NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

RPTS JACKSON

HIF301182

MARKUP OF S. 611, THE GRASSROOTS RURAL AND

SMALL COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS ASSISTANCE ACT

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2015

House of Representatives,

Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy,

Committee on Energy and Commerce,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 12:00 p.m., in Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Shimkus [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Shimkus, Harper,
Whitfield, Pitts, Latta, McKinley, Johnson, Bucshon, Cramer,
Tonko, Schrader, Green, Capps, McNerney, and Pallone (ex
officio).

Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Will Batson,
Legislative Clerk; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Jerry Couri,
Senior Environmental Policy Advisor; Peter Kielty, Deputy General

Counsel; David McCarthy, Chief Counsel, Environment and Economy;
Graham Pittman, Legislative Clerk; Chris Sarley, Policy
Coordinator, Environment and Economy; Dan Schneider, Press
Secretary; Dylan Vorbach, Legislative Clerk, Commerce,
Manufacturing, and Trade; Jessica Wilkerson, Oversight
Associate, Oversight and Investigations; and Andy Zach, Counsel,
Environment and Economy; Jen Berenholz, Chief Clerk; Jeff
Carroll, Staff Director; Jacqueline Cohen, Senior Counsel;
Elizabeth Ertel, Deputy Clerk; Rick Kessler, Senior Advisor and
Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Alexander Ratner, Policy
Analyst; and Tim Robinson, Chief Counsel.

Mr. Shimkus. The subcommittee will come to order and the Chair recognizes himself for an opening statement.

Today we mark up Senate 611, the Grass Roots Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act. S. 611 passed the Senate unanimously.

The House version is H.R. 2853, which was introduced by our ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Tonko, and vice chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Harper.

I congratulate and thank them for their bipartisan work.

Safe Drinking Water Act regulations issued by EPA present technical, managerial and physical challenges beyond the capacity of these towns to afford on the same scale as urban centers.

Residents of these communities work hard to support their families and their local government but often earning wages below those of their counterparts in the most urbanized areas. Yet, their per customer compliance costs are far higher than in many larger communities.

Sometimes it is just a matter of having the ability to keep up with the red tape. The bill before us reauthorizes the EPA's program providing technical assistance to small public water system.

S. 611 maintains the existing statutory authorization of \$15 million annually including 3 percent for technical assistance to public water systems owned or operated by Indian tribes but extends authorizations through fiscal year 2020.

S. 611 also authorized the EPA to provide technical assistance programs to small public water systems through grants or cooperative agreement made to nonprofit organizations.

The bill requires preference in awarding grants to nonprofit that are most qualified and experienced and that small water systems find both beneficial and effective, a feature we heard about during our February hearing and again last week.

Moving this bill without amendment is important. While the House Appropriations Committee has not provided small water system technical assistance funding for fiscal year 2016, that committee has left open the option that it would reevaluate funding for this matter as part of a later annual budget bill if Congress enacts a fresh authorization.

People who live in rural communities deserve every bit of water quality and technical resources that folks who live in the densely populated urban centers do.

I urge support for Senate 611 and now recognize my friend, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes for an opening statement.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for convening a subcommittee markup of S. 611, the Grass Roots Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act.

This legislation is a step forward on drinking water. I also want to thank our colleague, Rep. Harper, for introducing H.R. 2853, the House companion bill to Sen. Wickers' bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor of that legislation. It is a good bill and I

support it.

We began the 114th -- excuse me, the technical assistance offered by organizations such as the Rural Community Assistance Partnership and the National Rural Water Association is vital to small and rural water systems across our country.

I realize you hope to have this markup moved quickly. We hope not to have the two hearings on e-manifest and low-level nuclear waste immediately preceding this markup.

So much for our hopes. However, we do have some amendments to offer. We began the 114th with some important successes.

We marked up Representative Latta's bill to authorize a strategic plan for dealing with alga blooms in source waters for drinking water systems. There was bipartisan cooperation on that bill and it received a strong bipartisan endorsement by the House.

Working together, we produced a good TSCA reform bill, another bill that received strong bipartisan support when it passed our House.

Ultimately, I expect this bill to receive the same strong support. However, as I indicated earlier this week, I and other members of our subcommittee are anxious to tackle other important issues that the subcommittee has not yet addressed. It has been 12 years since we last authorized the drinking water programs in our jurisdiction.

With S. 611, we are reauthorizing a small but very important program in this area, although I believe the program should be

reauthorized at a higher level.

We should at least be accounting for 12 years of inflation so the program can deliver the same level of service reliably. And with the growing backlog of water infrastructure needs, we should be doing much more to assist states and their water utilities to reduce that backlog.

The drinking water SRF was authorized at \$1 billion back in 2003. It is the main source of federal assistance for water utilities. It needs to be reauthorized also and at a higher level than was provided in 2003.

Our inaction is also adding to the expenses of state and local governments enforcing increases in water utility rates for our consumers.

Across the country, we experience over 700 water main breaks per day, breaks that result in losses of treated water from water systems.

That represents a loss of not only revenue to the water utility but a loss of water to businesses and households.

Infrastructure does not repair itself. It does not improve with age.

Funding plans, strategic programs of infrastructure repair and replacement costs far less than doing emergency repairs.

Yesterday, Mr. Chair, you expressed concern that the authorization for e-manifest expires at the end of 2015 and the Appropriations Committee may decide not to fund programs that do

|| not have a current authorization.

Well, if that is the case we have a number of very vulnerable programs. The issues within this subcommittee's jurisdiction are serious and they have significant impacts on communities in every member's district.

I know there are budget concerns but we simply cannot cut our way to prosperity. We need to make strategic investments to provide the infrastructure needed to support economic opportunity and we can't afford to clean up contaminated properties and return them to productive use. We can afford to repair and upgrade our water infrastructure and we can afford to manage waste responsibly.

In fact, we cannot afford to ignore these needs. You have proven you are willing to work on tough issues through your efforts on issues like nuclear waste disposal and TSCA reform. By comparison, issues like drinking water and brown fields are easy.

So S. 611 is a small but very good step forward. I urge my colleagues to support the measure and also state that we should now move on to address the bigger problems.

And with that, I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman yields back his time.

Chair now recognizes the coauthor of the legislation, at least the House version, Mr. Harper from Mississippi, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the

ranking member, Mr. Tonko, for his support and cooperation in bringing this matter forward.

And I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this markup of S. 611, the Grass Roots Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act.

I appreciate the committee's commitment to this issue as we work to reauthorize this important technical assistance language. In a legislative hearing just last week, we heard from rural water professionals about the importance and timeliness of passing S. 611.

Rural water experts from the Mississippi Rural Water
Association and the Rural Community Assistance Partnership Inc.
testified to the benefits of S. 611 and, of course, our companion
bill, and helped provide insight into the needs of our rural water
constituents.

This insight will be beneficial as we continue to move forward and to discuss this issue. I believe this gives predictability that is needed and as we know and as is stated in S. 611 90 percent -- more than 90 percent of the community water systems in this country serve the population of less than 10,000 individuals.

So this is something that we do need to move forward. I know that it was mentioned maybe some concerns about having other hearings but those such as e-manifest and the one that just preceded on low-level radioactive waste are maybe not the most

glamorous topics that we are going to hear this year are nevertheless necessary.

And I am certainly willing to work with the ranking member to identify programs that perhaps that can be cut or reduced that he thinks are not necessary and try to transfer some of that money to more pressing areas such as this.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman yields back his time.

Chair now recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yesterday, the chairman noted that the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent and suggested that there are no substantive concerns with the legislation.

However, I think several serious substantive concerns were raised by Democratic members of the subcommittee at last week's hearing and I hope that we can address those concerns today or at least reach a bipartisan consensus about the potentially ambiguous terminology used in the bill.

Such a consensus would address many of the substantive concerns on this side of the aisle and smooth this bill's path into law.

I have heard from the majority that the need for this bill is pressing because of the appropriations process. But Democrats have repeatedly offered to work on this legislation for at least

8 months and we should not give up on good policy simply because the majority delayed consideration.

I would like to mention some of the specific concerns which I raised last week and which could be addressed today. First, the legislation creates a preference for nonprofit that are most qualified and the most experienced.

Similar language in past Democratic proposals would have given priority to the most effective organizations. I think these terms are intended to be synonymous and we all agree that the money should go to the most effective organizations.

Witnesses at last week's hearing certainly shared that view but the language could be more clear, Mr. Chairman.

Second, the bill requires EPA to determine which nonprofits small systems in each state find the most beneficial and this could be interpreted as requiring surveys in each state, an exercise that witnesses at last week's hearing oppose.

And third, the bill does not set out specific areas of technical assistance that are eligible for funding, leaving open the possibility that important will go unfunded.

Past Democratic proposals have delineated several important areas of technical assistance including source water protection and identifying options for water and energy efficiency.

And lastly and very importantly, the bill leaves unaddressed the major challenges facing water systems today. Water systems are facing serious threats from outdated infrastructure, lack of

funding, emerging contaminants and extreme weather.

We in Congress have continued to underfund infrastructure improvements and have continued to undermine efforts to address climate change. So we should expect these problems to get worse before they get better.

Resources are central to any conversation about safe drinking water. Much of our nation's drinking water infrastructure is well beyond its useful life and in desperate need of replacement.

But this bill would reauthorize only the small pot of money for technical assistance, not the large pot of money for infrastructure repairs.

It is imperative that this subcommittee take on the important task of reauthorizing the drinking water state revolving fund, ensuring that fracking is done safely, ensuring water -- ensuring source water protection, addressing drought and planning for climate change.

The majority has so far been unwilling to take up these issues but I don't think they can wait. So I hope that we can have a fruitful discussion of these issues today and in the coming months and I thank the chairman for calling this markup and yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman yields back his time.

The chair reminds members that pursuant to the committee rules, all members' opening statements will be made part of the record.

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 12 226 Are there further opening statements? 227 Seeing none, the chair now calls up Senate 611 and asks the 228 clerk to report. 229 The. Clerk. S. 611, an act, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water 230 231 systems and for other purposes. 232 [The Bill S. 611 follows:] 233 234 ******* INSERT 1 ******

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
	13
235	Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, the first reading of the
236	bill is dispensed with and the bill will be open for amendment
237	at any point, so ordered.
238	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Seeing
239	none, are there any amendments?
240	The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.
241	Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk. The
242	clerk will report the amendment.
243	The. Clerk. Sir, which number?
244	Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to have the
245	amendments numbered 1 through 6 considered en bloc.
246	Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, so ordered. So that would
247	be all the amendments there together.
248	The. Clerk. Amendments of S. 611 offered by Mr. Tonko,
249	amendments 1 through 6.

[The amendments offered en bloc of Mr. Tonko follow:]

Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with and the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

These are very simple amendments to clarify several important aspects of the technical assistance programs for small and rural water systems.

Small and rural systems have their size and lack of resources in common. However, the witnesses at our hearing talked about the wide range of problems they encounter in their work with different systems.

I want to ensure the program provides sufficient flexibility to the assistance providers so they can address the greatest needs of the small systems they serve.

I included many of these things in the technical assistance provisions of the bill I introduced at the end of the last Congress.

Amendment number one makes a one-word change. It substitutes effective for experienced. It can be experienced though still not be effective. We are not providing more money for this program so I want to ensure that every dollar spent delivers the best possible service.

Amendments two, three, four, five and six add several items to the list of activities that can be performed with funding under this program including assistance in identifying threats to

source waters -- assistance with increasing water or energy efficiency -- assistance with planning and adaptation for climate change -- assistance with planning and adaptation for drought and assistance with identifying alternative source waters in the event of contamination.

Small and rural systems are a feature of every state. The issue of source water protection, protection of both quality and quantity is vitally important to every water utility.

It is especially important for small and rural systems. The higher the source water quality, the lower the treatment costs. And for small systems, keeping treatment costs low helps them to keep rates low for their customers.

It helps them to avoid purchasing and operating complex expensive treatment technologies. One of the largest expenses for water utilities is energy. It takes considerable energy to move and to treat water. There are opportunities for reducing energy usage in a water treatment system. Technical assistance should include advice on how to conserve energy.

Finally, drought and climate change -- there are many small systems located in areas subject to severe storms, flooding, sea level rise and other extreme events that are becoming more frequent and severe due to changes in climate.

Rather than waiting until an emergency arises, small system operators should be able to get advice on cost effective ways to make their systems more resilient and less vulnerable to service

disruptions due to changes in weather and climate conditions.

There are already many areas in the West and Southwest that are experiencing record drought. These conditions impact both the quantity and the quality of source water available to small and rural systems.

People living in rural areas need safe drinking water. The technical assistance programs certainly ensure they receive it.

Mr. Chair, I would have preferred to make some of these changes in a manager's amendment to the bill. However I would consider withdrawing my in block amendments in exchange for your commitment that our staffs work together on the bill's report to clarify that these topic areas can be addressed through this program.

These are not mandates. They are options that can be exercised if a small system operator needs to address these issues.

So, Mr. Chair, I ask that, you know, we get a commitment so that I can withdraw the in block amendments.

Mr. Shimkus. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Tonko. Yes, sir.

Mr. Shimkus. The -- our concern with the amendment is that it -- because it -- there is two issues. One, any changes to the amendment -- I mean, to the bill itself will then throw it back to the Senate, which we are not sure will pass it and move it to the present as rapidly.

328 The second concern is is that the amendment and the line item 329 of issues diverts already limited scarce money to other programs that in my discussions with the rural water folks is not their 330 331 most pending need and so it is limiting the pot of money. 332 We will consider, we will engage in conversations. I don't 333 want to make a promise that I can't keep. But we are open to have discussions on how we can discuss this. 334 335 Mr. Pallone. I would like to say something in support of 336 Mr. Tonko's amendment. If you -- I will yield to Mr. Tonko. 337 Mr. Tonko. No, go ahead. 338 Mr. Pallone. Okay. Let me explain why -- I am not sure that 339 I am next, Mr. Chairman. 340 Mr. Shimkus. Well, Mr. Tonko has 20 seconds left. If you 341 just want to strike the last --342 Mr. Pallone. No, it is all right. I would rather have my own time. 343 344 Mr. Shimkus. Right. Mr. Tonko, do you want to yield back? 345 Mr. Tonko. I will yield back. 346 Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman yields back his time. Chair 347 recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes. 348 349 Mr. Pallone. I just wanted to strike the last word in 350 support of this amendment.

> I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Tonko, for his thoughtful amendment which would address the substantive

351

352

concerns that Democratic members have raised.

As I said in my opening statement, my Democratic colleagues and I have substantive concerns with ambiguous language in the bill and this amendment would address those ambiguities.

He obviously replaces the word experienced with the much clearer word effective. We heard at last week's hearing that the intent of the provision is to prioritize effective organization so I think this change would make the language more clear without changing the intent.

The amendment would also explicitly list important areas of technical assistance to make clear that Congress intends for this money to cover the range of needs of small water systems.

Specific areas called out in this amendment include protective source water, increasing water and energy efficiency, adapting for climate change and more.

Water systems across this country are in dire straits and climate change will present them with greater and greater challenges. As we reauthorize this funding we should ensure that it will continue to be useful to water systems in the future as they face these challenges.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might think this amendment is not necessary and I guess we were hoping we could reach agreement here today and in report language that we share the same intent. But I am not getting the impression that that is the case.

So let me just say that these are important clarifications for the bill and, again, I thank Mr. Tonko for raising these points and urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.

Anyone else that seeks time?

I would like to strike the last word, then I will yield to -- so I recognize myself for 5 minutes.

I want to talk to, first of all, to the ranking member of the full committee. I want to be -- I don't want to be vague. We will try to work on some of the language. But I don't want to make a promise that I just can't keep based upon some of the provisions.

So let's give us a try.

Mr. Pallone. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Shimkus. I would.

Mr. Pallone. My understanding is Mr. Tonko is simply asking for report language. He is not asking that you adopt the amendment.

But my problem, Mr. Chairman, is that you don't seem to be agreeable to report language that would accomplish these goals. You are saying you might be but you are not. Why is there a problem?

Since we are all sharing the same goal here why is there a problem with the report language that would achieve the goals of what Mr. Tonko is suggesting?

Mr. Shimkus. The -- and reclaiming my time -- we are happy to look at trying to address report language. We want to be careful that we don't jeopardize the passage of this bill and challenges and frustration with the Senate based upon what we may or may not have said. So --

Mr. Pallone. If you could yield to me, I mean, that is why we are suggesting the report language because we don't want to have to send it back to the Senate.

Again, I -- my having been here so many years -- I won't say how many -- I have never had a situation where because of report language that the bill has to go back to the Senate. That is just expressing the intent of the subcommittee or the committee.

Mr. Shimkus. We will do everything we can to try to address some of these issues in the report language.

Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, will you yield?

Mr. Shimkus. I would yield.

Mr. Tonko. Just to the concern about, you know, the options here that we are asking for, not mandates, but if a small rural system has a concern that can enable them to be a stronger outcome for the consumers they serve, with technical assistance perhaps with source water, all we are asking is that we not limit options here.

It is not a mandate and it is not impacting the money. We are asking that options not be limited and, again, we are asking that consideration be made to include this in the bill's report.

Mr. Shimkus. Right, and reclaiming my time. I think the only concern is, and you have rightly raised that it is a limited pot of money. Everybody would like to do more. This is not the venue to do more because of the Senate language and we have broadened the scope so that the real safe drinking water aspects of this can be protected by this advice and counsel and as we expand the opportunity we may lessen the ability for the expertise to go to those needed systems that are really trying to make sure they have safe water to their constituents.

We are just trying not to dilute the pot right now. That is kind of the basic --

Mr. Tonko. But I think we can -- you know, what we have heard, and if the gentleman would yield again.

Mr. Shimkus. I am sorry. I didn't hear you.

Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, if you would yield.

Mr. Shimkus. I will yield.

Mr. Tonko. What we heard in testimony was that these are ways to save money to be more efficient, more effective and by limiting options I think that we could cause consequences that are unnecessary.

So, again, if we could just include the language in the report, if you can offer the commitment to our side to work on developing that report language I am willing to withdraw my in block amendments.

Mr. Shimkus. And reclaiming my time, we are open to

considering what language we can include. We want to be very careful of that.

We can't -- report language can't amend a bill. I mean, it just gives instructions. So if the report language is opposite or makes, in essence, assumed change to a bill that is not the intent of report language.

Mr. Tonko. Well, if the bill passes in the House, it then -- if you will yield again.

Mr. Shimkus. I will yield.

Mr. Tonko. If the bill passes the House then it goes to the president's desk.

Mr. Shimkus. That is correct.

Mr. Tonko. So I believe that, you know, we can work amongst the two sides here, between the two sides and amongst all of us, Senate and here, to address that report language. I just don't see why we would limit these options.

Mr. Shimkus. I would only restate in my 13 second remaining that we don't want to dilute the pot. There is limited money. It goes for safe drinking water to poor systems that don't have the technical expertise on their own and by expanding it in the case of some of the listed items is problematic for this bill and not a larger bill.

And with that, my time is expired.

Anyone else seeking time to speak on the amendment?

Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chair.

478 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman from New York is recognized. 479 Mr. Pallone. Why don't we take your offer to work with us between now and report to the full committee and if we believe 480 481 there is progress made that hopefully will satisfy us. 482 Mr. Shimkus. I'm sorry. Would the gentleman yield? 483 Mr. Pallone. Yes, sir. 484 Mr. Shimkus. I would be happy to make that effort to see 485 what we can do between the two committees and with that we will 486 see where we go from there. 487 Mr. Pallone. Okay. Then I will withdraw my in block 488 amendments in the hope that we can address not limiting options. 489 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman withdraws his amendment. 490 The question now -- are there any other amendments to the 491 bill? 492 Seeing none, the question -- oh, there is. Mr. Pallone. Chairman, let me just point out there are 493 494 several amendments, just so you know. 495 Mr. Shimkus. Oh, I thought there was six in block. 496 Mr. Pallone. No, no. Those -- there are other amendments. 497 Mr. Shimkus. Oh. I was only told there were seven total. 498 Mr. Pallone. All right. I don't know what they told you 499 but I just want you to know there is a few. 500 Mr. Shimkus. There is one -- you can do yours next. 501 the gentleman yield? 502 The. Clerk. Sir, we have seven amendments at the desk. The

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
503	six that were considered on block and one that was received.
504	Mr. Shimkus. One more. Is that your understanding? Okay.
505	The chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas to offer his
506	amendment.
507	Mr. Green. That is Green 44. No?
508	The. Clerk. Sir, we don't have that amendment.
509	Mr. Pallone. Let us just take a minute to see. I know there
510	are three or four amendments. I don't know what happened here.
511	If you bear with us, Mr. Chairman.
512	Mr. Shimkus. I don't know why you are under the impression
513	that they were all going to be on block but whatever. Let us take
514	a minute.
515	Will the clerk report?
516	Mr. Green. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.
517	Mr. Shimkus. A point of order is reserved. A lot of
518	excitement for this committee.
519	The. Clerk. Amendment to S. 611 offered by Mr. Gene Green
520	of Texas.

[The amendment of Mr. Green follows:]

Mr. Shimkus. The point of order is reserved. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment I am offering today is a common sense proposal to help deal with one of the newest and fastest growing waste streams in our country -- electronic waste. Create tens of thousands of middle class jobs here in the United States by requiring that American-produced e-waste be recycled and disposed in our country and my amendment is based on legislation I have introduced for the last three Congresses, the Responsible Electronics Recycling Act.

E-waste is a product of the millions of discarded computers, TVs, cell phones and other consumer electronics Americans throw away or recycle annually. In 2011, EPA estimated that 3.4 million tons of e-waste is generated in our country each year.

The management of used electronics presents a number of significant environmental, health and national security concerns. Much of the e-waste being collected in the United States is being exported to China, India or West Africa where the GAO has determined that most of these receiving companies lack the capacity to safely recycle and dispose of these discarded and used electronics.

Although of great concern is the growing recognition of the Department of Defense and our National Security Agencies on the appearance of defective electronic equipment in our nation's

weapon systems. Much of this defective electronic equipment originally our own e-waste that was exported to countries like China falsely relabeled and resold to us as newly fully functioning equipment.

These problems are occurring because, unlike our European and Japanese friends, the United States does not have a comprehensive national approach for the export of used electronics.

My amendment would provide such a comprehensive approach by creating a new section under the Resource Recovery -- Conservation and Recovery Act, RCRA, to prohibit the export of restricted electronic waste to countries outside the OECD or the European Union.

While tested and working equipment can still be exported to promote reuse, other consumer electronic equipment, parts and material derived from them that contain toxic chemicals could not be exported in developing nations.

The legislation is supported by industry stakeholders, retailers and the environmental community. Again, it is common sense and it will do much to help our economy and the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked many times for a hearing on this issue and I would hope that you would consider it is an important issue and I hope the subcommittee will examine this issue in the near future.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my amendment

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
	27
574	but I would sure like at least a commitment that we will look at
575	this legislation and see if we can have a hearing on it.
576	Mr. Shimkus. Let us talk, Mr. Green.
577	Mr. Green. You and I talk a lot. I understand and I still
578	withdraw the amendment but I think it is something that this
579	Congress you could at least have a hearing on it to address
580	talk about the issue.
581	Mr. Shimkus. I understand your concern. Appreciate you
582	offering and withdrawing the amendment.
583	Anyone else have an amendment? The gentleman from
584	California is recognized. Do you have an amendment at the desk?
585	Mr. McNerney. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.
586	Mr. Shimkus. Will the clerk report the amendment?
587	The. Clerk. Amendment to S. 611, offered by Mr. McNerney
588	of California.
589	[The amendment of Mr. McNerney follows:]
590	

Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Here we are again working on a bipartisan bill that most of us agree is needed but doesn't address the bigger picture facing our nation on water shortages and water infrastructure needs.

The Safe Drinking Water Act's mission to protect public health by regulating the nation's public drinking water supply hasn't changed. But the new elements have emerged such as climate change and drought that threaten our water supplies.

More and more states including my state of California have been stricken by drought conditions. The result is that water and energy prices increase, agricultural production suffers and access to critical resources becomes more challenging.

Even in normal years some areas of California find it difficult to meet demands for water. The state population continues to grow, meaning for families, farms and businesses will rely on regional water supplies for their daily needs. You all have heard the California Water Board, I assume.

We must consider all options including technical assistance, strategic planning and managing for drought conditions, investments and new technologies that can better tackle the need to do more with less.

My amendment directs the EPA to develop a strategic plan for assessing and managing the risks of drought to drinking water that

is provided by public water systems.

It also establishes guidance around analytical methods and ways in which to protect drinking water as supplies become limited due to drought conditions.

There are currently more the 160,000 public water systems providing water to most all Americans at some time of their lives.

Ensuring the best available science and best practices are used when dealing with a drought is common sense and will allow us to better protect our towns when we are forced to manage scarce water resources while protecting public health. We need to continue working on this but at this point for technical reasons I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Pallone. Mr. McNerney, I would ask you not to withdraw it because I wanted to make a statement.

Mr. McNerney. Yes. Okay. I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman's time is expired.

The chair recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I understand that this amendment will be withdrawn but I did want to stress the importance of it because I think that the problem with S. 611 is, again, it addressed only one small part of the challenges facing water systems across the country and systems of all sizes need more assistance than this bill would provide.

And I think it is imperative that we provide guidance to water systems to address climate-related issues and adapt to the challenges presented by drought.

Now, Mr. McNerney's amendment would help to address these issues by requiring the EPA to plan for and manage the risks associated with drought. This plan would coordinate efforts and information to assist water systems.

Right now, the western United States and the southwestern U.S. are coping with serious drought conditions. We all know that, and they will increase in intensity and frequency in coming years as a result of climate change and these extreme drought events pose and enormous risk to our drinking water supplies.

Aquifer levels are dropping. Wells are drying up.

Contaminant concentration in wells are increasing, meaning some of them are no longer suitable as drinking water sources, and water systems need consolidated data they can apply information about the available feasible tools and guidance on the best practices for taking defensive and offensive actions against drought.

I don't think this subcommittee can continue to ignore major issues that matter to the American public and we should pass this amendment to address the serious drinking water risk associated with drought.

So if we can't adopt this amendment -- today obviously it is going to be withdrawn -- I do hope we can work together in the coming months to take on this challenge because I think that

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
	31
667	providing safe and reliable drinking water is a basic function
668	of government and we have a responsibility to help water systems
669	meet that obligation.
670	I yield back.
671	Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman yields back his time.
672	Is the amendment withdrawn?
673	Mr. McNerney. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the
674	amendment now.
675	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much.
676	Anyone else have an amendment?
677	Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk,
678	amendment number eight.
679	Mr. Shimkus. The clerk will report the amendment.
680	The. Clerk. Amendment to S. 611, offered by Mr. Tonko of
681	New York.
682	[The amendment of Mr. Tonko follows:]

Mr. Shimkus. Gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The state revolving loan fund that was established in the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments in 1996 is a major source of funding for drinking water infrastructure and compliance assistance for our water utilities.

The SRF has not been reauthorized and its authorization expired in 2003, some 12 years ago. If indeed the appropriations committee decides that programs without a current reauthorization should not receive funding, drinking water systems across the country will be in real trouble and so will the millions of people that rely on them to deliver safe drinking water.

We already have a tremendous backlog of infrastructure needs for these systems and states and local governments cannot do this alone. So my amendment provides an extension of the current authorization for the drinking water SRF.

At a minimum, we should be reauthorizing the SRF at a level that covers inflation over the past 12 years. That would set authorizing the program at \$1.52 billion and that is what my amendment does.

Safe drinking water programs are public health programs.

Delivery of safe clean water to homes and businesses is dependent upon infrastructure -- the network of pipes and treatment facilities that carry water from the source to its final

destination.

One of the most cost effective important things we ever initiated in this country was the disinfection and treatment of drinking water. Jersey City was the first to do it in 1908.

Other cities quickly followed. Why?

Because water treatment dramatically improved public health by reducing the transmission of infectious diseases that were all too common at the time including cholera and typhoid.

In fact, nothing we have done since including the development of penicillin has done more to improve public health and reduce infectious disease than providing safe clean drinking water.

For the past 100 years, communities large and small across our country have been able to rely on the delivery of safe drinking water. That is a record we should be very proud of.

It is a standard that we must maintain. As I have observed before, one of the most basic characteristics of a modern society is its ability to deliver clean water to every home, business and public building in communities large and small, urban and rural.

If we are to extend this excellent 100-year record, we need to address the backlog of infrastructure needs, workforce issues and constraints in maintenance and operating budgets that plague water utilities across our country.

Reauthorizing the SRF is the least we should do. The investments we have made in safe drinking water have paid tremendous dividends back to us over the years. But now these

systems need attention.

Our health and our well being depend on access to safe drinking water. Our economy depends on access to safe drinking water and the added bonuses that the funding to rebuild these systems would simply create jobs.

I urge support for my amendment to ensure that we maintain basic support for this essential program by extending the authorization for the drinking water SRF.

I will yield back my time, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Shimkus. Anyone else wishing to speak on the amendment?

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I appreciate my colleague from New York referencing the progressive nature of New Jersey City. That was pretty good.

Mr. Tonko. We love our neighbors.

Mr. Pallone. Okay. I just want to support this amendment. Our water infrastructure is in a dangerous state of disrepair. Most of it has been determined to be at or beyond the end of its useful life.

Every time EPA has assessed our drinking water infrastructure need, the need has gone up significantly and industry estimates are even higher.

The American Water Works Association has estimated that it will take more than a trillion dollar investment in water

infrastructure over the next 25 years to sustain delivery of clean and safe water and time and again we have heard testimony that greater investment in drinking water infrastructure is desperately needed.

Just last week at the Environment Subcommittee's hearing on this bill we heard that any incremental increase in infrastructure funding would help water systems and we have heard from the majority that programs with expired authorizations are in danger of going unfunded.

We simply can't allow that to happen for the drinking water state revolving fund and we can't keep taking clean water for granted.

So I just would say, Mr. Chairman, that providing the American people with safe drinking water is a fundamental duty of the government and we can't do that without investing in our infrastructure.

This amendment is an important step towards helping public water systems continue to deliver safe affordable drinking water to the American people. I hope we can work together on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from New York. I know you probably want to --

Mr. Tonko. Yes, thank you, Mr. Pallone.

Mr. Chair, I will withdraw the amendment for purposes of technical concern and appreciate the support echoed by

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
	36
785	Representative Pallone.
786	Mr. Shimkus. The amendment is withdrawn and I appreciate
787	the member doing that for the obviously, the consistency of
788	the bill that we moving at this time.
789	Is there any other amendments?
790	The gentlelady from California for what purpose do you
791	rise?
792	Ms. Capps. I do have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.
793	Mr. Shimkus. Will the clerk report the amendment?
794	The. Clerk. Amendment to S. 611, offered by Ms. Capps of
795	California.
796	[The amendment of Mr. Capps follows:]
797	

Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady is recognized for 5 minutes in support of our amendment.

Ms. Capps. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ensuring that everyone has access to secure reliable water systems, of course, is of paramount importance and should be a top priority in Congress and that means we should consider water as it applies to all communities across this country.

Furthermore, while we clearly must consider the provision of water, it is also important to support water-related services including wastewater treatment, storm water management plans under both current and changing future conditions.

Changing climatic and hydraulic conditions across the country are already impacting water and water services' availability and these changes are only predicted to intensify in the future.

Climate change is a reality and to ignore it is both unwise and irresponsible. We are experiencing changing conditions today. Reservoirs are drying up and floods are overwhelming storm systems.

Coastal areas are being threatened by sea level rise and salt water intrusion. Threats to safe drinking water are diverse and serious and we have a responsibility to help communities mitigate them.

We must be prepared. We can either choose to invest in our water infrastructure proactively or we can spend very much more

down the road when the repairs are more costly and that is why
I am offering this amendment, which is identical to my Water
Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act.

My amendment simply would help ensure our local drinking water, waste water and storm water operators have the resources they need to plan and implement projects to adapt their infrastructure to changing hydrological conditions. This shouldn't be a partisan issue.

These threats do not differentiate between rural communities and urban ones or between Democratic and Republican districts, and that is why my amendment is supported by a very broad group of stakeholders including the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, American Public Works Association, National Association of Water Companies and the National Association of Clean Water Agencies.

When it comes to basic needs of course water is at the top of their list. Access to clean and reliable water is not a luxury. It is a fundamental right. My amendment recognizes our responsibility as policy makers to help protect this right for all of our constituents.

Ignoring the problem is not going to make it go away. Like it or not, we know that climate and hydrological conditions are changing. We owe it to our constituents to respect the science and do everything we can to make sure they have safe water to drink, adequate waste water treatment and appropriate storm water

management now and in the future.

This amendment would strengthen the underlying bill by ensuring that we are not only considering the availability of water under current conditions but that we are adequately prepared to respond to water availability changes now and in the future.

This amendment provides a much needed forward-looking approach to water infrastructure and I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back.

Mr. Pallone. Could I ask you to yield me your time remaining?

Ms. Capps. I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

I just want to urge support for this amendment. Again, it addresses the climate change issue, which is one of the most pressing issues of our time and water systems are on the front lines of the battle to mitigate its effects.

And drought, extreme weather, storm surge and higher temperatures all affect the ability of water systems to continue to deliver safe and reliable drinking water.

Water systems may need to move intakes, change treatment techniques, develop procedures to address harmful alga blooms and more and we can't expect water systems to meet these challenges without guidance and assistance.

Water systems already face \$384 billion in infrastructure costs over the next 20 years and the effects of climate change

could dramatically increase those costs. The American people are relying on us to work on the most important and pervasive issues affecting their lives and instead the majority wants to work on the smallest parts of a massive issue and call that success.

And I don't think, Mr. Chairman, we can afford to react to these issues any longer. We need to be proactive in protecting our nation's water supply. And so I think this amendment is very important.

I yield back to the gentlewoman.

Mr. Shimkus. Does the gentlelady yield back her time?

Ms. Capps. I yield back my time.

Mr. Shimkus. Does the gentlelady -- considering
withdrawing the amendment?

Ms. Capps. I will consider withdrawing the amendment.

Mr. Shimkus. Is there any other debate on the amendment?

I will recognize myself for 5 minutes. Again, I appreciate

the comments from my colleagues on these water issues.

This is a Senate bill that if altered then pushes it back to the Senate for consideration and probably passage. There is a time frame here with the appropriation bill still being in flux that this technical assistance is really doable if we move the Senate bill unamended and we think it will get to the president's desk and with the appropriation process being -- maybe come to some type of conclusion technical assistance should be able to hopefully flow to the -- based upon the, and I will admit, small

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
899	criteria of what we can do with the amendment.
900	So I would hope that the gentlelady would reconsider.
901	Ms. Capps. With this encouragement, I will withdraw. But
902	I also want to underscore the fact that I believe many of us believe
903	we need to look at water from a more holistic perspective.
904	I do withdraw the amendment.
905	Mr. Shimkus. Your comment is noted. Thank you very much.
906	Is there any other amendment?
907	The gentleman from New Jersey.
908	Mr. Pallone. I have an amendment at the desk and this would
909	be our last amendment, Mr. Chairman.
910	Mr. Shimkus. The clerk will report the amendment.
911	Mr. Bucshon. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point
912	of order.
913	Mr. Shimkus. The point of order is reserved by the gentleman
914	from Indiana and the clerk will report.
915	The. Clerk. Amendment to S. 611, offered by Mr. Pallone of
916	New Jersey.

[The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to offer this amendment to reauthorize the brown fields program at EPA. As we heard yesterday and today, this markup is needed because the program with an expired authorization may go unfunded.

The authorization for the brown fields program is also expired and funding for the program was cut by House appropriators this year.

In fiscal year 2015, EPA received \$80 million for the brown fields program, \$5 million lower than the requested funding level. For fiscal year 2016, the president's budget recommends an additional \$30 million for a total of \$110 million.

However, the appropriators have recommended only \$75 for the brown fields program even lower than the funding level enacted in fiscal year 2015.

And the brown fields program has historically received bipartisan support. Actually was signed in the first year of the second President Bush's administration and Paul -- now I am forgetting -- Paul Gilmore and I were the sponsors of it in the House and we even had a signing ceremony with the president in Pennsylvania that I remember.

So it was bipartisan. It promotes job growth. It protects the environment and safeguards the health of our communities.

In fact, the Transportation Infrastructure Committee, which shares jurisdiction over the program, has been working on a bipartisan basis on reauthorization.

By any measure, the EPA brown fields program has been an invaluable tool successfully cleaning contaminated sites while also supporting responsible growth and revitalization of existing communities.

Brown fields investments are working, creating vibrant new community places and replacing lost jobs and taxes on sites where closed industrial plants have left a legacy of blight and contamination and this reauthorization would expand upon that success.

My amendment would raise the authorization level to begin to address the backlog of eligible contaminated sites. It would increase cleanup grant amounts to reflect inflation and allow funds to go to big projects. It would encourage tie ins between brown fields, sustainable development and renewable energy projects.

It would address eligibility barriers for nonprofits and local governments and clarify the liability of local governments in foreclosure acquisitions and it would establish multipurpose brown field grants.

It would also offer greater assistance to small and rural communities in keeping with the spirit of the underlying bill.

Small and rural communities need more than just technical

assistance for drinking water.

If we are concerned about expired authorizations we should incorporate this authorization to the bill and I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to support reauthorization of the brown fields program to work with me and my Democratic colleagues to strengthen this program.

Obviously, we are not going to do this today but I hope we can turn to it in coming months and I guess I am disappointed that, you know, we haven't been able to address this.

So I would like, you know, before I say anything further, if you would like to comment on this I would appreciate it.

Mr. Shimkus. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Pallone. Yield to the chairman.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much. This gives me a good opportunity to kind of just review what the subcommittee has done so far, you know, with the alga bloom bill signed into law.

We have got the coal ash bill that might be inserted somewhere in the final process of this year. TSCA is moving forward. We have had numerous hearings on nuclear policy, which we will wrap up into a bill.

You have given us another long laundry list of hearings that we should have and consider and I look forward to doing that. We will be a very busy subcommittee.

Mr. Pallone. All right.

Well, what about brown fields? Can we --

Mr. Shimkus. I would love the discussion of brown fields.
Mr. Pallone. Okay. All right.

Thanks again and, again, you know, I want to stress that, and I already made the point, but, you know, when -- this was always a very bipartisan issue.

I remember taking it up with Paul Gilmore and we worked with the EPA then under a Republican administration. So it is not something that should be perceived as partisan and I don't think you see it that way.

So thank you. With that, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman withdraws the amendment. Is there any other amendments to be considered?

Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding Senate 611 to the full committee. All those in favor, say aye.

(Vote was taken.)

Those opposed, no. The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. The bill is agreed to.

Without objection, staff is authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the legislation approved by the subcommittee today. So ordered.

The subcommittee stands adjourned and I thank my friends for their attendance.

[Whereupon, the committee adjourned 1:16 p.m.]