According to the Bureau of Reclamation, if the drought continues, California will lose 25 percent of its agricultural use and 45 percent of its municipal use. The California Department of Water Resources has curtailed all water deliveries for agricultural purposes from the State Water Project (SWP) and municipal water supplies from the SWP may also be reduced.

PERMANENT FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED

When drought conditions occurred throughout the west in 1977 and again in 1987 and 1988, Congress passed temporary emergency drought acts. The Emergency Drought Act of 1988 (P.L. 95-85) and the Reclamation Drought Assistance Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-387). The 1988 legislation directed the Bureau of Reclamation (BuRec) to help mitigate the effects of drought conditions through financial aid and resource management, in coordination with State governments. However, that temporary authority expired at the end of 1983. Although $25 million was authorized to be appropriated, no funds were appropriated. BuRec has not been able to address the long-term, and under the temporary authority, the BuRec did accomplish a number of drought response and planning studies. Although efforts were made to pass new legislation, the Congress failed to pass new, permanent drought assistance legislation in the 101st Congress.

Both earlier acts were not adequate to address the emergency nature of drought programs, primarily because of the temporary nature of the authority, time constraints, the time consuming nature of the necessary planning and implementation of federal drought response efforts, and lack of available funding. Permanent authority is needed.

Drought conditions in the west have become progressively more severe as we now enter the fifth year of sustained drought conditions in most of the 17 Reclamation states. Most Reclamation projects have carryover storage of less water due to a long consecutive years of drought. However, demand from Reclamation facilities has grown in the west as population and other water needs increase, and the drought conditions worsening. A future drought will most likely occur more frequently in the future, requiring both water supply and demand to be managed more effectively and efficiently.

Most of the available water conservation efforts can be pursued by the Bureau of Reclamation under existing authority. However, legislation is needed to broaden existing law to apply to multipurpose water facilities rather than just irrigation facilities. Legislation is also needed to provide the BuRec with the permanent authority to work with State governments to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in short-term drought contingency planning and other drought emergency response measures.

The Reclamation Drought Response Act of 1991 would provide permanent authority for the Secretary of the Interior to:

- Declare and terminate reclamation contingency plans.
- Facilitate water transfers or institute a water market to serve users beyond the existing service area and authorized project functions.
- Use reclamation project facilities for temporary storage and to transport water for municipal and industrial and other uses outside the project service area—extension of the Warren Act Authority.
- Provide short-term water from dead or inactive storage or ground water systems.
- Allocate emergency funds and request additional funds as needed.
- Provide emergency loans for minor structural and non-structural activities with repayment obligations consistent with existing law and policy.
- Establish water banks to exchange, sell, or lease water, consistent with all State water laws.
- Provide technical assistance for conservation, contingency planning and research.
- Establish a drought emergency fund with secretarial authority to disburse moneys from the fund.
- Authorize the Commissioner of Reclamation to provide technical assistance to U.S. territories, State and other non-Federal water authorities east of the 100th meridian for conservation, contingency planning and research, with funding advanced to the Secretary. Also, to conduct a Contingency Planning Technology Transfer Program and field studies on a cost-shared basis with the States.
- Make water available on a temporary basis for protecting fish and wildlife resources.
- Implement all secretarial authority to disburse moneys from the fund and the implementing rules.

The legislation provides that all these new or extended authorities shall comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and all other applicable environmental laws.

I urge my colleagues, especially those from hard hit drought areas in the west, to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

HON. CASS BALLENERG

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1991

Mr. BALLANGER, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the "Workers' Family Protection Act," which this bill is to study the problem of worker home contamination. Recent history has shown that chemicals found on work clothes are frequently brought into the family home. This poses a health risk to workers' families, particularly their children. Additional study is needed to determine the extent of the problem and if Federal regulations are needed.

My interest in this issue stems from incidents of workers' home contamination at a hazardous waste facility in Morrisville, Caldwell Systems, Inc. (CSCI) was closed in 1989 because of charges that it was not operated safely. Because of their work at the plant, employees unknowingly came in contact with many hazardous chemicals. These employees have experienced a number of problems including dizziness affecting their nerves, brains, and breathing. Another unfortunate result has been that the families of these workers are now faced with a number of children developed breathing and other health-related problems because of chemicals brought home on their parents' clothing.

The CSCI workers need protection, but so do their families. My bill is one small step in that direction. Join me in helping to make families health conscious by sponsoring the Workers' Family Protection Act.

Senator JAMES JEFFORDS introduced companion legislation in the Senate earlier this week. A summary of the bill is listed below.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Workers' Family Protection Act of 1991.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

The purpose of the bill is to study the problem of worker home contamination. Recent history has shown that chemicals found on work clothes are frequently brought into the family home. This poses a health risk to workers' families, particularly their children. Additional study is needed to determine the extent of the problem and if Federal regulations are needed.

SECTION 3. STUDY OF EMPLOYEES TRANSPORTED CONTAMINATED RELEASES

Case studies make up the primary emphasis of the research, such as stockpiling of soiled clothing. Aural and olfactory data is authorized, allowing up to 10 case studies ($10,000 each) of recent incidents. The case studies will review recent incidents to determine the extent of current and potential measurements used to prevent home contamination; and (3) compile a review of relevant industrial hygiene research. The Secretary of Labor is to (1) identify industries prone to such contaminations based on past incidents and enforcement data; (2) revise current and potential measurements used to prevent home contamination; and (3) determine the extent of the problem and if Federal regulations are needed.

NIOSE is to issue a report within two years of enactment summarizing the results of these studies.

SECTION 4. REGULATIONS

Within three years of enactment, the Secretary of Labor must either issue regulations to minimize the risk of future incidents of home contamination or report to Congress that he found studies conducted under Section 3, additional regulation is unnecessary. In making this determination, the Secretary of Labor shall specifically look at industries that use lead, mercury, asbestos, pharmaceuticals, and pesticides. Recent incidents of home contamination have been documented or are believed likely with these chemicals.

SECTION 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

The cost of this legislation is not yet known. It is not the intent of this bill to create a costly program. Maximum expenditures on the order of $3-$5 million over the course of the Act are anticipated.