

The outdated regulations in place before this rulemaking did not ensure that financial advisers act in their clients' best interests when giving retirement investment advice. Instead, some firms have incentivized advisers to steer clients into products that have higher fees and lower returns—costing America's families an estimated \$17 billion a year.

The Department of Labor's final rule will ensure that American workers and retirees receive retirement advice that is in their best interest, better enabling them to protect and grow their savings. The final rule reflects extensive feedback from industry, advocates, and Members of Congress, and has been streamlined to reduce the compliance burden and ensure continued access to advice, while maintaining an enforceable best interest standard that protects consumers. It is essential that these critical protections go into effect. Because this resolution seeks to block the progress represented by this rule and deny retirement savers investment advice in their best interest, I cannot support it. I am therefore vetoing this resolution.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the joint resolution will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the veto message and the bill are postponed until the legislative day of Wednesday, June 22, 2016, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY: PROTECTING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE OF PIPELINES AND ENHANCING SAFETY ACT

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2276) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016” or the “PIPES Act of 2016”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 3. Regulatory updates.
- Sec. 4. Natural gas integrity management review.
- Sec. 5. Hazardous liquid integrity management review.
- Sec. 6. Technical safety standards committees.
- Sec. 7. Inspection report information.
- Sec. 8. Improving damage prevention technology.
- Sec. 9. Workforce management.
- Sec. 10. Information-sharing system.
- Sec. 11. Nationwide integrated pipeline safety regulatory database.
- Sec. 12. Underground gas storage facilities.
- Sec. 13. Joint inspection and oversight.
- Sec. 14. Safety data sheets.
- Sec. 15. Hazardous materials identification numbers.
- Sec. 16. Emergency order authority.
- Sec. 17. State grant funds.
- Sec. 18. Response plans.
- Sec. 19. Unusually sensitive areas.
- Sec. 20. Pipeline safety technical assistance grants.
- Sec. 21. Study of materials and corrosion prevention in pipeline transportation.
- Sec. 22. Research and development.
- Sec. 23. Active and abandoned pipelines.
- Sec. 24. State pipeline safety agreements.
- Sec. 25. Requirements for certain hazardous liquid pipeline facilities.
- Sec. 26. Study on propane gas pipeline facilities.
- Sec. 27. Standards for certain liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.
- Sec. 28. Pipeline odorization study.
- Sec. 29. Report on natural gas leak reporting.
- Sec. 30. Review of State policies relating to natural gas leaks.
- Sec. 31. Aliso Canyon natural gas leak task force.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GAS AND HAZARDOUS LIQUID.—Section 60125(a) of title 49, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2015, from fees collected under section 60301, \$90,679,000, of which \$4,746,000 is for carrying out such section 12 and \$36,194,000 is for making grants.” and inserting the following: “there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation from fees collected under section 60301—

“(A) \$124,500,000 for fiscal year 2016, of which \$9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$39,385,000 shall be expended for making grants;

“(B) \$128,000,000 for fiscal year 2017 of which \$9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$41,885,000 shall be expended for making grants;

“(C) \$131,000,000 for fiscal year 2018, of which \$9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$44,885,000 shall be expended for making grants; and

“(D) \$134,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, of which \$9,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$47,885,000 shall be expended for making grants.”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “there is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2015 from the Oil Spill

Liability Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of this chapter related to hazardous liquid and section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note; Public Law 107–355), \$18,573,000, of which \$2,174,000 is for carrying out such section 12 and \$4,558,000 is for making grants.” and inserting the following: “there is authorized to be appropriated from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of this chapter related to hazardous liquid and section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note; Public Law 107–355)—

“(A) \$22,123,000 for fiscal year 2016, of which \$3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants;

“(B) \$22,123,000 for fiscal year 2017, of which \$3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants;

“(C) \$23,000,000 for fiscal year 2018, of which \$3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants; and

“(D) \$23,000,000 for fiscal year 2019, of which \$3,000,000 shall be expended for carrying out such section 12 and \$8,067,000 shall be expended for making grants.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) UNDERGROUND NATURAL GAS STORAGE FACILITY SAFETY ACCOUNT.—To carry out section 60141, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation from fees collected under section 60302 \$8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019.”.

(b) OPERATIONAL EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for the necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration the following amounts:

(1) \$21,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.

(2) \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 2017.

(3) \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.

(4) \$23,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(c) ONE-CALL NOTIFICATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 6107. Funding

“Of the amounts made available under section 60125(a)(1), the Secretary shall expend \$1,058,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 to carry out section 6106.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 61 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 6107 and inserting the following:

“6107. Funding.”.

(d) PIPELINE SAFETY INFORMATION GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES.—The first sentence of section 60130(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: “Of the amounts made available under section 2(b) of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall expend \$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 to carry out this section.”

(e) PIPELINE INTEGRITY PROGRAM.—Section 12(f) of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note) is amended by striking “2012 through 2015” and inserting “2016 through 2019”.

SEC. 3. REGULATORY UPDATES.

(a) PUBLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall publish an update on a publicly available Web site of the Department of Transportation regarding the status of a final rule for each outstanding regulation, and upon such publication notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the

House of Representatives that such publication has been made.

(2) **DEADLINES.**—The Secretary shall publish an update under this subsection not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until a final rule has been published in the Federal Register for each outstanding regulation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The Secretary shall include in each update published under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of the work plan for each outstanding regulation;

(2) an updated rulemaking timeline for each outstanding regulation;

(3) current staff allocations with respect to each outstanding regulation;

(4) any resource constraints affecting the rulemaking process for each outstanding regulation;

(5) any other details associated with the development of each outstanding regulation that affect the progress of the rulemaking process; and

(6) a description of all rulemakings regarding gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities published in the Federal Register that are not identified under subsection (c).

(c) **OUTSTANDING REGULATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “outstanding regulation” means—

(1) a final rule required under the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90) that has not been published in the Federal Register; and

(2) a final rule regarding gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities required under this Act or an Act enacted prior to the date of enactment of this Act (other than the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–90)) that has not been published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. NATURAL GAS INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a final rule regarding the safety of gas transmission pipelines related to the notice of proposed rulemaking issued on April 8, 2016, titled “Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipelines” (81 Fed. Reg. 20721), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the integrity management programs for gas pipeline facilities required under section 60109(c) of title 49, United States Code.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of stakeholder perspectives, taking into consideration technical, operational, and economic feasibility, regarding ways to enhance pipeline facility safety, prevent inadvertent releases from pipeline facilities, and mitigate any adverse consequences of such inadvertent releases, including changes to the definition of high consequence area, or expanding integrity management beyond high consequence areas;

(2) a review of the types of benefits, including safety benefits, and estimated costs of the legacy class location regulations;

(3) an analysis of the impact pipeline facility features, including the age, condition, materials, and construction of a pipeline facility, have on safety and risk analysis of a particular pipeline facility;

(4) a description of any challenges affecting Federal or State regulators in the oversight of gas transmission pipeline facilities

and how the challenges are being addressed; and

(5) a description of any challenges affecting the natural gas industry in complying with the programs, and how the challenges are being addressed, including any challenges faced by publicly owned natural gas distribution systems.

(c) **DEFINITION OF HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA.**—In this section, the term “high consequence area” has the meaning given the term in section 192.903 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 5. HAZARDOUS LIQUID INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a final rule regarding the safety of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities related to the notice of proposed rulemaking issued on October 13, 2015, titled “Pipeline Safety: Safety of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines” (80 Fed. Reg. 61610), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the integrity management programs for hazardous liquid pipeline facilities, as regulated under sections 195.450 and 195.452 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) taking into consideration technical, operational, and economic feasibility, an analysis of stakeholder perspectives on—

(A) ways to enhance hazardous liquid pipeline facility safety;

(B) risk factors that may warrant more frequent inspections of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities; and

(C) changes to the definition of high consequence area;

(2) an analysis of how surveying, assessment, mitigation, and monitoring activities, including real-time hazardous liquid pipeline facility monitoring during significant flood events and information sharing with Federal agencies, are being used to address risks associated with rivers, flood plains, lakes, and coastal areas;

(3) an analysis of the impact pipeline facility features, including the age, condition, materials, and construction of a pipeline facility, have on safety and risk analysis of a particular pipeline facility and what changes to the definition of high consequence area could be made to improve pipeline facility safety; and

(4) a description of any challenges affecting Federal or State regulators in the oversight of hazardous liquid pipeline facilities and how those challenges are being addressed.

(c) **DEFINITION OF HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA.**—In this section, the term “high consequence area” has the meaning given the term in section 195.450 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEES.

(a) **APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.**—Section 60115(b)(4)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “State commissioners. The Secretary shall consult with the national organization of State commissions before selecting those 2 individuals.” and inserting “State officials. The Secretary shall consult with national organizations representing State commissioners or utility regulators before making a selection under this subparagraph.”.

(b) **VACANCIES.**—Section 60115(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) Within 90 days of the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall fill all vacancies on the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, the Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, and any other committee established pursuant to this section. After that period, the Secretary shall fill a vacancy on any such committee not later than 60 days after the vacancy occurs.”.

SEC. 7. INSPECTION REPORT INFORMATION.

(a) **INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE.**—Section 60108 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **IN GENERAL.**—After the completion of a Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration pipeline safety inspection, the Administrator of such Administration, or the State authority certified under section 60105 of title 49, United States Code, to conduct such inspection, shall—

“(1) within 30 days, conduct a post-inspection briefing with the owner or operator of the gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility inspected outlining any concerns; and

“(2) within 90 days, to the extent practicable, provide the owner or operator with written preliminary findings of the inspection.”.

(b) **NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than October 1, 2017, and each fiscal year thereafter for 2 years, the Administrator shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of—

(1) the number of times a deadline under section 60108(e) of title 49, United States Code, was exceeded in the prior fiscal year; and

(2) in each instance, the length of time by which the deadline was exceeded.

SEC. 8. IMPROVING DAMAGE PREVENTION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with stakeholders, shall conduct a study on improving existing damage prevention programs through technological improvements in location, mapping, excavation, and communications practices to prevent excavation damage to a pipe or its coating, including considerations of technical, operational, and economic feasibility and existing damage prevention programs.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an identification of any methods to improve existing damage prevention programs through location and mapping practices or technologies in an effort to reduce releases caused by excavation;

(2) an analysis of how increased use of global positioning system digital mapping technologies, predictive analytic tools, public awareness initiatives including one-call initiatives, the use of mobile devices, and other advanced technologies could supplement existing one-call notification and damage prevention programs to reduce the frequency and severity of incidents caused by excavation damage;

(3) an identification of any methods to improve excavation practices or technologies in an effort to reduce pipeline damage;

(4) an analysis of the feasibility of a national data repository for pipeline excavation accident data that creates standardized data models for storing and sharing pipeline accident information; and

(5) an identification of opportunities for stakeholder engagement in preventing excavation damage.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on

Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations, that include the consideration of technical, operational, and economic feasibility, on how to incorporate into existing damage prevention programs technological improvements and practices that help prevent excavation damage.

SEC. 9. WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a review of Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration staff resource management, including—

(1) geographic allocation plans, hiring and time-to-hire challenges, and expected retirement rates and recruitment and retention strategies;

(2) an identification and description of any previous periods of macroeconomic and pipeline industry conditions under which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has encountered difficulty in filling vacancies, and the degree to which special hiring authorities, including direct hiring authority authorized by the Office of Personnel Management, could have ameliorated such difficulty; and

(3) recommendations to address hiring challenges, training needs, and any other identified staff resource challenges.

(b) DIRECT HIRING.—Upon identification of a period described in subsection (a)(2), the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration may apply to the Office of Personnel Management for the authority to appoint qualified candidates to any position relating to pipeline safety, as determined by the Administrator, without regard to sections 3309 through 3319 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration from applying to the Office of Personnel Management for the authority described in subsection (b) prior to the completion of the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 10. INFORMATION-SHARING SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall convene a working group to consider the development of a voluntary information-sharing system to encourage collaborative efforts to improve inspection information feedback and information sharing with the purpose of improving gas transmission and hazardous liquid pipeline facility integrity risk analysis.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The working group convened pursuant to subsection (a) shall include representatives from—

(1) the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration;

(2) industry stakeholders, including operators of pipeline facilities, inspection technology, coating, and cathodic protection vendors, and pipeline inspection organizations;

(3) safety advocacy groups;

(4) research institutions;

(5) State public utility commissions or State officials responsible for pipeline safety oversight;

(6) State pipeline safety inspectors;

(7) labor representatives; and

(8) other entities, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—The working group convened pursuant to subsection (a) shall consider and provide recommendations to the Secretary on—

(1) the need for, and the identification of, a system to ensure that dig verification data are shared with in-line inspection operators to the extent consistent with the need to maintain proprietary and security-sensitive data in a confidential manner to improve pipeline safety and inspection technology;

(2) ways to encourage the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(3) opportunities to share data, including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and in-line inspector vendors to expand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of the different types of in-line inspection technology and methodologies;

(4) options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis;

(5) means and best practices for the protection of safety- and security-sensitive information and proprietary information; and

(6) regulatory, funding, and legal barriers to sharing the information described in paragraphs (1) through (4).

(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the recommendations provided under subsection (c) on a publicly available Web site of the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 11. NATIONWIDE INTEGRATED PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DATABASE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the feasibility of establishing a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database to improve communication and collaboration between the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and State pipeline regulators.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of any efforts underway to test a secure information-sharing system for the purpose described in subsection (a);

(2) a description of any progress in establishing common standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting pipeline safety regulatory inspection data, and a methodology for sharing the data;

(3) a description of any inadequacies or gaps in State and Federal inspection, enforcement, geospatial, or other pipeline safety regulatory inspection data;

(4) a description of the potential safety benefits of a national integrated pipeline safety regulatory inspection database; and

(5) recommendations, including those of stakeholders for how to implement a secure information-sharing system that protects proprietary and security sensitive information and data for the purpose described in subsection (a).

(c) CONSULTATION.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including each State authority operating under a certification to regulate intrastate pipelines under section 60105 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Secretary may establish, if appropriate, a

national integrated pipeline safety regulatory database—

(1) after submission of the report required under subsection (a); or

(2) upon notification to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the need to establish such database prior to the submission of the report under subsection (a).

SEC. 12. UNDERGROUND GAS STORAGE FACILITIES.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—Section 60101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (21)(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (22)(B)(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (24) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (25) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(26) ‘underground natural gas storage facility’ means a gas pipeline facility that stores natural gas in an underground facility, including—

“(A) a depleted hydrocarbon reservoir;

“(B) an aquifer reservoir; or

“(C) a solution-mined salt cavern reservoir.”.

(b) STANDARDS FOR UNDERGROUND GAS STORAGE FACILITIES.—Chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 60141. Standards for underground natural gas storage facilities

“(a) MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall issue minimum safety standards for underground natural gas storage facilities.

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the safety standards required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable—

“(1) consider consensus standards for the operation, environmental protection, and integrity management of underground natural gas storage facilities;

“(2) consider the economic impacts of the regulations on individual gas customers;

“(3) ensure that the regulations do not have a significant economic impact on end users; and

“(4) consider the recommendations of the Aliso Canyon natural gas leak task force established under section 31 of the PIPES Act of 2016.

“(c) FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION.—The Secretary may authorize a State authority (including a municipality) to participate in the oversight of underground natural gas storage facilities in the same manner as provided in sections 60105 and 60106.

“(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any Federal regulation relating to gas pipeline facilities that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the Secretary—

“(A) to prescribe the location of an underground natural gas storage facility; or

“(B) to require the Secretary’s permission to construct a facility referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(e) PREEMPTION.—A State authority may adopt additional or more stringent safety standards for intrastate underground natural gas storage facilities if such standards are

compatible with the minimum standards prescribed under this section.

“(f) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the Secretary’s authority under this title to regulate the underground storage of gas that is not natural gas.”.

(c) USER FEES.—Chapter 603 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 60301 the following:

“§ 60302. User fees for underground natural gas storage facilities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A fee shall be imposed on an entity operating an underground natural gas storage facility subject to section 60141. Any such fee imposed shall be collected before the end of the fiscal year to which it applies.

“(b) MEANS OF COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe procedures to collect fees under this section. The Secretary may use a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government or of a State or local government to collect the fee and may reimburse the department, agency, or instrumentality a reasonable amount for its services.

“(c) USE OF FEES.—

“(1) ACCOUNT.—There is established an Underground Natural Gas Storage Facility Safety Account in the Pipeline Safety Fund established in the Treasury of the United States under section 60301.

“(2) USE OF FEES.—A fee collected under this section—

“(A) shall be deposited in the Underground Natural Gas Storage Facility Safety Account; and

“(B) if the fee is related to an underground natural gas storage facility subject to section 60141, the amount of the fee may be used only for an activity related to underground natural gas storage facility safety.

“(3) LIMITATION.—No fee may be collected under this section, except to the extent that the expenditure of such fee to pay the costs of an activity related to underground natural gas storage facility safety for which such fee is imposed is provided in advance in an appropriations Act.”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER 601.—The table of sections for chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “60141. Standards for underground natural gas storage facilities.”.

(2) CHAPTER 603.—The table of sections for chapter 603 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 60301 the following:

“60302. User fees for underground natural gas storage facilities.”.

SEC. 13. JOINT INSPECTION AND OVERSIGHT.

Section 60106 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) JOINT INSPECTORS.—At the request of a State authority, the Secretary shall allow for a certified State authority under section 60105 to participate in the inspection of an interstate pipeline facility.”.

SEC. 14. SAFETY DATA SHEETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each owner or operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline facility, following an accident involving such pipeline facility that results in a hazardous liquid spill, shall provide safety data sheets on any spilled hazardous liquid to the designated Federal On-Scene Coordinator and appropriate State and local emergency responders within 6 hours of a telephonic or electronic notice of the accident to the National Response Center.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL ON-SCENE COORDINATOR.—The term “Federal On-Scene Coordinator” has

the meaning given such term in section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)).

(2) NATIONAL RESPONSE CENTER.—The term “National Response Center” means the center described under section 300.125(a) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) SAFETY DATA SHEET.—The term “safety data sheet” means a safety data sheet required under section 1910.1200 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 15. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking to take public comment on the petition for rulemaking dated October 28, 2015, titled “Corrections to Title 49 C.F.R. §172.336 Identification numbers; special provisions” (P-1667).

SEC. 16. EMERGENCY ORDER AUTHORITY.

Section 60117 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) EMERGENCY ORDER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that an unsafe condition or practice, or a combination of unsafe conditions and practices, constitutes or is causing an imminent hazard, the Secretary may issue an emergency order described in paragraph (3) imposing emergency restrictions, prohibitions, and safety measures on owners and operators of gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities without prior notice or an opportunity for a hearing, but only to the extent necessary to abate the imminent hazard.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing an emergency order under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider, as appropriate, the following factors:

“(i) The impact of the emergency order on public health and safety.

“(ii) The impact, if any, of the emergency order on the national or regional economy or national security.

“(iii) The impact of the emergency order on the ability of owners and operators of pipeline facilities to maintain reliability and continuity of service to customers.

“(B) CONSULTATION.—In considering the factors under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult, as the Secretary determines appropriate, with appropriate Federal agencies, State agencies, and other entities knowledgeable in pipeline safety or operations.

“(3) WRITTEN ORDER.—An emergency order issued by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to an imminent hazard shall contain a written description of—

“(A) the violation, condition, or practice that constitutes or is causing the imminent hazard;

“(B) the entities subject to the order;

“(C) the restrictions, prohibitions, or safety measures imposed;

“(D) the standards and procedures for obtaining relief from the order;

“(E) how the order is tailored to abate the imminent hazard and the reasons the authorities under section 60112 and 60117(l) are insufficient to do so; and

“(F) how the considerations were taken into account pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(4) OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW.—Upon receipt of a petition for review from an entity subject to, and aggrieved by, an emergency order issued under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide an opportunity for a review of the order under section 554 of title 5 to determine whether the order should remain in effect, be modified, or be terminated.

“(5) EXPIRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS ORDER.—If a petition for review of an emergency

order is filed under paragraph (4) and an agency decision with respect to the petition is not issued on or before the last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the petition is filed, the order shall cease to be effective on such day, unless the Secretary determines in writing on or before the last day of such period that the imminent hazard still exists.

“(6) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—After completion of the review process described in paragraph (4), or the issuance of a written determination by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (5), an entity subject to, and aggrieved by, an emergency order issued under this subsection may seek judicial review of the order in a district court of the United States and shall be given expedited consideration.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The filing of a petition for review under subparagraph (A) shall not stay or modify the force and effect of the agency’s final decision under paragraph (4), or the written determination under paragraph (5), unless stayed or modified by the Secretary.

“(7) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) TEMPORARY REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall issue such temporary regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection. The temporary regulations shall expire on the date of issuance of the final regulations required under subparagraph (B).

“(B) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall ensure that the review process described in paragraph (4) contains the same procedures as subsections (d) and (g) of section 109.19 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, and is otherwise consistent with the review process developed under such section, to the greatest extent practicable and not inconsistent with this section.

“(8) IMMINENT HAZARD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘imminent hazard’ means the existence of a condition relating to a gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility that presents a substantial likelihood that death, serious illness, severe personal injury, or a substantial endangerment to health, property, or the environment may occur before the reasonably foreseeable completion date of a formal proceeding begun to lessen the risk of such death, illness, injury, or endangerment.

“(9) LIMITATION AND SAVINGS CLAUSE.—An emergency order issued under this subsection may not be construed to—

“(A) alter, amend, or limit the Secretary’s obligations under, or the applicability of, section 553 of title 5; or

“(B) provide the authority to amend the Code of Federal Regulations.”.

SEC. 17. STATE GRANT FUNDS.

Section 60107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) PAYMENTS.—After notifying and consulting with a State authority, the Secretary may withhold any part of a payment when the Secretary decides that the authority is not carrying out satisfactorily a safety program or not acting satisfactorily as an agent. The Secretary may pay an authority under this section only when the authority ensures the Secretary that it will provide the remaining costs of a safety program, except when the Secretary waives this requirement.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) REPURPOSING OF FUNDS.—If a State program’s certification is rejected under section 60105(f) or such program is otherwise

suspended or interrupted, the Secretary may use any undistributed, deobligated, or recovered funds authorized under this section to carry out pipeline safety activities for that State within the period of availability for such funds.”.

SEC. 18. RESPONSE PLANS.

Each owner or operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline facility required to prepare a response plan pursuant to part 194 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, shall—

(1) consider the impact of a discharge into or on navigable waters or adjoining shorelines, including those that may be covered in whole or in part by ice; and

(2) include procedures and resources for responding to such discharge in the plan.

SEC. 19. UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS.

(a) AREAS TO BE INCLUDED AS UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE.—Section 60109(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “have been identified as” and inserting “are part of the Great Lakes or have been identified as coastal beaches, marine coastal waters,”.

(b) UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (USA) ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Transportation shall revise section 195.6(b) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to explicitly state that the Great Lakes, coastal beaches, and marine coastal waters are USA ecological resources for purposes of determining whether a pipeline is in a high consequence area (as defined in section 195.450 of such title).

SEC. 20. PIPELINE SAFETY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

(a) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION LIMITATION.—Section 60130(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “on technical pipeline safety issues” after “public participation”.

(b) AUDIT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Secretary of Transportation, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report evaluating the grant program under section 60130 of title 49, United States Code. The report shall include—

(1) a list of the recipients of all grant funds during fiscal years 2010 through 2015;

(2) a description of how each grant was used;

(3) an analysis of the compliance with the terms of grant agreements, including subsections (a) and (b) of such section;

(4) an evaluation of the competitive processes used to award the grant funds; and

(5) an evaluation of—

(A) the ability of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to oversee grant funds and usage; and

(B) the procedures used for such oversight.

SEC. 21. STUDY OF MATERIALS AND CORROSION PREVENTION IN PIPELINE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a study on materials, training, and corrosion prevention technologies for gas and hazardous liquid pipeline facilities.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of—

(A) the range of piping materials, including plastic materials, used to transport haz-

ardous liquids and natural gas in the United States and in other developed countries around the world;

(B) the types of technologies used for corrosion prevention, including coatings and cathodic protection;

(C) common causes of corrosion, including interior and exterior moisture buildup and impacts of moisture buildup under insulation; and

(D) the training provided to personnel responsible for identifying and preventing corrosion in pipelines, and for repairing such pipelines;

(2) the extent to which best practices or guidance relating to pipeline facility design, installation, operation, and maintenance, including training, are available to recognize or prevent corrosion;

(3) an analysis of the estimated costs and anticipated benefits, including safety benefits, associated with the use of such materials and technologies; and

(4) stakeholder and expert perspectives on the effectiveness of corrosion control techniques to reduce the incidence of corrosion-related pipeline failures.

SEC. 22. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report regarding the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's research and development program carried out under section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note). The report shall include an evaluation of—

(1) compliance with the consultation requirement under subsection (d)(2) of such section;

(2) the extent to which the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration enters into joint research ventures with Federal and non-Federal entities, and benefits thereof;

(3) the policies and procedures the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has put in place to ensure there are no conflicts of interest with administering grants pursuant to the program, and whether those policies and procedures are being followed; and

(4) an evaluation of the outcomes of research conducted with Federal and non-Federal entities and the degree to which such outcomes have been adopted or utilized.

(b) COLLABORATIVE SAFETY RESEARCH REPORT.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Section 60124(a)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a summary of each research and development project carried out with Federal and non-Federal entities pursuant to section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 and a review of how the project affects safety.”.

(2) PIPELINE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section 12 of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (49 U.S.C. 60101 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d)(3)(C) and inserting the following:

“(C) FUNDING FROM NON-FEDERAL SOURCES.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

“(i) at least 30 percent of the costs of technology research and development activities may be carried out using non-Federal sources;

“(ii) at least 20 percent of the costs of basic research and development with universities may be carried out using non-Federal sources; and

“(iii) up to 100 percent of the costs of research and development for purely governmental purposes may be carried out using Federal funds.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) INDEPENDENT EXPERTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the PIPES Act of 2016, the Secretary shall—

“(1) implement processes and procedures to ensure that activities listed under subsection (c), to the greatest extent practicable, produce results that are peer-reviewed by independent experts and not by persons or entities that have a financial interest in the pipeline, petroleum, or natural gas industries, or that would be directly impacted by the results of the projects; and

“(2) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing the processes and procedures implemented under paragraph (1).

“(i) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall take all practical steps to ensure that each recipient of an agreement under this section discloses in writing to the Secretary any conflict of interest on a research and development project carried out under this section, and includes any such disclosure as part of the final deliverable pursuant to such agreement. The Secretary may not make an award under this section directly to a pipeline owner or operator that is regulated by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration or a State-certified regulatory authority if there is a conflict of interest relating to such owner or operator.”.

SEC. 23. ACTIVE AND ABANDONED PIPELINES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue an advisory bulletin to owners and operators of gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facilities and Federal and State pipeline safety personnel regarding procedures of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration required to change the status of a pipeline facility from active to abandoned, including specific guidance on the terms recognized by the Secretary for each pipeline status referred to in such advisory bulletin.

SEC. 24. STATE PIPELINE SAFETY AGREEMENTS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on State pipeline safety agreements made pursuant to section 60106 of title 49, United States Code. Such study shall consider the following:

(1) The integration of Federal and State or local authorities in carrying out activities pursuant to an agreement under such section.

(2) The estimated staff and other resources used by Federal and State authorities in carrying out inspection activities pursuant to agreements under such section.

(3) The estimated staff and other resources used by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in carrying out interstate inspections in areas where there is no interstate agreement with a State pursuant to such section.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR DENIAL.—Section 60106(b) of title 49, United States Code,

is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) NOTICE UPON DENIAL.—If a State authority requests an interstate agreement under this section and the Secretary denies such request, the Secretary shall provide written notification to the State authority of the denial that includes an explanation of the reasons for such denial.”.

SEC. 25. REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE FACILITIES.

Section 60109 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE FACILITIES.—

“(1) INTEGRITY ASSESSMENTS.—Notwithstanding any pipeline integrity management program or integrity assessment schedule otherwise required by the Secretary, each operator of a pipeline facility to which this subsection applies shall ensure that pipeline integrity assessments—

“(A) using internal inspection technology appropriate for the integrity threat are completed not less often than once every 12 months; and

“(B) using pipeline route surveys, depth of cover surveys, pressure tests, external corrosion direct assessment, or other technology that the operator demonstrates can further the understanding of the condition of the pipeline facility are completed on a schedule based on the risk that the pipeline facility poses to the high consequence area in which the pipeline facility is located.

“(2) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall apply to any underwater hazardous liquid pipeline facility located in a high consequence area—

“(A) that is not an offshore pipeline facility; and

“(B) any portion of which is located at depths greater than 150 feet under the surface of the water.

“(3) HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREA DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘high consequence area’ has the meaning given that term in section 195.450 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(4) INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct inspections under section 60117(c) to determine whether each operator of a pipeline facility to which this subsection applies is complying with this section.”.

SEC. 26. STUDY ON PROPANE GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies to conduct a study examining the safety, regulatory requirements, techniques, and best practices applicable to pipeline facilities that transport or store only petroleum gas or mixtures of petroleum gas and air to 100 or fewer customers, in accordance with the requirements of this section.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study pursuant to subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall analyze—

(1) Federal, State, and local regulatory requirements applicable to pipeline facilities described in subsection (a);

(2) techniques and best practices relating to the design, installation, operation, and maintenance of such pipeline facilities; and

(3) the costs and benefits, including safety benefits, associated with such applicable regulatory requirements and the use of such techniques and best practices.

(c) PARTICIPATION.—In conducting the study pursuant to subsection (a), the Transportation Research Board shall consult with Federal, State, and local governments, private sector entities, and consumer and pipeline safety advocates, as appropriate.

(d) DEADLINE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the results of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a) and any recommendations for improving the safety of such pipeline facilities.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “petroleum gas” has the meaning given that term in section 192.3 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 27. STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.

(a) NATIONAL SECURITY.—Section 60103(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) national security.”.

(b) UPDATE TO MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall review and update the minimum safety standards prescribed pursuant to section 60103 of title 49, United States Code, for permanent, small scale liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the Secretary’s authority under chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, to regulate liquefied natural gas pipeline facilities.

SEC. 28. PIPELINE ODORIZATION STUDY.

Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives that assesses—

(1) the feasibility, costs, and benefits of odorizing all combustible gas in pipeline transportation; and

(2) the affects of the odorization of all combustible gas in pipeline transportation on—

(A) manufacturers, agriculture, and other end users; and

(B) public health and safety.

SEC. 29. REPORT ON NATURAL GAS LEAK REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the metrics provided to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and other Federal and State agencies related to lost and unaccounted for natural gas from distribution pipelines and systems.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An examination of different reporting requirements or standards for lost and unaccounted for natural gas to different agencies, the reasons for any such discrepancies, and recommendations for harmonizing and improving the accuracy of reporting.

(2) An analysis of whether separate or alternative reporting could better measure the amounts and identify the location of lost and unaccounted for natural gas from natural gas distribution systems.

(3) A description of potential safety issues associated with natural gas that is lost and unaccounted for from natural gas distribution systems.

(4) An assessment of whether alternate reporting and measures will resolve any safety issues identified under paragraph (3), including an analysis of the potential impact, including potential savings, on rate payers and end users of natural gas products of such reporting and measures.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that alternate reporting structures or recommendations included in the report required under subsection (a) would significantly improve the reporting and measurement of lost and unaccounted for gas and safety of natural gas distribution systems, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 30. REVIEW OF STATE POLICIES RELATING TO NATURAL GAS LEAKS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration shall conduct a State-by-State review of State-level policies that—

(1) encourage the repair and replacement of leaking natural gas distribution pipelines or systems that pose a safety threat, such as timelines to repair leaks and limits on cost recovery from ratepayers; and

(2) may create barriers for entities to conduct work to repair and replace leaking natural gas pipelines or distribution systems.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the findings of the review conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations on Federal or State policies or best practices to improve safety by accelerating the repair and replacement of natural gas pipelines or systems that are leaking or releasing natural gas. The report shall consider the potential impact, including potential savings, of the implementation of such recommendations on ratepayers or end users of the natural gas pipeline system.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Administrator determines that the recommendations made under subsection (b) would significantly improve pipeline safety, the Administrator shall, not later than 1 year after making such determination, and in coordination with the heads of other relevant agencies as appropriate, issue regulations, as the Administrator determines appropriate, to implement the recommendations.

SEC. 31. ALISO CANYON NATURAL GAS LEAK TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE.—Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall lead and establish an Aliso Canyon natural gas leak task force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF TASK FORCE.—In addition to the Secretary, the task force established under subsection (a) shall be composed of—

(1) 1 representative from the Department of Transportation;

(2) 1 representative from the Department of Health and Human Services;

(3) 1 representative from the Environmental Protection Agency;

(4) 1 representative from the Department of the Interior;

(5) 1 representative from the Department of Commerce;

(6) 1 representative from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and

(7) representatives of State and local governments, as determined appropriate by the Secretary and the Administrator.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the task force established under subsection (a) shall submit a final report that contains the information described in paragraph (2) to—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(H) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives;

(I) the President; and

(J) relevant Federal and State agencies.

(2) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an analysis and conclusion of the cause and contributing factors of the Aliso Canyon natural gas leak;

(B) an analysis of measures taken to stop the natural gas leak, with an immediate focus on other, more effective measures that could be taken;

(C) an assessment of the impact of the natural gas leak on—

(i) health, safety, and the environment;

(ii) wholesale and retail electricity prices; and

(iii) the reliability of the bulk-power system;

(D) an analysis of how Federal, State, and local agencies responded to the natural gas leak;

(E) in order to lessen the negative impacts of leaks from underground natural gas storage facilities, recommendations on how to improve—

(i) the response to a future leak; and

(ii) coordination between all appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies in the response to the Aliso Canyon natural gas leak and future natural gas leaks;

(F) an analysis of the potential for a similar natural gas leak to occur at other underground natural gas storage facilities in the United States;

(G) recommendations on how to prevent any future natural gas leaks;

(H) recommendations regarding Aliso Canyon and other underground natural gas storage facilities located in close proximity to residential populations;

(I) any recommendations on information that is not currently collected but that would be in the public interest to collect and distribute to agencies and institutions for the continued study and monitoring of natural gas storage infrastructure in the United States; and

(J) any other recommendations, as appropriate.

(3) PUBLICATION.—The final report under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public in an electronically accessible format.

(4) FINDINGS.—If, before the final report is submitted under paragraph (1), the task force established under subsection (a) finds methods to solve the natural gas leak at Aliso Canyon, finds methods to better protect the affected communities, or finds methods to help prevent other leaks, the task force shall immediately submit such findings to the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (J) of paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 2276, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the Chair for the time to express my support for the Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016. This is the PIPES Act of 2016.

The United States has the largest network of energy pipelines in the world—over 2.6 million miles of pipe. Pipelines are a critical part of our energy infrastructure, with over 64 percent of our energy being transported by our pipes within this country. The sustained oversight of the Department of Transportation's pipeline safety programs is critical for pipelines to continue to safely transport our energy products.

This bill was developed in a bipartisan manner over the past several years. My subcommittee held a number of hearings and roundtables to hear from stakeholders on the need for reauthorization. On April 20, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee unanimously approved our bill. Similarly, the Energy and Commerce Committee, with which we share jurisdiction, passed its version on April 27. Since then, both House committees have worked on a bipartisan basis to meld this version with the Senate's version, which passed last December. This collaborative, constructive process has resulted in the bill we are considering today, which we believe is a solid safety improvement.

First, we require PHMSA to set minimum Federal standards for underground natural gas storage facilities—a critical issue for my home State of California after the Aliso Canyon leak.

We make sure PHMSA is focused on finishing outstanding issues from the last reauthorization by requiring PHMSA to update Congress every 90 days on its progress.

The bill also authorizes emergency order authority for the pipeline sector but with important preorder requirements to make sure, if the DOT uses such authority, it does it right.

This legislation promotes the better use of data and technology to improve safety, including studying the latest innovations in pipeline materials and corrosion prevention.

Ultimately, our goal is to make sure that we have the safest pipeline network in the world.

We have worked in a bipartisan, bicameral manner to develop this bill. I believe that this bill will improve the safety of our pipeline infrastructure.

I thank Messrs. CAPUANO, SHUSTER, and DEFazio for their work on this bill. I also thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, who has worked tirelessly on this with Ranking Member PALLONE. Lastly, I thank the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, & Transportation for its hard work. Together, we have made a great bill that will create a safer infrastructure for our pipelines.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As you have just heard, this is a great piece of legislation. This is exactly the way that Congress is supposed to work. We had our differences, but we worked them out because everybody gave a little bit to get to the middle—to get something good for America. This is the kind of bill that, on an average day, will not get any of us elected or unelected, but it is something that is good for the safety of America on pipelines and hazardous materials.

I would like to point out just a few items that, I think, are particularly important:

For the first time, we have added an emergency order authority so that our regulators, when there is a problem, can quickly address it as opposed to having to wait around and let it burn out on its own;

We added some provisions in there to boost funding to the States and the localities so that they can train their own people on how to deal with these things, because they are, after all, the first responders;

We added some information relative to oil spill response plans. For me, I thought it was very important that we added a section that makes sure that there are no conflicts of interest on the studies done by PHMSA, on which we rely.

There are many other provisions in this bill that are deserving of our support—as always, like with any bill. Any one of us can point out things that we don't like or that we wanted more on, but that is what compromise is all about. I am proud to be here again with another bill that comes out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and for the traditional way that we have worked for many, many years in a bipartisan way.

I thank Messrs. DENHAM, SHUSTER, and DEFazio, all of the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

This particular bill is more difficult than usual because there were two committees involved. It makes four different sides and eight different sides on the House, plus the Senate; yet we did it in a reasonable fashion and in a relatively quick way. It proves the system can work when you have people at the table who want it to work.

I thank everybody who has been involved with this, and I look forward to the passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to support this legislation today and to commend the committees for their work on pipeline safety and pipeline safety improvement. I also have to take this opportunity, because the committee has done very good work on the FAST Act, to talk about rail safety.

This rail accident occurred over the weekend just 7 miles from my home in the national scenic area of the Columbia River Gorge. I was there not long after it happened. I met with the incident commanders. I met with the fire chief. I met with city officials and county officials. Let me just say that, while you are protecting pipelines—and that is really important—we need to continue to make progress on rail safety and to make sure that the new cars that were ordered by this Congress get put into service, especially in these critical waterway areas, as soon as possible. We need to make sure that track improvements are required—that new fasteners are used to deal with issues where, in this case, perhaps, it is a track separation issue. We need to make sure that our first responders get all of the training and that the Department of Transportation finishes its work on its rule for spill response and for safety.

This is a critically important issue for the people I represent on both the Oregon and Washington sides of the Columbia River because these trains are going through, and we are having these kinds of situations. We need to make sure we have the most up-to-date safety, the most up-to-date training, and the safest cars and tracks possible. We are going to stay on this until that happens.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what Mr. CAPUANO said about the bipartisan nature of this bill and in our working together between the two committees to achieve success.

The vast network of energy pipelines in this country is essentially out of sight, out of mind for most Americans, but when something goes wrong, these facilities can make themselves known in devastating and sometimes deadly ways.

This is something that both Representative CAPPS and Representative SHERMAN, unfortunately, have experienced since the start of this Congress. My own district experienced the devastation of a pipeline failure in 1994 when a pipeline exploded in Edison, New Jer-

sey, and destroyed about 300 homes. Ever since then, I have sought to make our Nation's pipelines safer by making the law and its regulator stronger.

The legislation before us, while not the bill that maybe we would have written, as Mr. CAPUANO said, is a good proposal that moves the ball forward on safety. It is the result of a number of weeks of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. While some compromises were made, this is a product that in many ways is greater than the sum of its parts. I am particularly pleased that it includes versions of important provisions that were authored by a number of Energy and Power Subcommittee members, including Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. GREEN, ENGEL, MCNERNEY, and WELCH, and Ranking Member BOBBY RUSH.

In particular, the House amendment gives the Secretary of Transportation, for the first time ever, emergency order authority to address the threats to public health, safety, and the environment that are posed by dangerous pipelines on a comprehensive, industrywide basis. It also changes the existing pipeline safety information grant program, which helps ensure adequate funding of pipeline safety technical assistance grants to communities and nonprofit organizations. I am pleased that the legislation improves the protection of coastal beaches and marine coastal waters—areas that are vital to my district and to the districts of many others—by explicitly designating them as areas that are unusually sensitive to the environmental damage that is caused by pipeline failures. It also contains a provision that establishes a program for regulating underground natural gas storage facilities.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the full committee chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pipeline safety is especially personal for me. Back in 2010, we experienced a bad spill just outside of my district in southwest Michigan that impacted the Kalamazoo River. Ask anyone who was directly affected. Seeing the aftermath firsthand smacks the senses and leaves a lasting impression. While a spill can happen in an instant, the damage can take decades and, in fact, more than \$1 billion to fix. Underscoring the need for strong safety laws is what this bill does.

Congress asked the Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—that is PHMSA for short—to develop and enforce pipeline safety regulations. PHMSA doesn't do the job by itself. It relies heavily on partnerships with States and local governments to inspect the pipelines and, yes, to enforce the law; but the reality is that more can be done to prevent accidents from occurring and to mitigate spills when the unthinkable happens.

□ 1730

The amendment to the Senate bill before us today, this bill, incorporates texts from two House bills, which were both approved unanimously in committee: H.R. 5050, the Pipeline Safety Act, which passed the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and H.R. 4937, the PIPES Act of 2016, which passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

This important legislation will reauthorize PHMSA's pipeline safety through 2019, press PHMSA to complete overdue safety regs, and impose additional new safety requirements for pipeline operators.

I have often said that pipelines should be subject to greater scrutiny and more frequent inspections, and those that cross the Straits of Mackinac are a perfect example. The Straits of Mackinac is a narrow waterway that separates Michigan's two peninsulas. It connects Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. The exceptionally strong and complex currents hundreds of feet deep make this area tremendously sensitive. If a spill were to occur, the consequences would be unthinkable.

Our solution improves protections for the Great Lakes and other areas around the country where the threat of a spill poses the greatest risk to public safety and the environment. It also requires pipeline operators to consider a worst-case discharge into icy waters and conduct more frequent and transparent and, in some cases, annual inspections of deep underwater crossings. This bill does that.

We also update and improve PHMSA's pipeline safety program in a number of other ways by closing the gaps in Federal standards for underground natural gas storage and liquefied natural gas facilities. It promotes better use of data and technology and improves communication with pipeline operators to incorporate the lessons learned from past incidents.

We promised action, and today that is what this bill does. I am proud of the bipartisan agreement that will make a real difference. I am proud of the relationship that our committee has with Chairman SHUSTER and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and all the good work that everyone has done—Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, and our colleagues in the Senate. This is a bipartisan bill. Let's get 'er done.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act, the PIPES bill.

I thank the chairmen of the subcommittee, the full committee, and also the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative MIKE CAPUANO, and members of the Energy and Commerce Committee on our

side. This is a good bipartisan product, something that is pretty rare around here these days.

It reauthorizes the Department of Transportation's pipeline safety program for 4 years and includes a number of important measures that will better protect our communities, ensuring that pipelines are a safe means to transport natural gas, hazardous liquids, and crude oil.

Most importantly, this bill gives the Secretary of Transportation new emergency order authority to impose certain emergency restrictions and safety measures on pipeline operators to address an imminent hazard resulting from an incident or an unsafe practice, which is authority that doesn't currently exist.

Here is a good example. Fairly recently, we had a defective pipeline from China. We shouldn't be buying pipeline from China. But anyway, we had some defective, junky Chinese product pipeline, and there was an incident. But the administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Safety Materials Agency does not have the authority to order a nationwide inspection or removal of an imminent hazard, i.e., defective Chinese pipeline. All they could do was voluntary guidance.

Now, we will have emergency order authority. Some were concerned that they would use this as a way to end-run the regulatory process on other matters that are not an imminent hazard to health and safety, and there are provisions in the bill that would prevent that.

We are also pushing them to complete the mandates of the last bill, 2011, a bipartisan bill, where they have 16 mandates that Congress required that we felt were needed and prudent. And they are not through the regulatory process as yet. So we are moving them forward on that, and hopefully, the trolls down at the Office of Management and Budget who hold these things up—hello, do you live near a pipeline—that they will get the message and they will get these vital provisions that have been too long delayed.

It gives Federal, State, and emergency local responders MSDS sheets, safety sheets, so we know what the oil is. We have had past spills where we couldn't figure out what they were dealing with for days, and that is not acceptable.

It gives the agency the authority to have standards for underground natural gas storage facilities, but it allows States like Oregon, which has seven of these, to go above those standards so that the States can better protect their citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it would put a small fee on operators of underground storage tanks that would help to support the safety programs.

I would say with respect to funding, the bill is funded at current baseline levels. We should have provided them additional funds to carry out their numerous pipeline safety missions, but unfortunately, we couldn't reach bipartisan agreement on providing additional resources.

This bill does, however, increase grants to States to help them carry out their intrastate pipeline safety programs. It reauthorizes funding for pipeline safety information grants to communities, which are important to my constituents.

There are pipelines in places that no one is aware. There is one that runs down the middle of the Willamette Valley, all the way down, that supplies the Eugene Airport and a storage facility down in Eugene. A number of years ago, there was a news story, like: what pipeline? There are new developments going in. The signs are buried under blackberry bushes, and people aren't aware of these things. So we have to make certain those pipelines are safe.

The new provisions for coastal areas are absolutely critical to make sure those are maintained at the highest standard and built to the highest standard in other critical resource areas.

All in all, I congratulate my colleagues and recommend this bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the PIPES Act. I want to commend Chairman DENHAM, Ranking Member CAPUANO, and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for all the work they have put into this bill. I also want to thank Chairman FRED UPTON from the Energy and Commerce Committee for the great relationship we have been able to develop. In these bills, we share jurisdiction, so we have been able to work and incorporate provisions from both the committees.

I also want to thank my colleagues on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee who have worked with us over the past month to produce the legislation we are considering today.

Pipelines are vital for getting energy products to markets and users. It is one of the safest modes of transportation, if not the safest. I believe this bill will build on the safety advances that we have been making.

Congress last authorized the pipeline safety bill in 2011, and that bipartisan act charged DOT with updating regulations and procedures across a host of issues. But DOT needs to finish out those provisions, and this bill includes strong transparency and reporting requirements to keep pressure to finish the 2011 work.

Another major provision in this act provides PHMSA with emergency order authority for pipelines. Most other Department of Transportation modal ad-

ministrations have EO authority, which allows regulators to act quickly when they identify an industrywide safety issue that poses an imminent hazard to the public.

As we crafted this language, we took great care to balance a variety of concerns. This bill maintains the Transportation Committee language that requires PHMSA to consult with industry stakeholders and other regulators prior to issuing an EO so that PHMSA understands the potential impact on the economy, end users, and safety.

We also included extensive due process procedures on the back end so that if the agency makes a wrong call, affected parties will have redress, both administratively and judicially.

PHMSA is also required to issue regulations to carry out this authority, including requiring administrative law judge procedures that mirror similar requirements in the hazmat EO authority.

This is a good bill. It builds on the work that we did in 2011. It is developed in a bipartisan, bicameral manner.

Again, I thank Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PALLONE, and the Senate for their work and their leadership on this bill.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power—which, of course, I love that name—from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge some of my colleagues who worked together diligently with my office to draft this bipartisan PIPES Act that will help to modernize and secure our Nation's vast network of energy pipeline infrastructure.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I recognize my colleagues from the Energy and Commerce Committee, including Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE, as well as Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman ED WHITFIELD.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, including Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, as well as Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Chairman DENHAM and Ranking Member CAPUANO, the fine gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan piece of legislation improves safety by closing gaps in Federal standards and improving protection of coastal areas, including the Great Lakes.

Additionally, this bill will enhance the quality and timeliness of Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration rulemakings, promote better use of data and technology to improve pipeline safety, and leverage Federal and State pipeline safety resources to assist State and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine piece of bipartisan legislation, and I am honored

and privileged to stand before the House and ask all of my colleagues to support this outstanding bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in strong support of this legislation, which really includes some critical protections for one of our Nation's most precious assets. And that, of course, is the Great Lakes, which has 20 percent of our Nation's freshwater drinking supply, as well as it provides hundreds of jobs and billions of dollars of economic activity.

Today, there are millions of gallons per day of hazardous liquids which are transported through a number of lines in the Great Lakes. Mr. Speaker, we absolutely need energy in all transparency. We need the energy, but we need to make sure that we are transiting in a very safe and environmentally secure way because there is zero room for error in the Great Lakes.

There is a 62-year-old pipeline that is called line 5 that runs under the Straits of Mackinac, which is right in between Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. Any rupture there would be very, very difficult, if not impossible, to contain. This bill has a number of provisions in regards to line 5, for instance, that would conduct internal integrity assessments at least once a year.

This bill also designates the Great Lakes as a USA ecological resource, which is very important.

As well, it also makes sure that we have emergency spill response plans if, in the case of ice coverage, which really considers the unique environment of the Great Lakes.

In regards to Enbridge, there is also a line 6B which runs under the Saint Clair River, which is in my district. A number of years ago—and Chairman UPTON was talking about this particular line that had a spill just outside of his district—but this part of 6B runs under something called the Saint Clair River, again, a very environmentally sensitive artery for the Great Lakes.

We talked to Enbridge. And long story short, they came to the right conclusion there. They actually completely replaced almost 3,600 feet of this pipeline under the Saint Clair River. So they did the right thing there. They had been reluctant to address that.

Again, we need the energy, Mr. Speaker, but we need to make sure that we are transiting energy in a very safe way and in an environmentally sensitive way. I think this bill today goes a long way to address many of the concerns that we have had in the Great Lakes.

I thank Chairman DENHAM again for yielding the time and for taking these issues into consideration.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. GENE GREEN), my friend who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for letting us Energy and Commerce folks have some time.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the United States has more than 2.9 million miles of pipelines in our vast network. According to the Texas Pipeline Association, Texas has more than 320,000 miles of intrastate pipelines.

□ 1745

As a lifelong Houstonian, there has never been a time in my life when I haven't lived along a pipeline easement. Needless to say, in Texas, we know pipelines, but we also know about the importance of safety.

Every day, industry moves millions of gallons or cubic feet of domestically produced and refined product without any problems. Since 2005, the United States has seen a general decline in the number of pipeline releases or accidents that result in environmental damage or personal injury.

We understand that the compounds moved via pipeline pose a risk, and we must effectively manage and mitigate that risk to protect our citizens and the environment. Today I think we are taking another step in the right direction.

The bill before the House today is a good bill that attempts to lay down concrete rules of the road for the next 5 years. For the sake of our constituencies, we need to pass this bipartisan bill in a bipartisan way. I would like to voice my support for this bill and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Four years ago we gave PHMSA a job to do. While some of their work has been completed, there is still work to do. That is why this bill directs PHMSA to prioritize rulemaking and complete the work before them. We should not continue to add requirements on their plate. We should allow PHMSA the time and, most importantly, give them the resources required to finish this important job. I would like to express support for the PHMSA workforce management language.

We need inspectors in the field working closely with their industry partners to avoid another emergency situation. In my opinion, robust inspection is the best option available for everyone involved. If we reach the enforcement stage, that means something has gone wrong and we are too late. Industry, PHMSA, and the workers support this provision.

The second provision I would like to support is the emergency authority for PHMSA. While this provision may not be perfect, it represents a strong balance between enforcement and review. It is important to keep in mind that this is emergency authority. Unfortu-

nately, when there is an incident involving a pipeline, we need to act with speed, efficiency, and resolve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want our executive agencies on the scene ensuring we are protecting the people and the environment. We must ensure that people have confidence in the pipeline system, and effective crisis management will help build that belief.

I appreciate the hard work that went into crafting this provision. Compromise is not easy, so I want to thank both sides for drafting these provisions. I know there is more work ahead, but I look forward to supporting the current bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, a gas leak was discovered at one of the 115 wells at the Aliso Canyon natural gas storage facility located in my district near Porter Ranch, California. I want to thank Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, who lives in Porter Ranch and was a great partner in this terrible tragedy, making sure that people were taken care of and we could move past this and move quickly to getting this taken care of.

This leak persisted for 118 days and was recognized as one of the largest disasters of 2015. During this time, residents of the surrounding neighborhoods suffered. Some temporarily relocated their families. Two schools were permanently relocated, at least for that semester, and many businesses were put on hold.

As the Representative for Porter Ranch, my immediate priority was to protect my constituents who live there and then ensure that this situation was resolved as quickly as possible. At the same time, I wanted to make sure that a crisis like this can never happen in our communities again. Today we take a giant step forward in doing just that.

In February, I introduced the Natural Gas Leak Prevention Act, which would require the Secretary of Transportation to issue adequate safety standards for natural gas storage facilities like Aliso Canyon in Porter Ranch and another very large facility, Honor Rancho in Valencia, which is also in my district.

The SAFE PIPES Act contains the language from the Natural Gas Leak Prevention Act as well as provisions to create an Aliso Canyon task force that would investigate the causes of the leak and recommend further actions to prevent such disasters in the future.

This is the type of swift and effective action that we need in order to prevent our communities and our families from tragedies like the Porter Ranch gas leak.

I want to thank many people who were involved in this situation. A special thanks to Paula Cracium and the

entire neighborhood council for providing support to the community in its time of need. I would also like to thank my colleague, Representative JEFF DENHAM, for his efforts to move this measure forward, including flying down to my district in March to tour the facility with the people involved.

I would like to thank, as well, Senator DEB FISCHER and Chairman BILL SHUSTER for their immense support and the many staff members who worked tirelessly on this legislation.

This terrible tragedy had real impacts on the lives of thousands of people I represent. We cannot undo the damage that was done in Porter Ranch, but we can and must make sure every effort to mitigate the impacts on their day-to-day lives and assist in the recovery process.

It is time to move forward on comprehensive legislation to prevent another incident from happening in our communities ever again. I would like to say that this would never, ever happen again; but without action, without us moving forward, without people working together and Congress working together, this can happen. So this type of legislation is needed, and the people who are affected appreciate this; and the people who have worked on this, I appreciate very much.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from California pointed out, we in Porter Ranch experienced the largest natural gas leak in history. Seven thousand families were evacuated for months, and yet, as I speak, there are no Federal regulations for underground natural gas storage facilities, and the State regulations are surprisingly minimal, even in famously green California. Why? Because the natural gas industry and regulators believed that natural gas was only a problem if you were within a few hundred feet.

What we have experienced with this multibillion-cubic-foot leak is 7,000 families evacuated from an area in a 5-mile radius because the volatile organic compounds and the mercaptan in that natural gas caused enormous health problems. That is why I went to the President of the United States and the Vice President at the caucus that we attended and got a public commitment that we would get regulations probably this year.

This legislation is important because it makes it clear that, while PHMSA has the regulatory authority to act, if they don't act, they are required to act within 2 years under this legislation.

I am pleased to say that the legislation includes a provision that I think is very important and which I have championed from the beginning, and that is to clarify that a State can adopt tougher standards than whatever the Federal Government adopts.

The legislation also officially establishes the Department of Energy's

Aliso Canyon natural gas task force. That task force is already up and running. We are working with it. It is the brainchild of Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN, and I think formally establishing it in this regulation makes sense.

We need to adopt tough natural gas storage safety regulations for this entire country because Aliso Canyon, the storage facility next to Porter Ranch, was only the fifth largest natural gas storage field. There could be others. It could be in your district. That is why we need tough standards, and if we don't get them from PHMSA this year, we will have legislation requiring them within 2 years after the enactment of this legislation.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just like to close out by simply repeating what I said earlier. I am very happy, very proud to have worked on this bill. I am very happy and very satisfied with the way we worked cooperatively. I want to thank the staff on our side who worked on it, Jennifer Esposito Homendy and Steve Carlson on my staff. I want to thank all the staff on the Republican side.

I know that America has this view that we hate each other and we never talk to each other and we do nothing but call each other names. I have done that in private, of course, but the truth is this is exactly the way it is supposed to work. Absent not getting a few things I wanted, this was actually a pleasure to work on. I am very proud of the work product. I am very proud of the work environment that we have. I think this is a bill that the American people can be proud of. I think it is a bill that the Congress can be proud of.

Again, I want to thank everyone who worked with us on this. I look forward to the President's signature.

Again, I want to thank the staff. Let's be honest, we take all the credit. We do the big speeches and all that kind of stuff, but without the staff, we couldn't get this done. I want to thank everybody involved with it for their professionalism, for their enthusiasm, for their long nights and difficult time. I look forward to doing this again in 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. CAPUANO has been a great partner in this. This has been going on for many years now, many months of roundtables, many months of hearings, and it has been a true pleasure working together in a bipartisan way to address our differences, but most importantly, to actually address the safety of the American public.

This is a big bill: 2.6 million miles of pipeline, 64 percent of our Nation's energy. We didn't take it lightly. We

wanted to hear from the public. We wanted to hear from stakeholders across the country, and we wanted to hear from Members across the country representing their districts. It was truly a bipartisan effort.

We appreciate the support and work of the ranking member and full committee chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce as well as the ranking member and the committee chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Specifically, I want to thank Mr. KNIGHT for his leadership on this issue. You never expect to have an emergency in the middle of deliberating on a bill. In this case, we did. He showed real leadership in coming to the table and inviting us out to his district to see it firsthand so that we could actually address safety concerns in this bill as well. It is a great bill to improve the safety of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the final passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House Amendment to S. 2276.

Millions of miles of natural gas and hazardous liquid pipelines crisscross our country and touch countless communities. While these pipelines are an essential part of our nation's energy infrastructure, we all know—many from first-hand experience—that our reliance on these pipelines is inherently risky. Too often we hear of a pipeline failure, just like the Plains pipeline spill in my congressional district last year, which harms the health of local communities, the regional economy, and the environment. And we know that it really isn't a question of if there will be another spill in another community, but when.

With that in mind it is clear that we must do all we can to prevent the next spill from occurring and mitigate the damage when it does. We need to make the oil and gas industries that rely on these vulnerable methods of transportation more transparent and safer. We need to ensure that the federal regulator, the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA), has the tools it needs to ensure the safe operation of natural gas and hazardous liquid pipelines under federal jurisdiction. And we owe it to the communities who are still picking up the pieces from these incidents to do all we can to learn from these tragedies to protect others in the future.

The bill before us today is an important step to do just that. This bill would provide PHMSA with the emergency order authority to appropriately respond to systemic pipeline issues. And it would ensure that important, long overdue rules are finalized and implemented, including the rules for automatic shutoff valves and leak detection. This technology is critical to minimizing the damage when a spill does occur.

This bill also includes specific provisions that apply the lessons learned from the Plains spill. Specifically, this legislation would mandate a study on the causes of corrosion including risks associated with insulated pipelines—the underlying cause of the Plains failure—and the best methods to prevent corrosion from occurring in this infrastructure. This legislation would also improve protection of

coastal areas, including coastal beaches, marine coastal waters, and the Great Lakes, by explicitly designating them as “unusually sensitive areas.” This will bring more stringent safety requirements to these particularly vulnerable areas like my community. Finally, this legislation would require a report examining ways to improve hazardous liquid pipeline safety through integrity management actions, including an analysis of risk factors that may warrant more frequent inspections.

While nothing can take us back to prevent the Plains spill, this bill as a whole is an important, bipartisan effort to protect my and other communities going forward. And that is why I support it. We must embrace this opportunity for the sake of the health and safety of our constituents and the environment.

I would like to thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE as well as subcommittee Ranking Member RUSH for working with me to craft a bill that addresses the failures that led to the Plains spill. I would also like to commend staff from both the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working in a bipartisan and bicameral way to get to this final product.

Our constituents are relying on us. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I hope we are able to send S. 2276 to the President for his signature in the very near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2276, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DuBOIS AREA MIDDLE SCHOOL ON BEING NAMED A “SCHOOL TO WATCH”

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the students and staff at the DuBois Area Middle School on being named a Pennsylvania Don Eichhorn School to Watch. This is the 12th consecutive year that the middle school has earned this distinction, one of only two middle schools in the State to do so.

The Schools to Watch program was started in 1999 as a national program to identify exceptional middle schools across the country. As part of the program, State teams observe classrooms; interview administrators, teachers, parents, and students; and look at achievement data, suspension rates, quality of lessons, and student work.

DuBois Area Middle School will be formally recognized at an event coming up on June 25 in Arlington at the national Schools to Watch Conference.

Maintaining this level of excellence over more than a decade is hard work. I have the highest respect for the students, the staff, and the administration at the DuBois Area Middle School. I wish them the best of success in the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MUHAMMAD ALI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys of representing Louisville in the House of Representatives is that I get to constantly claim that I represent Muhammad Ali and the home of Muhammad Ali. It has always been a source of pride not just to me, but to all of my fellow Louisvillians that we could say that the Louisville Lip, the greatest of all time, called Louisville home.

Now one of the brightest lights in the world has extinguished. Muhammad Ali passed away last Friday after a long and courageous battle with Parkinson's disease, and the world has experienced a collective grief period. The joy of his accomplishments, the recognition of his commitment to peace, to tolerance, to respect, to love, all of those things, have come from all over the world.

□ 1800

So tonight, some of my colleagues and I have come to the floor to talk about Muhammad Ali, his life, his legacy, personal stories, the impact that he has had on our lives and on this country's life and on the world. He will be laid to rest this Friday in Louisville. Former President Clinton will eulogize him, and many leaders from around the world will be there to pay their respects.

But I go back many, many years. When I was 16 years old, living in Louisville, having watched him—then, Cassius Clay, an 8-to-1 underdog—upset the great, terrifying Sonny Liston in Miami, and then going to the airport the next day to welcome him home.

I stood outside the airport. There weren't a lot of people there that day. And as Cassius Clay emerged from that terminal and looked around and drew himself up, I said I had never seen a more beautiful human specimen in my life.

So when he called himself not just the greatest of all time, but the

prettiest of all time, I was not going to argue with him. Of course, I wasn't going to argue with him about much.

That was my first personal exposure to Muhammad Ali. He was a man who gained fame in a violent game, but he earned his immortality as a kind, gentle, and caring soul. In the later years, when I got to know him better and spent more time around him, that is the one thing that always came through: his wonderful soul.

I don't know that I have ever known a person or seen a person who got more joy out of making a child smile as Muhammad Ali. And there was never a time when he was in the presence of children where he didn't make an effort to stop, joke with them, play with them. That was a source of incredible joy for him.

So, as we remember Muhammad Ali tonight, we remember not just his boxing prowess. We remember the courage he showed outside the ring.

He came to age in a very, very turbulent period in American history: during the civil rights demonstrations, when America was experiencing a convulsion over how to deal with the issue of race. And then the Vietnam war—a war whose opposition Ali paid a dear price for in 1967—refusing to be drafted into the armed services, knowing that it would cost him his boxing career, understanding that he might well go to jail and never fight again, but willing to stand for principles. And in doing that, I think he turned the country around and made them view the Vietnam war in a different light. It wouldn't have happened, but for Muhammad Ali. He was not the only one, of course, but he was the most prominent one.

Later, who can forget lighting that torch in the Atlanta Olympics in 1996, shaking from the Parkinson's disease that he had, but inspiring millions. And, again, making a statement about disabilities that meant so much to so many.

So tonight, as we hear from various Members about Muhammad Ali, I think what will come through is not just, again, his skills as an athlete, but his contributions as a citizen of the world and someone who has left a lasting legacy, not just on people's lives individually, but on the civilization as a whole.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Mr. YARMUTH for putting together this hour. I think it is important that we recognize icons in our society and people who have contributed so much, as you well expressed, to American culture and to the thinking in our country about war, about race, and about people with disabilities. Those are three very, very major areas that Muhammad Ali had a great impact on.

You related back to when you were 16 years old. I was not quite 15 years old. At that time, my family had moved to Coral Gables, Florida. We lived there