

in and year out amounts to many millions of dollars every year.

For example, the successful flood fight of 2009 cost Fargo-Moorhead about \$50 million. When you lose the flood fight, the cost is much greater in both human terms and in financial terms.

For example, in another community, a much smaller community, Minot, ND, lost the flood fight in 2011, destroying or damaging more than 4,000 homes and displacing thousands of people. The Federal Government has put more than \$632 million—let me repeat—more than \$632 million into the city's recovery efforts to date, and we are still not done.

A similar flood in the Fargo-Moorhead metro area would be far worse and far more expensive. The Army Corps of Engineers predicts a 500-year flood in the Red River Valley would cost more than \$10 million in damage, and that doesn't even take into account the impact in terms of human cost and difficulty to families and to businesses.

Let's look at how the costs of such a flood are typically shared. This is very important when we do the cost-benefit analysis. Typically local government covers 15 percent of the cost. The State pays about 10 percent of the cost, and the Federal Government pays by far the largest share of the cost. The Federal Government is paying 75 percent of the cost every single year—oh, except, in severe disasters, FEMA recommends raising the 75-percent Federal share for public assistance, the repair of infrastructure, to 90 percent Federal cost after you meet a certain threshold.

When you have very significant damage and higher losses, now the Federal Government is picking up as much as 90 percent of the cost, particularly for the public infrastructure. That cost, in

our case now, is incurred on a year-in and year-out basis.

In fact, Fargo-Moorhead has not only had to mount a flood fight but then conduct cleanup afterwards in 4 out of the last 5 years, including this spring. That is my point. That is exactly my point. With permanent flood protection, which is provided through the WRDA bill, we can break that cycle. With one-time spending we can protect people on a permanent basis and do so much more cost-effectively. Once you build it, you are done with the endless and traumatic sequence of fighting floods and cleaning up after them. Not only that, but the cost-sharing for permanent flood protection is lower for the Federal Government. The Federal share would be less than half of the cost of the permanent project, 45 percent of the permanent project. That compares with 75 to 90 percent the Federal Government is obliged to cover for the annual flood fight or, worse, if you lose the flood fight and you have that recovery effort.

We are saying for the permanent protection, the non-Federal share, Federal share 45 percent. The non-Federal share is more than half, which means State and local government will cover 55 percent of the cost, which is actually the majority of the project. We have already lined up those funds. At that local level and the State level, we are ready to go.

This is a two-State effort, as I said. That cost is incurred by the State of North Dakota, by local government, and Minnesota, and it breaks out as follows: Minnesota would cover about 10 percent of the non-Federal share or about \$100 million. North Dakota will cover 90 percent of the non-Federal share, about \$900 million, divided evenly between the State and local municipalities, each putting in about \$450 million.

In the end you can't put a price on the kind of hardship and despair that losing a home or a business means after the fact. You can help to spare people that hardship in the first place with permanent flood protection.

That is what the Fargo-Moorhead diversion is all about, and that is why it is so important to North Dakota, to Minnesota, and to the Red River Valley region of the North. The Water Resources Development Act, however, does more. It is key to building and rebuilding vital water infrastructure projects throughout our Nation, projects that will make us stronger and safer.

Moreover, the WRDA bill includes streamlining provisions to help us complete worthy projects more cost effectively with less bureaucracy, with greater savings, and with less redtape. In addition, we work conscientiously through the process to make sure we do these vital projects right. They have been subjected to full corps review, including cost-benefit analyses, in an open and transparent way.

For all of these reasons and more, I urge my colleagues to support the Water Resources Development Act for the peace of mind permanent flood control and protection will give to the people of our region and other regions throughout the country.

I yield the floor.

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:18 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 9, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.