819), and to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project as so combined.

**SEC. 322. MIAMI RIVER, FLORIDA.**

The portion of the project for navigation, Miami River, Florida, authorized by the Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 925; 59 Stat. 16; 74 Stat. 481; 100 Stat. 4257), beginning at the existing railroad bascule bridge and extending approximately 1,000 linear feet upstream to an existing salinity barrier and flood control structure, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 323. JULIAN KEEN, JR. LOCK AND DAM, MOORE HAVEN, FLORIDA.**

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The Moore Haven Lock and Dam, Moore Haven, Florida, authorized pursuant to the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1032), shall hereafter be known and designated as the “Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Lock and Dam referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam”.

**SEC. 324. TAYLOR CREEK RESERVOIR AND LEVEE L-73 (SECTION 1), UPPER ST. JOHNS RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.**

The portions of the project for flood control and other purposes, Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1176), consisting of the Taylor Creek Reservoir and Levee L-73, Section 1, within the Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida, are no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 325. CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LOUISIANA.**

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on plans to modify the Calcasieu River and Pass Dredged Material Management Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (December 16, 2010 DMMP/SEIS) to allow for the expansion of Dredged Material Placement Facilities (DMPFs) 17, 19, 22, D, and E to the lakeside foreshore rock boundaries during planned rehabilitation of these facilities.

**SEC. 326. SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT; ABIQUIU DAM, NEW MEXICO.**

(a) ABIQUIU RESERVOIR.—Section 5(b) of Public Law 97-140 (43 U.S.C. 620a note) is amended by striking “a total of two hundred thousand acre-feet of”.

(b) WATER STORAGE AT ABIQUIU DAM, NEW MEXICO.—Section 1 of Public Law 100-522 (43 U.S.C. 620a note) is amended—

(1) by striking “200,000 acre-feet of”;

(2) by inserting “and San Juan-Chama project” after “Rio Grande system”; and

(3) by striking “, in lieu of the water storage authorized by section 5 of Public Law 97-140, to the extent that contracting entities under section 5 of Public Law 97-140 no longer require such storage”.

(c) WATER STORAGE.—The Secretary shall—

(1) store up to elevation 6230.00 NGVD29 at Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico, to the extent that the necessary real property interests have been acquired by any entity requesting such storage; and

(2) amend the March 20, 1986, contract between the United States of America and the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (assigned by the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico to the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority) for water storage space in Abiquiu Reservoir to allow for storage by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority of San Juan-Chama project water or native Rio Grande system water up to elevation 6230.00 NGVD29.

(d) STORAGE AGREEMENTS WITH USERS OTHER THAN THE ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall—

(1) retain or enter into new agreements with entities for a proportionate allocation of 29,100 acre-feet of storage space pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 97-140; and

(2) amend or enter into new storage agreements for storage of San Juan-Chama project water or native Rio Grande system water up to the space allocated for each entity's proportionate share of San Juan-Chama water.

(e) OPERATIONS DOCUMENTS.—The Secretary shall amend or revise any existing operations documents, including the Water Control Manual or operations plan for Abiquiu Reservoir, as necessary to meet the requirements of this section.

(f) LIMITATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the following limitations shall apply:

(1) The storage of native Rio Grande system water shall be subject to the provisions of the Rio Grande Compact and the resolutions of the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

(2) The storage of native Rio Grande system water shall only be authorized to the extent that the necessary water ownership and storage rights have been acquired by the entity requesting such storage.

(3) The storage of native Rio Grande system water or San-Juan Chama project water shall not interfere with the authorized purposes of the Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir project.

(4) Each user of storage space, regardless of source of water, shall pay for any increase in costs attributable to storage of that user's water.

**SEC. 327. PAWCATUCK RIVER, LITTLE NARRAGANSETT BAY AND WATCH HILL COVE, RHODE ISLAND AND CONNECTICUT.**

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, that portion of the project for navigation, Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 13), consisting of a 10-foot deep, 16-acre anchorage area in Watch Hill Cove is no longer authorized.

**SEC. 328. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS.**

Section 575 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789) is repealed.

**SEC. 329. CAP SANTE WATERWAY, WASHINGTON.**

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Cap Sante Waterway and Navigation Channel, Skagit County, Washington, authorized by the Act of March 2, 1919 (chapter 95, 40 Stat. 1285), is modified to deauthorize the portion of the project consisting of an approximately 334,434 foot area of the Federal channel within Anacortes Harbor inside and directly adjacent to the Federal breakwater and training wall structure, starting at a point with coordinates N557015.552, E1210819.619, thence running S88 13°2.06'E approximately 200 feet to a point with coordinates N557009.330, E1211019.522, thence running S01 46°58.08'W approximately 578 feet to a point with coordinates N556431.405, E1211001.534, thence running S49 49°50.23'W approximately 69 feet to a point with coordinates N556387.076, E1210949.002, thence running S51 53°0.25'E approximately 35 feet to a point with coordinates N556365.662, E1210976.316, thence running S49 38°58.48'W approximately 112 feet to a point with coordinates N556292.989, E1210890.775, thence running N88 13°1.87'W approximately 109 feet to a point with coordinates N556296.367, E1210782.226, thence running S46 46°58.97'W approximately 141 feet to a point with coordinates N556199.527, E1210679.164, thence running N88 13°1.77'W approximately 700 feet to a point with coordinates N556221.305, E1209979.502, thence running N01 46°58.08'E approximately 250 feet to a point with coordinates N556471.184, E1209987.280, thence running S88 13°1.77'E approximately 815 feet to a point with coordinates N556445.828, E1210801.886, thence running N01 46°58.08'E approximately 570 feet to the point of origin.

**SEC. 330. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.**

The Secretary shall expedite the activities required to be carried out under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) regarding the use of improvement dredging of the Portsmouth Federal navigation project in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, as a source of clean beach fill material to reinforce the stone revetment at Nantasket Beach, Hull, Massachusetts.

**SEC. 331. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL PROJECTS.**

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the project modifications described in this section are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(b) MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat.

336; 117 Stat. 1840) is amended to read as follows:

“(23) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—\$45,000,000 for regional water conservation, recycling, reliability, and resiliency projects in Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento Counties and the San Juan Suburban Water District, California.”.

(2) SOUTH PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(52) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220) is amended by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”.

(3) MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(55) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A-221) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$45,000,000”.

(4) SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.—Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3773; 113 Stat. 348; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1226) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting “Boyd, Carter, Elliott, Lincoln,” after “Lee,”; and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$80,000,000”.

(5) DESOTO COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220; 119 Stat. 282; 119 Stat. 2257; 122 Stat. 1623) is amended by striking “\$75,000,000” and inserting “\$130,000,000”.

(6) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 1494; 121 Stat. 1258) is amended by striking “\$32,500,000” and inserting “\$57,500,000”.

(7) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—Section 219(f)(32) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 337; 121 Stat. 1233) is amended by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$70,000,000”.

(8) MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA.—Section 219(f)(231) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1266) is amended by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”.

(9) SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845; 109 Stat. 407; 110 Stat. 3723; 113 Stat. 310; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1146) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “\$200,000,000” and inserting “\$400,000,000”; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2), by inserting “Beaver, Jefferson,” after “Washington,”.

(10) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A-220; 117 Stat. 1838; 130 Stat. 1677; 132 Stat. 3818) is amended by striking “\$89,550,000” and inserting “\$110,000,000”.

(11) EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS.—Section 219(f)(269) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1268) is amended by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

(12) WESTERN RURAL WATER.—Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 139; 117 Stat. 142; 117 Stat. 1836; 118 Stat. 440; 121 Stat. 1219; 123 Stat. 2851; 128 Stat. 1316; 130 Stat. 1681) is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting “WESTERN RURAL WATER.”;

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “Arizona,” before “rural Idaho.”;

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting “Arizona,” before “Idaho”; and

(D) in subsection (i), by striking “for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001, \$435,000,000, to remain available until expended.” and inserting the following: “, to remain available until expended—

“(1) for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001, \$435,000,000 for Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming; and

“(2) \$150,000,000 for Arizona.”.

(13) CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.—Section 571(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 371; 121 Stat. 1257) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

(14) SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.—Section 340(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856; 110 Stat. 3727; 113 Stat. 320) is amended by striking “\$40,000,000” and inserting “\$120,000,000”.

(c) LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, SEWARD, ALASKA.—Section 5032(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114, 121 Stat. 1205) is amended by striking “15” and inserting “20”.

#### SEC. 332. PROJECT MODIFICATION AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) WATER SUPPLY.—The following project modifications for water supply, as identified in the report entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development” dated February 2019, and submitted to Congress on June 3, 2019, pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the recommendations, included in such report pursuant to section 301(c) of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b(c)):

(1) The project modification for the State of Missouri, Clarence Cannon Dam and Mark Twain Lake Project Salt River, Missouri.

(2) The project modification for the City of Plattsburg, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(3) The project modification for the City of Smithville, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(b) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—The following project modifications for flood risk management, as identified in a report entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, and submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary:

(1) Modification of the project for flood risk management, lower Mississippi River, authorized by the Act of May 15, 1928 (chapter 569, 45 Stat. 534), to incorporate the Wolf River Backwater and Nonconnah Creek levee systems into the project, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1575; 50 Stat. 881), subject to the determination of the Secretary that such systems meet all requirements applicable to such project.

(2) Modification of the project for flood risk management, Red River below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, authorized by the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1219), to incorporate the Cherokee Park Levee into the project, subject to the determination of the Secretary that such levee meets all requirements applicable to such project.

#### SEC. 333. APPLICATION OF CREDIT.

Section 7007(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1277; 128 Stat. 1226) is amended by inserting “, or may be applied to reduce the amounts required to be paid by the non-Federal interest under the terms of the deferred payment agreements entered into between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the projects authorized by section 7012(a)(1)” before the period at the end.

#### SEC. 334. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) MUDDY RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The separable elements for ecosystem restora-

tion of the project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts, authorized by section 522 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2656), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(2) EAST CHESTER CREEK, NEW YORK.—Notwithstanding section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a), the project for navigation, East Chester Creek, New York, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 164; 100 Stat. 4181), and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579(a)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(3) CHRISTIANSTED HARBOR, UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), the portion of the project for navigation, Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 167), and deauthorized under section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(4) CHARLOTTE HARBOR, UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), the portion of the project for navigation, Charlotte Amalie (St. Thomas) Harbor, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands, authorized by the Act of August 26, 1937 (chapter 832, 50 Stat. 850), and deauthorized under section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall complete and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a post-authorization change report (as such term is defined in section 1132(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2282e(d)) prior to carrying out a project identified in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 335. CONVEYANCES.

(a) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) EUFAULA, ALABAMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Eufaula, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in the Department of the Army Lease No. DACW01-2-17-0747, containing 56.76 acres, more or less, and being a part of Tracts L-1268 (26.12 acres), L-1273 (13.71 acres), L-1278 (6.75 acres), and L1279 (10.36 acres) of the Walter F. George Lock and Dam and Lake project.

(2) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Eufaula, Alabama, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Montgomery, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is the 62.38 acres of land and water under the primary jurisdiction of the Secretary in the R.E. “Bob” Woodruff Project Area that is covered by lease number DACW01-1-05-0037, including the parcels and structure known as “Powder Magazine”.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, to include retaining the right to inundate with water any land transferred under this subsection.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Montgomery, Alabama, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) OHIO RIVER LOCK AND DAM NUMBER 52, MASSAC COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the Massac-Metropolis Port District, Illinois, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property located north of the south bank of the Ohio River in Massac County, Illinois, that is associated with the Ohio River Lock and Dam 52.

(2) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The Massac-Metropolis Port District, Illinois, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) CLINTON, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Clinton, Missouri, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(4) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is a tract of land situated in the S ½ of Section 12 and the N ½ of Section 13, Township 41 North, Range 26 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, Henry County, Missouri, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of the north line of said S ½ of Section 12 and the easterly right-of-way of State Highway No. 13; thence easterly along the north line of said S ½ to the northeast corner of the W ½ NW ¼ NE ¼ SW ¼ of said Section

12; thence southerly along the east line of said W  $\frac{1}{2}$  NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  NE  $\frac{1}{4}$  SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  to the southeast corner thereof; thence easterly along the north line of the S  $\frac{1}{2}$  NE  $\frac{1}{4}$  SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  of said Section 12 to the southwest corner of the W  $\frac{1}{2}$  NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  SE  $\frac{1}{4}$  of said Section 12; thence in a northeasterly direction to the northeast corner of said W  $\frac{1}{2}$  NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  SE  $\frac{1}{4}$ ; thence easterly along the north line of said S  $\frac{1}{2}$  to the westerly right-of-way of the County Road; thence in a southeasterly and southerly direction along the westerly right-of-way of said County Road approximately 2500 feet to the center of Deer Creek; thence in a southwesterly direction along the center of said Deer Creek, approximately 3900 feet to the south line of said N  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Section 13; thence westerly along the south line of said N  $\frac{1}{2}$  to the easterly right-of-way line of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad; thence in a northwesterly direction along the easterly right-of-way of said railroad to the easterly right-of-way of said State Highway No. 13; thence in a northeasterly direction along the easterly right-of-way of said State Highway No. 13 to the point of the beginning; and including a roadway easement for ingress and egress, described as a strip of land 80 feet in width, lying 40 feet on each side of the following described line, the initial extremities of the following described strip being extended or reduced as required to exactly adjoin the boundary lines which they meet, situated in the S  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Section 12, Township 41 North Range 26 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian, Henry County, Missouri, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the center of said Section 12, thence S1°24'56"W, 1265.52 feet to a point, thence N88°29'02"W, 483.97 feet to the point of beginning of the strip of land herein described; thence in a northeasterly direction along a curve to the right, said curve having an initial tangent bearing of N3°44'41"E, a radius of 238.73 feet and an interior angle of 61°29'26", an arc distance of 256.21 feet to a point; thence N65°14'07"E 218.58 feet to a point; thence in a northeasterly direction along a curve to the left, having a radius of 674.07 feet and an interior angle of 36°00'01", an arc distance of 423.53 feet to a point; thence N29°14'07"E, 417.87 feet to a point; thence northeasterly along a curve to the right, having a radius of 818.51 feet and an interior angle of 14°30'01", an arc distance of 207.15 feet to a point; thence N43°44'07"E, 57.00 feet to the southerly right-of-way line of a county road, containing 2,948 acres, more or less; Excluding therefrom a tract of land situated in the S  $\frac{1}{2}$  of said Section 12, said Township and Range, described as commencing at the center of said Section 12; thence S1°24'56"W, 1265.52 feet to the point of beginning of the tract of land herein described; thence N88°29'02"W, 1122.50 feet; thence S1°43'26"W, 872.62 feet; thence S88°29'02"E, 1337.36 feet; thence N1°43'26"E, 872.62 feet; thence N88°29'02"W, 214.86 feet to the point of beginning, containing 26.79 acres, more or less. The above described tract contains, in the aggregate, 177.69 acres, more or less.

(2) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(f) CITY OF CLINTON, OLD ORCHARD ADDITION, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Clinton, Missouri, all right, title, and interest of the

United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is Lot 28 in Old Orchard Addition, a subdivision of the City of Clinton, Henry County, Missouri, containing 0.36 acres, more or less, including any improvements thereon.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including such reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to allow the United States to operate and maintain the Harry S. Truman Reservoir Project.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Clinton, Missouri, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(g) TRI-COUNTY LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the Tri-County Levee District, Missouri, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is the part of Sections 1 and 12 Township 45 North Range 6 West of the 5th P.M. in Montgomery County, Missouri, described as follows: A tract of land being 60' wide and lying South and East of and adjoining the centerline of the existing levee and being described as follows: Commencing at the NW corner of Section 12, thence S 87° 52' 35" E 587.4', thence S 01° 29' 25" W 453.68' to the point of the beginning; said point being in the center of the levee, thence with the centerline of the levee N 77° 01' 30" E 164.92', thence N 74° 26' 55" E 250.0', thence N 72° 27' 55" E 270.0', thence N 69° 06' 10" E 300.0', thence N 66° 42' 15" E 500.0', thence N 64° 14' 30" E 270.0', thence N 61° 09' 10" E 800.0', thence N 60° 58' 15" E 1724.45', thence leaving the centerline S 01° 10' 35" W 69.43', thence parallel with the above described centerline S 60° 58' 15" W 1689.62', thence S 61° 09' 10" W 801.71', thence S 64° 14' 30" W 272.91', thence S 66° 42' 15" W 502.55', thence S 69° 06' 10" W 303.02', thence S 72° 27' 55" W 272.8', thence S 74° 26' 55" W 252.39', thence S 77° 01' 30" W 181.75', thence leaving the South side of the levee N 01° 26' 25" E 61.96' to the point of beginning and containing 5.89 acres more or less.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The Tri-County Levee District, Missouri, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(h) JUDGE JOSEPH BARKER, JR., HOUSE, OHIO.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term "non-Federal entity" means the Friends of Joseph Barker, Jr., House, a nonprofit organization in the State of Ohio.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (6), the Secretary shall convey to the non-Federal entity, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in paragraph (3)(A).

(B) EASEMENT.—Upon conveyance of the property under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal entity, without consideration, an easement over the property described in paragraph (3)(B) for

access to the conveyed property for as long as the non-Federal entity is in legal possession of the conveyed property.

(3) DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The property referred to in paragraph (2)(A) is the following (as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act):

(i) JUDGE JOSEPH BARKER, JR., HOUSE.—The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point located on the southern right-of-way line of Ohio Route 7, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said Route 7 and severing the land of said United States of America parallel to and approximately 10 feet easterly of the toe of the existing dredge disposal berm, southeasterly approximately 326 feet to a point prior to the current Corps of Engineers access to the dredging spoil area; thence, northeasterly approximately 480 feet paralleling the top of the slope to the riverbank side of the house and approximately 25 feet northerly therefrom; thence, northwest approximately 302 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7; thence with the right-of-way of said Route 7, southwesterly approximately 485 feet to the point of beginning, containing approximately 3.51 acres.

(ii) ROAD TRACT.—The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point located on the southern right-of-way line of Ohio Route 7, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said Route 7 and severing the land of said United States of America and with the House Parcel southeasterly 25 feet; thence, northeast, running parallel to said Route 7 right-of-way, approximately 994 feet to a point of deflection; thence northeasterly 368 feet to a point beyond the existing fence corner; thence, east 140 feet to the edge of the existing Willow Island access road; thence with said access road, northwesterly approximately 62 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7; thence with the right-of-way of said Route 7, southwesterly approximately 1,491 feet to the point of beginning, containing approximately 1 acre.

(B) EASEMENT.—The property referred to in paragraph (2)(B) is the following: The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point at the intersection of the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7 and the northeast side of the existing Willow Island access road, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, southwest, running with said Route 7 right-of-way, approximately 30 feet to a point on the southwest side of the existing access road, and corner to the road tract; thence with said access road and the line of the road parcel, southeasterly approximately 62 feet to a point; thence leaving the road parcel and crossing the existing access road northeasterly approximately 30 feet to a point located on the northeast side of the existing access road; thence, northwesterly approximately 62 feet, to the point of beginning, containing approximately 0.04 acre.

(4) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(5) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this

subsection is not being used by the non-Federal entity for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(6) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IMPROVEMENTS.—The Secretary shall make such improvements and alterations to the property described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) as the Secretary, in consultation with the non-Federal entity and relevant stakeholders, determines to be appropriate to facilitate conveyance of the property and provision of the easement under this subsection, subject to the condition that the total cost of those improvements and alterations undertaken by the Secretary shall be not more than \$120,000.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—Before making a conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(i) conduct, with respect to the property to be conveyed, an assessment of the environmental condition of the property, including an investigation of any potential hazardous, toxic, or radioactive waste present on such property; and

(ii) submit to the non-Federal entity a report describing the results of such assessment.

(C) REFUSAL BY NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon review by the non-Federal entity of the report under subparagraph (B), the non-Federal entity may elect to refuse the conveyance under this subsection.

(ii) ELECTION.—An election under clause (i)—

(I) shall be at the sole discretion of the non-Federal entity; and

(II) shall be made by the non-Federal entity by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of submission of the report under subparagraph (B)(ii).

(D) DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall—

(i) notify and coordinate with the non-Federal entity and relevant stakeholders before carrying out any dredged material placement activities associated with the property described in paragraph (3)(A) after the date on which such property is conveyed under this subsection; and

(ii) in carrying out a dredged material placement activity under clause (i), act in accordance with Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-5025 (or a subsequent version of that manual).

(7) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary may reserve and retain from any conveyance under this subsection a right-of-way or any other right that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the authorized Federal channel along the Ohio River.

(8) TREATMENT.—Conveyance to the non-Federal entity under this subsection of property described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) shall satisfy all obligations of the Secretary with respect to such property under—

(A) section 306101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(B) section 306108 of title 54, United States Code, with respect to the effects on the property of dredged material placement activities carried out by the Secretary after the date of the conveyances.

(9) INAPPLICABILITY.—Subtitle I of title 40, and chapter 4 of title 41, United States Code shall not apply to any conveyance or easement provided under this subsection.

(i) LEABURG FISH HATCHERY, LANE COUNTY, OREGON.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall convey, without consideration, to the State of Oregon, acting through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, all

right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property comprising the Leaburg Fish Hatchery, consisting of approximately 21.55 acres, identified as tracts Q-1500, Q-1501E, and 300E-1 and described in Department of the Army Lease No. DACW57-1-18-0009, together with any improvements on the property.

(2) WATER RIGHTS.—The Secretary may transfer to the State of Oregon, acting through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, any water rights held by the United States that are appurtenant to the property conveyed under this subsection.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including a condition that all of the property conveyed under this subsection be used and maintained by the State of Oregon for the purpose of operating a fish hatchery in perpetuity.

(4) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used or maintained by the State of Oregon for the purpose of operating a fish hatchery in perpetuity, all or any portion of the property, including any water rights transferred under this subsection, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(5) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—If the State of Oregon does not accept the conveyance under this subsection, the Secretary may dispose of the property, including appurtenant water rights, under subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code.

(j) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS, WILLAMETTE RIVER, OREGON.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) REAL ESTATE APPENDIX.—The term “real estate appendix” means Appendix A of the document published by the District Commander of the Portland District of the Corps of Engineers, titled “Willamette Falls Locks Willamette River Oregon Section 216 Disposition Study with Integrated Environmental Assessment”.

(B) RECEIVING ENTITY.—The term “receiving entity” means an entity identified by the State of Oregon, in consultation with the Willamette Falls Locks Commission, to receive the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(C) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS PROJECT.—The term “Willamette Falls Locks project” means the project for navigation, Willamette Falls Locks, Willamette River, Oregon, authorized by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 664, chapter 382).

(D) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS REPORT.—The term “Willamette Falls Locks report” means the memorandum of the Director of Civil Works with the subject “Willamette Falls Locks (WFL), Willamette River Oregon Section 216 Disposition Study with Integrated Environmental Assessment (Study)”, dated July 11, 2019.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to convey to the receiving entity, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any land in which the Federal Government has a property interest for the Willamette Falls Locks project, together with any improvements on the land, subject to the requirements of this subsection and in accordance with the Willamette Falls Locks report.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) SUBJECT TO EXISTING EASEMENTS AND OTHER INTERESTS.—The conveyance of property under paragraph (2) shall be subject to all existing deed reservations, easements,

rights-of-way, and leases that are in effect as of the date of the conveyance.

(5) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection cease to be held in public ownership, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(6) REQUIREMENTS BEFORE CONVEYANCE.—

(A) PERPETUAL ROAD EASEMENT.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall acquire a perpetual road easement from an adjacent property owner for use of an access road, which easement shall convey with the property conveyed under such paragraph.

(B) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), in accordance with the real estate appendix, the Secretary shall complete a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

(C) HISTORIC PRESERVATION.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of agreement with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that identifies actions the Secretary shall take before making the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(D) REPAIRS.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall carry out repairs to address primary seismic and safety risks in accordance with the recommendations approved in the Willamette Falls Locks report.

(7) DEAUTHORIZATION.—Beginning on the date on which the Secretary makes the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Willamette Falls Locks project is no longer authorized.

**SEC. 336. REPEALS.**

(a) Section 710 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2264) is repealed.

(b) Section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(c) Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (c), the Secretary” and inserting “The Secretary”;

(B) by striking “subsections (a) and (c)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively.

(d) Section 6003 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 579c), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(e) Section 1301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 579d), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(f) Section 1302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 579c-1), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(g) Section 1301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 579d-1), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(h) Section 1302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 579c-2), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

**TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

**SEC. 401. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other pur-

poses, as identified in the reports titled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development” submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Con-

gress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports or decision documents designated in this section:

(1) NAVIGATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AK	Port of Nome Modifications	May 29, 2020	Federal: \$368,173,000 Non-Federal: \$122,746,000 Total: \$490,919,000
2. AK	Unalaska (Dutch Harbor) Channels	February 7, 2020	Federal: \$26,202,750 Non-Federal: \$8,734,250 Total: \$34,937,000
3. CT	New Haven Harbor Navigation Improvement Project	May 7, 2020	Federal: \$53,489,000 Non-Federal: \$18,822,000 Total: \$72,311,000
4. NY, NJ	New York and New Jersey Harbor Anchorages	April 23, 2020	Federal: \$18,940,000 Non-Federal: \$6,310,000 Total: \$25,250,000
5. TX	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River Floodgates and Colorado River Locks	October 23, 2019	Total: \$409,777,000, to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.
6. TX	Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, Harris, Chambers, and Galveston Counties	April 23, 2020	Federal: \$462,803,000 Non-Federal: \$414,045,000 Total: \$876,848,000
7. TX	Matagorda Ship Channel Improvement Project, Port Lavaca	November 15, 2019	Federal: \$138,660,000 Non-Federal: \$79,664,000 Total: \$218,324,000

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AZ	Little Colorado River at Winslow, Navajo County	December 14, 2018	Federal: \$52,462,000 Non-Federal: \$28,249,000 Total: \$80,711,000
2. CA	Westminster, East Garden Grove, California Flood Risk Management	July 9, 2020	Federal: \$314,506,000 Non-Federal: \$910,092,000 Total: \$1,224,598,000
3. CT, NY	Westchester County Streams, Byram River Basin, Fairfield County, Connecticut, and Westchester County, New York	May 7, 2020	Federal: \$14,702,500 Non-Federal: \$14,702,500 Total: \$29,405,000
4. ND	Souris River Basin Flood Risk Management	April 16, 2019	Federal: \$58,041,750 Non-Federal: \$31,253,250 Total: \$89,295,000
5. NJ	Peckman River Basin	April 29, 2020	Federal: \$95,022,000 Non-Federal: \$51,166,000 Total: \$146,188,000
6. NM	Middle Rio Grande Flood Protection, Bernalillo to Belen	March 13, 2020	Federal: \$190,538,000 Non-Federal: \$102,598,000 Total: \$293,136,000
7. OK	Tulsa and West-Tulsa Levee System, Tulsa County	April 23, 2020	Federal: \$86,780,000 Non-Federal: \$46,728,000 Total: \$133,508,000

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—



A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. DE	Delaware Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River	March 6, 2020	Initial Federal: \$53,220,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$28,660,000 Total: \$81,880,000 Renourishment Federal: \$116,380,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$116,380,000 Renourishment Total: \$232,760,000
2. NJ	New Jersey Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River	April 8, 2020	Initial Federal: \$80,780,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$43,500,000 Total: \$124,280,000 Renourishment Federal: \$82,140,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$82,140,000 Renourishment Total: \$164,280,000
3. NJ	Rahway River Basin, New Jersey Coastal Storm Risk Management	June 9, 2020	Federal: \$46,754,000 Non-Federal: \$25,175,000 Total: \$71,929,000
4. NY	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, Atlantic Coast of New York	August 22, 2019	Initial Federal: \$604,203,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$0 Total: \$604,203,000 Renourishment Federal: \$189,763,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$189,763,000 Renourishment Total: \$379,526,000
5. NY	Hashamomuck Cove Coastal Storm Risk Management	December 9, 2019	Initial Federal: \$11,549,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$6,218,000 Total: \$17,767,000 Renourishment Federal: \$23,481,500 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$23,481,500 Renourishment Total: \$46,963,000
6. RI	Pawcatuck River Coastal Storm Risk Management Project	December 19, 2018	Federal: \$37,848,000 Non-Federal: \$20,379,000 Total: \$58,227,000
7. VA	Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management	February 5, 2019	Federal: \$909,040,000 Non-Federal: \$489,480,000 Total: \$1,398,520,000

## (4) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND ECO-SYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CO	South Platte River and Tributaries, Adams and Denver Counties	July 29, 2019	Federal: \$334,412,000 Non-Federal: \$200,406,000 Total: \$534,818,000
2. NY	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York Reformulation	July 9, 2020	Initial Federal: \$1,541,981,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$0 Total: \$1,541,981,000 Renourishment Federal: \$742,926,500 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$742,926,500 Renourishment Total: \$1,485,853,000

## (5) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CA	Delta Islands and Levees	December 18, 2018	Federal: \$16,746,395 Non-Federal: \$9,016,736 Total: \$25,763,131
2. CA	Yuba River Ecosystem Restoration	June 20, 2019	Federal: \$65,014,326 Non-Federal: \$35,008,268 Total: \$100,022,594
3. FL	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Loxahatchee River Watershed Restoration Project, Martin and Palm Beach Counties	April 8, 2020	Federal: \$372,232,000 Non-Federal: \$368,528,000 Total: \$740,760,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
4. IL	The Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study - Brandon Road, Will County	May 23, 2019	Federal: \$690,643,200 Non-Federal: \$172,660,800 Total: \$863,304,000
5. IL	South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, Bubbly Creek, Ecosystem Restoration	July 9, 2020	Federal: \$11,657,000 Non-Federal: \$6,277,000 Total: \$17,934,000
6. MD	Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County	December 19, 2018	Federal: \$23,171,000 Non-Federal: \$12,476,000 Total: \$35,647,000
7. MO	St. Louis Riverfront- Meramec River Basin Ecosystem Restoration	November 1, 2019	Federal: \$60,124,000 Non-Federal: \$32,375,000 Total: \$92,499,000
8. NM	Rio Grande, Environmental Management Program, Sandia Pueblo to Isleta Pueblo, New Mexico Ecosystem Restoration	August 5, 2019	Federal: \$16,163,000 Non-Federal: \$8,703,000 Total: \$24,866,000
9. NY, NJ	Hudson-Raritan Estuary Ecosystem Restoration	May 26, 2020	Federal: \$265,320,000 Non-Federal: \$142,864,000 Total: \$408,184,000
10. TX	Jefferson County Ecosystem Restoration	September 12, 2019	Federal: \$37,615,000 Non-Federal: \$20,254,000 Total: \$57,869,000

## (6) WATER SUPPLY.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. OR	Willamette River Basin Review Reallocation,	December 18, 2019	Federal: \$0 Non-Federal: \$0 Total: \$0

## (7) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
1. FL	Caloosahatchee River West Basin Storage Reservoir (C-43 WBSR)	July 24, 2020	Federal: \$503,466,500 Non-Federal: \$503,466,500 Total: \$1,006,933,000
2. KY	Kentucky Lock	June 9, 2020	Total: \$1,152,769,000 (to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund)
3. NC	Carolina Beach Integrated Beach Renourishment	June 16, 2020	Federal: \$24,205,000 Non-Federal: \$24,205,000 Total: \$48,410,000
4. NC	Wrightsville Beach	July 2, 2020	Federal: \$53,788,000 Non-Federal: \$22,329,000 Total: \$76,117,000 Renourishment Federal: \$14,553,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$14,553,000 Renourishment Total: \$29,106,000
5. TX	Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Deepening and Widening and Barge Shelves	May 4, 2020	Federal: \$403,000,000 Non-Federal: \$273,010,000 Total: \$676,010,000

## SEC. 402. SPECIAL RULES.

(a) GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for ecosystem restoration, Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin project, Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois, authorized by section 401 of this Act, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the Report of the

Chief of Engineers, dated May 23, 2019, with the following modifications:

(1) The Federal share of the cost of construction shall be 80 percent.

(2) The Secretary may include the addition or substitution of technologies or measures not described in the report, as the Secretary determines to be advisable.

(b) WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW REALLOCATION STUDY.—The Secretary shall

carry out the project for water supply, Willamette River Basin Review Reallocation, Oregon, authorized by section 401 of this Act, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 18, 2019, with the following modifications:

(1) The Secretary shall meet the obligations of the Corps of Engineers under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 by complying

with the June 2019 NMFS Willamette Basin Review Study Biological Opinion Reasonable and Prudent Alternative until such time, if any, as it is modified or replaced, in whole or in part, through the consultation process under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(2) The Secretary may reallocate not more than 10 percent of overall storage in the joint conservation pool, as authorized by this Act and without further congressional action, if such reallocation is consistent with the ongoing consultation under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 related to Willamette Valley System operations.

(3) The Secretary shall ensure that the revised reallocation is not reallocated from a single storage use, does not seriously affect authorized project purposes, and does not otherwise involve major operational changes to the project.

(c) CANO MARTIN PENA, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—Section 5127 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1242) is amended by striking “\$150,000,000” and inserting “\$232,430,000”.

**SEC. 403. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS BASED ON FEASIBILITY STUDIES PREPARED BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, subject to subsection (b):

(1) FORT PIERCE, ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Fort Pierce, St. Lucie County, Florida, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of St. Lucie County, Florida Port Pierce Shore Protection Project Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment (June 2018)” and dated July 2018, at a total cost of \$33,107,639, and at an estimated total cost of \$97,958,972 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project.

(2) BAPTISTE COLLETTE BAYOU, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Baptiste Collette Bayou, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Plaquemines Parish Government’s Section 203 Study Baptiste Collette Bayou Navigation Channel Deepening Project Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment (January 2017, Amended April 2018)” and dated June 2018, at a total cost of \$44,920,000.

(3) HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Houma Navigation Canal, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Houma Navigation Canal Deepening Project Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Report and DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement (June 2018)” and dated July 2018, at a total cost of \$253,458,000.

(4) PORT FOURCHON BELLE PASS CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel Deepening Project Section 203 Feasibility Study (January 2019, revised January 2020)” and dated April 2020, at a total cost of \$95,483,000.

(5) WILMINGTON HARBOR, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina Navigation Improvement Project Integrated Section 203 Study & Environmental Report (February 2020)” and dated May 2020, at a total cost of \$834,093,000.

(6) CHACON CREEK, TEXAS.—The project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and other purposes, Chacon Creek, Texas, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Chacon Creek, Texas Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Report and DRAFT Environmental Assessment (August 2018)” and dated September 2018, at a total cost of \$51,973,000.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may only carry out a project authorized under subsection (a)—

(1) substantially in accordance with the applicable review assessment for the project submitted by the Secretary under section 203(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as identified in subsection (a) of this section, and subject to such modifications or conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and identifies in a final assessment that addresses the concerns, recommendations, and conditions identified by the Secretary in the applicable review assessment; and

(2) after the Secretary transmits to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate such final assessment.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(c)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a report” and inserting “an assessment”.

**TITLE V—BUDGETARY EFFECTS**

**SEC. 501. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7575, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we continue the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee tradition by considering the fourth consecutive bipartisan Water Resources Development Act since 2014, a tradition started by my friend and predecessor, Bill Shuster. It is a great tradition, and it is an incredible service to our Nation.

I am proud to be joined by Ranking Member SAM GRAVES, Subcommittee

Chair NAPOLITANO, and Subcommittee Ranking Member BRUCE WESTERMAN in sponsoring the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

The bill under consideration today was developed in a bipartisan manner with input from both sides of the aisle. The legislation was considered in committee and favorably reported by voice vote.

H.R. 7575 includes projects and policy provisions that impact communities across the Nation. It authorizes construction of 34 projects studied and approved by the chief of engineers since WRDA 2018 was signed into law.

It authorizes 36 new Corps of Engineers feasibility studies and directs the Corps to expedite the completion of 41 ongoing studies, which were submitted to the Corps by local sponsors willing to share the costs of these project studies.

H.R. 7575 continues our work to ensure the full utilization of the harbor maintenance trust fund by unlocking nearly \$10 billion. This is \$10 billion under an initiative started by Ronald Reagan of taxes collected from shippers that are ultimately paid by consumers in the United States. So, for years, we have been taking money under false pretenses and not spending that money on its designated purpose.

This bill will finally rectify that problem. There is ample need to invest that \$10 billion in our ports and harbors around the country.

The legislation also directs the Secretary of the Army to equitably allocate maintenance funds to pay for harbor operation maintenance needs, while addressing the ongoing needs of the Nation’s largest ports, the Great Lakes harbors, its emerging harbors.

This is especially important in communities like my district along Oregon’s southwest coast, where the difference between life and death for those who both recreate or fish commercially is in the conditions of our harbors, jetties, and breakwaters. It is literally life and death in very cold water. So, this is incredibly important.

Before earmarks were banned, I used to get my harbors dredged by earmarking. Since that was banned when the Republicans took over in 2010, I managed in the first WRDA bill in 2014 to get a 10 percent set-aside for small and emerging harbors. That has provided the critical dredging for my district and many, many harbors around the United States of America.

This bill, because we will have a lot more money, will provide actually 20 percent to small and emerging harbors. We have delayed and deferred projects all around the country.

This bill also recognizes the important role that inland waterways play in our Nation and provides a cost-share shift to help in completing construction of much-needed projects. I would give a shout-out to CONOR LAMB from Pennsylvania as being a tireless advocate on that, as well as other Members.

WRDA 2020 also includes specific policies that focus on climate change,

natural infrastructure solutions, and affordability, and provisions that assist minority, Tribal, and rural communities.

The bill recognizes the important role of resiliency in helping communities meet the current and future challenges of changing hydrologic conditions and repetitive and more frequent flooding events. I am glad to include provisions in this bill that will ensure taxpayer dollars are spent on infrastructure that will be resilient and will contribute to the resiliency of communities across the country.

It also ensures that all communities, especially communities with socioeconomic challenges, have a path forward in getting the tools they need for flood protection and ecosystem restoration. H.R. 7575 continues this tradition with a 2-year extension of the process.

We accommodated many, many Member requests from both sides of the aisle in this bill. There are some provisions in this bill, however, that will need further review. This legislation continues in conference.

For example, H.R. 7575 authorizes six projects where the studies were developed by the non-Federal interest under section 203 of WRDA-86.

The committee has received letters of concern about whether these projects have undergone sufficient environmental review, which would include public input of an equivalent level to studies developed by the Corps of Engineers. These are valid questions, and they may require changes to the 203 process as we go to conference with the Senate.

I would like to recognize a few individual members on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their valuable contributions to this bill: Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, for her dogged support in addressing the maintenance needs of our largest ports, particularly southern California, and for meeting future water supply needs of arid regions around the Nation, and the dedication of some of the newest members of my committee.

The vice chairwoman of the subcommittee is Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL from Florida, and her dedication to getting provisions to protect and restore the national treasure that is the Everglades was tireless.

I also recognize the work of the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) for her incredibly strong advocacy for the Port of Houston and their needs, and for the protection and sustainability of the businesses and communities along the Texas Gulf Coast that depend upon that navigable area.

I also recognize the new Member, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER), for her advocacy in addressing flooding risks of rural and economically disadvantaged communities within the Mississippi River Valley.

As I mentioned before, CONOR LAMB contributed. ANGIE CRAIG, Mr. PAPPAS from New Hampshire, Representative

DELGADO, HARLEY ROUDA, and SHARICE DAVIDS, they were all instrumental in bringing important issues to the committee and contributed to the formation of WRDA 2020.

The Water Resources Development Act is essential to communities throughout the country that depend upon the safe and affordable uses of their ports, harbors, and inland waterways. Our economy, safety, and environment will benefit from passage of WRDA 2020.

I am proud of our work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, July 24, 2020.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. H.R. 7575 contains provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill.

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

Thank you for agreeing to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. YARMUTH,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE,  
Washington, DC, July 24, 2020.

Hon. JOHN YARMUTH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. YARMUTH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. I appreciate your decision to waive formal consideration of the bill.

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

Thank you again and I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the

Committee on the Budget on this important issue.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,  
Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, or WRDA 2020.

Two weeks ago, we advanced this bipartisan legislation out of committee by voice vote. In taking up this bill, as the chairman pointed out, we are maintaining Congress' consideration of WRDA legislation on a 2-year cycle, something that we have done for some time now, since 2014.

We are also demonstrating that when we work in partnership instead of partisanship, we can accomplish great things for the infrastructure and for the American people.

I want to thank all the members of the committee and staff, especially the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, for their hard work and their willingness to work together on this important piece of legislation.

WRDA authorizes 39 critical projects across the country that originate at the local level but provide far-reaching benefits throughout their regions and the national economy.

WRDA is going to strengthen our American competitiveness. It is going to provide greater safeguards and peace of mind to our constituencies and help create jobs. Importantly, this bill supports the Nation's inland waterway networks and flood protection infrastructure.

In my home State of Missouri, we experienced devastating high water in 2019. RECORD flooding along the Missouri River destroyed homes, farms, and businesses in communities like Big Lake and Craig, Missouri, and many of those affected are still recovering to this day.

The threat of flooding remains for many Americans, and this bill authorizes some bold new plans to evaluate flood risk reduction in many of the major river basins.

This is a good first step to providing greater protections for the lives and property of the folks in the Lower Missouri River Basin. My district also borders the Mississippi River, with local communities facing very similar challenges with flood control and navigation.

To address these issues, WRDA provides new authority for the construction of permanent flood control structures in communities that experience repetitive losses as a result of flood events. We simply have to stop rebuilding back to the same inadequate standards in repeatedly flooded communities like mine in north Missouri.

This bill also streamlines the Public Law 84-99 program to ensure critical projects under this program can be done more efficiently and more effectively.

It has been more than a year since floods devastated parts of my district, and I am still getting calls from levee districts and communities on both the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers about issues they are having with this program. Under this bill, some of that is going to be alleviated.

The bill also delays construction and requires further evaluation of interception-rearing complexes, or IRCs. These expensive and unproven projects are supposedly designed to save the pallid sturgeon, but we don't know if they will actually do that. What we do know is that they are disastrous for navigation and disastrous for flood control along the Missouri River.

This bill recognizes the Corps should not build any more IRCs until it is proven that they won't negatively impact navigation and flood protection for many of our towns, farms, and businesses along the river.

Additionally, this legislation provides important new tools and funding set-asides for rural communities. It ensures that major construction and rehabilitation efforts on the inland waterway system are completed more quickly, and it offsets new project authorizations with deauthorizations of old, out-of-date projects to ensure fiscal responsibility.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill, and I want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Chairwoman NAPOLITANO, and Ranking Member WESTERMAN for their partnership in this bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 7575, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Development Act.

This bill, which was artfully and carefully drafted by Chairman DEFAZIO and the chair of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, enjoys broad bipartisan support.

In particular, this bill includes provisions that will protect the Great Lakes, which contain 90 percent of North America's fresh surface water.

It includes a specific authorization of the invasive species control system at Brandon Road Lock and Dam. Once completed, Brandon Road will prevent Asian carp and other invasive species from entering the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes delegation has fought for that authorization for nearly a decade. Since 2010, when Congress authorized the Great Lakes interbasin study, our delegation has worked for a long-term and basin-wide solution to the threat posed by the Asian carp.

Today's authorization is not the end, but it sends a bipartisan and clear message to our Nation that we take the protection of America's greatest \$7 billion recreational, fishery, and freshwater system seriously.

In addition to the bill's commitment to the Brandon Road project, I also

commend the committee and its chair for taking important steps updating requirements for resiliency, embedding beneficial reuse into the Corps' project development process, and investing and rebuilding the Nation's water infrastructure for the 21st century, all of which will create good jobs across this Nation.

Let me applaud Chairman DEFAZIO and the ranking member for their careful work to develop a bipartisan bill. The Water Resources Development Act of 2020 enjoys broad support and will ensure our Nation's continued prosperity.

□ 1430

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), who is on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican leader and our ranking member, Mr. GRAVES from Missouri, for their continued leadership on the consideration of the Water Resource Development Acts, or WRDAs.

Today I rise in strong support of H.R. 7575, WRDA 2020. H.R. 7575 strengthens our Nation's ability to withstand severe weather and flood events. It authorizes the construction of key water infrastructure projects, creates jobs here at home, and directly contributes to our economic growth and competitiveness.

The Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, where I have the honor of serving as ranking member, has jurisdiction over the water resources development missions of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. H.R. 7575 authorizes vital Corps projects for navigation; flood control; shoreline protection; recreation; water supply; environmental protection, restoration, and enhancement; and fish and wildlife management.

This WRDA bill focuses on supporting more resilient infrastructure, increasing rural flood protection, addressing the maintenance backlogs at our Nation's ports and harbors, and prioritizes our Nation's inland waterways.

This bill will help key projects in my home State of Arkansas that will spur economic development and prevent further environmental degradation. It advances the long-stalled MKARNS deepening project, protects the water supply for users of the Ouachita-Black system, and begins the process of preventing bank destabilization of the Sulphur River.

Our committee passed this bill 2 weeks ago by a voice vote, continuing the strong bipartisan support and the WRDA tradition.

H.R. 7575 is fiscally responsible, with new project authorizations fully offset by deauthorizations of projects that are outdated or no longer viable.

Above all, this legislation represents the continued bipartisan commitment

to regular order for consideration of water resources projects. Regularly overseeing the improvement of our Nation's infrastructure is one of Congress' most important responsibilities.

This is a good, commonsense bill, and I want to thank Chair DEFAZIO and especially Chair NAPOLITANO for her leadership on our Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and both of them for working across the aisle with us.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the incredible staff work on both sides of the aisle, but, in particular, the Republican staff, which includes Ian Bennitt, Jon Pawlow, and Victor Sarmiento. I also want to recognize Jefferson Deming on my staff for his work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 7575.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I included in the RECORD a letter from Chairman JOHN YARMUTH from the House Committee on the Budget agreeing to waive consideration of H.R. 7575, as amended, as well as my response to Chairman YARMUTH expressing appreciation for his willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD several letters of support from organizations and stakeholders in support of H.R. 7575.

JULY 28, 2020.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

The farmers, ranchers, food and beverage manufacturers, processors, package suppliers and agricultural product marketers that comprise our memberships are dedicated to providing the safe, abundant and affordable food, fiber and feed required to ensure our country stays healthy and fed.

Because American agriculture's competitive advantage largely depends upon the quality, reliability, accessibility and cost-effectiveness of the national transportation system, our organizations commend Congress for consistently examining water infrastructure projects every two years and write today to urge your support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2020.

As you know, agricultural commodities move via truck, rail, barge and ocean-going vessels. Consistent and timely focus on the U.S. inland waterways transportation network is vital to agricultural stakeholders because 20 percent of a farmer's income depends on exports. Inland waterway barge transportation is the least expensive, most efficient and most environmentally friendly mode, and U.S. locks and dams help relieve congestion and wear-and-tear on highways as well as discipline rail rates.

With respect to U.S. port and inland waterways infrastructure, H.R. 7575 includes two notable provisions we wish to highlight. Both Section 101 concerning the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) and Section 108 pertaining to inland waterways projects would positively affect the ability of our organizations' members to fulfill their role in the agricultural value chain to serve American farmers and domestic and global customers.

As you know, the intent of Section 101 of H.R. 7575 is to "unlock" the more than \$9 billion that's been collected and deposited in the HMTF by those that pay the 0.125 percent ad valorem tax based upon the value of

cargo imports. The inability thus far to access and spend those dollars on much-needed port dredging further has eroded the United States' comparative transportation advantage and contributed to lost export opportunities to the detriment of U.S. economic growth. Our organizations strongly support Section 101, which would provide critical and overdue access to the existing balance in the HMTF so that these funds can be spent on dredging as intended.

In addition, we believe that adjusting the cost-share formula for inland waterway construction and major rehabilitation of navigation projects, as proposed in Section 108 of H.R. 7575, is a prudent policy that would help address a critical problem facing our inland waterways transportation system. As you know, the majority of U.S. locks and dams are operating on borrowed time, having long outlived their 50-year design life. Further, most are not of sufficient capacity to handle modern 1,200-foot barge tows, and others require more maintenance. Each of these factors costs shippers valuable time and resources.

Section 108 amends the cost-share formula for the construction and major rehabilitation of each inland waterways navigation project from the current 50 percent general revenue and 50 percent Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) funding to 65 percent general revenue and 35 percent IWTF. The policy is a step in the right direction that would expedite completion of such projects and help bring the U.S. inland waterways transportation system into the 21st century. For these reasons, we support making permanent the cost share formula adjustment in H.R. 7575 to provide certainty for these projects, which reduces construction costs.

Our organizations strongly support passage of H.R. 7575 because Section 101 and Section 108 would enhance U.S. agriculture's competitiveness, contribute to the overall efficiency of the U.S. transportation system, and promote overall U.S. economic growth and job creation. We urge you to support and approve this critical infrastructure bill so that negotiations can proceed with the Senate with the goal of enacting a new WRDA law in 2020.

Sincerely,

Agricultural and Food Transporters Conference, Agricultural Retailers Association, Agriculture Transportation Coalition, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, American Sugar Cane League, Corn Refiners Association, Farm Credit Council, Florida Sugar Cane League, Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils, National Aquaculture Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Grain and Feed Association, National Milk Producers Federation, National Oilseed Processors Association, North American Millers' Association, North American Renderers Association, Specialty Soya & Grains Alliance, The Fertilizer Institute, United Fresh Produce Association, USA Rice, Waterways Council, Inc., Western Growers.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
OF PORT AUTHORITIES,  
July 15, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

Hon. SAM GRAVES,  
*Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

Re Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFazio AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: The American Association

of Port Authorities (AAPA) supports passage of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 through the House of Representatives. On behalf of our 78 United States member ports, AAPA appreciates that this legislation expands the budget cap adjustment to all the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund revenues for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) which would unlock approximately \$10 billion from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. We are pleased to see that the legislation recognizes the needs of donor ports, emerging harbors and Great Lakes navigation projects and look forward to working with you prior to enactment on these provisions.

The legislation also authorizes new navigation channel improvement studies as well as authorizing projects to proceed to construction. The legislation continues to improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of Corps study efforts and product delivery. These efforts are essential for our Nation's future economic growth as well as providing family supporting jobs.

I thank you for your work on these issues and others related to maritime infrastructure, both included in this bill and otherwise. Our Association looks forward to working with you, your Committee staff, and the rest of Congress on passage of this legislation.

Respectfully,  
CHRISTOPHER J. CONNOR,  
*President and CEO.*

THE CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION,  
July 28, 2020.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Minority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Re H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC)—the leading association in the construction industry representing more than 27,000 firms, including America's leading general contractors, specialty-contracting firms, service providers, and suppliers—I urge you to vote "yes" on H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, which is expected to be considered by the U.S. House of Representatives under the suspension of the rules this week.

H.R. 7575 is an essential step forward as Congress works to continue the biennial process of passing legislation that invests in our nation's water resources infrastructure. The predictability of the biennial passage of water resources development acts is critical for all stakeholders involved in the planning and execution of water resources projects. Through these investments, H.R. 7575 will create jobs, improve the quality of life for all Americans, protect our communities, facilitate waterborne commerce, restore environmentally sensitive areas of the country, and help grow our economy.

AGC appreciates that the bill will help ensure that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Civil Works Program is appropriately responsive to the water resources needs identified by local communities. Specifically, the bill authorizes more than 30 pending Corps Chief's Reports, which will facilitate important water resources projects across the country, authorizes dozens of new feasibility studies, and expedites the completion of many existing feasibility studies. In addition, AGC supports the provisions of H.R. 7575 that ensure funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund go towards their intended uses, extend a pilot program that al-

lows non-federal interests to carry out feasibility studies and projects, and modify the cost share of projects funded by the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, among others.

AGC applauds the bipartisan process used to develop H.R. 7575 and is hopeful that the House and U.S. Senate will reach an agreement between their respective legislative proposals this year. Again, AGC urges you to vote "yes" on H.R. 7575 and looks forward to working with the Congress as the legislative process continues.

Sincerely,  
JAMES V. CHRISTIANSON,  
*Vice President, Government Relations.*

THE PORT  
OF LOS ANGELES,  
July 16, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFazio,  
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

Hon. GARRET GRAVES,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure, Washington, DC.*

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,  
*Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.*

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
*Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFazio, CHAIRWOMAN NAPOLITANO, RANKING MEMBER GRAVES, AND RANKING MEMBER WESTERMAN: On behalf of the Port of Los Angeles, I am writing to thank you for your leadership in advancing the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 and to express our strong support for its swift enactment.

Combined, the San Pedro Bay ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach handle more than one third of the nation's containerized imports and exports. In fact, every single Congressional district in the nation is reached by the goods moving through the San Pedro bay, so maintaining the in-water infrastructure at these ports is essential for American competitiveness in the global economy.

In previous communications we noted that historically the San Pedro Bay ports receive a disproportionately low return of Harbor Maintenance Trust (HMT) revenues, and what we do receive cannot be used for vital infrastructure maintenance. We are grateful that you have recognized the importance of equity for donor ports in your legislation and addressed these priorities:

Fair share of HMT funding for donor ports.

Expanded uses for emerging harbors and donor ports.

Extension of the 2106 program for donor and energy transfer ports.

A robust and healthy port industry is vital to our nation's economy. Donor ports, such as the Port of Los Angeles, play a fundamental role in supporting the national freight system and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Full spend of HMT revenues (including the trust fund balance), and fair and equitable allocations, will ensure that this important funding is used to enhance our nation's competitiveness.

Language in the recently passed CARES Act includes "full-spend" to be implemented with either the passage of WRDA reauthorization or in January 2021. This makes addressing donor equity and expanded uses extremely urgent and I am grateful for your work to address these vital issues and am happy to express my strong support for this bi-partisan legislation.

We applaud your efforts to address this vital infrastructure need and hope to work



with you as this bill moves forward to address the unique requirements of our nation's ports.

Sincerely,

EUGENE D. SEROKA,  
*Executive Director.*

[From the National Wildlife Federation,  
July 15, 2020]

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT  
INCLUDES WINS FOR WILDLIFE, COMMUNITIES**

WASHINGTON, DC—The Water Resources Development Act of 2020, which is being marked up by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, includes numerous provisions to advance ecosystem restoration and strengthen climate resilience. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee reported out a related bill, America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2020, earlier this year.

"Nature has long been an underutilized tool in the Army Corps' toolbox. This bill takes important steps to remedy this, with a suite of reforms that remove barriers to using healthy rivers, floodplains, wetlands and shorelines to protect communities from hurricanes and floods," said Melissa Samet, senior water resources counsel at the National Wildlife Federation. "The National Wildlife Federation is grateful for the strong leadership of Chairman DeFazio, Subcommittee Chair Napolitano, Ranking Member Sam Graves and Subcommittee Ranking Member Westerman for their bipartisan efforts to advance important provisions to protect frontline communities and vital ecosystems including the Everglades, Mississippi River Delta, and Great Lakes."

The National Wildlife Federation supports many important provisions of this bill, including:

Provisions that remove barriers to, and drive use of natural infrastructure, including by ensuring that natural infrastructure solutions will benefit from the same cost-share requirements as non-structural measures.

Careful evaluation of natural infrastructure solutions to protect communities from storms and floods, including a robust pilot program that provides full federal funding for flood and storm risk reduction studies for economically disadvantaged communities and ensures robust evaluation of natural infrastructure solutions.

Implementation of the Water Resources Principles, Requirements and Guidelines (PR&G) by the Corps, including fully engaging the public in that effort. Effective implementation of the PR&G will bring the Corps' water resources planning process in line with 21st Century water resources management principles, and improve water resources planning across the board.

Comprehensive review of the Corps' mitigation record by the Government Accountability Office. Ensuring full compliance with mitigation requirements is critical for fish and wildlife and for the communities and economies that rely on these vital resources.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
July 14, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,  
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. SAM GRAVES,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation  
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce applauds the bipartisan approach taken by your Committee in advance of tomorrow's markup of the Water Resources

Development Act (WRDA) of 2020. Reauthorization of America's water resources programs is critical to economic growth and environmental stewardship, and we support this legislation.

WRDA would ensure the viability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works programs including navigation, flood risk management, recreation, and associated environmental infrastructure. Enactment of this bill would provide critical economic and environmental benefits to the United States.

Reauthorizing these programs prior to their September 30 expiration would provide the certainty of federal commitment needed to allow state, local, and private partners to move forward with needed planning and construction of modern, resilient infrastructure. These important water projects would bring economic benefits to both rural and urban regions.

The Chamber also applauds the inclusion of 34 new project authorizations, additional provisions to ensure modern, resilient infrastructure, improvements in water supply delivery, and increased investment from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, a long-time priority of both your Committee and the Chamber.

With less than three months until the current authorization expires, the Chamber is pleased that House leadership anticipates floor consideration of the bill later this month. We appreciate your Committee moving promptly to ensure timely action on these critical issues.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

WATERWAYS COUNCIL, INC.,  
Washington, DC, July 28, 2020.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,  
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. SAM GRAVES,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation  
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO AND RANKING MEMBER GRAVES: The members of Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI) thank you for your leadership and commitment to the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) biennial process.

America's inland waterways system includes 12,000 miles of commercially operated and maintained navigable channels that directly affect 38 states. The inland waterways system is tasked with transporting the nation's bulk commodities that keep America competitive in the most energy-efficient and environmentally friendly way. In 2016, 558 million tons of commodities valued at \$300 billion transited the waterways, supporting 541,000 American jobs.

WCI thanks you for Section 108. This section adjusts the cost-share formula for the construction and major rehabilitation of inland waterways navigation projects from the current 50 percent general revenue and 50 percent Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) to 65 percent general revenue and 35 percent IWTF for seven years. The policy is a step in the right direction and will help expedite the completion of inland waterways construction and major rehabilitation projects during the applicable years. WCI looks forward to working with the Committee as they proceed to conference on making the cost-share permanent.

Passing this legislation in regular order is critical to ensuring waterways reliability in order to keep America competitive. WCI offers its support of passing WRDA 2020.

Sincerely,

TRACY ZEA,  
*President and CEO,  
Waterways Council, Inc.*

**WRDA 2020 SUPPORT LIST**

American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, Agricultural Working Group, American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), American Society of Civil Engineers, Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), Association of California Water Agencies, Association of Marina Industries, BOAT US, Earthjustice, Future Ports, Great Lakes Metro Chambers Coalition (GLMCC), Healing Our Waters-Great Lakes Coalition, Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA), Lake Carriers' Association, Marine Retailers Association of America.

National Association of Counties (NACo), National Audubon Society, National Grain and Feed Association, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), National Water Supply Alliance, National Wildlife Federation (NWF), Port of Los Angeles, Resources Legacy Fund/Open Rivers Fund, Rise to Resilience and Waterfront Alliance, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, The Nature Conservancy, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Waterways Council, Inc.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCIA), who is a member of the committee.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 and commend the leadership of Chairman DEFAZIO and Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment Chair NAPOLITANO.

I hail from Chicago and the Nation's Gold Coast along Lake Michigan, and we know how important a healthy Great Lakes system is. Lake Michigan is not only Chicago's primary drinking water source, it is part of the largest freshwater source in the world—our beloved Great Lakes.

Lake Michigan is a tremendous recreational resource and economic asset, and it needs to be protected. This legislation authorizes projects important to my constituents.

First, the Brandon Road Lock and Dam project must be completed to prevent Asian carp, an invasive species, from migrating into Lake Michigan.

We must also restore Bubbly Creek, a degraded waterway that was polluted by Chicago's meatpacking industry in the early 1900s and made famous by Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle." Restoring the waterway will create a healthy ecosystem and benefit neighborhoods like McKinley Park, Bridgeport, and Pilsen.

Managing storm water systems can be challenging in Chicago because it is heavily urbanized. This bill promotes more natural infrastructure and studies for Chicago area rivers and the Great Lakes river basins to make sure future projects preserve our drinking water, protect people's homes and businesses from flooding, and restore our environment so that all communities benefit from our rivers and Great Lakes.

I am proud of the bipartisan effort developing and passing this legislation through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

I also want to give a shout-out to my incredible Brookings Institution fellow, Christine Gallagher, who has done tremendous work for my office on transportation and water issues. This is her last week before she returns to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and I congratulate her.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise also, today, in support of the Water Resources and Development Act of 2020. This piece of legislation is a top priority for my constituents in south Florida on the Treasure Coast because it is critical to our public health, our environment, and our economy.

Now, I am smiling because this legislation includes a number of provisions that I was proud to write to protect Florida's waterways, including accelerating construction of the EAA reservoir, reducing discharges from Lake Okeechobee to the St. Lucie Estuary, and to combat harmful algal blooms—all yeomen's work.

Now, demanding that the Army Corps of Engineers must seek to reduce discharges into our coastal estuaries is a huge victory that everybody in our community should be proud of.

However, I ask my colleagues this: If their constituents were being, literally, poisoned by the Federal Government, would they fight for anything less than a complete stop to that poisoning?

That is why I am going to continue to be in this fight with everything that I have got, build on this momentum to eliminate all toxic discharges into my community and send more water south into Florida's Everglades.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), who is a member of the committee and who was key in getting the additional investments in the inland waterways.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, others before me have said why it matters that we have working locks and dams. It has always mattered.

The United States has more miles of navigable rivers, lakes, and canals than anywhere else in the world. It made us who we are as a nation. We could move iron ore to make steel faster, cheaper, and easier than all of our competitors because of our water, but especially because of our locks and dams that control the water. So we need to fix them, and this bill will help.

I hope that America will take note of something else here today, which is that this Congress still works. It might not be as well as people would want every single day, but this is a major bill. This is a major infrastructure bill, and this is a major infrastructure bill that has been bipartisan from the very beginning and, hopefully, will end bipartisan when our friends in the Senate work with us to get this done.

I want to give a special thanks to my Republican friend and colleague from

Texas (Mr. BABIN). Together, we led a big group of Members from both parties in support of a better way to fund these locks and dams.

I especially want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES, who agreed. Now we have a better chance to rebuild the locks and dams and to deliver on the promise we made to the American people.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend Republicans and Democrats for coming together. This bill is a bipartisan bill. It doesn't mean it is perfect, but it means that we all came together and we worked together to ensure that we are advancing our Nation's water resources.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does everything from ecological restoration, to our navigation channels, to flood control, to hurricane protection.

This is about the resilience and sustainability of our community and the resilience and sustainability of our ecosystem and our economy. These are projects that we need to be working together on.

I want to thank my friend, the chairman, Mr. DEFAZIO; the ranking member, SAM GRAVES; as well as the subcommittee—friends—chairman and ranking member, GRACE NAPOLITANO and BRUCE WESTERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, this bill advances important priorities like ensuring section 1043 can be expanded to allow our State and non-Federal sponsors to be a partner with the Corps of Engineers—a true partner—and lead some sections of the projects; allowing our continuing authorities programs to be expanded; incorporating tools like natural infrastructure into the toolbox of achieving these objectives that we all share; ensuring that we attack—and I want to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. MAST) for leading on this—the harmful algal blooms off the coast of Louisiana, which I represent, largest dead zone in this Nation on a national basis; and importantly, ensuring that we maintain and take a different sustainable approach to the authorized depth of the Mississippi River system, which is America's commerce superhighway, connecting 31 States with the least expensive and lowest emissions form of transportation; putting shipments on barges and on oceangoing vessels so America can compete globally with the great products that we develop here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the great staff who worked on this, including Ian Bennett, Victor Sarmiento, Ryan Seiger, Maggie Ayrea, Paul Sawyer, and all the folks who helped put this bill together. I urge adoption.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the Water Resources Development Act contains

important language to help prevent a public health crisis at the Salton Sea, California's largest lake, which is in my district.

The Salton Sea's shoreline is rapidly receding, exposing thousands of acres of lake bed and sending dust loaded with selenium and pesticides into the air and into the lungs of residents in my district.

My provision will authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to take the next steps and study the construction of a northern perimeter lake project at the sea, which is the next major project under the State of California's Salton Sea Management Program, and it will strengthen the Federal-State partnership.

Later this week, we will pass the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, which contains another one of my provisions which will prioritize the Army Corps' efforts at the Salton Sea.

I would like to thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Congressman VARGAS, and Congresswoman NAPOLITANO for their partnership on this pressing and important issue, and I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), who is the ranking member on the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRAVES for his leadership on this issue and also the ranking member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, a good friend, Mr. WESTERMAN, along with Chairman DEFAZIO and Chair NAPOLITANO of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

This is a great day. This is a continuation of what was started in 2014 under Chairman Shuster at the time, and it was with bipartisan success that we began getting the water resource development bills passed on a 2-year basis. This is another shining example of what bipartisan work can do. We are here to talk about the successes of authorizing all of the Corps of Engineers' programs, which is extremely important to my district, which is surrounded by the inland waterway system.

If we don't do our job in this institution in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to pass a Water Resources Development Act on a biannual basis, then what happens is we put the effectiveness of our farmers and our manufacturers from getting their products from their manufacturing facilities or their fields into the inland waterway system and out into the global marketplace in a cost-effective way and in a way that is going to allow them to continue to provide jobs in my district.

One aspect of this bill I am particularly grateful for is the cost share adjustment in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. This is a big deal for us to

upgrade our antiquated lock and dam system along the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. This is a success story.

I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES. I do also want to thank the staff of the Transportation and Infrastructure committee. They worked hard. All of them deserve a round of thanks, and I appreciate the efforts on not just this bill, but every other piece of legislation that goes through that great committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on this bill, and I am glad to see the process is working today.

□ 1445

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO for working in a bipartisan manner, and subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO, to make sure this bill got through on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that two policy changes that I led the fight for have been included in this legislation. Flooding disproportionately impacts low-economic communities and people of color.

Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago, a severe storm in my district flooded the streets of Compton and shut down parts of the 710 freeway. Many communities lack the money to pay for studies to plan and develop projects that can reduce damage from flooding and storms. As part of a new program funded by this bill, the Federal Government will now cover 100 percent of the cost of these studies for a select number of disadvantaged communities.

This bill also makes it less costly for communities to restore nature in ways that will reduce the risk of flooding and help provide cleaner air and water.

For example, it will be easier to restore areas where water covers the soil, known as wetlands, such as the Dominguez Gap Wetlands along the Los Angeles River. Or we can more easily afford planting street trees and trees in local parks to absorb flood water, cool the community, and clean the air.

In short, this bill will make our communities stronger, built to last, and better prepared for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. I appreciate the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure bringing us a strong bipartisan product, of which you have heard. This meets the water management needs across our country.

The Third District of Nebraska was heavily impacted by unprecedented

flooding last year. These floods ravaged farmland, destroyed essential infrastructure, like highways, water treatment plants, and levees that had withstood the test of time for decades. The Army Corps of Engineers has worked within their authority to address these water management issues around our State; however, they have not been able to address every concern.

I appreciate the chairman and ranking member working with me to ensure inactive levees have an opportunity to receive assistance from the Army Corps of Engineers if they meet certain criteria. Peru, Nebraska, is one of the many communities that could be helped by this legislative language.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES and their staff for the wonderful work that they did for putting this bipartisan bill together, and also Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 14 years, I have been working in Congress to advocate for the full authorized funding of Laredo, Texas’ Chacon Creek Restoration Project.

The Army Corps now, once we get this done, can carry out the flood risk management and ecosystem project totaling about \$52 million. The flood mitigation component will evacuate 250 homes from the floodplain, from Lake Casa Blanca all the way down to the Rio Grande along the Chacon Creek.

This ecosystem restoration component will also include 417 acres of wetland and riparian restoration. This is a natural treasure that we have in Laredo, Texas, and it will provide hundreds of acres of new recreational and educational parklands.

Mr. Speaker, the Chacon Creek is a tremendous natural resource in Laredo, and I thank the ranking member and committee staff for doing this great work.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRAVES and Chairman DEFAZIO.

Mr. Speaker, Southeast Texas is the global leader in creating reliable, affordable energy that powers America and, quite frankly, much of the world. But we can’t do that without modernizing and improving our water infrastructure, which it is my honor to have achieved in this bill for the people of the 36th Congressional District of Texas, and by extension, all American families.

My district has four ports, including the main port terminal of the Port of Houston. The Houston Ship Channel is the busiest U.S. deep-draft waterway, and it is the top exporting port in the Nation.

This bill turns years of advocacy to dredge, widen, and improve two-way traffic on the Houston Ship Channel into real results. This will allow for a more efficient, safe, and productive waterway for all. But I also recognize that there is still much work to be done. It is not an exaggeration to say that by spending \$1 million today on hurricane and flood prevention infrastructure, we can save a billion dollars in damages down the road from another storm like Hurricane Harvey, which dumped 60 inches of rain on my district—a North American rainfall record, by the way.

Thankfully, this bill contains numerous provisions for me and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that work to address these critical needs. It is a great honor to serve the people of Southeast Texas in Congress in producing legislation like this bipartisanly—one of the biggest reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the bipartisan work of the chairman, the ranking member, and also the staff and the subcommittee chair.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in Washington State, we are blessed with an abundance of rivers and lakes that support fish and wildlife. Right now, projects like modifying tide gates and restoring or reconnecting floodplains and wetlands are not getting the priority they need to protect these important ecosystems.

I am so pleased that the bill I introduced with Congressman RICK LARSEN was included in WRDA. By prioritizing rivers with the greatest chance of recovery, we have the best shot at protecting these waterways and achieving the largest return on our investments.

Healthy rivers mean clean water for fish, wildlife, and communities, and healthy salmon runs help us meet our treaty rights obligations, ensure thriving local economies and recreational opportunities, and protect our endangered salmon and orca populations.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this year’s bipartisan Water Resources Development Act.

Our country was built on an elaborate system of inland waterways, ports, and harbors to facilitate trade and transportation. And nearly every community in our country relies on open waterways to move their products.

My district is no exception. We are home to the Port of Huntington Tri-State on the Ohio River. This interconnected water system creates jobs and ensures that Appalachia remains a competitive region of economic growth.

As we rethink and reform America's supply chains post-COVID, we must continue to open, update, and modernize key water infrastructure to maintain safety and efficiency. WRDA investments secure this mission.

WRDA also delivers protection from hurricanes and flooding. In my district in southern West Virginia, we saw disaster strike in 2016 when our dams overflowed, and our rivers tore through many vibrant communities. As we recover and rebuild, we must also prepare for the future.

If we pass this bill, we can double the funding for flood protection in central West Virginia and triple the funding in southern West Virginia. The vast majority of American communities lie along key U.S. waterways. And while I work for my district, countless others will also see increased protections.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country, I implore my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2020 Water Resources Development Act, a bill that includes language that I fought for to ensure that the Federal Government not just supports and funds flood control projects, but also supports those projects in economically disadvantaged communities.

For too long, the Army Corps has relied on an outdated metric when making decisions whether or not to invest. Unfortunately, it is a metric that doesn't always capture the project's full value, including the potential loss of valuable agricultural land, like that in the Pajaro Valley in my district on the central coast of California.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, though, with continued pressure by me and many other stakeholders, I am proud that the 2020 WRDA contains language that directs the Army Corps when they re-scope projects to take into account non-Federal interests, especially in economically disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for their leadership on WRDA, and I look forward to working with them to reach a final compromise with the Senate that maintains this language to properly invest in all communities, not just to save money, but to save lives.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for including my request to fund Section 531, the program for Southern and Eastern Kentucky.

In the region that I serve, we are still fighting for clean water and reliable wastewater systems for our families, our schools, and our businesses. Many of our folks, like those in Martin Coun-

ty, are often forced to boil water because lines are failing, and believe it or not, we are still finding straight pipes dumping raw sewage into some of our beautiful streams.

Thanks to Section 531, some 35,000 families in Southern and Eastern Kentucky now have their own septic system or access to a reliable wastewater system, and over 90 percent of my rural region now has access to clean water.

But it should be 100 percent in every part of America. Anything less is shameful. And that is why this funding increase and this bill are so critical.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. GRAVES, and Chairman DEFAZIO for bringing a great bill out, and I urge its support.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for answering the plea of so many of us in relation to our districts. I thank subcommittee chairwoman, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ranking Member WESTERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad for all these years I have been working on issues dealing collectively with our Houston port or bayous and the flooding crisis that we have in Houston, Texas, Harris County.

I am glad that this legislation authorizes the Houston Ship Channel Expansion Improvement Project, part of my district, the Federal contribution to which is approximately \$463 million. I remember standing at the edge of our port looking at the mud collecting and impeding the going and coming of those vessels.

It authorizes the construction of all 34 pending Corps Chief's Reports received since the enactment of WRDA;

Authorizes 35 feasibility studies for water resources development projects;

And directs the Corps, which we have worked with, to expedite the completion of 41 feasibility studies currently underway, including the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment, Flood Risk Management feasibility study, which I have introduced over and over again. It is now going to move.

It fully unlocks the approximately \$10 billion currently held in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

It helps bayous in my district, Greens Bayou, White Oak Bayou, Hunting Bayou; and, of course, it recognizes that Hurricane Harvey—we had 21 trillion gallons of water, losing housing, 203,000 homes were damaged and 12,700 were destroyed.

Finally, what is so important, the bill directs the secretary to issue final agency procedures for its Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines to ensure that future water resources development projects will maximize sustainable development and affordably address the needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

The bill authorizes the Corps to study, design, and construct water resources.

Mr. Speaker, the most disadvantaged persons are the ones that suffer the most. I am grateful for this bill, and I ask support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act for 2020, which strengthens America's competitive edge by investing in our ports, harbors and inland waterways, builds more resilient communities, and creates additional flexibility for the Corps to address the water resources needs of economically disadvantaged communities, communities of color, and rural communities.

I thank Congressman DEFAZIO and Congressman GRAVES of Missouri, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Congresswoman NAPOLITANO and Congressman WESTERMAN, the Water Development Resources Subcommittee Chair and Ranking Member, respectively, for their work in shepherding this important bipartisan legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan legislation because it:

1. Authorizes the Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, the federal contribution to which is approximately \$463 million.

2. Authorizes the construction of all 34 pending Corps Chief's Reports received since the enactment of WRDA 2018.

3. Authorizes 35 feasibility studies for water resources development projects, those identified through the public review process established by section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

4. Directs the Corps to expedite the completion of 41 feasibility studies currently underway, including the Houston Regional Watershed Assessment Flood Risk Management Feasibility study, which is certainly needed given the frequency and severity of historic-level flood events in recent years in and around the Houston metropolitan area.

5. Fully unlocks the approximately \$10 billion currently held in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) by providing the authority to appropriate additional funds for harbor maintenance needs from the existing balance in the Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, these water development projects managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in consultation with local partners are key to preserving our Nation's economy, to protecting our communities, and to maintaining our quality of life.

The Army Corps of Engineers has been working with the Harris County Flood Control District since 1937 to reduce the risk of flooding within Harris County.

Current projects include 6 federal flood risk management projects:

1. Sims Bayou;
2. Greens Bayou;
3. Brays Bayou;
4. White Oak Bayou;
5. Hunting Bayou; and
6. Clear Creek.

In addition to these ongoing projects, the Army Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the Addicks and Barker (A&B) Detention Dams in northwest Harris County.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation because it is essential in minimizing the risk of flood damage to Houston and Harris

County metropolitan area, the nation's fourth largest, is a matter of national significance because the region is one of the Nation's major technology, energy, finance, export and medical centers:

1. The Port of Houston is the largest bulk port in the world;

2. Texas Medical Center is a world renowned teaching, research and treatment center;

3. Houston is home to the largest conglomeration of foreign bank representation and second only to New York City as home to the most Fortune 500 companies; and

4. The Houston Watershed Assessment study area sits within major Hurricane Evacuation arteries for the larger Galveston Gulf Coast region.

At its peak on September 1, 2017, one-third of Houston was underwater due to Hurricane Harvey flooding.

There were over 41,500 square miles of land mass impacted by Hurricane Harvey and the subsequent flooding that covered an area larger than the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont combined.

Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

In September 2017, NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory reported that Hurricane Harvey's rainfall created 275 trillion pounds of water, which caused the crust in and around Houston to deform and sink nearly 1 inch because of the weight.

Over 300,000 structures flooded in southeastern Texas, where extreme rainfall hit many areas that are densely populated.

Hurricane Harvey is the largest housing disaster to strike the U.S. in our Nation's history.

Hurricane Harvey damaged 203,000 homes, of which 12,700 were destroyed.

Texas flood control districts are still struggling to recover from this record breaking flood event.

Nineteen trillion gallons of flood waters poured into the Houston Ship Channel from area rivers and bayous on the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

As a consequence, tens of millions of tons of sediment and debris flowed through the big-gest waterway in the nation.

The Port of Houston produces 27 percent of the nation's gasoline and about 60 percent of the U.S. aviation fuel.

Investments in all aspects of our Nation's water infrastructure pays dividends in the form of economic activity.

The Houston Ship Channel generates \$617 billion in the U.S. with \$265 billion of that in Texas representing 16 percent of the state of Texas's GDP.

The Port of Houston sustains 2.7 million jobs nationally with 1.2 million of them within the state of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, let me list a few of the provisions in this bill that will benefit my communities I represent.

The bill directs the Secretary to issue final agency procedures for its Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines (PR&G) to ensure that future water resources development projects will maximize sustainable development and affordably address the needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

The bill authorizes the Corps to study, design and construct water resources projects

for communities that have been subjected to repetitive flooding events and have received emergency flood assistance, including construction of temporary barriers.

This authority will help repetitive loss communities, especially those in economically-disadvantaged communities, obtain critical flood protection.

The legislation requires the Corps to undertake an inventory of water resources development projects and associated properties that are or may be contaminated with PFAS, and to develop a plan to remediate and limit potential human exposure to the contamination.

The bill requires the Corps to complete its review on minority community and tribal consultation, as well as update Corps' policies on environmental justice considerations and community engagement and consultation.

Finally, the legislation authorizes and creates additional flexibility for the Corps to address the water resources needs of economically disadvantaged communities, communities of color, and rural communities, such as authorizing the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance for resiliency planning, with priority given to economically disadvantaged communities.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 7575, the bipartisan Water Resources Development Act of 2020.

□ 1500

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the First Congressional District of New York, located on the East End of Long Island, a district almost completely surrounded by water. We were hit really hard by Superstorm Sandy, and the widespread devastation emphasized the dire need to ensure our communities were better prepared for the future.

Working hard with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Colonel Thomas Asbery of the Army Corps, and their entire hardworking team, this bill prioritizes local projects that are vital to my congressional district.

That includes the Fire Island to Montauk Point project, which includes essential dredging and shoreline projects over 83 miles of coastline.

Coastal storm risk management for Hashamomuck Cove in Southold is included, where right now local residents, businesses, and first responders are paralyzed even during a severe thunderstorm.

Equally as important, this legislation continues to build on these victories, jump-starting movement on projects at Reel Point Reserve and Shelter Island, Goldsmith's Inlet in Southold, and Wading River Creek in Riverhead through authorizing feasibility studies.

The Water Resources Development Act is great news for our shorelines on

Long Island and across the country, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for the opportunity to briefly speak on the bipartisan 2020 Water Resources Development Act.

I am pleased that this bill includes my legislation, the Tuscarawas River Flooding Study Act, which authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct a comprehensive feasibility study on the Tuscarawas River watershed.

Northeast Ohio is justifiably proud of our historical heritage regarding the Ohio and Erie Canal. From the Portage Lakes to Canal Fulton, this heritage is embedded throughout my district. However, this legacy also means that cities and villages often encounter recurring flooding events because of the historical building patterns from the 19th century.

Just last summer, southwest Summit County saw significant flooding throughout the Tuscarawas River basin. This study will serve as a first step toward beginning to find solutions to address these challenges.

I would like to thank the Huntington District of the Army Corps for their extensive work with my office on this issue and Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District for their knowledge and guidance.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue in my district that I have been working tirelessly on, and that is to preserve the pool at the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam.

I am extremely disappointed this legislation was brought before the House with no opportunity to amend the bill before negotiations began with the Senate.

The lock and dam, and the pool it creates, is critical to the Augusta community and is utilized for municipal and industrial water supply as well as recreation.

The Corps of Engineers recently selected a rock weir as an alternative to replace the lock and dam, a design that drops the pool level and was demonstrated last year with disastrous results. Not only does this plan not meet the requirements of the WIIN Act, but local stakeholders have expressed serious concerns with the Corps of Engineers' proposal. This option does not meet the intent of Congress and maintain the pool.

Moving forward with the rock weir is unacceptable, and I thank my colleagues from Georgia for their bipartisan effort to champion this issue in the recent committee markup.

I urge the committee to work with me to include language in the final bill that will repair and maintain the lock and dam and the pool, while still accommodating the mitigation project. It is essential.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), who understands water issues.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill that includes language for flood control in Puerto Rico. We are now in the hurricane season, and today, it is announced a tropical storm between today and tomorrow.

The flood control projects included in the bill are Río Guayanilla, Río Manatí in Ciales, and Río Culebrinas on the northwestern part of the island, as well as important provisions to study flood damage, provide resiliency planning assistance, and evaluate seismic risks.

I am also most proud to have secured in this bill an increase to the authorization cost for the Cano Martín Peña project, \$232.4 million, as established during the feasibility phase in 2016, fixing a discrepancy in WRDA 2007. This increase ensures updated costs are considered as the project moves forward, which is especially critical for the development of eight communities in the San Juan area.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, WRDA 2020 is a good bipartisan piece of legislation that is going to improve flood control infrastructure and improve ports, harbors, and inland waterways across the country.

This is infrastructure that is critical to protecting our communities and our farms and businesses in north Missouri and the rest of America. It is essential to the efficient movement of goods, products, commodities, and resources nationwide.

Again, I want to thank the many cosponsors and the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work on this very important bill.

Also, committee staff on both sides put a lot of work into this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank them all for their hard work. Specifically, from the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, the Republican staff, I want to thank Ian Bennitt, Jon Pawlow, and Victor Sarmiento. From the Democrat staff, I want to thank Ryan Seiger, Navis Bermudez, Camille Touton, and Alexa Williams. From the Republican full committee staff, I want to thank Paul

Sass, Jack Ruddy, Corey Cooke, Tara Hupman, Abby Camp, Nick Christensen, Justin Harclerode, Tyler Micheletti, Jamie Hopkins, and Shawn Bloch. In addition, I very much want to thank Kathy Dedrick, Mohsin Syed, and the rest of the Democrat full committee staff.

WRDA is a perfect example of Republicans and Democrats working together to address America's infrastructure needs, as this committee is meant to do, I would urge all Members to support this legislation.

I want to add, too, Mr. Speaker, the gracious work of and being able to work with Chairman DEFAZIO. When we work together, it actually works quite well, and I want to thank him for that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. We find many opportunities to work together. There are times when we have significant policy differences, and we get through it. And we will keep plugging.

This bill is great for our Nation. On a daily basis, of our Nation's 58 largest ports, they only have about 40 percent of their capability due to deferred dredging.

We have jetties failing around the Nation. We heard from CONOR LAMB from Pennsylvania. We did great engineering work in the 1800s and early 1900s. I viewed a lock in his district built in the early 1900s, but these things do have a lifetime.

The increase in cost share for inland waterways is going to make a great difference. We are finally going to spend the \$10 billion that the American people have put into an account for harbor maintenance on harbor maintenance. Things take a long time in Washington, D.C. I started on that with Bud Shuster in 1996, but finally, we are going to get there.

This money can and will be very productively spent. It will put people to work, and it will make our Nation more competitive.

We had, for quite some time, a dispute among the various ports, large, small, and in between. We worked all of that out. It is easier to do when there is more money. So, this bill is going to be good for large, medium, and small ports, and emerging harbors. And just to be parochial, it is going to be great for my district.

We have many, many dangerous bar entrances. Fishers, particularly commercial, sometimes recreational, die there. The dredging needs are always going to be there. Also, we have failing jetties that need replacement, so the additional cost share there will help.

Then an additional cost share by statute for the Great Lakes, although I did talk with Ms. KAPTUR, and she feels that we didn't quite get it right. We will work on that in conference.

I would like to thank staff: Ryan Seiger, who is chief counsel on the sub-

committee; Camille Touton; Alexa Williams; Navis Bermudez; Joe Sheehy, who works for GRACE NAPOLITANO, who couldn't be here today; and legislative counsel Kakuti Lin. Legislative counsel has been fabulous. Then, the other side of the aisle: Ian Bennitt, Victor Sarmiento, Jon Pawlow. Again, thanks to my friend and colleague, the ranking member.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act for 2020. This legislation is the result of bipartisan work and leadership of Committee Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES and many others. It deserves to be passed by the this House as a vital contribution to improving and maintaining our Nation's ports system, inland waterways, dams, levees, aids to navigation, flood control, and the many critical support and operational functions of our U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in support of national, state and local water resources development needs.

Alaska's 33,904 miles of shoreline dwarf the Lower 48 and with fewer miles of paved road than Rhode Island, Alaska's rivers are our highways and our ports are the lifeblood of our state's communities. The Committee continues to make incremental progress on embracing the unique challenges Alaskan communities face with respect to port and harbor improvements, inland waterway navigation, flood and storm protection and other water resource infrastructure overseen by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Army Corps Alaska District is an integral partner to Alaska's communities managing significant project demand with limited resources. However, need continues to outpace available appropriations and Corps resources to get projects completed. The reforms to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund included in this bill is a step in the right direction and I will continue to advocate for greater federal investment for our nation's water infrastructure.

I am particularly pleased that WRDA 2020 contains an authorization for improvements to the Port of Nome, Alaska as well as other provisions for ports and harbors in Alaska. It is rewarding to see that a majority of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in this House and in the other body, have come to recognize, along with the Administration, the essential and indispensable strategic, national defense and commercial importance of the Arctic for our Nation's future.

The authorization of \$490,919,000 for the Arctic Deep Draft Port project in Nome included in this bill has been a long time coming, and it is a positive step forward for Alaska and the country. The Port of Nome, due to its geographic location, is a strategic transportation hub that meets the needs of U.S. Arctic Policy by strengthening U.S. presence in the region. The Port of Nome expansion is critical to ensure more effective search and rescue and environmental response activities as vessel traffic increases throughout the Arctic. The port will serve the country's National interests and support Coast Guard and Navy operations. It will also expand an existing logistics



hub for more than 50 Alaskan coastal communities to help reduce the cost of living and create economic opportunity throughout Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

I want to commend the Army Corp's Alaska District, General Semonite and Assistant Secretary James for all their hard work to get the Chiefs report done in time for this bill. As a former tugboat captain in Alaska, I know how important it is to have good ports, and I would like to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for including this provision in the bill.

The bill also provides for the authorization of two other much needed projects to benefit Alaskan harbors. The bill authorizes a \$34,937,000 dredging project for Unalaska Dutch Harbor. Dutch Harbor is one of the nation's top fishing ports measured by catch volume and value and is essential to the Alaska fishing economy and the nation's food supply. The project will dredge the entrance channel of the harbor to 58 feet improving the ability of commercial, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Navy, U.S. military assets and ships from allied nations to utilize the harbor.

The bill also includes language to include the authorization for St. George's navigation improvements project pending the timely release of a positive Chiefs Report from the Army Corps. The project will provide for the operability, safety and reliability of the St. George Harbor as promised by the federal government to aid the transition of the economy of the Pribilof Islands away from fur seals to commercial fishing.

Importantly, the bill makes an improvement to the Tribal Partnership Program by increasing the per project federal cost share cap to \$15 million dollars from \$12.5 million. This improvement is a step in the right direction and the increase begins to take into account the challenges Alaska faces with higher project costs. In forthcoming WRDA bills, I will continue to work with my colleagues and the Committee to ensure that Corps policies regarding benefit-cost ratios, existing authorities and cost share requirements treat Alaska fairly and take into account all the unique environmental challenges present in Alaska.

As this bill moves into the Conference process, I will continue working with my colleagues to include language, present in the Senate's draft bill, that will protect nonfederal project sponsors from shouldering cost liabilities incurred by the Army Corps through no fault of their own. This language is needed for Project Cooperation Agreement in instances where the Army Corps has been assessed a large adverse judgment by the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals or another court of competent jurisdiction.

In December 2018, the Aleutians East Borough was notified by the Army Corps that the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals had awarded Kelly-Ryan, Inc. a \$20,000,000 judgement for a procurement dispute arising in 2006–09 over the construction of a breakwater and other general navigation features in False Pass, Alaska. The standard Project Cooperation Agreement between a non-federal project sponsor and the Corps for any Civil Works project sets out the specific cost-sharing requirements applicable to the project. The Agreement includes a definition of "total costs of construction of the general navigation features". This definition includes "the Government's costs of contract dispute settlements or awards". The costs of disputes, claims, and

equitable adjustments are added to the final cost of a project and allocated between the non-federal and USACE based on the cost-share formula.

The Army Corps has verbally informed the Borough that 20 percent of this judgement (\$4 million) may be allocated to the Borough's financial share of the project in the future. Notably, the dispute had nothing to do with the project's design, engineering, or construction. The dispute was instead focused on the manner in which the USACE's contracting officer sought to comply with a congressional directive changing the manner in which the Corps funded continuing contracts. Non-federal sponsors, especially smaller rural communities, should not be required to carry a significant share of the financial burden when there is a violation of procurement law peripheral to the actual design, engineering, and construction of the project itself.

As many know one of my mottos is "Alaska to the future." Looking ahead, as the only "Arctic State" in the Union, Alaska will play the central role in hosting future arctic infrastructure including as "System of Ports" and safe harbors as national security, government and commercial activities inevitably increase in and around the Arctic in the coming years. The Army Corp's Alaska Deep-Draft Arctic Port System Study and recent Defense Department and U.S. Coast Guard strategic studies have shown that, U.S. strategic interests will benefit from increased arctic infrastructure including port infrastructure to cover Alaska's vast arctic land mass.

What is needed, and what has been called for, is a "System of U.S. Arctic Ports" whereby the improvements at Nome should be the first in a series of needed improvements at other key Alaska locations that will provide the United States with the breadth of assets including a specialized Ports System for coverage and access to the Arctic.

One location that should warrant due consideration for future improvements in an Arctic Ports System is Port Clarence/Point Spencer located immediately adjacent to the Bering Strait. Today's U.S. year-round ice free "Arctic" ports are in Dutch Harbor, Adak, and St. Paul, Alaska which play important roles because of their locations. As ice navigability improves the natural and protected deep-water port of Port Clarence can serve as a year-round potential forward service center and port of refuge close to, and directly adjacent to the key "choke point" of the Bering Strait.

The following is a brief overview of key information about this strategically located natural deep-water port in the Arctic:

Port Clarence is north-northwest of Nome (70 miles), on the Seward Peninsula, and is a protected natural deep-water harbor. It is sheltered by a long isthmus called Point Spencer. Most recently, the U.S. Coast Guard based a LORAN facility at Point Spencer with associated power and an 8,000-foot airstrip (4,500 feet of paved runway and 3,500 feet of extended gravel-covered runway).

Port Clarence's protected harbor served Indigenous people of the region before contact with European cultures.

Port Clarence served as a port of refuge for whaling vessels in the mid-1850s while Alaska was under Russian sovereignty. It still serves as the Port of Refuge from storms for vessels, including U.S. Coast Guard vessels and other government and commercial vessels travelling

through the Bering Strait or docked temporarily in Nome.

From 1866 to 1867, Port Clarence served as the forward operating base for the Western Union Telegraph Expedition in the attempt to link the continents with an undersea telegraph cable.

Around 1884 it became the central summer refitting port for the Arctic fleet, which usually arrived in July and headed south around September (unless they elected to overwinter there).

The Port of Nome project and potential development Port Clarence/Point Spencer is positioned to become a key part of America's deep-water Arctic Ports System, ready to receive and assist vessels moving to and from Arctic destinations, trans-Arctic shipping, or Navy and Coast Guard vessels and aircraft undertaking a wide variety of missions from those dealing with national security to economic development, search and rescue, shipping safety, oil spill prevention, response and clean up, arctic research, maritime law enforcement on the Bering Sea, the Chukchi Sea, and the Arctic Ocean.

The Congress authorized the transfer of certain tracts of land at Point Spencer to Bering Straits Native Corporation (BSNC) while providing the opportunity for retention of certain tracts by the USCG and the State of Alaska should the USCG and the State wish to retain those tracts. Port development at Point Spencer-Port Clarence should proceed as a cooperative effort among the State, the Federal government, and BSNC in coordination with the enhancements of the Port of Nome.

Port Clarence has, historically been and will continue to be a valuable "Port of Refuge" because of its naturally deep waters and naturally protected harbor—as shipping vessel traffic continues to increase in the Arctic.

BSNC is working now with U.S. Corps of Engineers to place 30-ton and 60-ton industrial grade mooring system buoys at Port Clarence to serve maritime safety needs for the entire Bering Strait Region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for their leadership in this unusually challenging time in the Congress and for our nation by bringing this bipartisan Water Resources Development Act legislation to the House Floor. I look forward to the positive impact that WRDA 2020 will have on our nation's water resources development for decades to come.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support of the Water Resources Development Act. This strong, bipartisan bill will help assure that our nation's ports, harbors, and waterways are developed and maintained to enhance economic and environmental vitality.

I am particularly pleased with the commitment to beneficial reuse of dredged material from Corps water resources projects. Dredged material is a valuable resource that can help restore impacted shorelines and ecosystems and that can create resilient coastlines and estuaries. Environmental groups in California have emphasized the importance of beneficial reuse, specifically because the dredged material can play a vital role in restoring and preserving shallow water habitats such as tidal marshes and mudflats. The beneficial use pilot program, first authorized in WRDA 2016, was so successful that H.R. 7575 increases the

number of eligible projects. Notably, our own San Francisco Bay estuary faces a number of issues associated with resiliency and sustainability, and the reuse of dredged material can be enormously helpful in addressing these critical issues around the Bay. In its report for WRDA 2020, the Committee highlighted Richmond Outer Harbor, Pinole Shoal, and the San Francisco Bay as priorities for consideration in the next round of pilot projects.

This year's bill also highlights the role and value of alternative dredging methods and equipment to beneficial reuse of dredged material. Specifically, I am encouraged that the Committee clarifies that the use of alternative dredging methods and equipment must be part of the overall beneficial use program. This is important as, too often, we find that the old ways utilized by the Corps for maintaining navigation channels will not meet modern day demands to protect our natural resources and build a resilient future through reliable strategic management plans that allow annual dredging.

This bill will go a long way toward improving our environment, providing much-needed direction to the Army Corps, and supporting California's 11th District.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020. I would like to thank Chairman DeFazio and my fellow colleagues on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their diligent work to produce this much needed water resources bill. Everyone in the U.S. is impacted by the need for clean water and I believe this bill takes a giant step forward to ensuring this becomes a reality for every American.

Within my district, The City of Dallas is appreciative to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for their funding of the Dallas Floodway, Dallas Floodway Extension flood risk management projects and Lewisville Dam repairs and their continued efforts to complete these projects quickly. I look forward to continuing to hear good reports on the progress of these projects. I am pleased that the Corps is moving forward with these projects.

Please allow me to note that it is helpful for the Corps to accept input from non-federal sponsors in the development of WRDA guidance. The Corps, working with local non-federal sponsors instead of developing guidance independently, will result in more resilient projects with multiple benefits. The role of resiliency in the construction, operation and maintenance of projects carried out by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) must continue to be a priority.

The Dallas area falls within the Southwestern Division of the Army Corps of Engineers. Flooding and flood control continue to be issues that are ever-present on the minds of residents along the Trinity River. I have held several meetings on flooding in the Dallas area to address this issue and hope to continue to work with the Corps to combat flooding in Dallas.

Other parts of North Texas have also benefited from projects included in previous versions of WRDA legislation. The projects addressing pump stations and levy heights in Dallas, along with bridge projects in Ft. Worth would not be where they are today without the Corps and this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex is growing at a quite rapid pace and

this updated legislation will help to provide adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to meet the demands, given the rapid pace of growth and development in our area. Furthermore, the bill will help in addressing maintenance needs, replacing aging infrastructure, and help in accounting for human behavior in all aspects of our water system—from sewer overflows, to promoting water conservation through drought tolerant outdoor landscaping.

Lastly, I want to thank the committee for working with me to include language in the bill regarding the embankment of Lake Waco, on which Lake Shore Drive is located, so that we may keep the public safe from danger. I understand that there is also language in the Senate bill on the Lakeshore Drive issue that may be more direct. As we move through completion of this bill in conference, I hope to continue to work with the committee to ensure that Lakeshore Drive is not a safety hazard.

Mr. Speaker, the projects I just mentioned are a tiny piece of the multitude of projects the Army Corps of Engineers works on to help address the water needs of the United States and its residents. Every American is impacted by this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7575, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1523

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY) at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7617, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1067) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7617) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 181, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

### YEAS—230

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Haaland	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hastings	Peters
Beyer	Hayes	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Phillips
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Pressley
Brindisi	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Case	Keating	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cisneros	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Cohen	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Shalala
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Craig	Lee (NV)	Sires
Crist	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Crow	Levin (MI)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Cunningham	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Loebach	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stanton
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Stevens
Dean	Lowe	Suozi
DeFazio	Lujan	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Luria	Takano
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Malinowski	Thompson (MS)
Delgado	Maloney	Titus
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Deutch	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Dingell	McAdams	Torres Small
Doggett	McBath	(NM)
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Trahan
Engel	McEachin	Trone
Escobar	McGovern	Underwood
Eshoo	McNerney	Vargas
Espallat	Meeks	Veasey
Evans	Meng	Vela
Finkenauer	Mfume	Velázquez
Fletcher	Moore	Vislosky
Foster	Morelle	Wasserman
Frankel	Moulton	Schultz
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Golden	Norcross	Yarmuth
	O'Halleran	
	Ocasio-Cortez	

### NAYS—181

Aderholt	Bergman	Bucshon
Allen	Biggs	Budd
Amash	Bilirakis	Burchett
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Burgess
Armstrong	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Babin	Bost	Calvert
Bacon	Brady	Carter (GA)
Baird	Brooks (AL)	Carter (TX)
Balderson	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Banks	Buchanan	Cheney
Barr	Buck	Cline

Cloud	Jordan	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Joyce (OH)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Comer	Katko	Rutherford
Cook	Keller	Scalise
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Curtis	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Davidson (OH)	King (NY)	Shimkus
Davis, Rodney	Kinziger	Simpson
DesJarlais	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Duncan	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Lamborn	Smucker
Emmer	Latta	Spano
Estes	Lesko	Stauber
Ferguson	Long	Stefanik
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Steil
Fleischmann	Lucas	Steube
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Fortenberry	Marshall	Stivers
Fox (NC)	Massie	Taylor
Fulcher	Mast	Thompson (PA)
Gaetz	McCarthy	Thornberry
Gallagher	McCauley	Tiffany
Garcia (CA)	McClintock	Tipton
Gianforte	McHenry	Turner
Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley	Meuser
Gooden	Meuser	Upton
Graves (GA)	Miller	Van Drew
Graves (LA)	Moolenaar	Wagner
Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)	Walberg
Green (TN)	Murphy (NC)	Walden
Griffith	Newhouse	Walorski
Grothman	Norman	Waltz
Guest	Nunes	Watkins
Guthrie	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hagedorn	Palazzo	Webster (FL)
Harris	Palmer	Wenstrup
Hartzler	Pence	Westerman
Hern, Kevin	Perry	Williams
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Higgins (LA)	Reed	Wittman
Hill (AR)	Rice (SC)	Womack
Hollingsworth	Riggleman	Woodall
Huizenga	Roby	Wright
Hurd (TX)	Rodgers (WA)	Yoho
Jacobs	Roe, David P.	Young
Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin
Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)	

## NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Granger	Mullin
Arrington	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Cicilline	Holding	Rouzer
Conaway	Hudson	Timmons
Gibbs	Johnson (LA)	Walker
Gohmert	Marchant	
Gosar	Mitchell	

□ 1615

Messrs. KATKO and STIVERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Clay (Davids (KS))	Kuster (NH)	Payne
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	(Brownley (CA))	(Wasserman Schultz)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Langevin (Lynch)	Peters (Rice (NY))
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lawson (FL)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Garamendi (Sherman)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Pocan (Raskin)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Lipinski (Cooper)	Porter (Wexton)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rooney (FL)
Horsford (Kildee)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	(Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	McEachin (Wexton)	Rush
(Jeffries)	Moore (Beyer)	(Underwood)
Khanna (Sherman)	Mucarsel-Powell	Serrano
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Schultz	(Jeffries)
	Nadler (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman
	Napolitano (McGovern)	(Pallone)
	(Correa)	Welch
	Pascrell (Sires)	(McGovern)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1626

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY) at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7617, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1067) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7617) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 182, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—229

Adams	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Aguilar	Cisneros	Deutch
Allred	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Axne	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Barragán	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Bass	Cleaver	F.
Beatty	Clyburn	Engel
Bera	Cohen	Escobar
Beyer	Connolly	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Espallat
Blumenauer	Correa	Evans
Blunt Rochester	Costa	Finkenauer
Bonamici	Courtney	Fletcher
Boyle, Brendan	Cox (CA)	Foster
F.	Craig	Frankel
Brindisi	Crist	Fudge
Brown (MD)	Crow	Gabbard
Brownley (CA)	Cuellar	Gallego
Bustos	Cunningham	Garamendi
Butterfield	Davids (KS)	Garcia (IL)
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	Garcia (TX)
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	Gomez
Carson (IN)	Dean	Gonzalez (TX)
Cartwright	DeFazio	Gottheimer
Case	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)
Casten (IL)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Castor (FL)	DelBene	Haaland
Castro (TX)	Delgado	Harder (CA)
Chu, Judy	Demings	Hastings

Hayes	McAdams	Scanlon
Heck	McBath	Schakowsky
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Schiff
Himes	McEachin	Schneider
Horn, Kendra S.	McGovern	Schrader
Horsford	McNerney	Schrier
Houlahan	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	Meng	Scott, David
Huffman	Mfume	Serrano
Jackson Lee	Moore	Sewell (AL)
Jayapal	Morelle	Shalala
Jeffries	Moulton	Sherman
Johnson (GA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Sherrill
Johnson (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Kaptur	Nadler	Slotkin
Keating	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Soto
Kennedy	Neguse	Spanberger
Khanna	Norcross	Speier
Kildee	O'Halleran	Stanton
Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Stevens
Kim	Omar	Suozi
Kind	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Kirkpatrick	Panetta	Takano
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Thompson (CA)
Kuster (NH)	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Lamb	Payne	Titus
Langevin	Perlmutter	Tlaib
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Tonko
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Torres (CA)
Lawrence	Phillips	Torres Small
Lawson (FL)	Pingree	(NM)
Lee (CA)	Pocan	Trahan
Lee (NV)	Porter	Trone
Levin (CA)	Pressley	Underwood
Levin (MI)	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Veasey
Loeb sack	Raskin	Vela
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Lowenthal	Richmond	Visclosky
Lowey	Rose (NY)	Wasserman
Luján	Rouda	Schultz
Luria	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Lynch	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Malinowski	Ruppersberger	Welch
Maloney,	Rush	Wexton
Carolyn B.	Ryan	Wild
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

## NAYS—182

Aderholt	Estes	Lamborn
Allen	Ferguson	Latta
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Lesko
Amodei	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Armstrong	Flores	Long
Babin	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Bacon	Fox (NC)	Lucas
Baird	Fulcher	Luetkemeyer
Balderson	Gaetz	Marshall
Banks	Gallagher	Massie
Barr	Garcia (CA)	Mast
Bergman	Gianforte	McCarthy
Biggs	Golden	McCauley
Bilirakis	Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock
Bishop (NC)	Gooden	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Bost	Graves (MO)	Meuser
Brady	Green (TN)	Miller
Brooks (AL)	Griffith	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Grothman	Mooney (WV)
Buchanan	Guest	Murphy (NC)
Buck	Guthrie	Newhouse
Bucshon	Hagedorn	Norman
Budd	Harris	Nunes
Burchett	Hartzler	Olson
Burgess	Hern, Kevin	Palazzo
Byrne	Herrera Beutler	Palmer
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Pence
Carter (GA)	Hill (AR)	Perry
Carter (TX)	Hollingsworth	Posey
Chabot	Huizenga	Reed
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)
Cline	Jacobs	Riggleman
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Roe, David P.
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Katko	Rooney (FL)
Crenshaw	Keller	Rose, John W.
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Scalise
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	LaHood	Shimkus
Emmer	LaMalfa	Simpson

Smith (MO) Thornberry Webster (FL)  
 Smith (NE) Tiffany Wenstrup  
 Smith (NJ) Tipton Westernman  
 Smucker Turner Williams  
 Spano Upton Wilson (SC)  
 Stauber Van Drew Wittman  
 Stefanik Wagner Womack  
 Steil Walberg Woodall  
 Steube Walden Wright  
 Stewart Walorski Yoho  
 Stivers Waltz Young  
 Taylor Watkins Zeldin  
 Thompson (PA) Weber (TX)

## NOT VOTING—19

Abraham Graves (GA) Mullin  
 Arrington Hice (GA) Reschenthaler  
 Conaway Holding Rouzer  
 Gibbs Hudson Timmons  
 Gohmert Johnson (LA) Walker  
 Gosar Marchant  
 Granger Mitchell

□ 1711

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Clay (Davids Kuster (NH) Payne  
 (KS) (Brownley) (Wasserman  
 Cleaver (Davids (CA)) Schultz  
 (KS) Langevin Peters (Rice  
 DeSaulnier (Lynch) (NY))  
 (Matsui) Lawson (FL) Pingree (Clark  
 Frankel (Clark (Evans) (MA))  
 (MA)) Lieu, Ted (Beyer) Pocan (Raskin)  
 Garamendi Lipinski (Cooper) Porter (Wexton)  
 (Sherman) Lofgren (Jeffries) Rooney (FL)  
 Grijalva (Garcia Lowenthal (Beyer)  
 (IL)) (Beyer) Rush  
 Hastings McEachin (Underwood)  
 (Wasserman (Wexton) Serrano  
 Schultz) Moore (Beyer) (Jeffries)  
 Horsford (Kildee) Mucarsel-Powell Watson Coleman  
 Johnson (TX) (Wasserman (Pallone)  
 (Jeffries) Schultz) Welch  
 Khanna Nadler (Jeffries) (McGovern)  
 (Sherman) Napolitano Wilson (FL)  
 Kirkpatrick (Correa) (Hayes)  
 (Gallego) Pascrell (Sires)

## CHILD CARE IS ESSENTIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 7027) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 212, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—195

Aderholt Banks Brooks (AL)  
 Allen Barr Brooks (IN)  
 Amash Bergman Buchanan  
 Amodei Biggs Buck  
 Armstrong Bilirakis Busch  
 Babin Bishop (NC) Budd  
 Bacon Bost Burchett  
 Baird Brady Burgess  
 Balderson Brindisi Byrne

Calvert Carter (GA) Huizenga  
 Carter (TX) Hurd (TX) Rose (NY)  
 Chabot Jacobs Rose, John W.  
 Cheney Johnson (OH) Roy  
 Cline Johnson (SD) Rutherford  
 Cloud Joyce (OH) Scalise  
 Cole Joye (PA) Schrader  
 Collins (GA) Katko Schweikert  
 Comer Keller Scott, Austin  
 Cook Kelly (MS) Sensenbrenner  
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Sherrill  
 Crenshaw King (IA) Shimkus  
 Crow King (NY) Simpson  
 Cunningham Kinstinger Slotkin  
 Curtis Kustoff (TN) Smith (MO)  
 Davidson (OH) LaHood Smith (NE)  
 Davis, Rodney LaMalfa Smith (NJ)  
 DesJarlais Lamb Smucker  
 Diaz-Balart Lamborn Spanberger  
 Duncan Latta Spino  
 Dunn Lesko Stauber  
 Emmer Long Stelanik  
 Estes Lucas Steil  
 Ferguson Luetkemeyer Steube  
 Finkenauer Luria Stewart  
 Fitzpatrick Marshall Stivers  
 Fleischmann Massie Taylor  
 Flores Mast Thompson (PA)  
 Fortenberry McAdams Thornberry  
 Foxx (NC) McEachin Tiffany  
 Fulcher McCarthy Tipton  
 Gallagher McCaul Torres Small  
 Garcia (CA) McClintock (NM)  
 Gianforte McHenry Turner  
 Golden McKinley Upton  
 Gonzalez (OH) Meuser Van Drew  
 Gooden Miller Wagner  
 Gottheimer Moolenaar Walberg  
 Graves (GA) Mooney (WV) Walden  
 Graves (LA) Murphy (NC) Walorski  
 Graves (MO) Newhouse Waltz  
 Green (TN) Norman Watkins  
 Griffith Nunes Weber (TX)  
 Grothman Olson Webster (FL)  
 Guest Palazzo Wenstrup  
 Guthrie Palmer Westernman  
 Hagedorn Pence Williams  
 Harris Perry Wilson (SC)  
 Hartzler Posey Wittman  
 Reed Womack  
 Rice (SC) Riggelman Woodall  
 Riggleman Roby Wright  
 Rodgers (WA) Yoho Young  
 Roe, David P. Young Zeldin  
 Rogers (KY)

## NAYS—212

Adams Cox (CA) Hastings  
 Aguilar Craig Hayes  
 Alford Crist Heck  
 Axne Cuellar Higgins (NY)  
 Barragán Davids (KS) Himes  
 Bass Davis (CA) Horsford  
 Beatty Davis, Danny K. Hoyer  
 Bera Dean Huffman  
 Beyer DeFazio Jackson Lee  
 Bishop (GA) DeGette Jayapal  
 Blumenauer DeLauro Jeffries  
 Blunt Rochester Johnson (GA)  
 Bonamici Delgado Johnson (TX)  
 Boyle, Brendan Demings  
 F. DeSaulnier Keating  
 Brown (MD) Deutch Kelly (IL)  
 Brownley (CA) Dingell Kennedy  
 Bustos Doggett Khanna  
 Butterfield Doyle, Michael Kildee  
 Carbajal F. Kilmer  
 Cárdenas Engle Kim  
 Carson (IN) Escobar Kind  
 Cartwright Eshoo Kirkpatrick  
 Case Espallat Krishnamoorthi  
 Casten (IL) Evans Kuster (NH)  
 Castor (FL) Fletcher Langevin  
 Castro (TX) Foster Larsen (WA)  
 Chu, Judy Frankel Larson (CT)  
 Cisneros Fudge Lawrence  
 Clark (MA) Gabbard Lawson (FL)  
 Clarke (NY) Gallego Lee (CA)  
 Clay Garamendi Lee (NV)  
 Cleaver Garcia (IL) Levin (CA)  
 Clyburn Garcia (TX) Levin (MI)  
 Cohen Gomez Lieu, Ted  
 Connolly Gonzalez (TX) Lipinski  
 Cooper Green, Al (TX) Loebach  
 Correa Grijalva Lofgren  
 Costa Haaland Lowenthal  
 Courtney Harder (CA) Lowey

Lujan Perlmutter Sires  
 Lynch Peters Smith (WA)  
 Malinowski Peterson Soto  
 Maloney Phillips Speier  
 Carolyn B. Pingree Stanton  
 Maloney, Sean Pocan Stevens  
 Matsui Porter Suozzi  
 McCollum Pressley Swalwell (CA)  
 McEachin Price (NC) Takano  
 McGovern Quigley Thompson (CA)  
 McNeerney Raskin Thompson (MS)  
 Meeks Rice (NY) Titus  
 Meng Richmond Tlaib  
 Mfume Rouda Tonko  
 Moore Roybal-Allard Torres (CA)  
 Morelle Ruiz Trahan  
 Moulton Ruppertsberger Trone  
 Mucarsel-Powell Rush Underwood  
 Murphy (FL) Ryan Vargas  
 Nadler Sánchez Veasey  
 Napolitano Sarbanes Vela  
 Neal Scanlon Velázquez  
 Neguse Schakowsky Visclosky  
 Norcross Schiff Wasserman  
 O'Halleran Schneider Schultz  
 Ocasio-Cortez Schrier Waters  
 Omar Scott (VA) Watson Coleman  
 Pallone Scott, David Welch  
 Panetta Serrano Wexton  
 Pappas Sewell (AL) Wild  
 Pascrell Shalala Wilson (FL)  
 Payne Sherman Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—23

Abraham Gosar Mitchell  
 Arrington Granger Mullin  
 Bishop (UT) Hice (GA) Reschenthaler  
 Cicilline Holding Rogers (AL)  
 Conaway Hudson Rouzer  
 Gaetz Johnson (LA) Timmons  
 Gibbs Jordan Walker  
 Gohmert Marchant

□ 1800

Messrs. CLAY, CLEAVER, CORREA, HOYER, SCOTT of Virginia, PASCRELL, and TAKANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. PALAZZO and DAVIDSON of Ohio changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 170 and “yea” on rollcall No. 168.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Clay (Davids Kuster (NH) Payne  
 (KS)) (Brownley) (Wasserman  
 Cleaver (Davids (CA)) Schultz  
 (KS)) Langevin Peters (Rice  
 DeSaulnier (Lynch) (NY))  
 (Matsui) Lawson (FL) Pingree (Clark  
 Frankel (Clark (Evans) (MA))  
 (MA)) Lieu, Ted (Beyer) Pocan (Raskin)  
 Garamendi Lipinski (Cooper) Porter (Wexton)  
 (Sherman) Lofgren (Jeffries) Rooney (FL)  
 Grijalva (Garcia Lowenthal (Beyer)  
 (IL)) (Beyer) Rush  
 Hastings McEachin (Underwood)  
 (Wasserman (Wexton) Serrano  
 Schultz) Moore (Beyer) (Jeffries)  
 Horsford (Kildee) Mucarsel-Powell Watson Coleman  
 Johnson (TX) (Wasserman (Pallone)  
 (Jeffries) Schultz) Welch  
 Khanna Nadler (Jeffries) (McGovern)  
 (Sherman) Napolitano Wilson (FL)  
 Kirkpatrick (Correa) (Hayes)  
 (Gallego) Pascrell (Sires)

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

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take this occasion to make an announcement concerning the wearing of masks in the Hall of the House during the coronavirus pandemic.

Under clause 2 of rule I, the Chair is required to preserve order and decorum in the Chamber. This includes the responsibility to ensure the protection of Member and staff safety and health during proceedings. This responsibility is of paramount importance, particularly in the midst of a pandemic.

To that end, the Chair announces that, during the pendency of a covered period pursuant to House Resolution 965, Members and staff will be required to wear masks at all times in the Hall of the House, except that Members may remove their masks temporarily when recognized. The Chair expects all Members and staff to adhere to this requirement as a sign of respect for the health, safety, and well-being of others present in the Chamber and surrounding areas.

The Chair would further inform Members and staff that they will not be permitted to enter the Hall of the House without wearing a mask. Masks will be available at the entry points for any Member who forgets to bring one. The Chair would also like to remind Members that the Speaker has the authority to direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove a Member from the floor as a matter of decorum. To reiterate, the Chair views the failure to wear a mask as a serious breach of decorum.

As always, the Chair appreciates the cooperation of Members and staff in preserving order and decorum in the Chamber and in displaying respect and safety for one another by wearing a mask.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1813

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HAALAND) at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.

#### CHILD CARE IS ESSENTIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 7027) making addi-

tional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 163, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—249

Adams	Garcia (IL)	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Neal
Allred	Golden	Neguse
Axne	Gomez	Norcross
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bass	Gottheimer	Ocasio-Cortez
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Omar
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Haaland	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Pappas
Blumenauer	Hartzer	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Payne
Bonamici	Hayes	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Peters
F.	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Brindisi	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Brooks (IN)	Himes	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Horn, Kendra S.	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Porter
Buchanan	Houlihan	Pressley
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Carbajal	Hurd (TX)	Raskin
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jacobs	Richmond
Cartwright	Jayapal	Rose (NY)
Case	Jeffries	Rouda
Casten (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Katko	Rush
Cicilline	Keating	Ryan
Cisneros	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Scanlon
Clay	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schiff
Clyburn	Kim	Schneider
Cohen	Kind	Schrader
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Cook	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Correa	Lamb	Serrano
Costa	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Craig	Lawrence	Sherrill
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Crow	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Cuellar	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Davids (KS)	Levin (MI)	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Spanberger
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski	Speier
Davis, Rodney	Loeb	Stanton
Dean	Loeb	Staub
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Stefanik
DeGette	Lowey	Stevens
DeLauro	Lujan	Suozzi
DelBene	Luria	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Lynch	Takano
Demings	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Titus
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
Doggett	Matsui	Tonko
Doyle, Michael	McAdams	Torres (CA)
F.	McBath	Torres Small
Engel	McCaul	(NM)
Escobar	McCollum	Trahan
Eshoo	McEachin	Trone
Españillat	McGovern	Underwood
Evans	McNerney	Upton
Finkenauer	Meeks	Van Drew
Fitzpatrick	Meng	Vargas
Fletcher	Mfume	Veasey
Foster	Moore	Vela
Frankel	Morille	Velázquez
Fudge	Moulton	Visclosky
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Wagner
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Garamendi	Nadler	Schultz

Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch

Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth  
Young

NAYS—163

Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Palmer
Allen	Gooden	Pence
Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Posey
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Reed
Babin	Green (TN)	Rice (SC)
Bacon	Griffith	Riggleman
Baird	Grothman	Roby
Balderson	Guest	Rodgers (WA)
Banks	Guthrie	Roe, David P.
Barr	Hagedorn	Rogers (AL)
Bergman	Harris	Rogers (KY)
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Rooney (FL)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (NC)	Hill (AR)	Roy
Bishop (UT)	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Bost	Huizenga	Scalise
Brady	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Buck	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Bucshon	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Budd	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Burchett	Keller	Smith (MO)
Burgess	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Byrne	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Calvert	King (IA)	Spano
Carter (GA)	King (NY)	Steil
Carter (TX)	Kinziger	Steube
Chabot	Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
Cheney	LaHood	Stivers
Cline	LaMalfa	Taylor
Cloud	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Cole	Latta	Thornberry
Collins (GA)	Lesko	Tiffany
Comer	Long	Tipton
Crawford	Loudermilk	Turner
Crenshaw	Lucas	Walberg
Curtis	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Davidson (OH)	Marshall	Walorski
DesJarlais	Massie	Waltz
Diaz-Balart	Mast	Watkins
Duncan	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Dunn	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Emmer	McHenry	Wenstrup
Estes	McKinley	Westerman
Ferguson	Meuser	Williams
Fleischmann	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Moolenaar	Wittman
Fortenberry	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Fox (NC)	Murphy (NC)	Woodall
Fulcher	Newhouse	Wright
Gaetz	Norman	Yoho
Gallagher	Nunes	Zeldin
Garcia (CA)	Olson	
Gianforte	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—18

Abraham	Granger	Mitchell
Arrington	Hice (GA)	Mullin
Lawrence	Holding	Reschenthaler
Gibbs	Hudson	Rouzer
Gohmert	Johnson (LA)	Timmons
Gosar	Marchant	Walker

□ 1904

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." Ms. SANCHEZ, PRESSLEY, STEFANIK, and Mr. JACOBS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Clay (Davids)	Hastings	Langevin
(KS)	(Wasserman)	(Lynch)
Cleaver (Davids)	Schultz	Lawson (FL)
(KS)	Horsford (Kildee)	(Evans)
DeSaulnier	Johnson (TX)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
(Matsui)	(Jeffries)	Lipinski (Cooper)
Frankel (Clark)	Khanna	Lofgren (Jeffries)
(MA)	(Sherman)	Lowenthal
Garamendi	Kirkpatrick	(Beyer)
(Sherman)	(Galleo)	McEachin
Grijalva (Garcia)	Kuster (NH)	(Wexton)
(IL)	(Brownley)	Moore (Beyer)
	(CA))	

Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)  
Nadler (Jeffries)  
Napolitano (Correa)  
Pascrell (Sires)  
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)

Peters (Rice (NY))  
Pingree (Clark (MA))  
Pocan (Raskin)  
Porter (Wexton)  
Rooney (FL) (Beyer)  
Rush (Underwood)

Serrano (Jeffries)  
Watson Coleman (Pallone)  
Welch (McGovern)  
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David

Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Stevens  
Suzuki  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko

Torres (CA)  
Torres Small (NM)  
Trahan  
Underwood  
Upton  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walden  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I was attending an event in my district with President Trump to discuss the importance of American energy independence. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 168, “nay” on rollcall No. 169, “yea” on rollcall No. 170, “nay” on rollcall No. 171, and “nay” on rollcall No. 172.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to be present for today's votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 168, “nay” on rollcall No. 169, “yea” on rollcall No. 170, “nay” on rollcall No. 171, and “nay” on rollcall No. 172.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 171 and 172, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on rollcall No. 171 and NAY on rollcall No. 172.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Clay (Davids (KS))	Kuster (NH) (Brownley (CA))	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Langevin (Lynch)	Peters (Rice (NY))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Pocan (Raskin)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Porter (Wexton)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Rush (Underwood)
Horsford (Kildee)	McEachin (Wexton)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Moore (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Khanna (Sherman)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	Welch (McGovern)
Kirkpatrick (Correa)	Nadler (Jeffries)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Pascrell (Sires)	Napolitano	

## SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF AUGUST 2020 AS NATIONAL WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE MONTH

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 1046, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 1046

Whereas the 19th Amendment extended the franchise to women across the United States;

Whereas August 18, 2020, marks the centennial of the ratification of the 19th Amendment by three-fourths of the States;

Whereas August 26, 2020, marks the centennial of the 19th Amendment becoming part of the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the centennial of the ratification of the 19th Amendment is a pivotal chapter in the history of American democracy;

Whereas the ratification of the 19th Amendment marks the single largest expansion of voting rights in United States history;

Whereas the ratification of the 19th Amendment did not, in practice, guarantee voting rights to all American women, as African-American women, Native American

## CHILD CARE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 7327) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 161, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

## YEAS—250

Adams	Demings	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Kuster (NH)
Allred	Deutch	Lamb
Axne	Dingell	Langevin
Barragán	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Doyle, Michael F.	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Engel	Lawrence
Bera	Escobar	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Españal	Lee (NV)
Blumenauer	Evans	Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Finkenauer	Levin (MI)
Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fletcher	Lipinski
Brindisi	Foster	Loeb sack
Brooks (IN)	Frankel	Lofgren
Brown (MD)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Lowe
Buchanan	Gallego	Lujan
Bustos	Garamendi	Luria
Butterfield	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Cárdenas	Golden	Maloney,
Carson (IN)	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Cartwright	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Case	Gothelmer	Matsui
Casten (IL)	Green, Al (TX)	McAdams
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McBath
Castro (TX)	Haaland	McCaul
Chu, Judy	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Cicilline	Hastings	McEachin
Cisneros	Hayes	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Heck	McKinley
Clarke (NY)	Herrera Beutler	McNerney
Clay	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Cleaver	Himes	Meng
Clyburn	Horn, Kendra S.	Mfume
Cohen	Horsford	Moore
Connolly	Houlahan	Morelle
Cook	Hoyer	Moulton
Cooper	Huffman	Mucarsel-Powell
Correa	Hurd (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Courtney	Jacobs	Napolitano
Cox (CA)	Jayapal	Neal
Craig	Jeffries	Neguse
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez
Cunningham	Katko	Osio
Davids (KS)	Keating	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Davis, Danny K.	Kennedy	Pappas
Davis, Rodney	Khanna	Pascarell
Dean	Kildee	Payne
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kim	Peters
DeLauro	Kind	Peterson
DeBene	King (NY)	Phillips
Delgado	Kirkpatrick	Pingree
		Pocan

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garcia (CA)

Gianforte  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hern, Kevin  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Hollingsworth  
Huizenga  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garcia (CA)

Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Reed  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiffany  
Tipton  
Turner  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Zeldin

## NAYS—161

## NOT VOTING—19

Abraham  
Arrington  
Conaway  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gosar  
Granger

Hice (GA)  
Holding  
Hudson  
Johnson (LA)  
Marchant  
Mitchell  
Mullin

Reschenthaler  
Rouzer  
Timmons  
Trone  
Walker

□ 1939

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



women, Asian American women, Hispanic American women, and other women of color in America continued to face legal and social barriers to voting throughout the twentieth century;

Whereas the suffragists persevered in their quest for women's equality through generations of hardships, including the Civil War, Reconstruction, World War I, and the Spanish Flu pandemic; and

Whereas the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission was created to encourage, plan, develop, and execute programs, projects, and activities to commemorate the centennial of the passage and ratification of the 19th Amendment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Women's Suffrage Month;

(2) celebrates the 100th anniversary of the passage and ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution;

(3) honors the fearless voting rights activists who fought for generations to secure women's access to the ballot;

(4) reaffirms that all citizens have the right to full participation in American democracy;

(5) recommits to uplifting an inclusive, diverse, and complete history of women's fight for the vote;

(6) recommits to persevering through these unexpected times to celebrate the suffragists, educate new generations about this critical chapter in the history of American democracy, and create a legacy that will inspire for the next 100 years;

(7) recommends that Members of Congress demonstrate their support for the suffrage centennial through local and national commemorative efforts, such as the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission's Forward Into Light Campaign; and

(8) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Women's Suffrage Month and commemorate this milestone of American democracy by ensuring that the untold stories of women's decades-long battle for the ballot are recognized and celebrated across the United States.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3010

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDE CITIES FINANCIAL SUPPORT

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of our local cities in the 39th Congressional District and across America. Our cities continue to combat the coronavirus and provide central services, but they are losing revenue fast.

Citizens in my district sent a letter urging support, and since the beginning of this pandemic, I have been advo-

cating on their behalf. Without Congress stepping up, public safety will be on the chopping block.

While my Republican colleagues and the White House want to speak out against defunding the police, their lack of support for our towns and cities means they are not only defunding the police but also the fire department and other public safety services.

This last-minute Senate Republican COVID relief bill does just that and puts the safety of the American people at risk. It also ties school funding to reopening and puts big corporations over frontline workers.

I renew my call to all of my colleagues and to the White House to not put our cities in a situation where they have to lay off first responders and cut community programs.

Let's provide our cities with the financial support they need.

□ 1945

#### CHINESE ESPIONAGE IN ACADEMIA

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, whether we like it or not, every day the Communist Government of China seeks the downfall of our great Nation. Since 2000, there have been well over 100 documented cases of Chinese espionage in the United States.

Many of these have come from the infiltration of American academic institutions. This past year, even the chairman of the Department of Chemistry at Harvard University was charged with academic espionage.

This is a national crisis and why I introduced the INFLUENCE Act today.

Existing law requires institutions of higher learning to report any gift or contract from a foreign source valued at \$250,000 or more. That is simply too high a threshold. My bill lowers this threshold to \$50,000 so we can have a better idea of who is influencing American higher education.

We cannot be naive to the fact that China desires this Nation's downfall, and their infiltration of American higher education is a clear and present danger to this great Nation's security. I hope my colleagues will bolster our national security by supporting the INFLUENCE Act.

#### CHILDCARE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the thousands and millions of childcare workers—essential workers—and their families and the children in support of legislation that provides \$50 billion to reaffirm childcare essential workers and, as well, to provide relief to desperate parents.

COVID-19 has taken an enormous toll on our community. It has taken a toll

because people have not worn masks, there have not been stay-at-home orders, and Houston and Harris County are suffering. This legislation will be a lifeline.

In addition, I fight for and advocate for the moneys for our States and local communities. We cannot suffer a Republican bill. We must have \$600 for our unemployment extension or addition, and, as well, it is imperative that we have testing money. The way you stop COVID-19 is testing, testing, testing, social distancing, wearing a mask, and giving authority to local jurisdictions to be able to issue stay-at-home orders.

This is a pandemic and a crisis. When is the Nation going to stand up to an administration that refuses to understand that?

We in the Congress, this majority in the United States House of Representatives, will fight against eliminating \$600, not getting the money for our States and local governments, and not getting testing money.

#### RECOGNIZING CHRIS MARTIN IV

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, as he prepares to retire as CEO after four decades, I rise to recognize a constituent of mine, Chris Martin, for his leadership of Martin Guitars, an exceptional business in Nazareth, Pennsylvania, that has been a source of pride in my community for generations.

For almost 200 years, C.F. Martin & Company has produced acoustic guitars widely recognized as the finest in the world. The product of an unparalleled legacy of craftsmanship, Martin Guitars have been proudly used by legendary musicians across our country and the world: Bob Dylan and Eric Clapton, Paul McCartney and Joan Baez, Willie Nelson and Kurt Cobain, to name only a few.

I want to express my gratitude to Chris and the Martin Guitars team for their continued dedication to contributing to a made-in-the-USA economy based on excellence; for their commitment to maintaining and expanding music education in our classrooms; and for their determination to advance social, economic, environmental, and racial justice.

I congratulate Chris on all he has achieved. As he looks forward to a new chapter, I wish him the very best.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LEBANON—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-141)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISNEROS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Lebanon declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2020.

Certain ongoing activities, such as Iran's continuing arms transfers to Hizballah—which include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems—serve to undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 29, 2020.

#### REFLECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL. 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 the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I have asked the members of the Ways and Means family to assemble on the floor tonight so that we might offer appropriate praise to the life of one of the iconic figures of not just the civil rights movement, but of the Ways and Means Committee.

I sat next to John Lewis for 25 years on the Ways and Means Committee, and I must tell you, Madam Speaker, he was the bravest and most gentle person I ever met.

He nearly lost his life in pursuit of justice and confronted some of the darkest facets of our society at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as a very young man, but he never lost faith in what America could become.

During those many conversations—and he offered a tutorial to me about

the life and the legend that he had offered to America—his unyielding optimism and hope lifted the spirits of his fellow Members of Congress and the American people in our Nation's most trying moments.

With quiet strength, grace, and love, he shouldered unthinkable burdens and changed this world for the better. Through it all, he was unfailingly humble, selfless, and kind.

I must say—and I was commenting a moment ago to some colleagues on the committee—if he was in the room, Madam Speaker, you would have to get him to come to the microphone. That was that reluctance that he had. And we all had known about the great achievements that he had offered to this Nation, but it was never, "Let me get to the microphone." It was always a much more humble arrangement.

He came to my constituency in 2015. He was invited by the Sisters of St. Joseph, who staffed a small Catholic college in Chicopee, Massachusetts. They invited him to commemorate the fact that on Bloody Sunday on the Edmund Pettus Bridge they were the only ones, with members of the Edmundite priesthood, who would care for them when others closed their doors.

When John greeted Sister Maxyne Schneider upon introduction for the commencement address, the two of them broke out in tears, and 5,000 people in the Springfield Civic Center broke out in tears with them. He remembered that moment, and they remembered him—another great story in the legacy of John Lewis.

It is rare that a person has an opportunity in this institution to work alongside a real hero. We had that here, and we sometimes forget that in the din of incendiary debate. But for three decades, I, along with other members of the Ways and Means Committee, had that honor. To be in his presence, his wisdom, and his joyful spirit day in and day out was a blessing beyond words.

John served in this Congress until his last day, in part because his work was not done. Despite all the advancements he achieved, glaring inequities remain in our Nation that demand reform. But lucky for us, John Lewis inspired generations of young people to follow in his steps, to stand up to injustice, and to fight for what is right.

Now he can clearly rest, and our prayers are with him as we carry on his vital and unfinished business. It is up to all of us to pick up where John left off and to be part of his legacy in action.

For those of us who will join his funeral service tomorrow in Atlanta, what a great journey this has been to have served with him in this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing the Ways and Means family, as he termed it, together for this important evening.

These past few days, our country has taken time to reflect on the life and

the legacy of John Robert Lewis, from the Edmund Pettus Bridge to Auburn Avenue. Through streets of the South to the rotunda of the United States Capitol, our Nation has come together to celebrate the life of a man who rose to the occasion to fight for the rights of all human beings.

A Congressman for the great State of Georgia and an esteemed member of the Ways and Means Committee, John Lewis was a blessing to our institution. It was an honor of a lifetime to sit next to such giants as he, Congressman Sam Johnson, and others who made their way through the Ways and Means Committee in the Longworth House Office Building.

I was lucky to not just sit near John in the committee room, but I realized early this session, as I went to look at my old office in the Cannon House Office Building, that John Lewis was serving there, too. That day I had a big smile on my face as I greeted John, and we reminisced a bit about sharing our offices.

Madam Speaker, you couldn't help but smile if you ever crossed paths with him. He was one of the better angels of our nature. He was one of our thousand points of light.

The man who walked in the wind to bring equality to America now is walking in the heavens with his creator. We are a better nation and a better people because of him, and this institution and all of our country will miss him dearly.

To know John, as every member of this committee will tell you, is a blessing. His life, his career, and his legislative achievements will be studied by future students for generations.

It was an honor to have worked on such important issues with him, including the first reforms of the IRS in over two decades and in making improvements to Medicare for our Nation's seniors.

It is common knowledge in D.C., and certainly in the Ways and Means Committee, that our room happens to be one of the coldest rooms in the Capitol. But that was not the case when John walked in. His presence alone brought that room warmth, calmness, and reassurance that, if we work together, we all can make a difference.

When I look down the dais in the weeks ahead, I will be sad to miss our friend, but I will always be proud to have had the privilege of working with such a remarkable man. Each day he walked in these Halls, we all witnessed, firsthand, his remarkable integrity, his intelligence toward the complex policy issues we debate, and his willingness to work across the aisle if it means Americans will have greater dignity, opportunity, and equal rights.

I will tell you, Madam Speaker, if you were poor, if you were born on the wrong side of the tracks, or if you felt powerless, John Lewis was your man. John Lewis would fight for you.

God loved this remarkable servant, and I know John is walking hand in

hand with God and his beloved Lillian today.

Tomorrow, I will be honored to join Chairman NEAL to attend his funeral in Atlanta with many of our House colleagues.

John, it will be a celebration of your life, a chance for us to honor you and reflect on all the joy, passion, and love you brought to this Congress, to our lives, and to this country.

May you rest in peace, my friend, and may God continue to shower you with faith, hope, and love each day.

I thank Chairman NEAL for having me as part of this dedication today.

□ 2000

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), another esteemed member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, in my time in Congress rarely have I participated in Special Orders, but tonight, this is more than a Special Order.

John Lewis was one of the greatest men to have ever served in the Congress of the United States of America. He devoted his entire life to helping others and to making our country a better place. It was an incredible honor to serve with him in Congress and on the Committee on Ways and Means.

My wife, Jan, and I walked with him over the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. That was 50 years after John was almost killed on that bridge after peacefully protesting discrimination that disenfranchised Americans in our country.

He visited my district, and hundreds of my constituents came out to see him. One man came in a wheelchair, pushed by his daughter. And his daughter said: My father was a Freedom Rider and marched with John Lewis. And he checked himself out of the hospital tonight so he could be here to see John Lewis. After they said their hellos, he got back in the wheelchair and said: Take me back to the hospital.

I am thanked to this day for bringing John to our community.

When you would pass John in the halls of Congress, and he would greet you with, "Hello, my brother," he made you believe that you were actually his brother. We must all commit to working harder to be a little more like John Lewis.

Good-bye, John, and thank you. Godspeed, my brother.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL. What an honor to be here with the Committee on Ways and Means' family.

They said pictures are worth a thousand words, and I am going to try to go through these as rapidly as I can.

The first picture is my son and daughter, who came—as Mike was just

explaining as part of his family—to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, but they had to be back in school the next day and so they couldn't actually march across the bridge that Sunday.

John said: Wait a minute. That won't do. He put them in a car and drove them out there, and for 20 minutes talked to them about that experience and what it was. And it was very tense, very graphic, the violence that he endured and what they went through. And I could see both my daughter and my son looking at him, and they were taking it all in.

And my daughter, very innocently—she was 13 at the time—said: Mr. Lewis, did you ever have any fun?

And John Lewis put his head back and had the broadest grin. He said: Well, sure, darling, we did. You know, at night we used to go back and we would pitch our tents, and we would make campfires, and we sat around and told stories. And we sang and we danced. He said: I can still see Andy Young in his coveralls doing the jitterbug, and he could dance. Andy Young in his coveralls doing the jitterbug.

Madam Speaker, I will include in the RECORD our other items, but this iconic photo says it all about John Lewis.

Madam Speaker, on the day that we passed the Affordable Care Act, the day before, he had been spat on. So was Reverend Cleaver, and so were others who were walking over here to vote on that bill that day. But John Lewis said: No—we had a caucus that morning with President Obama—he said: Say nothing of this. Remember that during the movement, we cast this aside. This is a distraction. Don't be taken in by this crowd.

We learned about it the next day. And at that caucus I asked him to get up and address the caucus. And he said: Let's stay calm. Let's stay together, and let's make sure that we keep our eye on the prize.

He went to walk away from the microphone, and then he stepped back, and he said: 45 years to the day, we marched from Selma to Montgomery, he said, and let me tell you, we faced far worse crowds than are out here today. So let's lock arms. Let's go across that street and pass that bill. And we did.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for convening our Committee on Ways and Means' family.

It was a bittersweet moment this morning as we gathered outside the Capitol saying good-bye to John. His visits to Portland touched thousands of people, and I heard so much about them. He was not just a civil rights icon and a tremendous human being and an inspiration, he was a moral compass of our Committee on Ways and Means. He was the living, breath-

ing manifestation of policy that impacts every family in America, not just merely numbers and dry policy, but things that matter.

Too seldom does the consideration of everyday citizens—especially the poor, the weak, and the disadvantaged—get the same attention as the rich and powerful and well-connected. Well, that is not the fault of John Lewis. And I would hope that all of us here who are celebrating his life, would be inspired by his deeds, by his life's work.

As John would say, "not just our words, but our deeds." And I hope our moral compass of the Committee on Ways and Means will guide us as we move forward to give the American people the policies that John would have expected.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), our friend, who asked me on the floor last week, will the committee be paying a tribute to John Lewis.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, we all have these memories of Mr. Lewis, and some of you knew him far longer and far better than I did, but I can just tell you this: The time that I spent with Mr. Lewis that I remember the most was not so much in a committee hearing or not so much on the floor, but in March of 2015 when I took my 8-year-old grandson to Selma for the 50th anniversary of crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

We started off in Birmingham and went to the Baptist church. And George, my grandson, could not understand, when we were looking at this, he was looking at some men in hoods. He said: Grandpa, who are those guys?

I said: Those are the Ku Klux Klan.

He said: Who are they?

I said: George, these are people that you don't want to be associated with. They are haters.

He said: Well, what did they do?

I said: Well, this is the church they bombed, and they killed little girls that were practicing for a choir.

And he goes: Why would anybody want to kill little girls?

I said: Because they were filled with hate. They weren't filled with love.

Now, at that same trip, Mr. Lewis was with us. Mr. Lewis was there. And I said: Mr. Lewis, I just want you to meet my grandson, George.

And he stopped and he talked to George.

And George said to him: Mr. Lewis, why do they have on hoods? If they are so tough and they are so brave and they are so courageous, why did they have to wear a hood?

He said: George, at 8-years-old, you get it far better than some adults do.

Now, we go to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and Mr. Lewis stops to take time to talk to a little boy. Not for a minute, not if you stand off to the side, son, I will get with you later on.

No, he stops, he walks away from other people who were surrounding him and talking to him, and he stoops down

and he talks to an 8-year-old boy to tell him how proud he is that that child is going to walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him.

And as I watched that, I thought, what better example could any person give to a child than to spend that time with them. And I thought at that point, Mr. Lewis and I are both grandfathers. What an example for grandfathers, not just an example for fellow Americans, but what an example of who this man really was.

And if you look on his tombstone, it is going to say born February 21, 1940; died July 17, 2020—80 years. The time between his birth and the time between his death are some of the most significant years in our country's history of someone who stopped to recognize what was going on and said: Not on my time. I will do everything I can to change this. I will go through any sacrifice. I will endure any type of pain, any type of ridicule, any type of beatings to prove a point to say, It is time.

The one thing I always thought—I never, ever called him “John” by the way, because I just thought that would be disrespectful. Some of you know him much better than I did, so it was always “Mr. Lewis.”

Mr. Lewis, every time I would see him, I would say: Good morning, Mr. Lewis. He would say: Good morning, my brother. We would have a subcommittee meeting, and I would say: Mr. Lewis, it was really good being with you. He would say: It was good being with you, my brother.

And I say tonight, as we are here, we are not saying “good-bye, my brother.” We are saying, “until we meet again, my brother.” What a phenomenal human being and somebody who is going to be missed forever—80 years of being the finest example of humankind you could possibly be.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing us to speak tonight. This is truly a family of the Committee on Ways and Means. We really do appreciate each other.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGETT).

Mr. DOGETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, for the past 3 years, it has been my good fortune to sit next to Mr. Lewis on the dais of the Committee on Ways and Means.

His warmth, his humility, his lack of bitterness after all that he endured was truly extraordinary. His decades of service touched so many lives. With his multi-volume graphic novel, “March,” he found a way to reach a younger audience with his enduring message of struggle, hope, and love.

Reading it to my own grandchildren, they were hooked early when John talked about the fact that, as a young boy, he preached to his chickens—and that is how he became the great orator that we know him as being. He noted that: They would never quite say amen.

The dedication in March reads, “To the past and future children of the movement.” Not just this work, but his entire life's work was dedicated to the past and future children of the movement. For all that you have done, for all our children, John, we say “amen.”

John knew that America could not call itself a democracy until everyone could cast a ballot, and that the struggle for voting rights was a struggle for democracy itself. He dedicated himself to completing the promise of the Declaration of Independence as he exhorted the crowd down the Mall here at the Lincoln Memorial at the March on Washington to “Get in and stay in the streets of every city, every village and hamlet of this Nation until true freedom comes, until the revolution of 1776 is complete.”

And, again, in 2015, as he annually commemorated that March across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, John asked “Get out there and push and pull until we redeem the soul of America.”

John Lewis worked so tirelessly to get in “good trouble.” When the LBJ Foundation from Austin awarded him with the Liberty & Justice For All Award, I learned that he had experienced over 40 arrests, physical attacks, and serious injuries. But then I had seen, sitting next to him, some of the marks on his balding head of those very attacks.

Through it all, he maintained that “good trouble” was what America really needed. There will never be a time when America can afford to forget the legacy of John Lewis. He fought so long, so selflessly to advance our democracy, and he called the right to vote “sacred.”

Madam Speaker, we honor his tireless labor by picking up the baton and voting. We honor his legacy when we vote and enable more of our friends and neighbors to do the same. John Lewis now rests, but we cannot. Inspired by his sacrifice, we must continue his struggle.

No one can ever replace him, but no one person must. There are so many who share John Lewis' dream. And we will grow our numbers, and when we do, we will overcome.

□ 2015

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a very close friend of John Lewis.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, you know, if there are angels on Earth, John would be one. He was the most angelic person I have ever known, generous to a fault, easy to get along with.

John was known for marching, but I am reminded that the Bible says that the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord. John was and is a good man, always looking out for the underdog, always looking out for the disadvantaged, the poor, the needy, the hopeless, the helpless.

John has been an inspiration for me for more than 50 years, when he was a

mere teenager. If I had a message, I would say that the songwriter probably had John in mind when he said:

If you give the best of your service,  
Telling the world that the Savior is come;  
Be not dismayed when men don't believe  
you.

Pick up the cross and run swiftly to him.  
He'll understand.

And we all say: John, well done. Well done.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. Few men ever achieve what John Lewis has in his life, and few men do so while genuinely caring about every single person they meet.

When I joined the Ways and Means Committee as a new member, John made a point to make me feel welcome.

Despite all that he had accomplished in his life, John was never too busy or too important for you.

John made such a profound impact on all of us because his kindness, humility, and gentle strength were rooted in his nature.

He understood that his life's work could never be finished, and he never missed an opportunity to inspire younger generations to carry that work forward.

I will never forget when John's inspiration healed deep wounds in my own community. In 2005, a high school in my district was struggling with racial tension between Black and Latinx students. Students were hopelessly divided, and John offered to visit the high school with me.

He spoke to students and their parents and helped them understand that the civil rights movement benefited all disenfranchised communities. He reminded us that when minority communities allow ourselves to be pitted against each other, we all suffer.

As serious as John was, he also had a lighthearted and fun side to him as well. I will never forget when he made a video of himself dancing “Gangnam Style” to encourage young people to vote. He was up for anything that promoted voting and civic engagement.

John had a profound impact on my son, Joaquin, when we walked together in Selma across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Joaquin, who was 7 at the time, was able to walk with John Lewis and retrace the footsteps of history with a living legend. Joaquin was so moved that he read all of John's books and wrote a report on him during a unit on African-American history in school.

I will always cherish the memories that my family and I were lucky enough to share with John.

It is a cruel irony that we should lose John when the qualities that made him great are needed so desperately today in our government. But his passing is a heartbreaking reminder of what really matters.

Because of John, we know that riding our society of injustice requires

all of us to get in good trouble. Because of John, we know we can withstand true adversity.

History will remember John Lewis as a hero who made the world better for all. It is worth remembering that he did so by showing and reminding us all to be better versions of ourselves.

I am so grateful to have called him a friend, a colleague, and a mentor. My husband and son were here this morning to say good-bye to Mr. Lewis for the last time. My son thought it was important to see him off on his journey to walk with angels. We will miss him dearly.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, as has been said, John Lewis grew up on a chicken farm to sharecroppers in Troy, Alabama. During that time, there was great pain and suffering for our African-American brothers and sisters in the segregated South.

John Lewis's mother, in the summer of 1951, when John was 11, wanted to get him out of the heat of the segregated South, and she sent him to a place called Buffalo, New York, my hometown. Mrs. Lewis had baked for 3 days, because stopping in a diner along the way was not an option for the Lewis family.

John Lewis, when he got to Buffalo, he saw young kids, Black and White, playing together in Olmsted Park, now appropriately called Martin Luther King Jr. Park. He saw White women and Black women drinking from the same water fountain. He saw his uncles, Black men, working aside White men in the steel and flour mills of Buffalo, New York.

It was from that experience in Buffalo, in the summer of 1951, at age 11, that John said that he believed the desegregation of the South was possible, and he committed his lifework to that cause.

On March 7, 1965, as we know, John led a peaceful civil rights march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge. The idea was to march from Selma to Montgomery, the State's capital, a distance of about 55 miles. There were 148 State troopers waiting at the foot of the bridge for John and the peaceful demonstrators.

The State troopers said to cease and disperse. John led his fellow marchers, and they knelt and prayed. Then, they were attacked.

They broke John's skull. But before John went to the hospital to be administered to, he insisted on waiting till the news media got there. With blood pouring down his face, he admonished the President of the United States to take up the civil rights cause.

On August 6 of that year, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law by President Johnson.

John said, oddly, one time that he was grateful for the police beating because had that event not occurred, had

that not become Bloody Sunday, it would have just passed as a local news story. Nobody would have witnessed it, and nothing would have changed.

John always said, you sometimes have to give a little blood to redeem the soul of a nation.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a testament to the vision of John Lewis, a man of goodness and a man of grace, who at the age of 11, in the summer of 1951, was inspired by what he saw in Buffalo and had the presence of mind and the courage to act on that inspiration.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise again to honor the life and legacy of John Robert Lewis, a civil rights hero, mentor, and dear friend.

It is rare that you grow up to meet your hero and rarer still that you get to befriend them.

Growing up in Selma, Alabama, and a lifelong member of Brown Chapel AME Church, year after year, I would sit and marvel at those foot soldiers coming to my church to reenact that Bloody Sunday. There was Coretta Scott King and Joseph Lowery. There was Amelia Boynton Robinson, but, of course, there was John Lewis.

Never in my wildest dreams did I think that I would grow up and become Alabama's first Black congresswoman and not only walk the halls with John Lewis but get to sit on the same committee with John Lewis.

John was a slice of home for me in Congress. You see, looking into his eyes, I would see home, and all I would want to do is emulate home. John was a chief deputy whip, so I wanted to be a chief deputy whip. John was on the Ways and Means Committee. Sounded good to me.

John was always allowing people to radiate in his smile and in his light. He could never talk about voting rights—if I were within earshot, he would say: "And TERRI SEWELL represents Selma. Where is Terri?" And we would laugh. Those private moments were so precious to me. Those are the moments that I will cherish.

When I would call him the boy from Troy, he would call me the girl from Selma. We would laugh at how far our State had come, how far our Nation had come. I would say: "But, John, we have so much more to do." He would remind me that the better days of our Nation were ahead of it.

I don't know how I will continue to fight for the right to vote and restore the Voting Rights Act that he shed a little blood on a bridge in my hometown for, but I know that I am not alone, that John has sowed seeds of hope and inspiration into so many of us.

We are all disciples of John, and we all owe it to him to pick up that mantle and to continue the march, the march toward a more perfect Union.

For, you see, John has sowed seeds in all of us. Can't you hear him? Just close your eyes. If you see something that is unjust, unfair, you have a moral obligation to do something about it, to get in the way.

Never give up. Never give in. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize.

Rest in peace, my friend. Know that we all will pick up that mantle and continue your march.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I was born in Selma, Alabama, and I was 3 years old when John Lewis crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

My family moved away when I was young, but I still carried my birthplace. We moved quite frequently, and every new town we would go to, I would go to a school, and a teacher would ask where I was born. I would say Selma, and that started a whole conversation about what happened in Selma.

It is on my passport: Selma, Alabama. So many people who have seen that have started a conversation about what John Lewis and so many people did, crossing that bridge in Selma.

The story has become part of me, part of my life.

And I never, ever imagined, first, that I would be a Member of Congress, let alone have the opportunity to serve on the Ways and Means Committee with my hero, John Lewis.

One of the first trips I ever took as a Member of Congress was to go to Selma, to go back to my birthplace with TERRI SEWELL, with John Lewis. We were the Selma caucus, the three of us, on the Ways and Means Committee.

Just to be able to experience that, to talk to John—I had the chance to go to South Africa with John when he gave a talk at the 50th anniversary of Bobby Kennedy's "Ripples of Hope" speech and talk to John and hear his stories.

He lifted all of us up. He was an icon, yet when you were with him, I think we all became better people. He lifted us up, and he reminded all of us—in fact, he showed all of us what is possible, what each of us can do, how we can create change if we stand up, if we speak up for what is right and for what is just and what is fair.

□ 2030

So we will continue to honor John, each of us, by doing that, by speaking out, by getting into "good trouble," necessary trouble.

And, John, we will always remember your words, your kindness, your leadership. Thank you for passing a little bit of that on to each of us. Rest in peace. We will miss you terribly.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember my friend and colleague, John Lewis.

To say John Lewis was a civil rights icon barely captures his legacy because

he was so much more than that. He was a living piece of the civil rights movement, a connection to historic injustice, and a reminder of our power to remedy it.

John didn't just talk about voting rights, he nearly died defending the right to vote. And because of him and his determination to do what was right, to stand up to injustice whenever he saw it, and to cause a little "good trouble" whenever it was needed, our country is a more just and equitable one.

It was one of the greatest privileges of my life that I was not only able to serve alongside John on the Ways and Means Committee, but I was able to march alongside him as well. In Alabama, he led many of us on the annual pilgrimage of Selma across that Edmund Pettus Bridge.

But throughout his life, he gave voice to the voiceless, fought to empower the powerless, and stood up for those who could not.

I will never forget that June day here in Washington, D.C., after 49 people were shot dead in Florida in yet another senseless mass shooting. John said, "Enough is enough." He came to the House floor, right there, in fact, and sat down. We joined him for 26 straight hours while the Nation tuned in, transfixed.

When the President was keeping immigrant children in cages, John led us on a march to the CBP offices to demand these children be released. It was so hot and humid that many of us felt like fainting, but I looked over at John, and there he was still standing strong and marching. I thought to myself: His strength is the result of decades of civil disobedience.

This past week, we passed the historic NO BAN Act to stop the senseless travel ban against Muslims. And it was John who, 3 years ago, went to the Atlanta airport when the ban was first announced to demand answers and release. And when he was essentially ignored by Customs and Border Protection, he started a sit-in right that moment at the airport.

John was always a moral voice urging us to think of others and to do all that we can to improve their lives. Even in the face of the worst, John never stopped believing in our capacity for the best. I will miss him and his guidance. John may be gone, but we will keep marching.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for arranging for this opportunity for the Ways and Means Committee to come together to honor our brother, John Lewis.

Just listening to my colleagues gives me a greater sense of just how privileged we all have been. I think we often take for granted the people who are around us, and I don't think we can ever take John for granted, but to a certain extent, when I arrived here, I got used to seeing him on the floor.

And it is hard to come to this floor without having a little bit of anticipation that, of the many privileges that come with serving our country in this place, the one privilege that I could always count on was that, even on those tough days when the job wasn't so great, we could always plan on seeing John Lewis and getting some encouragement from him.

I met John before I came to Congress, just about 8 years ago, through my Uncle Dale. Dale Kildee served here for a long time. He served almost a quarter of a century with John and loved John—still does.

I have talked to Dale about John quite often. That was a relationship that led to me wanting to make sure that I tried to develop that same relationship and, of course, becoming a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

We spend so much time together, despite the fact that we haven't been able to the last couple of months. As a committee, we spend an enormous amount of time working together and having meals together and talking to one another. It felt like I had a chance to get so much closer to John, and I will never forget that.

As big and monumental a life as he led, as important a voice as he was, as such a soldier for justice and a figure in American history, as good and decent as a man he was in that respect, as we all know now, of course, is that he was that good a friend. He was that good a human being. He was that generous a person.

For me, the last couple of months, obviously, it has been hard, but it has been special, because John, under our temporary rules, John, of course, hasn't been able to be with us in these last couple of months as he was battling a sickness but asked if I would be willing to carry his proxy and cast his votes here on the floor.

I don't know that a greater honor could ever be bestowed upon me by him, but he was always grateful to me. I had to speak to him before each vote series, and he was always so grateful.

I thought to myself: John, I am grateful to you that you have given me this honor to cast a vote for the person who is most known for the sacred right to vote of anyone in our generation, perhaps anyone in our Nation's history.

The way we honor him, though, is with moments like this; but the best way that we honor him is to carry his work forward, to continue to do his work. And so the way I view it, while, for a couple of months I did carry his vote to this floor, even though John is gone, I think we can all continue to carry his vote, carry his voice, carry his work to this place and all across the country.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for giving us this opportunity.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of our colleague, John Lewis.

In my short time in Congress, I have had the privilege of working with John as members of the Ways and Means Committee. And in that time, I can tell you John is a true statesman.

Here in Washington, and even inside this Chamber, we see some individuals with personal agendas who are only interested in transactional relationships; however, John was a compassionate soul, dedicated to the cause of equality and justice.

Because of John's experiences with discrimination and hate, he brought to this body a thoughtful and passionate approach to ensuring that all Americans can experience the blessings of liberty that are guaranteed in our Constitution.

He understood the pain of a divided nation, the progress we have made over the past century, and the challenges we still face. Through it all, he met anger and violence with peace and love, a demonstration of his character that I think all of us can learn from.

I used to live in Nashville, Tennessee, and one of John's earliest acts was seeking peaceful change and organizing sit-ins at Nashville lunch counters. This is reminiscent to me of a courageous group of young people in my hometown, Wichita, who also sought equal treatment at a popular downtown lunch counter. The 1958 Dockum Drug Store sit-in was part of an early movement in cities across the country that helped advance desegregation.

I am so thankful that the youth in Wichita, along with men and women like John Lewis, had the boldness and fortitude to advance necessary and overdue changes in a racially segregated environment.

While we served on different sides of the aisle, his compassion for others was evident and his love of country unwavering. My memories of John will be of his legacy and his service. I am grateful to have served alongside him during my tenure in Congress, and I am thankful for his dedication to equality for Americans, the Georgians he represented, and the United States.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for leading this special hour.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for organizing this opportunity for those of us who served with John on the Ways and Means Committee to be able to come together as a committee and mourn him.

I have to say sitting here for the last hour or so and listening to all of my colleagues share their remembrances about John Lewis and just how special he was to them has truly been one of the best hours that I have spent on the House floor, and it has just been beautiful to listen to. I think it is a side of Congress that people rarely get to see, and I think we would be better off, all of us would be better off, if we were able to do this more.



When I hear the name John Lewis, obviously, this is one of the great American heroes in history, but that is not the first thing I think of.

When he comes to mind, the first thing I think of was just what a kind and quiet and humble and gentle man he was, always so nice to me from my very first day as a freshman, when I heard a voice behind me that said, "Young man, is this seat taken?" And I looked to the side of me and it was John Lewis, and I couldn't even speak.

He was just always that person to everyone. And, to me, that is a great lesson that should inspire us all to be better people.

I also believe, as a matter of faith, that I don't think it was an accident or a coincidence that the Lord called him home at this time during this summer of crisis in our Nation.

America has not quite become. We are constantly in the act of becoming. America is a nation born not of a race or a tribe, but out of ideas, a commitment to ideals. Someone who firmly believed that with every fiber of his being to deep in his soul was John Lewis. And throughout this year, and at this time, I know there are many in our society who are questioning the future of America, as it seems like we are coming apart at the seams.

Well, let's listen to the voice again of John Lewis, someone who never lost his faith and his optimism in this country, what it stands for, what it is called to be, and what he truly believed it will be. He gave his blood for this cause. He lived his life for it. And let him continue to be an example for all of us today.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL for doing this. I found this the most healing experience since John's loss.

Madam Speaker, as we approach the end of our life, it is fitting to think about how we will be remembered. Will they say: Was he brave? Was he kind? Was he humble? Was he honest?

But time wipes all memories away, and what is left? What impact did we have on the lives of others, of the people to come?

John Lewis is the best of men, the most Christ-like person I have ever known, and he changed the personal trajectories of tens of millions of people.

Born into poverty and racism, John has become the desperate hope that we need. Hammarskjöld wrote that all life asks of us is that we live it with courage. I grieve, we all grieve deeply this most courageous man, and thank God for his life.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

□ 2045

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to honor truly a great American, a real-life hero, who I was fortunate enough to have as a colleague for 4 years, including the 2 years serving together on the Ways and Means Committee. Congressman John Lewis has been an inspiration to me from a very young age.

I remember the first time I saw him on the Walter Cronkite evening news. He was walking across the Pettus Bridge in Selma. I felt very strongly about him and what he was doing. Madam Speaker, I was 10 years old, and I found him to be inspiring. He was purposeful. He was driven to make a difference. He was driven for "good trouble."

As a result of his action and because of the action of another gentleman who was a part of the Big Six, Whitney Young, I worked at the Urban League. I recall being elected to the Pennsylvania State House at 26 years of age, and it was John Lewis that inspired me, though I had never been to Alabama, but I had seen him on television. I remember that impression that he left upon me, because—although I had heard all the words I have heard today—I had never seen such determination.

So you can imagine growing up in the city of Philadelphia in Pennsylvania, him from Selma, Alabama, and the influence he was having.

I also honored him by welcoming Congressman Lewis to the southeast part of Pennsylvania for a gun reform ceasefire. I recall introducing him. I recall all of that.

But now, Madam Speaker, we must carry on his work of civil rights, equal opportunity. Most of all, we must rededicate ourselves to protecting the right to vote and making use of hard-won rights, a right for which John Lewis and many others sacrificed for all of us.

So I say to you, Madam Speaker and Mr. Chairman, he should rest in peace and power.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing this Special Order this evening.

This morning the Capitol bid farewell for the last time to our colleague and friend, the inimitable American hero, our beloved John Lewis.

In the days since his passing, countless words have been delivered in tribute to John's life, his accomplishments, his character, his importance to our Nation.

I have no doubt in the years to come John Lewis will take his place in our history books among not only the champions of the civil rights movement but also in the pantheon of historical giants who have literally reshaped the foundation and recalibrated the moral compass of our Nation.

But as our Speaker clearly recognized on Tuesday when his body was

brought to lie in state under the Capitol's dome, no words, no matter how great the tribute, can match those of John himself. From his famous speech in 1963 at the March on Washington to his frequent and inspired remarks to his fellow Members of Congress, often in what seemed like the darkest moments, John Lewis' voice thundered, but his words were always uplifting.

He talked to us about "good trouble," noting that there is nothing wrong with a little agitation for what is right and what is fair.

He instructed us to see all sides of an issue, "You have to tell the whole truth, the good and the bad, maybe some things that are uncomfortable for some people."

And he always looked to the future with hope and optimism. "Take a long, hard look down the road you will have to travel once you have made a commitment to work for change. Know that this transformation will not happen right away. Change often takes time." But he also said: "If you're not hopeful and optimistic, then you just give up. You have to take the long, hard look and just believe that if you're consistent, you will succeed."

John may have left this Earth, but his inspiration remains deep within us. I hope in the days ahead we can honor his memory by passing into law the John Lewis Voting Rights Act.

And wouldn't it be fitting to also rename the Edmund Pettus Bridge—where 55 years ago John put his life on the line to change the world—the John Robert Lewis Memorial Bridge to reflect the change that John brought to the world.

May his memory remain a blessing for each of us and for our country at these most difficult times and hopefully in better times ahead.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, it was such a great gift and honor when John Lewis would call me like he called many of us, "my brother," to serve on his committee, to ask him to give the closing prayer at this year's National Prayer Breakfast, to travel to Selma with him, and like all he came in contact with, to learn from him.

When the Christian church was in its infancy, there was tremendous infighting, different tribes and sects, different personalities battling over the direction of this new organization that will go on to transform the world.

Paul the Apostle, one of the earliest and most prolific leaders, was imprisoned by the Romans and ultimately beheaded for his belief in Jesus.

While in prison in 62 AD, Paul wrote a series of letters to the followers of Jesus instructing them how to conduct themselves.

In his letter to the Ephesians, Paul gave this instruction in chapter 4, versus 1 to 3: "I, then, a prisoner for the Lord, urge you to live in a manner worthy of the call you have received,

with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another through love, striving to preserve the unity of the spirit through the bond of peace."

John Lewis also a prisoner for the Lord many times, lived that model life worthy of his calling with humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with everyone through love, striving to preserve unity through the bond of peace.

John Lewis showed us that strength comes from humility and gentleness and patience and love, striving for unity through peace.

I know I need to be better. Thank you, John Lewis. Rest in peace, good and faithful servant.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### REFLECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for having this Special Order in which we rise, remember, and recognize one of our country's civil rights champions, one of America's heroes, my friend, our colleague, and, yes, the conscience of Congress, Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Now, unlike some other Members that spoke earlier, even though John was a fellow Member of Congress, he was a fellow Member on the Ways and Means Committee, I have to say I never got used to having John Lewis as a fellow colleague.

As Mr. KELLY alluded to and said, I should say, we do have a family here on the Ways and Means Committee, but it was clear that John was that favorite child. All of us were in awe as to everything he did and everything that John stood for.

And that is part of the reason why my wife and I took our two daughters down to Selma, Alabama, this last March to walk arm in arm with John Lewis across the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the last time.

Now, obviously, with the ceremonies this week in John's passing we have been thinking a lot about John, but this past weekend I could not get him out of my head. And it resonated with me the most when my wife and I took our two daughters up to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and we stood on the battlefield, in that cemetery and at that monument and read the speech that President Lincoln gave to consecrate that hallowed ground. And I can tell you it reminded me of the lifelong fight of John Lewis. It reminded me of

our Nation's lifelong fight for equality. And it reminded me of our continued fight today. And you will see what I mean when I use some of that speech in my following remarks.

Although we are a Nation conceived in liberty and equality, it seems as if now our Nation is divided and being tested as to whether we can endure together. Now we gather here tonight to honor the death of a man who literally shed blood so that our Nation can live together. But in a larger sense what we say here tonight is nothing compared to what John Lewis did throughout his life.

See, as with most of our speeches on the House floor, the world will little note nor long remember what we say here tonight, but it can never forget what John did, not only in this Chamber, but also for civil rights and for this country.

So it is for us, from Congress Members to frontline workers to peaceful protestors to be dedicated to the unfinished work which John fought for and so nobly advanced. And with the passing of John Lewis let us be dedicated to the task remaining before us, that from John's life we take increased devotion to the cause for which he gave full measure of devotion that we here highly resolve, that his actions, his service, his sacrifice shall never be in vain, that this Nation under God shall continue to have freedom and equality and that our government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall never perish from this Earth, but shall always live with the conscience of our country, John Robert Lewis.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for doing this Special Order hour to remember the life of John Lewis.

He called other people "brother." He called me "young brother," so I guess I was the little guy.

He was such an amazing man. He had a huge character. He was a civil rights giant who amplified the voices of a generation. His commitment to dismantling hatred and oppression in whatever its form was something that inspired generations, and it is something that we all know that we stand on his shoulders on for our own fights for greater equality in this country.

His strength and resolve, showcased during the Nashville sit-in movement, the Freedom Riders, and the March on Washington gave us the momentum to carry on through adversity and taught us what it means to get into some "good trouble."

And those who knew John and marched with him, whether it was to protest the detention of immigrant children, as I did a few years ago, or to speak out against racial injustice, always felt a little bit more hopeful when he was around. It created that little bit of a ripple of hope from person to person when he was marching with you.

I believe he also created a little bit of a ripple of change in every single person he met that transformed and empowered communities and for future generations still unborn. That is the kind of legacy he left.

But I also got to see him as just a humble person, a regular person. And I noticed when we would walk from the Ways and Means Committee room back here to vote, I would always kind of walk with him, and people would come up and ask for a photograph, you know, school children and adults alike. And they would get around him and, you know, I was pushed aside, and I took the phone and I was proud to take the photographs. He would always say: Hi, I am John Lewis. What is your name and where are you from? And he took that moment to make it about them, not about him.

Imagine if we were all like that, where we just paused a little bit and took the moment to make it about the other person, the other party, the other State, the other person from a different country. Imagine what this country would be like. It would be a lot better. It would be a lot more hopeful and would create that ripple of change that we all desire.

I know John is getting up to the pearly gates of Heaven with Saint Peter, who is the guardian of those gates, and John is going to say: Hi, I am John Lewis, nice to meet you.

□ 2100

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Speaker, the Nation had a chance tonight to hear about the affection and regard that we held for a very important member of the Ways and Means family, John Lewis.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. KELLY for yielding me the time. He did urge at a moment last week: I hope that we will be able to do a bipartisan tribute to John.

I said we planned one, and we want to make sure both sides are involved.

I just want to close on this note, as we travel to Atlanta tomorrow to say good-bye to John. At a Committee on Ways and Means Democratic retreat in New York about 2 years ago, with a very distinguished alumnus of the Democratic Party as well, Charlie Rangel came over to the dinner. John, myself, and former Chairman Rangel, we were sitting and just talking at the end of the night. After the conversation, when John got up and left, Charlie Rangel said to me: You know, Rich, there were many of us who did the right thing along the way. Many of us participated fully in the civil rights movement. But John Lewis would have died for the cause.

Pretty remarkable: John Lewis would have died for the cause.

Tonight, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Members of the House, both political parties, and the Ways and Means family for a nice tribute to our friend, John Lewis.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman NEAL so much for hosting this Special Order.

We truly are a family, and at times like this, that really comes out.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor my friend John Lewis. A giant of the civil rights movement in life, John Lewis' legacy now transcends his death. Nearly two hundred years after our Founders dedicated our nation to the proposition that all men are created equal, John Lewis worked to secure that precious truth. He did so with a warm heart and a smile on his face. He brought that same spirit to Congress, where we served on the Ways and Means Committee together and his presence was always uplifting.

Facing racial segregation and violence, Congressman Lewis held an unwavering conviction in the ability of nonviolence to deliver equality to all Americans.

His tireless and bold efforts were met with determined resistance and brutality. He suffered vicious beatings and unwarranted arrests. Through all strife and opposition, he stood bloody but unbowed.

John Lewis helped move our nation, and he will be dearly missed in this House.

#### HONORING DR. HAFEEZ MALIK AND DR. LYNDA MALIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise in tribute to a man whose life not only stands as a testament to his own achievements but also as an illustration of the greatness of the United States of America and as an embodiment of the American Dream.

Dr. Hafeez Malik, whose son Dean Malik has resided in Bucks County with his family for almost 20 years, passed away on April 20, 2020, at the age of 90 years old.

Dr. Malik was a professor at Villanova University for over 50 years, teaching undergraduate and graduate-level courses in political science, international relations, American history, and American government.

Dr. Malik was a world-renowned scholar who dedicated much of his life to strengthening the relationship between Pakistan, the country from which he emigrated, and the United States.

Dr. Malik provided lectures to American diplomats and senior military officers on multiple occasions at the U.S. State Department, while also forming the Pakistani American Congress in the 1990s.

Dr. Malik's scholarship has become an invaluable contribution, enabling the United States to understand the nuances of diplomacy throughout the Muslim world and has guided American foreign policy for nearly half a century.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Malik's success and acclaim would not have been pos-

sible without the love and support of the love of his life, his wife of 64 years, fellow Villanova professor Dr. Lynda Malik.

Hafeez and Lynda met as students at Syracuse University in the early 1950s. They got married in 1956.

These two amazing people embarked upon an amazing, productive, and renowned public partnership grounded in the bonds of everlasting marriage, ending only with Hafeez's recent death.

Throughout the Villanova University community, in the international world of academia, as well as in their social circles in southeastern Pennsylvania, where I represent, and elsewhere in the United States and in their home country of Pakistan, Hafeez and Lynda were known as a married power couple.

Throughout the years, they shared in each other's successes as well as each other's hardships and served as productive, upstanding members of our community.

Hafeez and Lynda were also proud, patriotic Americans. Their son Dean, who is a friend of mine, is a former Marine officer, a former criminal prosecutor, a practicing attorney, and a proud Iraq war veteran.

Madam Speaker, in death, Dr. Malik leaves behind his lifelong spouse and partner, who is suffering from dementia, and a disabled older son. Nevertheless, it is a comfort to all who know them that the success earned by this couple throughout their lifetime shall go to support these family members now in their time of vulnerability and their time of need, and that their son is to carry on Hafeez's legacy of public service in this life.

Madam Speaker, I rise in tribute to a man and his wife whose life not only stands as a testament to his own achievements but also as an illustration of the greatness of the United States of America and as an embodiment of the American Dream itself.

Madam Speaker, let us honor not only the life of Hafeez Malik and his wife, Lynda, but also his lifelong partnership with his wife, Lynda; their amazing family; all they have done for the community of Pennsylvania; all they have done for Villanova University as a couple; and all they have done for the United States of America as a couple.

They are a great family. They were a very, very special couple, and I wanted to honor them on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight.

Madam Speaker, I ask to have this speech and the life of Hafeez and his wife, Lynda, permanently entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LETTER SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 4(b) OF HOUSE RES- OLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, July 27, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI

Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 965, we are writing to inform you that the Committee on Natural Resources has met the requirements for conducting a business meeting outlined in regulation E.1 of the remote committee proceedings regulations, inserted into the Congressional Record on May 15, 2020, and that the Committee is prepared to conduct a remote meeting and permit remote participation.

In meeting these requirements, the Committee held a non-public business meeting rehearsal on July 27, 2020; a public full committee hearing with remote participation on June 11, 2020; and a public subcommittee hearing with remote participation on June 18, 2020.

Sincerely,

Raúl M. Grijalva, Chair, Committee on Natural Resources; Debra Haaland, Member of Congress; Jared Huffman, Member of Congress; Ruben Gallego, Member of Congress; Alan Lowenthal, Member of Congress; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Member of Congress; Nydia M. Velázquez, Member of Congress; Grace Napolitano, Member of Congress; Matt Cartwright, Member of Congress; Darren Soto, Member of Congress; Paul D. Tonko, Member of Congress; TJ Cox, Member of Congress; Mike Levin, Member of Congress; Diana DeGette, Member of Congress; Ed Case, Member of Congress; Jesús G. "Chuy" Garcia, Member of Congress; Steven Horsford, Member of Congress; A. Donald McEachin, Member of Congress; Anthony G. Brown, Member of Congress; Debbie Dingell, Member of Congress; Wm. Lacy Clay, Member of Congress; Jim Costa, Member of Congress; Joe Neguse, Member of Congress.

#### LETTER SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 4(b) OF HOUSE RES- OLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, July 29, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 965, we are writing to inform you that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has met the requirements for conducting a business meeting outlined in regulation E.1 of the remote committee proceedings regulations, inserted into the Congressional Record on May 15, 2020, and that the Committee is prepared to conduct a remote meeting and permit remote participation.

In meeting these requirements, the committee held a non-public business meeting rehearsal on July 28, 2020, a public full committee hearing with remote participation on June 11, 2020, and a public subcommittee hearing with remote participation on June 3, 2020.

Sincerely,

Mark Takano, Chairman; Kathleen Rice,  
Member of Congress; Mike Levin,

Member of Congress; Julia Brownley, Member of Congress; Conor Lamb, Member of Congress; Anthony Brindisi, Member of Congress; Max Rose, Member of Congress; Elaine Luria, Member of Congress; Joe Cunningham, Member of Congress; Collin Peterson, Member of Congress; Colin Allred, Member of Congress; Chris Pappas, Member of Congress; Susie Lee, Member of Con-

gress; Gilbert R. Cisneros, Jr., Member of Congress; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Member of Congress; Lauren Underwood, Member of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution

967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 30, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2020, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2020

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR., July 9, 2020.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2020

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH, July 7, 2020.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2020

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Lale Morrison .....	2/17	2/20	Austria .....		1,423.12		792.91		517.58		2,733.61
	2/22	2/23	England .....		536.99		293.48		531.16		1,361.63
Committee total .....					1,960.11		1,086.39		1,048.74		4,095.24

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JIM MCGOVERN, July 20, 2020.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2020

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETER A. DEFAZIO, July 14, 2020.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 4686, Sami's Law, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 7575, the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

## ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 7575

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—													
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2020–2025	2020–2030	
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact .....	0	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	337	673	
Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.														

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4823. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce T. Crawford, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4824. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph L. Osterman, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4825. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Major General Timothy J. Kadavy, Army National Guard of the United States, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4826. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Thomas J. Moore, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4827. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David H. Lewis, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4828. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James C. Vechery, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4829. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard A. Brown, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C.

1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4830. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Joseph L. Lengyel, Air National Guard of the United States, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4831. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4832. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General James M. Holmes, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4833. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the 20 officers whose names appear on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4834. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the 12 officers whose names appear on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4835. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the 15 officers whose names appear on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4836. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the three officers whose names appear on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4837. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the nine officers whose names appear on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C.

777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4838. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John J. Broadmeadow, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4839. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Todd T. Semonite, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4840. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas W. Bergeson, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4841. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas C. Seamands, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4842. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, United Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4843. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Grounds; Lower Mississippi River below Baton Rouge, LA, including South and Southwest Passes; New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0991] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4844. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Chartier Fireworks, St. Clair River, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2020-0375] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4845. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; HMS MEDWAY, St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2020-0264] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4846. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-1076; Product Identifier 2019-NM-173-AD; Amendment 39-19914; AD 2020-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4847. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0452; Product Identifier 2020-NM-062-AD; Amendment 39-19910; AD 2020-09-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4848. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0454; Product Identifier 2019-SW-113-AD; Amendment 39-19911; AD 2020-09-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4849. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0450; Product Identifier 2020-NM-034-AD; Amendment 39-19907; AD 2020-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4850. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0101; Product Identifier 2019-NM-190-AD; Amendment 39-19908; AD 2020-09-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4851. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hardin, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0954; Airspace Docket No.: 19-ANM-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4852. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Safety Zone, Object Removal; Delaware River and

Bay, Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2020-0344] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1067. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7617) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-461). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5119. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require certain air carriers to provide reports with respect to maintenance, preventive maintenance, or alterations, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5139. A bill to protect transportation personnel and passengers from sexual assault and harassment, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-463, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5912. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the use of incentive payments to expedite certain federally financed airport development projects (Rept. 116-464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 7808. A bill to amend section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (commonly referred to as the Communications Decency Act) to stop censorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 7809. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a HOPE Preferred Equity Facility to guarantee certain financial investments of commercial borrowers affected by COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GOMMERT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. BRADY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ROY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr.

CUELLAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 7810. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3519 East Walnut Street in Pearland, Texas, as the "Tom Reid Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 7811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a reduction in loan fees for certain veterans affected by major disasters; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment is made in property used to extract critical minerals and metals from the United States, to modify the prohibition on the acquisition of certain sensitive materials from non-allied foreign nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7813. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require disclosures of foreign gifts by entities affiliated with institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Ms. CHENEY):

H.R. 7814. A bill to establish a strategic uranium reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 7815. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Desert Tortoise Habitat Conservation Plan, Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mrs. TORRES of California):

H.R. 7816. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the use of funds for comprehensive reproductive health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 7817. A bill to direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to submit a report on facilitating efficient, timely environmental reviews of nuclear reactors through expanded use of categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and generic environmental impact statements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODEN (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 7818. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to strip foreign sovereign immunity of certain foreign states to secure justice for victims of novel coronavirus in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 7819. A bill to provide that CARES Act Provider Relief Fund payments are not includible in gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 7820. A bill to establish the John Lewis Election Day holiday on November 3, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.



By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HECK, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DEAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CASE, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 7821. A bill to automatically extend and adjust enhanced unemployment assistance for the duration of the COVID-19 emergency and economic crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for himself, Mr. McEACHIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 7822. A bill to protect clean air and public health by expanding fenceline and ambient air monitoring and access to air quality information for communities affected by air pollution; to require immediate toxic air monitoring at the fenceline of facilities with pollution linked to local health threats; to ensure the Environmental Protection Agency promulgates rules that require fenceline air monitoring in communities with air polluting industrial source categories; to expand and strengthen the national ambient air quality monitoring network; to deploy air sensors in communities affected by air pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 7823. A bill to provide for emergency grants for essential community facilities and temporary installations needed in response to COVID-19 pandemic in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 7824. A bill to require certain businesses to disclose the use of forced labor in their direct supply chain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 7825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create increased opportunities for savings to HSA, MSA and FSA plans, to mitigate the financial strain on families caused by COVID-19, to provide for child nutrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 7826. A bill to amend the Wire Act to clarify that gambling on commercial greyhound racing and field coursing using wire communication technology is prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HECK, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr.

SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 7827. A bill to authorize funding for certain offices and programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 7828. A bill to permit vicarious liability claims against an employer of a person who, under color of law, subjects another to the deprivation of rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 7829. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 935 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest in the District of Columbia as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 7830. A bill to provide protections to Social Security and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries relating to extra payments due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 7831. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a pilot program to provide selected States with an increased reimbursement for school lunches that are comprised of locally-grown and unprocessed foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 7832. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4020 Broadway Street in Houston, Texas, as the "Benny C. Martinez Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 7833. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to conduct a feasibility study for the project for comprehensive watershed study, Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 7834. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of

Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARTZ, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 7835. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Eric Fisher Wood, Jr. for the acts of valor during the Battle of the Bulge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SOTO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 7836. A bill to provide, manufacture, and distribute high quality face masks for every individual in the United States during the COVID-19 emergency using the Defense Production Act and other means; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 7837. A bill to provide a payroll tax credit for certain employee dependent care expenses paid by employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 7838. A bill to provide for certain temporary waivers with respect to the 340B drug discount program due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. BRADY):

H.R. 7839. A bill to amend the Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 to extend the Medicare Patient IVIG Access Demonstration Project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 7840. A bill to reauthorize the Blue Ridge National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McHENRY (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 7841. A bill to require the purchase by the Federal Government of certain medical supplies and protection equipment be from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Energy and Commerce, Veterans' Affairs, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 7842. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve protections against foreign influence at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 7843. A bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to promote reforestation following unplanned events on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 7844. A bill to authorize the Director of the Minority Business Development Agency of the Department of Commerce to provide assistance for nonprofit economic development organizations to provide services for low- and moderate-income individuals who are aspiring entrepreneurs or seeking employment and for owners of smaller businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7845. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a forgivable loan program for remote recreational businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 7846. A bill to ensure access to Pandemic Unemployment Assistance for workers who are unable to obtain child and family care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 7847. A bill to create a database of eviction information, establish grant programs for eviction prevention and legal aid, and limit use of housing court-related records in consumer reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 7848. A bill to divert Federal funding away from supporting the presence of police in schools and toward evidence-based and trauma informed services that address the needs of marginalized students and improve academic outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7849. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to carry out a pilot program to award competitive grants to eligible entities to train individuals for careers in the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 7850. A bill to require a National Intelligence Estimate on Iranian proxy forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs,

for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 7851. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate overpayments of tax as contributions and to make additional contributions to the Homeless Veterans Assistance Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 7852. A bill to establish a presumption of occupational disease for certain employees at the Department of Energy's Radioactive Waste Management Complex, to refine the definition of compensable illnesses, to establish a research program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 7853. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a task force to identify vulnerabilities in supply chains for United States entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 7854. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security to extend the period with respect to which amounts under the Coronavirus Relief Fund may be expended; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. PERRY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 7855. A bill to authorize the President to use military force for the purpose of securing and defending Taiwan against armed attack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H. Res. 1068. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Slovenia and the enduring friendship between the American and Slovenian peoples is critical to United States interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself and Mr. CARDENAS):

H. Res. 1069. A resolution declaring racism a public health crisis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BURGESS):

H. Res. 1070. A resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Veterans History Project of the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 7808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

Article 1 Section 8: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

In *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* (1992), Justice Kennedy stated, in an opinion co-authored by Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and David Souter, that "At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence." Justice Kennedy continued in *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015): "The Constitution promises liberty to all within its reach, a liberty that includes certain specific rights that allow persons, within a lawful realm, to define and express their identity."

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 7809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution:

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 7810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;"

Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . ."

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 7814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 7815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 authorizes Congress "[t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 7816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 7817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GOODEN:

H.R. 7818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 7819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 7820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 7821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 7822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 7823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 7824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 7825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 7826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 7827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 7828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIV, Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Amendment XIV, Section 5: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 7829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;"

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 7830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: "The Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 7831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 7832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 to establish post offices and post Roads

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 7833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution stating that Congress has the authority to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution."

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 7834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 7836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 7837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 7838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 7839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 7840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 provides Congress with the power to "dispose of and make all needful rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 7841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 7842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 7843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 7844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 7846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 7847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 7848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 7849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 7850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 7851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 7852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 7853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States of any Department of Office thereof."

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 7855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Powers of the Congress

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 444: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 906: Mr. MORELLE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. ROY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 945: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1127: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1349: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1508: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1597: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1694: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1714: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1873: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1895: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 2075: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.

H.R. 2086: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 2166: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2200: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 2208: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2261: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 2271: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2350: Ms. WILD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 2419: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2442: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2482: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2571: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 2650: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2694: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2733: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2859: Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 2965: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2986: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 3010: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BACON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3119: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3570: Mr. COOPER and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 3572: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. NORTON, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 3662: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3690: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3716: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 3766: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 3935: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4078: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4104: Mr. SPANO, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 4150: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 4228: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 4439: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 4512: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 4525: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 4644: Mr. SIRES and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4679: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 4681: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 4686: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 4701: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4764: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 4817: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4986: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5041: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 5046: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 5098: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 5110: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 5172: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5260: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5292: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 5420: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 5435: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 5485: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 5577: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 5586: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 5619: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 5689: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 5741: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 5845: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 5861: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5884: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 5900: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 5983: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 5986: Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 5989: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 6027: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 6039: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROUDA, Mr.

LEVIN of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 6047: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6141: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 6142: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 6174: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6338: Mr. SPANO and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 6364: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 6495: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 6537: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 6556: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 6559: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 6561: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 6626: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 6646: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 6680: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 6688: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 6697: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 6718: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 6720: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 6788: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 6799: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 6813: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 6814: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 6829: Mr. PASCARELL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 6837: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 6926: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 6952: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 6958: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 6970: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.

H.R. 7039: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7040: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7052: Mr. COSTA and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 7072: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7096: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 7149: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 7153: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 7175: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 7178: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 7189: Mr. COOK and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 7197: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SOTO, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 7232: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 7269: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 7280: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 7285: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 7292: Mr. RESCENTIALER and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 7293: Mr. UPTON and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 7327: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 7356: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 7388: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 7393: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 7414: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 7415: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 7434: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 7443: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 7463: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 7483: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 7490: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.  
 H.R. 7496: Mr. PHILLIPS.  
 H.R. 7527: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
 H.R. 7534: Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 7536: Ms. NORTON and Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H.R. 7539: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. SOTO.  
 H.R. 7550: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H.R. 7553: Mr. SOTO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 7557: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
 H.R. 7561: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 7585: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 7595: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. RYAN.  
 H.R. 7604: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 7615: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 H.R. 7622: Ms. MOORE.  
 H.R. 7623: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SIRE.  
 H.R. 7632: Mr. REED and Mr. LAMB.  
 H.R. 7642: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASE, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H.R. 7651: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 7659: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ROUDA.  
 H.R. 7666: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. COLE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 7679: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. MARSHALL.  
 H.R. 7682: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 7690: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GUEST, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 7691: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. ROUDA.  
 H.R. 7696: Mr. PALMER.  
 H.R. 7699: Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 7700: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. GALLEGO.  
 H.R. 7703: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
 H.R. 7710: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 7724: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H.R. 7734: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. HOLDING.  
 H.R. 7739: Mr. LYNCH.  
 H.R. 7743: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
 H.R. 7751: Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 7760: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 7768: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.  
 H.R. 7778: Mr. COLE and Mr. CURTIS.  
 H.R. 7790: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 7792: Mr. SPANO and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 7795: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 7799: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SIRE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TRONE, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. CORREA.  
 H.R. 7802: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mrs. WALORSKI.  
 H.R. 7804: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BACON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COLE, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. ESTES.  
 H.R. 7805: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PHILLIPS.  
 H.R. 7806: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. TRONE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. DEAN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. SOTO and Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COOK, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. GUEST.  
 H. Res. 114: Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H. Res. 302: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H. Res. 759: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. TITUS.  
 H. Res. 823: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
 H. Res. 835: Ms. PINGREE.  
 H. Res. 837: Mr. TRONE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
 H. Res. 894: Mr. COSTA, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
 H. Res. 958: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
 H. Res. 972: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. KIM, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H. Res. 977: Ms. MENG, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SIRE, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H. Res. 985: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H. Res. 1003: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H. Res. 1024: Ms. OMAR.  
 H. Res. 1033: Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. COOK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H. Res. 1034: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.  
 H. Res. 1040: Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H. Res. 1046: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mrs. WALORSKI.  
 H. Res. 1052: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H. Res. 1056: Mr. PETERS.  
 H. Res. 1062: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. TRONE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3010: Mr. BERGMAN.