

H.R. 212—Drinking Water Protection Act, as amended (Rep. Latta, R-OH)

CONTACT: NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

FLOOR SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 24, 2015 UNDER A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL

TOPLINE SUMMARY: [H.R. 212](#) would require the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop and submit to Congress a strategic plan for assessing and managing risks associated with [algal toxins](#) (red tide toxins) in drinking water provided by public water systems.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS: There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: The strategic plan would:

- evaluate the risk to human health from drinking water provided by public water systems contaminated with algal toxins;
- establish, publish, and update a comprehensive list of algal toxins which the EPA administrator determines may have an adverse effect on human health when present in drinking water;
- summarize the known adverse human health effects of algal toxins, factors that cause toxin-producing cyanobacteria and algae to proliferate and express toxins;
- publish health advisories, establish guidance regarding feasible analytical methods to quantify the presence of algal toxins, the frequency of monitoring necessary to determine if such algal toxins are present in drinking water;
- recommend feasible treatment options, including procedures, equipment, and source water protection practices, to mitigate any adverse public health effects of algal toxins; and
- enter into cooperative agreements with, and provide technical assistance to, affected States and public water systems, identified by the EPA.

COST: Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that implementing H.R. 212 would cost less than \$500,000 annually over the next two years, assuming the availability of appropriated funds. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending and revenues, therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. The CBO estimate for H.R. 212 can be found [here](#).

The EPA would additionally be required to update and submit to Congress the strategic plan and to identify gaps in the Agency's understanding of algal toxins. The bill would require the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to submit to Congress a report that includes an inventory of funds that occurred between 2010 and 2014 related to addressing the health concerns stemming from algal toxins. The House Committee on Energy and Commerce markup background memo can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION: This bill was introduced on January 8, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: No statement of administration position is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: “Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

H.R. 734—Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2015 (Rep. Scalise, R-LA)

CONTACT: NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

FLOOR SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 24, 2015 UNDER A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL

TOPLINE SUMMARY: [H.R. 734](#) would amend the [Communications Act of 1934](#) to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The FCC would be required to submit a report to Congress, due during the last quarter of every even-numbered year, on the state of the communications marketplace. The report shall also be made available on the FCC’s website.

COST: No Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is available. The CBO estimate for H.R. 2844 can be found [here](#).

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS: There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: Each report would:

- assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial mobile service, multichannel video programming distributors broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;
- assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability regardless of the technology used for such deployment, including whether advanced telecommunications capability is being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion;
- assess whether laws, regulations, or regulatory practices pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services;
- describe the FCC’s agenda for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments required in the bill; and
- describe the actions that the FCC has taken in pursuit of the agenda described in the bill.

If the president designates a commissioner as chairman of the FCC during the last quarter of an even-numbered year, the FCC may publish on the FCC website and submit to Congress its next 2-year agenda for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace during the first quarter of the following odd-numbered year.

The FCC is also required to consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal, facilities-based, and competition from new and emergent communications services, including the Internet. The FCC is required to compile a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability. The commission may use readily available data to draw appropriate comparisons between the United States communications marketplace and the international communications marketplace, and to correlate its assessments with demographic information.

In assessing the state of competition and regulatory barriers, the FCC shall also consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace. The FCC shall include in each report required by the bill, the aggregate average total amount paid by cable systems in compensation during the period covered by such report.

The bill would additionally consolidate into a Communications Marketplace Report: the ORBIT Act Report, the Satellite Competition Report, the International Broadband Data Report, the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming Report, the Report on Cable Industry Prices, the Triennial Report Identifying and Eliminating Market Entry Barriers for Entrepreneurs and Other Small Businesses, the Section 706 Report, and the Report on the State of Competitive Market Conditions With Respect to Commercial Mobile Radio Services.

Nothing in H.R. 734 or the amendments made by the bill shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the FCC, nor shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the FCC from producing any additional reports within the authority of the Commission.

The Senate version of H.R. 734 (S. 253) can be found [here](#). The House Committee on Energy and Commerce markup background memo can be found [here](#).

A similar bill ([H.R. 2844](#)) was introduced in the 113th Congress and passed in the House on September 9, 2013 by the yeas and nays ([415 – 0](#)). The RSC’s legislative bulletin for H.R. 2844 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION: This bill was introduced on February 4, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: No statement of administration policy is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: “Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.”

H.R. 1020—STEM Education Act of 2015 (Rep. Smith, R-TX)

CONTACT: REBEKAH ARMSTRONG, REBEKAH.ARMSTRONG@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 202-226-0678

FLOOR SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 24, 2015 UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES, WHICH REQUIRES TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY FOR PASSAGE.

TOPLINE SUMMARY: This bill would define science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education to include computer science. In addition, the bill would support existing National Science Foundation (NSF) STEM education programs for students and fellowship programs for teachers.

COST: A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) score is not currently available for this bill.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS: There are no substantive conservative concerns.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: In the 113th Congress, the House passed H.R. 5031, the STEM Education Act of 2014, on July 14, 2014, by voice vote. Read the RSC legislative bulletin, [here](#).

This bill would add computer science to the definition of STEM education activities for the purposes of the NSF, the Department of Energy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Environmental Protection Agency.

In addition, the bill would direct the director of the National Science Foundation (NSF) to continue to award competitive merit-reviewed grants to support innovative out-of-school STEM learning.

Finally, the bill would amend the [Noyce Scholarship Program](#) to allow the NSF to award the Master Teaching Fellowship to math and science teachers who have a bachelor's degree (currently, it is limited to those who hold a master's degree). For teachers with a bachelor's degree, working towards a master's degree, fellowship grants would be used to offer academic courses and leadership training to prepare individuals to become master teachers.

COMMITTEE ACTION: This bill was introduced on February 20, 2015, by Representative Smith and referred to the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology where it awaits further action.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: No statement of administration policy is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: According to the sponsor, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: "Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution

the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

NOTE: *RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*

###