



To: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife Republican Members
From: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife Republican Staff; Kiel Weaver (Kiel.Weaver@mail.house.gov), Annick Miller (Annick.Miller@mail.house.gov), and Rob MacGregor (Robert.MacGregor@mail.house.gov)
Date: May 9, 2022
Subject: Hybrid Legislative Hearing on Seven Bills

The Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife will hold a hybrid legislative hearing on seven bills: H.R. 263, *Big Cats Public Safety Act* (Quigley, D-IL); H.R. 3081, *To make certain irrigation districts eligible for Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program pumping power* (Armstrong, R-ND); H.R. 5880, *To amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010* (O'Halleran, D-AZ); H.R. 6238, *WaterSMART Access for Tribes Act* (Stansbury, D-NM); H.R. 7612, *Desalination Research Advancement Act* (Levin, D-CA); H.R. 7632, *Tribal Access to Clean Water Act* (Neguse, D-CO); and H.R. 7633, *Hualapai Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 2022* (O'Halleran, D-AZ) on **Thursday, May 12, 2022, at 2:00 p.m.**, in room 1324 Longworth and via Cisco WebEx.

Republican Members are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to participate in person from the hearing room.

Member offices are requested to notify Annick Miller (Annick.Miller@mail.house.gov) **no later than Tuesday, May 10, at 4:30 p.m.**, if their Member intends to participate in person in the hearing room or remotely from his/her laptop from another location. Submissions for the hearing Disadvantaged record must be submitted through the Committee's electronic repository at HNRCDocs@mail.house.gov. Please contact David DeMarco (David.DeMarco@mail.house.gov) or Everett Winnick (EverettWinnick@mail.house.gov) should any technical difficulties arise.

I. KEY MESSAGES

- One of the biggest factors contributing to increasing grocery prices is the severe drought impacting much of the West. Coupled with Biden-era supply chain issues, rising energy costs that increase agricultural input costs, and the war in Ukraine, food scarcity worldwide could be looming.
- Disadvantaged communities and rural economies in the western United States are suffering from severe drought.
- The Committee Democrats refuse to focus on these real-life issues and instead focus on efforts that increase the national debt, deliver very little water in the short-term, and

ignore federal laws and regulations that have caused some of today's water supply problems.

- Republicans are focused on solutions to water supply and food availability, but have been prohibited from considering bills to achieve these goals in this hearing.

II. WITNESSES

Panel I – Members

- **TBD**

Panel II – Federal

- **Mr. David Raff**, Chief Engineer, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado [testifying on H.R. 3081, H.R. 5880, H.R. 6238, H.R. 7612, H.R. 7632, and H.R. 7633.]
- According to the Majority, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will address H.R. 263 through a statement for the record.

Panel III – Non-Federal

- **Mr. Carter Vander Wal**, Irrigator, Board of Directors, North Dakota Irrigation Association, and District 2 Board of Directors Representative, KEM Electric Cooperative, Strasburg, N.D. (Republican Witness on H.R. 3081)
- **Republican Witness on H.R. 263 TBD**
- **The Honorable Dr. Damon R. Clarke**, Chairman, Hualapai Tribe, Peach Springs, Arizona (H.R. 7633)
- **The Honorable Jonathan Nez**, President, Navajo Nation, Window Rock, Arizona (H.R. 6238 and H.R. 7632)
- **The Honorable Kasey Velasquez**, Chairman, White Mountain Apache Tribe, Whiteriver, Arizona (H.R. 5880)
- **Ms. Sandy L. Kerl**, General Manager, San Diego County Water Authority, San Diego, California (H.R. 7612)
- **Mr. Matt Lutz**, Sheriff, Muskingum County, Ohio (H.R. 263)

III. BACKGROUND

H.R. 263. (Rep. Quigley, D-IL) *Big Cat Public Safety Act*

Congress amended the Lacey Act of 1900 (16 U.S.C. 3371-3378) in 2003 with the Captive Wildlife Safety Act (CWSA, P.L. 108-191) to make it illegal to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase big cats¹ across state lines or the U.S. border. These amendments specifically prohibited the preemption of a state's authority to regulate big cat species within that state.² As such, the Lacey Act does not address possession of big cats that are bought or sold within a state. However, it prohibits all interstate commerce of big cats **unless** a person or entity qualifies under the following exemptions:

¹ The term "big cats" means live species of lion, tiger, leopard, cheetah, jaguar, or cougar or any hybrid of such species.

² 16 USC 3372(e)(4) states "Nothing in this subsection preempts or supersedes the authority of a State to regulate wildlife species within that State."

- Class C license by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) under the Animal Welfare Act (AWA, 7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.);
- state college, university, or agency;
- state-licensed wildlife rehabilitator;
- state-licensed veterinarian; or
- an accredited wildlife sanctuary that meets specific restrictions.³

Under the Animal Welfare Act, a Class C license is for animal exhibitors, which include circuses, zoos, petting farms/zoos, animal acts, wildlife parks and some sanctuaries. APHIS is responsible for regulating and inspecting all licensed exhibitors. APHIS does not regulate the ownership and care of big cats as pets; however, state, and local laws may apply in those instances. At the state level, laws governing private ownership of big cats and other exotic animals vary: 20 states have comprehensive bans, 13 have partial bans, 14 require a license or permit, and 3 (Alabama, Nevada, and North Carolina) do not have specific laws in place.⁴

H.R. 263 would make three main changes to current law:

- Remove the 2003 state authority pre-emption language, which prevents the Lacey Act from superseding a state’s authority to regulate big cats within that state. As mentioned above, the Lacey Act limits who can engage in interstate commerce when it comes to big cats and the AWA sets requirements on the treatment of big cats.
- Mandate all persons or entities that currently possess big cats to register each animal with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) within 180 days of enactment. In addition, owners must agree not to breed, acquire, or sell big cats and prohibit “public contact”. As written, this requirement appears to apply to every entity that possesses big cats, including private owners (pets), Class C license exhibitors, and non-federal research facilities licensed under the AWA.
- There is no implementation period. Under the bill, all exhibitors that are not in compliance with the new requirements, including the requirement to construct and maintain a permanent barrier or 15-foot gap, set by the bill prior to enactment would be subject to fines and/or jail time.

When the Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife had a hearing on an identical bill in the 116th Congress, the Trump administration was not invited to testify. However, the Biden administration has testified in the 117th Congress on similar legislation (H.R. 3135, Blumenauer) regarding non-human primates, which uses the same Lacey Act framework as H.R. 263. FWS testified that H.R. 3135 “*would expand [Fish and Wildlife] Service enforcement responsibilities into an area that has historically been a responsibility of state agencies and which the Service does not consider to be a wildlife conservation issue. ...If the goal of this legislation is to address public safety and the humane treatment of non-human primates, the Service respectfully suggests*

³ Must be a non-profit entity that is tax exempt under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code; cannot engage in commercial trade in big cat species, including their offspring, parts, and products made from them; cannot breed big cats; cannot allow direct contact between big cats and the public at their facilities; must keep records of transactions involving covered cats; must allow the FWS to inspect their facilities, records, and animals.

⁴ Michigan State University, Map of Private Exotic Pet Ownership Laws, <https://www.animallaw.info/content/map-private-exotic-pet-ownership-laws>.

that the sponsor consider working with the United States Department of Agriculture to address these concerns through a more suitable legislative vehicle.”⁵

H.R. 263 has 256 cosponsors, including 52 Republicans.

H.R. 3081. (Rep. Armstrong, R-ND) *To make certain irrigation districts eligible for Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program pumping power, and for other purposes.*

H.R. 3081 would make certain irrigation districts in North Dakota eligible to receive project use power from the federal Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. The Flood Control Act of 1944 (P.L. 78-534) approved a general comprehensive plan for the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to develop water resources in the entire Missouri River Basin, which includes portions of 10 states. This plan was later called the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program (Pick-Sloan), which includes projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation of more than 3 million acres of land, a supplemental water supply to nearly 700,000 acres of land, hydropower generation from plants with a total installed capacity of about 2.5 million kilowatts, municipal and industrial water supplies, stream-pollution abatement, sediment control, preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife, and creation of recreation opportunities.⁶

The priority use for the hydropower that Pick-Sloan produces is for authorized irrigation projects. This power, referred to as “project use power” or PUP, is used for pumping water from a river or a ditch for gravity flow to irrigated land. Under the laws governing this program, PUP is only available to federal water projects (unless otherwise authorized by Congress) and is generally less expensive than other federal hydropower rates and commercial electricity.⁷

Specific to North Dakota, Congress passed the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000 (DWRA, P.L. 89-108), which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to develop certain areas for irrigation, including up to 28,000 acres of irrigation agriculture outside of the Hudson Bay/Devils Lake Basin but in other areas of North Dakota, such as the Elk/Charbonneau, Mon-Dak, Nesson Valley, Horsehead Flats, and Oliver-Mercer areas of North Dakota.⁸ This marked a continued reduction in the authorized acres for irrigation in North Dakota from the original assessment of 1.2 million acres in the Flood Control Act of 1944.⁹ The DWRA allows for authorized irrigation development to be eligible for Pick-Sloan PUP rates. While Reclamation ultimately did not develop the area described in DWRA for federal irrigation, the area included existing irrigation districts that had been privately developed.¹⁰

⁵ Testimony of Stephen Guertin before the House Committee on Natural Resources, Deputy Director for Policy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, (July 29, 2021), <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II13/20210729/113985/HHRG-117-II13-Wstate-GuertinS-20210729.pdf>.

⁶ U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, <https://www.usbr.gov/projects/index.php?id=380>.

⁷ U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, An Overview of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, https://www.usbr.gov/gp/multimedia/publications/pick_sloan_overview.pdf.

⁸ Advisory Council on Community Renewal Act (114 Stat. 2763; Pub. L. 106-554).

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Finding of Economic, Financial and Engineering Feasibility as it Relates to the 28,000 Undesignated Acres, for the Garrison Diversion Unite, Required by the Dakota Water Resource Act of 2000, https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/2005_irrigation_report.pdf.

As part of the DWRA requirements, Reclamation produced a findings report related to the 28,000 undesignated acres in which it stated that “there are a number of other existing districts interested in receiving project pumping power, as authorized in Section 5(a)(4) of DWRA of 2000.”¹¹ While that 2005 report stated Reclamation would work on entering into contracts with these districts, Reclamation’s interpretation of the law has prevented irrigators in the state from being able to receive PUP rates. The bill would make it clear that those irrigation districts are eligible for PUP rates.

The bill does not have any cosponsors.

H.R. 5880. (Rep. O’Halloran, D-AZ) *To amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to modify the enforceability date for certain provisions, and for other purposes.*

H.R. 5880 would amend the 2010 White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act (Quantification Act), which became law as part of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-291), by extending the deadline for the Department of the Interior to publish a statement of findings required to fulfill the conditions of the settlement until 2025. H.R. 5880 would increase the Cost Overrun Subaccount authorization levels by \$250 million, as described below.

The Quantification Act settled the White Mountain Apache Tribe’s (WMAT) water rights in Arizona and authorized the design and construction of the WMAT rural water system, consisting of a dam and storage reservoir, pumping plant, distribution system and water treatment facilities. The Quantification Act authorized \$126.2 million in mandatory funding for the construction of the WMAT rural water system and created a Cost Overrun Subaccount that authorized \$24 million in mandatory funding and \$11 million in discretionary funding. Separately, the law authorized \$78.5 million in discretionary funding for the WMAT Settlement Fund for several uses, including hatcheries, rehabilitation of existing irrigation systems and water-related economic development projects.¹²

When Congress was considering the Quantification Act, the Obama administration testified that it had concerns with the legislation. Specifically, then-Reclamation Commissioner Michael Connor stated: “*The Bureau of Reclamation recently completed a review of the Design, Engineering, and Construction (DEC) estimates for the WMAT Rural Water System. Based on that review, Reclamation determined the Tribe’s cost estimate of roughly \$126.2 million, which is in the proposed legislation, is not sufficiently detailed or comprehensive to provide the necessary assurance that the project can be constructed for that amount of money. Moreover, the legislation does not provide any cap on the amount of Federal funds that can be expended for project construction. The Administration is concerned about authorizing a project in cases such as this where we are very uncertain as to end costs. Our experience has been that projects authorized in this manner can become far more expensive than originally contemplated.*”¹³

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Pub. L. 111-291 (111th Congress), <https://www.congress.gov/111/plaws/publ291/PLAW-111publ291.pdf>, beginning at 11.

¹³ [Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Testimony from Michael Connor, HRG-2009-HNR-0030, Title: H.R. 1065, H.R. 1738, H.R. 2265, H.R. 2442, H.R. 2522, H.R. 2741, and H.R. 2950, July 21, 2009.](#)

Under current law, the settlement will not become enforceable until certain conditions are satisfied. One of those conditions is the issuance of a record of decision by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) approving construction of the WMAT rural water project. The Secretary must publish a statement of findings in the Federal Register that all conditions for enforceability have been satisfied by no later than April 30, 2023, or the settlement will be voided.¹⁴

The main WMAT rural water project component, the Miner Flat Dam, is not yet designed to a thirty percent design level, which is the level of design usually necessary for environmental compliance activities to move forward. On March 23, 2022, then-White Mountain Apache Chairwoman Gwendena Lee-Gatewood testified before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs regarding the Senate counterpart to H.R. 5880, S. 3168. According to her testimony, the dam design needs to be altered to address seepage and stability issues at the dam site. In addition, she testified that “*The upper end of the costs for options in the VA [Viability Assessment] required an additional funding amount of approximately \$250 million to complete HDR’s proposal for construction of Miner Flat Dam.*”¹⁵ In that same hearing, the Department of the Interior witness stated that “*At this time, the Department cannot determine whether the additional \$250 million proposed by S. 3168 would provide sufficient funding to complete the WMAT rural water system.*”¹⁶

The White Mountain Apache Settlement is one of a number of settlements included in the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 that have been re-opened for additional funding and revision during this and the last Congress.

The bill does not have cosponsors.

H.R. 6238. (Rep. Stansbury, D-NM) *WaterSMART Access for Tribes Act.*

H.R. 6238 would allow the Secretary of the Interior to reduce or waive cost-share requirements for tribal governments under Reclamation’s WaterSMART program. It is unclear what metrics Reclamation would use to determine “that the Indian tribe does not have sufficient funds to pay such cost share,” as required by the bill.

Reclamation provides a series of funding opportunities through the WaterSMART program for projects and activities intended to increase water efficiency and conservation.¹⁷ This includes cost-shared grants for water management improvement projects such as canal lining and piping, watershed resilience projects, the Basin Study Program, and drought planning and

¹⁴ *Supra* n. 12.

¹⁵ Testimony of Gwendena Lee-Gatewood, Tribal Chairwoman of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, March 23, 2022, https://www.indian.senate.gov/sites/default/files/FINAL%20SCIA%20Written%20Testimony%20WMAT_Hon.%20Gwendena%20Lee-Gatewood.pdf.

¹⁶ Testimony of Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, March 23, 2022, <https://www.indian.senate.gov/sites/default/files/03.23.2022%20SCIA%20Legislative%20Hearing%20Testimony%20%28CLEARED%29.pdf>.

¹⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, WaterSMART, <https://www.doi.gov/watersmart#:~:text=WaterSMART%20is%20a%20program%20of,sound%20decisions%20about%20water%20use..>

implementation actions to address future water shortages.¹⁸ Most WaterSMART projects require cost sharing of at least 50 percent to leverage non-federal financial resources.¹⁹ In the last Congress, WaterSMART was amended to allow Reclamation to contribute up to 75 percent of the cost of certain projects that are focused on environmental benefits.²⁰

The bill has thirteen cosponsors, including two Republicans.

[H.R. 7612](#). (Rep. M. Levin, D-CA) *Desalination Research Advancement Act*.

The bill would reauthorize Section 3 of the Water Desalination Act of 1996, which provides grants for desalination research and development work. Funding for this section, which expired in 2021, was authorized at \$5 million per fiscal year.²¹ H.R. 7612 would increase the funding authorization to \$20 million per year for fiscal years 2022 through 2026. In addition, the bill increases to \$15 million, from \$1 million, the amount that could be awarded to institutions of higher education, including United States-Mexico binational research foundations. Examples of recent funding recipients can be found [here](#).

Reclamation requested \$5.7 million in Fiscal Year 2023 for Reclamation's Office of Desalination and Water Purification Research (DWPR).²²

The bill has one cosponsor, Rep. Nancy Mace (R-SC).

[H.R. 7633](#). (Rep. O'Halleran, D-AZ) *Hualapai Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 2022*.

The Hualapai Tribe (Tribe) in Arizona claims water rights in the Colorado, Verde, and Bill Williams River basins. Negotiations regarding potential settlement of the Tribe's water rights claims have been ongoing since 2012, when the United States established a team to negotiate a comprehensive settlement of all the Tribe's water rights.²³ The negotiations were divided into two phases: the first phase addressed reserved water rights to several off-reservation tracts in the Bill Williams River basin and resulted in the Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-223);²⁴ the second phase, addressed in H.R. 7633, aims to resolve the Tribe's remaining water rights claims in Arizona; ratify and confirm the Hualapai Tribe water rights settlement agreement among the Hualapai Tribe, the United States, the State of Arizona, and others; and authorize funds to implement the Settlement.

¹⁸ U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, WaterSMART, <https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/>.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021, P.L. 116-260, Division FF, Title XI—Western Water and Indian Affairs, <https://www.congress.gov/116/plaws/publ260/PLAW-116publ260.pdf>.

²¹ 42 U.S.C. Ch. 109.

²² Budget Justifications and Performance information Fiscal Year 2023, Bureau of Reclamation, <https://www.usbr.gov/budget/2023/FY-2023-Bureau-of-Reclamation-Budget-Justifications.pdf>.

²³ Responses to Questions for the Record from Alan Mikkelsen, Senior Advisor to the Secretary on Water and Western Resource Issues, U.S. Department of the Interior, (Oct. 21, 2019), <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II13/20190626/109713/HHRG-116-II13-20190626-QFR002.pdf>.

²⁴ Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-223), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-113publ223/pdf/PLAW-113publ223.pdf>.

H.R. 7633 would authorize \$180 million, subject to indexing, to be deposited into a “Hualapai Water Trust Fund Account” for the Tribe to plan, design, construct, and maintain the Hualapai Water Project. This project would be authorized to divert up to 3,414 acre-feet per year of water from the Colorado River in the lower basin in Arizona. The bill would also create a \$5 million “Hualapai Water Settlement Implementation Fund” for the Secretary of the Interior to conduct groundwater monitoring in the Truxton Basin.

H.R. 7633 would set an enforceability deadline of April 15, 2029, by which time the Tribe and the federal government need to meet all the conditions set forth in the settlement agreement. Should that deadline not be met, the settlement would be voided.

In the last Congress, the Department of the Interior testified in opposition to similar legislation.²⁵ However, H.R. 7633 includes several significant changes, including converting the project-based settlement into a fund-based settlement. This change means Reclamation is no longer responsible for constructing a water project for the Tribe. To date, the Biden administration’s position on the bill is unknown.

The bill does not have cosponsors.

H.R. 7632. (Rep. Neguse, D-CO) *Tribal Access to Clean Water Act.*

H.R. 7632 proposes changes to three programs: the Department of Health and Human Services’ Indian Health Services Program, the Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Rural Development Program, and the Bureau of Reclamation’s Rural Water Supply Program. The only program within the Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife’s jurisdiction is Reclamation’s Rural Water Supply Program. H.R. 7632 would reauthorize this program, which expired in 2016, until 2032 and maintain its original funding level of \$15 million per year. In addition, the bill would create a new grant program specifically for tribes, which would allow up to 100 percent federal funding for the cost of planning, design, and construction of a project. The grant program would be funded by transferring \$1 billion of unappropriated funds in the Treasury.

H.R. 7632 would require the transfer of an additional \$90 million of unappropriated funds in the Treasury for the Native American Affairs Technical Assistance Program within Reclamation. This program provides technical assistance for tribes to develop, manage, and protect their water and related resources. The Fiscal Year 2023 budget request for the entire Native American Affairs Program within Reclamation, which includes technical assistance and the Indian water rights settlement teams, is \$20 million.²⁶

²⁵ Statement of Alan Mikkelsen, Senior Advisor to the Secretary on Water and Western Resource Issues U.S. Department of the Interior, before the Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, June 26, 2019, <https://www.doi.gov/ocl/pending-legislation-5>.

²⁶ Budget Justifications and Performance information Fiscal Year 2023, Bureau of Reclamation, <https://www.usbr.gov/budget/2023/FY-2023-Bureau-of-Reclamation-Budget-Justifications.pdf>.

Indian Health Services and Rural Development

New sanitation facility construction is under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States. H.R. 7632 would make available \$100 million from the Treasury for the construction of sanitation facilities. This is in addition to the \$3.5 billion made available under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (P.L. 117-58). In addition, the bill would provide \$150 million in mandatory funding for technical assistance support in Native communities regarding sanitation facilities and \$500 million in mandatory funding for the operation and maintenance of water facilities serving Native communities. Additionally, the bill would provide \$500 million in mandatory funding for water and waste facility grants to Native communities under USDA's Rural Development Program. The bill specifically states that these funds would not require any matching funds.

The bill has thirteen Democrat cosponsors.

IV. MAJOR PROVISIONS & ANALYSIS

H.R. 263. (Rep. Quigley, D-IL)

- Removes the 2003 state authority preemption language, which prevents the Lacey Act from superseding a state's authority to regulate big cats within that state.
- Mandates all persons or entities that currently possess big cats to register each animal with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within 180 days of enactment. In addition, owners must agree not to breed, acquire, or sell big cats and prohibit "public contact".

H.R. 3081. (Rep. Armstrong, R-ND)

- Makes certain irrigation districts in North Dakota eligible to receive project use power from the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program.

H.R. 5880. (Rep. O'Halleran, D-AZ)

- Amends the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Settlement by extending the enforceability deadline until 2025.
- Increases the Cost Overrun Subaccount authorization levels by \$250 million.

H.R. 6238. (Rep. Stansbury, D-NM)

- Authorizes the Department of the Interior to reduce or waive cost-share requirements for tribal governments under Reclamation's WaterSMART program.

H.R. 7612. (Rep. M. Levin, D-CA)

- Reauthorizes Reclamation's desalination research and development grant program until 2026.
- Increases the funding authorization to \$20 million per year for fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

H.R. 7633. (Rep. O'Halleran, D-AZ)

- Authorizes a \$180 million fund-based settlement for the Hualapai Tribe in Arizona.

H.R. 7632. (Rep. Neguse, D-CO)

- Provides \$1.84 billion in mandatory funding for Native communities under the Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Services, the Department of Agriculture's Rural Development, and the Bureau of Reclamation's Rural Water Supply programs.
- Reauthorizes Reclamation's Rural Water Supply Program until 2032.

V. COST

H.R. 263 – CBO provided a cost estimate for an identical bill in the last Congress and estimated that the bill would cost \$3 million in discretionary funding over the 2020-2024 period.²⁷

CBO has not provided a cost estimate for the other bills.

VI. ADMINISTRATION POSITION

Unknown at this time.

VII. EFFECT ON CURRENT LAW (RAMSEYER)

H.R. 263

H.R. 3081

H.R. 5880

H.R. 6238

H.R. 7612

H.R. 7632

²⁷ CBO Cost Estimate, H.R. 1380 (116th), <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/56240>.