third no-hitter against the Detroit Tigers on July 1, 1951, pitching 12 1-hit games, amassing 266 victories and 2,581 strikeouts, and leading the league in strikeouts 7 times;

Whereas Bob Feller was inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1962; and

Whereas Bob Feller, a beloved baseball figure known as ''Bullet Bob'' and ''Rapid Robert,'' placed service to his country ahead of playing the game he loved and is a decorated war veteran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress commemorates the 60th anniversary of the 1946 season of Bob Feller and his return from military service to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4681. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 728, to provide for the consideration and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

SA 4682. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 728, supra.

SA 4683. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BOND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 728, supra.

SA 4684. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 728, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4681. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 728, to provide for the consideration and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 2007 and insert the following:

SEC. 2007. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''construction activities'' means development of detailed engineering and design specifications during the preconstruction engineering and design phase and the engineering and design phase of a water resources project carried out by the Corps of Engineers, and other activities carried out on a water resources project prior to completion of the construction and to turning the project over to the local cost-share partner.

(2) PROJECT STUDY.—The term ''project study'' means a feasibility report, reevaluation report, or environmental impact statement prepared by the Corps of Engineers.

(b) DIRECTOR OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—The Secretary shall appoint in the Office of the Secretary a Director of Independent Review. The Director shall be selected from among individuals who are distinguished experts in engineering, hydrology, biology, economics, or another discipline related to water resources management. The Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the Director does not have a financial, professional, or other conflict of interest with projects subject to review. The Director of Independent Review shall carry out the duties set forth in this section and such other duties as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(c) SOUND PROJECT PLANNING.—

(1) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PLANNING REVIEW.—The Secretary shall ensure that each project study for a water resources project shall be reviewed by an independent panel of experts established under this subsection if—

(A) the project has an estimated total cost of more than $40,000,000, including mitigation costs;

(B) the Governor of a State in which the water resources project is located in whole or in part, or the Governor of a State within the drainage basin in which a water resources project is located and that would be directly affected economically or environmentally as a result of the project, requests in writing to the Secretary the establishment of an independent panel of experts for the project;

(C) the head of a Federal agency with authority to review the project determines that the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on public safety, or on environmental, fish and wildlife, historical, cultural, or other resources under the jurisdiction of the agency, and requests in writing to the Secretary the establishment of an independent panel of experts for the project; or

(D) the Secretary determines on his or her own initiative, or shall determine within 30 days of receipt of a written request for a controversy determination by any party, that the project is controversial because—

(i) there is a significant dispute regarding the size, nature, potential safety risks, or effects of the project; or

(ii) there is a significant dispute regarding the economic, or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

(2) PROJECT PLANNING REVIEW PANELS.—

(A) PROJECT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP.—For each water resources project subject to review under this subsection, the Director of Independent Review shall establish a panel of independent experts that shall be composed of not less than 5 nor more than 9 independent experts (including at least 1 engineer, 1 hydrologist, 1 biologist, and 1 economist) who represent a range of areas of expertise. The Director of Independent Review shall apply the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting committee members to ensure that members have no conflict with the project being reviewed, and shall consult with the National Academy of Sciences in developing lists of individuals to serve on panels of experts under this subsection. An individual serving on a panel under this subsection shall be compensated at a rate of pay to be determined by the Secretary, and shall be allowed travel expenses.

(B) DUTIES OF PROJECT PLANNING REVIEW PANELS.—An independent panel of experts established under this subsection shall review the project study, receive from the public written and oral comments concerning the project study, and submit a written report to the Secretary that shall contain the panel's conclusions and recommendations regarding project study issues identified as significant by the panel, including issues such as—

(i) economic and environmental assumptions and projections;

(ii) project evaluation data;

(iii) economic or environmental analyses;

(iv) engineering analyses;

(v) formulation of alternative plans;

(vi) methods for integrating risk and uncertainty;

(vii) models used in evaluation of economic or environmental impacts of proposed projects; and

(viii) any related biological opinions.

(C) PROJECT PLANNING REVIEW RECORD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—After receiving a report from an independent panel of experts established under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration any recommendations contained in the report and shall immediately make the report available to the public on the internet.

(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary shall prepare a written explanation of any recommendations of the independent panel of experts established under this subsection not adopted by the Secretary. Recommendations and findings of the independent panel of experts rejected without good cause shown, as determined by judicial review, shall be given equal deference as the recommendations and findings of the Secretary during a judicial proceeding relating to the water resources project.

(iii) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The report of the independent panel of experts established under this subsection and the written explanation of the Secretary required by clause (ii) shall be included with the report of the Chief of Engineers to Congress, shall be published in the Federal Register, and shall be made available to the public on the Internet.

(D) DEADLINES FOR PROJECT PLANNING REVIEWS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Independent review of a project study shall be completed prior to the completion of any Chief of Engineers report for a specific water resources project.

(ii) DEADLINE FOR PROJECT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL STUDIES.—An independent panel of experts established under this subsection shall complete its review of the project study and submit to the Secretary a report not later than 180 days after the date of establishment of the panel, or not later than 90 days after the close of the public comment period on a draft project study that includes a preferred alternative, whichever is later. The Secretary may extend these deadlines for good cause.

(iii) FAILURE TO COMPLETE REVIEW AND REPORT.—If an independent panel of experts established under this subsection does not submit to the Secretary a report by the deadline established by clause (ii), the Chief of Engineers may continue project planning without delay.

(iv) DURATION OF PANELS.—An independent panel of experts established under this subsection shall terminate on the date of submission of the report by the panel.

(E) EFFECT ON EXISTING GUIDANCE.—The project planning review required by this subsection shall be deemed to satisfy any external review required by Engineering Circular 1105-2-408 (31 May 2005) on Peer Review of Decision Documents.

(d) SAFETY ASSURANCE.—

(1) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.—The Secretary shall ensure that the construction activities for any flood damage reduction project shall be reviewed by an independent panel of experts established under this subsection if the Director of Independent Review determines that—

(A) project performance is critical to the public health and safety;

(B) reliability of project performance under emergency conditions is critical;

(C) the project utilizes innovative materials or techniques; or

(D) the project design is lacking in redundancy, or the project has a unique construction sequencing or a short or overlapping design construction schedule.

(2) SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW PANELS.—At the appropriate point in the development of

detailed engineering and design specifications for each water resources project subject to review under this subsection, the Director of Independent Review shall establish an independent panel of experts to review and report to the Secretary on the adequacy of construction activities for the project. An independent panel of experts under this subsection shall be composed of not less than 5 nor more than 9 independent experts selected from among individuals who are distinguished experts in engineering, hydrology, or other pertinent disciplines. The Director of Independent Review shall apply the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting committee members to ensure that panel members have no conflict with the project being reviewed. An individual serving on a panel of experts under this subsection shall be compensated at a rate of pay to be determined by the Secretary, and shall be allowed travel expenses.

(3) DEADLINES FOR SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEWS.—An independent panel of experts established under this subsection shall submit a written report to the Secretary on the adequacy of the construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and every two years thereafter until construction activities are completed. The Director of Independent Review may establish an alternate schedule if such schedule would better serve the purposes of assuring public safety, and upon written notification to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(4) SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW RECORD.—After receiving a written report from an independent panel of experts established under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration any recommendations contained in the report and shall immediately make the report available to the public on the internet. The Secretary also shall submit the report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(e) EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The costs of an independent panel of experts established under subsection (c) or (d) shall be a Federal expense and shall not exceed—

(A) $250,000, if the total cost of the project in current year dollars is less than $50,000,000; and

(B) 0.5 percent of the total cost of the project in current year dollars, if the total cost is $50,000,000 or more.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary, at the written request of the Director of Independent Review, may waive the cost limitations under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines appropriate.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any authority of the Secretary to cause or conduct a peer review of the engineering, scientific, or technical basis of any water resources project in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4682. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 728, to provide for the consideration and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 2007 and insert the following:

SEC. 2007. INDEPENDENT REVIEWS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFECTED STATE.—The term ''affected State'' means a State in which a water resources project is located, in whole or in part.

(2) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''eligible organization'' means an organization that—

(A) is described in section 501(c)(3), and exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(B) is independent;

(C) is free from conflicts of interest;

(D) does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects; and

(E) has experience in establishing and administering peer review panels.

(3) PROJECT STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''project study'' means a feasibility study or reevaluation study for a project.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''project study'' includes any other study associated with a modification or update of a project that includes an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment.

(b) PEER REVIEWS.—

(1) POLICY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Major engineering, scientific, and technical work products related to Corps of Engineers decisions and recommendations to Congress should be peer reviewed.

(B) APPLICATION.—This policy—

(i) applies to peer review of the scientific, engineering, or technical basis of the decision or recommendation; and

(ii) does not apply to the decision or recommendation itself.

(2) GUIDELINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief of Engineers shall publish and implement guidelines to Corps of Engineers Division and District Engineers for the use of peer review (including independent peer review) of major scientific, engineering, and technical work products that support the recommendations of the Chief to Congress for implementation of water resources projects.

(B) INFORMATION QUALITY ACT.—The guidelines shall be consistent with section 515 of Public Law 106–554 (114 Stat. 2763A153) (commonly known as the ''Information Quality Act''), as implemented in Office of Management and Budget, Revised Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, dated December 15, 2004.

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—The guidelines shall adhere to the following requirements:

(i) APPLICATION OF PEER REVIEW.—Peer review shall—

(I) be applied only to the engineering, scientific, and technical basis for recommendations; and

(II) shall not be applied to—

(aa) a specific recommendation; or

(bb) the application of policy to recommendations.

(ii) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of Engineers shall ensure that each project study for a water resources project is subject to review by an independent panel of experts if—

(aa) the project has an estimated total cost of more than $100,000,000 (including mitigation costs); or

(bb) the Secretary determines that the project is controversial because—

(AA) there is a significant dispute regarding the size, nature, potential safety risks, or effects of the project; or

(BB) there is a significant dispute regarding the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

(II) INDEPENDENT PANELS.—The Chief of Engineers may consider whether to establish an independent panel of experts to review a project study if—

(aa) the Governor of an affected State submits to the Secretary a written request for the establishment of an independent panel of experts for the project; or

(bb) the head of a Federal agency charged with reviewing the project determines that the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on cultural, environmental, or other resources under the jurisdiction of the agency and submits to the Secretary a written request for the establishment of an independent panel of experts for the project.

(III) REVIEW OF TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS AND DESIGN.—The Chief of Engineers shall establish an independent panel of experts, at the appropriate point in project planning, to review and provide written comments on the technical and design specifications of the Corps of Engineers for any water resources project—

(aa) the performance of which is critical to the public health, safety, and welfare;

(bb) the reliability of performance under emergency conditions of which is critical;

(cc) that uses innovative materials or techniques; or

(dd) in any case in which—

(AA) the project design of which is lacking in redundancy; or

(BB) the project has a unique construction sequencing or a short or overlapping design construction schedule.

(iii) ANALYSES AND EVALUATIONS IN MULTIPLE PROJECT STUDIES.—Guidelines shall provide for conducting and documenting peer review of major scientific, technical, or engineering methods, models, procedures, or data that are used for conducting analyses and evaluations in multiple project studies.

(iv) INCLUSIONS.—Peer review applied to project studies may include a review of—

(I) the economic and environmental assumptions and projections;

(II) project evaluation data;

(III) economic or environmental analyses;

(IV) engineering analyses;

(V) methods for integrating risk and uncertainty;

(VI) models used in evaluation of economic or environmental impacts of proposed projects; and

(VII) any related biological opinions.

(v) EXCLUSION.—Peer review applied to project studies shall exclude a review of any methods, models, procedures, or data previously subjected to peer review.

(vi) TIMING OF REVIEW.—Peer review related to the engineering, scientific, or technical basis of any project study shall be completed prior to the completion of any Chief of Engineers report for a specific water resources project.

(vii) DELAYS; INCREASED COSTS.—Peer reviews shall be conducted in a manner that does not—

(I) cause a delay in study completion; or

(II) increase costs.

(viii) RECORD OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—After receiving a report from any peer review panel, the Chief of Engineers shall prepare a record that documents—

(aa) any recommendations contained in the report; and

(bb) any written response for any recommendation adopted or not adopted and included in the study documentation.

(II) INDEPENDENT REVIEW RECORD.—If the panel is an independent peer review panel of a project study, the record of the review shall be included with the report of the Chief of Engineers to Congress.

(ix) INDEPENDENT PANEL OF EXPERTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Any independent panel of experts assembled to review the engineering, science, or technical basis for the recommendations of a specific project study shall—

(aa) complete the peer review of the project study and submit to the Chief of Engineers a report not later than 180 days after the date of establishment of the panel, or (if the Chief of Engineers determines that a longer period of time is necessary) at the time established by the Chief, but in no event later than 90 days after the date a draft project study of the District Engineer is made available for public review; and

(bb) terminate on the date of submission of the report by the panel.

(II) FAILURE TO COMPLETE REVIEW AND REPORT.—If an independent panel does not complete the peer review of a project study and submit to the Chief of Engineers a report by the deadline established under subclause (I), the Chief of Engineers shall continue the project without delay.

(3) COSTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The costs of a panel of experts established for a peer review under this section—

(i) shall be a Federal expense; and

(ii) shall not exceed $500,000 for review of the engineering, scientific, or technical basis for any single water resources project study.

(B) WAIVER.—The Chief of Engineers may waive the $500,000 limitation under subparagraph (A) as the Chief of Engineers determines appropriate.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

(5) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to any peer review panel established under this section.

(6) PANEL OF EXPERTS.—The Chief of Engineers may contract with the National Academy of Sciences (or a similar independent scientific and technical advisory organization), or an eligible organization, to establish a panel of experts to peer review for technical and scientific sufficiency.

(7) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section affects any authority of the Secretary or the Chief of Engineers to cause or conduct a peer review of the engineering, scientific, or technical basis of any water resources project in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4683. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BOND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 728, to provide for the consideration and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 2004 and insert the following:

SEC. 2004. FISCAL TRANSPARENCY AND PRIORITIZATION REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On the third Tuesday of January of each year beginning January 2008, the Chief of Engineers 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 a report describing—

(1) the expenditures of the Corps of Engineers for the preceding fiscal year and estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year; and

(2) the extent to which each authorized project of the Corps of Engineers meets the national priorities described in subsection (b).

(b) NATIONAL PRIORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The national priorities referred to in subsection (a)(2) are—

(A) to reduce the risk of loss of human life and risk to public safety;

(B) to benefit the national economy;

(C) to protect and enhance the environment; and

(D) to promote the national defense.

(2) EVALUATION OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating the extent to which a project of the Corps of Engineers meets the national priorities under paragraph (1), the Chief of Engineers—

(i) shall develop a relative rating system that is appropriate for—

(I) each project purpose; and

(II) if applicable, multipurpose projects; and

(ii) may include an evaluation of projects using additional criteria or subcriteria, if the additional criteria or subcriteria are—

(I) clearly explained; and

(II) consistent with the method of evaluating the extent to which a project meets the national priorities under this paragraph.

(B) FACTORS.—The Chief of Engineers shall establish such factors, and assign to the factors such priority, as the Chief of Engineers determines to be appropriate to evaluate the extent to which a project meets the national priorities.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—In establishing factors under subparagraph (B), the Chief of Engineers may consider—

(i) for evaluating the reduction in the risk of loss of human life and risk to public safety of a project—

(I) the human population protected by the project;

(II) current levels of protection of human life under the project; and

(III) the risk of loss of human life and risk to public safety if the project is not completed, taking into consideration the existence and probability of success of evacuation plans relating to the project, as determined by the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(ii) for evaluating the benefit of a project to the national economy—

(I) the benefit-cost ratio, and the remaining benefit-remaining cost ratio, of the project;

(II) the availability and cost of alternate transportation methods relating to the project;

(III) any applicable financial risk to a non-Federal sponsor of the project;

(IV) the costs to State, regional, and local entities of project termination;

(V) any contribution of the project with respect to international competitiveness; and

(VI) the extent to which the project is integrated with, and complementary to, other Federal, State, and local government programs, projects, and objectives within the project area;

(iii) for evaluating the extent to which a project protects or enhances the environment—

(I) for ecosystem restoration projects and mitigation plans associated with other project purposes—

(aa) the extent to which the project or plan restores the natural hydrologic processes of an aquatic habitat;

(bb) the significance of the resource to be protected or restored by the project or plan;

(cc) the extent to which the project or plan is self-sustaining; and

(dd) the cost-effectiveness of the project or plan; and

(II) the pollution reduction benefits associated with using water as a method of transportation of goods; and

(iv) for evaluating the extent to which a project promotes the national defense—

(I) the effect of the project relating to a strategic port designation; and

(II) the reduction of dependence on foreign oil associated with using water as a method of transportation of goods.

(c) CONTENTS.—In addition to the information described in subsections (a) and (b), the report shall contain a detailed accounting of the following information:

(1) With respect to general construction, information on—

(A) projects currently under construction, including—

(i) allocations to date;

(ii) the number of years remaining to complete construction;

(iii) the estimated annual Federal cost to maintain that construction schedule; and

(iv) a list of projects the Corps of Engineers expects to complete during the current fiscal year; and

(B) projects for which there is a signed cost-sharing agreement and completed planning, engineering, and design, including—

(i) the number of years the project is expected to require for completion; and

(ii) estimated annual Federal cost to maintain that construction schedule.

(2) With respect to operation and maintenance of the inland and intracoastal waterways under section 206 of Public Law 95–502 (33 U.S.C. 1804)—

(A) the estimated annual cost to maintain each waterway for the authorized reach and at the authorized depth; and

(B) the estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance of locks and dams to ensure navigation without interruption.

(3) With respect to general investigations and reconnaissance and feasibility studies—

(A) the number of active studies;

(B) the number of completed studies not yet authorized for construction;

(C) the number of initiated studies; and

(D) the number of studies expected to be completed during the fiscal year.

(4) Funding received and estimates of funds to be received for interagency and international support activities under section 318(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2323(a)).

(5) Recreation fees and lease payments.

(6) Hydropower and water storage fees.

(7) Deposits into the Inland Waterway Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(8) Other revenues and fees collected.

(9) With respect to permit applications and notifications, a list of individual permit applications and nationwide permit notifications, including—

(A) the date on which each permit application is filed;

(B) the date on which each permit application is determined to be complete; and

(C) the date on which the Corps of Engineers grants, withdraws, or denies each permit.

(10) With respect to the project backlog, a list of authorized projects for which no funds have been allocated for the 5 preceding fiscal years, including, for each project—

(A) the authorization date;

(B) the last allocation date;

(C) the percentage of construction completed;

(D) the estimated cost remaining until completion of the project; and

(E) a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay.

SA 4684. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 728, to provide for the consideration and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 76 between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 2007. WATER RESOURCES CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PRIORITIZATION REPORT.

(a) PRIORITIZATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the third Tuesday of January of each year beginning January 2007, the Water Resources Planning Coordinating Committee established under section 2006(a) (referred to in this section as the ''Coordinating Committee'') shall submit to the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Office of Management and Budget, and make available to the public on the Internet, a prioritization report describing Corps of Engineers water resources projects authorized for construction.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) each water resources project included in the fiscal transparency report under section 2004(b)(1);

(B) each water resources project authorized for construction—

(i) on or after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) during the 10-year period ending on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) other water resources projects authorized for construction, as the Coordinating Committee and the Secretary determine to be appropriate.

(3) PRIORITIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each project described in a report under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) be categorized by project type; and

(ii) be classified into a tier system of descending priority, to be established by the Coordinating Committee, in cooperation with the Secretary, in a manner that reflects the extent to which the project achieves national priority criteria established under subsection (b).

(B) MULTIPURPOSE PROJECTS.—Each multipurpose project described in a report under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) be classified by the project type that best represents the primary project purpose, as determined by the Coordinating Committee; and

(ii) be classified into the tier system described in subparagraph (A)(ii) within that project type.

(C) TIER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing a tier system under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall ensure that—

(i) each tier is limited to $5,000,000,000 in total authorized project costs; and

(ii) includes not more than 100 projects.

(4) REQUIREMENT.—In preparing reports under paragraph (1), the Coordinating Committee shall balance, to the maximum extent practicable—

(A) stability in project prioritization between reports; and

(B) recognition of newly-authorized construction projects and changing needs of the United States.

(b) NATIONAL PRIORITY CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In preparing a report under subsection (a), the Coordinating Committee shall prioritize water resources construction projects within the applicable category based on an assessment by the Coordinating Committee of the following criteria:

(A) For flood and storm damage reduction projects, the extent to which the project—

(i) addresses critical flood damage reduction needs of the United States, including by reducing the risks to loss of life by considering current protection levels; and

(ii) avoids increasing risks to human life or damages to property in the case of large flood events, avoids adverse environmental impacts, or produces environmental benefits.

(B) For navigation projects, the extent to which the project—

(i) addresses priority navigation needs of the United States, including by having a high probability of producing the economic benefits projected with respect to the project and reflecting regional planning needs, as applicable; and

(ii) avoids adverse environmental impacts.

(C) For environmental restoration projects, the extent to which the project—

(i) addresses priority environmental restoration needs of the United States, including by restoring the natural hydrologic processes and spatial extent of an aquatic habitat while being, to the maximum extent practicable, self-sustaining; and

(ii) is cost-effective or produces economic benefits.

(2) BENEFIT-TO-COST RATIOS.—In prioritizing water resources projects under subsection (a)(3) that require benefit-to-cost ratios for inclusion in a report under subsection (a)(1), the Coordinating Committee shall assess and take into consideration the benefit-to-cost ratio and the remaining benefit-to-cost ratio of each project.

(3) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In preparing reports under subsection (a)(1), the Coordinating Committee may take into consideration any additional criteria or subcriteria, if the criteria or subcriteria are fully explained in the report.

(4) STATE PRIORITIZATION DETERMINATIONS.—The Coordinating Committee shall establish a process by which each State may submit to the Coordinating Committee for consideration in carrying out this subsection any prioritization determination of the State with respect to a water resources project in the State.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coordinating Committee shall submit to Congress proposed recommendations with respect to—

(A) a process to prioritize water resources projects across project type;

(B) a process to prioritize ongoing operational activities carried out by the Corps of Engineers;

(C) a process to address in the prioritization process recreation and other ancillary benefits resulting from the construction of Corps of Engineers projects; and

(D) potential improvements to the prioritization process established under this section.

(2) CONTRACTS WITH OTHER ENTITIES.—The Coordinating Committee may offer to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Public Administration or any similar entity to assist in developing recommendations under this subsection.

NOTICE OF HEARING

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, July 27, 2006 at 2:30 p.m. in Room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 3638, to encourage the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects to plan, design, and construct water supply projects and to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to encourage the design, planning, and construction of projects to treat impaired surface water, reclaim and reuse impaired groundwater, and provide brine disposal in the State of California; S. 3639, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to provide standards and procedures for the review of water reclamation and reuse projects; H.R. 177, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Prado Basin Natural Treatment System Project, to authorize the Secretary to carry out a program to assist agencies in projects to construct regional brine lines in California, to authorize the Secretary to participate in the Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project, and for other purposes.; H.R. 2341, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of a project to reclaim and reuse wastewater within and outside of the service area of the City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility, Texas; and H.R. 3418, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Central Texas Water Recycling and Reuse Project, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact Joshua Johnson at 202–224–5861 or Steve Waskiewicz at 202–228–6195.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the