

That is what my amendment does. It says that we are going to work to fix this infrastructure with the bill that we are working on, that my colleague from Maine is leading on with the DRIVE Act. But we are also going to be smart. We are not going to require Americans to take half a decade to get permission from the Federal Government to rebuild a bridge.

These bridges sustain our economy, they connect our communities, they connect us, they keep us safe, and we need to expedite the ability to fix our infrastructure in this country, starting with our bridges. That is all this amendment does. It is simple. It is common sense. I hope that if I can bring this to the floor, we will get a unanimous vote in favor of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, let me commend my colleague from Alaska for raising this important issue.

First, it is important to understand that his amendment only applies to structurally deficient bridges. These are bridges that are deteriorating and that need extensive renovation or replacement. And it is important that we address the problem of structurally deficient bridges before they become unsafe to use. That is the risk, and that is what my colleague from Alaska is attempting to address with his amendment. He is proposing that if we are replacing a structurally deficient bridge in exactly the same place, that we do not need to start all over again with an environmental impact statement that may delay the replacement of this structurally deficient bridge for literally years, not to mention the enormous cost that is undertaken when with an environmental impact statement and all the attendant studies are done. He is correct that the amount of time to do this kind of analysis, as well as the length of these studies, has grown enormously in recent years, and that, too, is a problem when we are dealing with a structurally deficient bridge.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment. I would not want to waive environmental impact studies if the bridge were going to be built in a new location. Then we would need to do that kind of careful environmental analysis and review to make sure the environmental impact is well under-

stood. But that is not what Senator SULLIVAN is proposing. He is proposing that for this one category of bridges, we would not have to do the environmental impact statement if it is being rebuilt in exactly the same place. I think this makes sense. I think this is the kind of common sense that my colleague from Alaska has brought to Washington, and I commend him for his amendment.

I do know there are some concerns, I believe, on the other side of the aisle, and I appreciate the Senator from Alaska working with us. But I, for one, believe his amendment does make sense. It is narrowly tailored, and I believe it should be adopted by this body.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from Maine for her comments. I very much appreciate her support. We will work with the others if they have questions.

I have worked on a number of issues now in my first year in the Senate with my colleague from Rhode Island, and I certainly want to make sure he is comfortable with this commonsense amendment. But I guarantee my colleagues, whether it is in Maine or Alaska or Rhode Island, if our citizens look—it doesn't matter; Democrat or Republican—at an amendment like this, I think the vast majority of them would say: Of course. Of course that is what we should be doing—protecting our citizens, building infrastructure, protecting the environment, but not making things take forever. That is what we are trying to do.

So I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Maine about the amendment, and I am hoping we can move forward on this tomorrow.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

Ms. COLLINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be

in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. Today the Senate agreed to consider H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The bill includes a provision related to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's administrative costs for disaster relief activities that results in \$1 million in outlays. This provision is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act of 1985. The inclusion of this designation makes this spending eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act.

As a result, I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for 2016 by \$1 million in outlays. I am also increasing the 2016 allocations to the Appropriations Committee by \$1 million in outlays.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

	\$ in millions	2016
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,033,488
Outlays		3,091,973
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority		0
Outlays		1
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,033,488
Outlays		3,091,974

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$ in millions	2016
Current Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		523,091
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority*		494,191
General Purpose Outlays*		1,157,344
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		0
General Purpose Outlays		1
Revised Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		523,091
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		494,191
General Purpose Outlays		1,157,345