

The Commission also set out minimum service standards for Lifeline-supported services to ensure maximum value for the universal service dollar, and established a National Eligibility Verifier to make independent subscriber eligibility determinations.

Lifeline enables the most vulnerable among us to be participating members of our society; cutting wireless services could prevent individuals from being able to, among other things: receive a communication about a child's illness at school while they are at work; summon medical help in a car accident; speak with their employers about additional work shifts while commuting by public transit; or

alert first-responders of public emergencies (such as a fast-moving fire, a flooded road, or a violent attack) that pose a threat to the larger community.

Today, 9.8 million Americans depend on the Lifeline program to stay connected using mobile phones.

The legislation comes on the heels of real enforcement by the FCC to crack down on carriers that have abused the program, including a \$51 million fine against Total Call Mobile announced in April.

Even more, this shameful bill was not considered under regular order and has not been considered by any committee.

If the critics of the Lifeline program sincerely think the costs of the program are a problem, they should work with Democrats to address inequality, to close the gender pay gap, to raise the minimum wage, and to put more people to work through universal broadband infrastructure projects.

The Lifeline Program is working in my state of Texas.

Texans are eligible for lifeline cell phone service if they receive benefits from any of the following programs:

National School Lunch (free program only);
Federal Public Housing Assistance / Section 8;

Health Benefit Coverage under Children's Health Insurance Plan (CHIP);

Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP)

Medicaid;
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Food Stamps);

Supplemental Security Income (SSI);
Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance;
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;
Tribally-Administered Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;

Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations;

You may also qualify for lifeline service in Texas if your Total Household Income is at or under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.

For these reasons I join the NAACP in strongly opposing H.R. 5525, because it will do real damage to our national effort to expand indispensable access to telephone and cellphone service.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 5525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5525.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORIZING USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4369) to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4369

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

SECTION 1. USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On December 22, 2015, the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles Board of Airports, the Ontario City Council, and the Ontario International Airport Authority agreed to transfer ownership and control of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports to the Ontario International Airport Authority, a local joint powers authority established by and between the county of San Bernardino and the city of Ontario.

(2) Pursuant to the agreement, the Ontario International Airport Authority intends to use between \$70,000,000 and \$120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected at Ontario International Airport to finance eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport, as compensation for passenger facility charges collected, consistent with section 40117(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, at Los Angeles International Airport for use at Ontario International Airport in the 1990s, when both airports were controlled by Los Angeles World Airports.

(3) The amendment made by subsection (b) applies exclusively to Ontario International Airport, allowing passenger facility charges to be used for eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport while making no other changes to passenger facility charges eligibility requirements.

(4) No additional appropriations are required to implement the agreement described in paragraph (1) or the amendment made by subsection (b).

(b) PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES.—Section 40117(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) USE OF PFC REVENUES AT PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (1) and subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may authorize use of a passenger facility charge to finance an eligible airport-related project if—

“(i) the eligible agency seeking to impose the new charge controls an airport where a \$2 passenger facility charge became effective on January 1, 2013; and

“(ii) the airport described in clause (i) and the airport at which the project will be carried out were under the control of the same eligible agency on October 1, 2015.

“(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than \$120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected under subparagraph (A) may be used to carry out an eligible airport-related project described in that subparagraph.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4369.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4369, a bill that will provide regulatory relief to Los Angeles International Airport and Ontario International Airport and facilitate a transfer of Ontario International Airport to a new airport authority.

I want to thank Mr. CALVERT, the sponsor of the bill, for introducing this legislation and for his leadership on this issue.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4369.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4369, as you heard, is a bipartisan, narrowly tailored bill to address a time-sensitive issue in southern California that impacts the Ontario and Los Angeles International Airports, both of which serve my district in southern Nevada.

This bill has the support of my colleagues from southern California, and I appreciate them coming to the floor today to speak about its importance to their districts.

Mr. Speaker, when one airport authority takes ownership of an airport from another authority, there needs to be a process by which that new authority can repay the passenger facility charges that were collected up to that point. This bill would provide such a mechanism.

There is urgency in addressing this issue, as the current transfer authority between these two airports is set to expire at the end of this year. I support that, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the fact that, while we stand on the floor today discussing this urgent matter affecting our aviation system, we are mere weeks away from

the expiration of the third extension of the current FAA authorization bill.

Months ago, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee passed legislation which includes numerous time-sensitive and important provisions. Yet, because of a proposal to privatize our air traffic control system, I, along with my fellow Democrats on the committee, were forced to oppose the bill. Meanwhile, our Senate colleagues have passed a bipartisan FAA bill with overwhelming support.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am in favor of this legislation that we are considering today, but it is my sincere hope that we will see a similar urgency in addressing other aviation needs, like the needs of large airports like McCarran International Airport, in my district; the need to extend the authorization for the unmanned aerial test ranges; the need to develop a low-altitude air traffic management system for UAS operations; and the need to address a number of the important issues that are facing our Nation's airspace that are in the FAA reauthorization bill.

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, today is a good day for the Inland Empire region in southern California. For many years now, our region has advocated for restoring local control of Ontario International Airport and putting the future growth of air travel in our own hands.

My legislation that the House is considering today, H.R. 4369, is one of the final necessary steps that will facilitate the transfer of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles to the Ontario International Airport Authority.

Both the cities of Ontario and Los Angeles, as well as FAA staff, have put in hundreds of hours of effort to approve and prepare for the management transfer of this hub airport.

When both Ontario International Airport and Los Angeles International Airport were operated by the same agencies, passenger facility charges, or PFCs, collected at one airport could be used for the projects at the other one.

□ 1445

Going forward, H.R. 4369 will enable a certain amount of passenger facility charges collected at the now independent Ontario International Airport to be used for projects at Los Angeles International Airport as a way to pay back LAX for sharing its passenger facility charges in the past years. Since it is not possible under existing law today, we are fixing this glitch.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support and will not cost the taxpayers a penny. Furthermore, the bill does nothing to increase passenger facility charges or any other fees for airport passengers.

H.R. 4369 is supported by all stakeholders, including the FAA, the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles World Airports, the City of Ontario, and the Ontario International Airport Authority. The bill is supported by the entire bipartisan Inland Empire delegation, including Representative TORRES, Representative AGUILAR, Representative COOK, Representative ROYCE, Representative RUIZ, and Representative TAKANO.

Over in the Senate, Senator FEINSTEIN has introduced identical legislation, and I am hopeful the Senate can quickly approve this bill after we pass it here today.

There have been many people involved in this effort over the past few years. I want to specifically thank FAA Administrator Michael Huerta, Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti, Ontario Councilmen Alan Wapner and Jim Bowman, as well as the rest of the Ontario City Council and other elected officials from throughout the Inland Empire who have supported restoring local control of Ontario Airport.

I also want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY and Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER for helping us move this important legislation to the House floor today.

The Inland Empire has and continues to be one of the fastest growing regions in California and in the Nation, and it is far past time that we control our own aviation future. I am confident, with local control restored, Ontario International Airport will be a significant contributor to future economic growth in our region.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who is a cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today is a key step to finalizing the transfer of local control of the Ontario International Airport, a transfer which, after lengthy negotiations, was finally agreed to by all parties last year.

This transfer, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. Ontario Airport, located in my congressional district, is a major economic driver for the Inland Empire region.

When Los Angeles World Airports began operating Ontario back in 1967, it was with the intention of attracting more airlines and service options to the Inland Empire. Well, circumstances have changed quite a bit since that time.

The Inland Empire isn't just the outskirts of Los Angeles anymore. It is a rapidly growing region, attracting more and more new residents and businesses with a strategic location along a major freight corridor that makes it a hub for manufactured and agricultural goods.

It also provides more convenient air travel options to residents of San

Bernardino and Riverside Counties who, otherwise, would have to travel up to 2 or 3 hours to fly out of LAX.

Transferring control of the airport back to Ontario means that the people who are most affected and who most closely understand the needs of the region are the ones who are going to be shaping the airport's future. This transfer is not possible without the legislation we are considering today.

As part of the settlement agreement, \$120 million of passenger facility revenue collected at Ontario will be used for FAA-qualified capital projects at LAX. \$50 million of that will come from existing passenger facilities fees that are controlled by LAWA, but were collected at Ontario. The remaining \$70 million will come from future passenger facility charges collected at Ontario within the next 10 years. These are funds that have always been intended to go to LAWA for projects at LAX.

Congress must now pass this one-time fix that will allow the transfer of funds from one airport authority to another. Otherwise, once control of Ontario Airport shifts to the Ontario International Airport Authority, there will be no mechanism to transfer the funds to LAWA as they have agreed. Without this bill, the agreement cannot move forward, and the FAA cannot approve the agreement and grant the Ontario International Airport Authority a certificate to operate.

Many of us have been calling for local control of Ontario Airport for quite a long time, and this agreement has been years in the making. All parties have agreed to the terms and are ready to move forward. As a frequent flier out of Ontario, I hope Congress does not stand in its way.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman CALVERT, for helping to bring this important bill to the floor, and the rest of the Inland Empire delegation for their support.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), another cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Inland Empire should have control of its regional airport, and local residents should have access to affordable domestic and international flights.

With that in mind, I rise in support of H.R. 4369, which would facilitate the transfer of Ontario International Airport from the City of Los Angeles.

While the number of flights offered at Ontario Airport has decreased, the demand for those flights has not. Industry experts estimate that 2 million passengers a year are forced to drive to Los Angeles or other regional airports due to the lack of flights and connections offered at Ontario. The region is

losing up to 8,000 jobs and \$400 million in yearly business activity.

As the Inland Empire continues to grow in population, it needs the Ontario International Airport to be under local control. It is a vital economic resource to our region, with the potential to serve 30 million passengers annually, and it is a conflict of interest for Los Angeles World Airports to control Ontario, a direct competitor.

On a personal note, I am ready to give up the long commute from Riverside to LAX. And in that spirit, 3 years ago I wrote a letter to Mayor Garcetti of Los Angeles outlining the need to transfer control of Ontario Airport to our region. I am happy that we are finally moving forward with this legislation to ensure an arrangement that is best for the Inland Empire.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman KEN CALVERT and Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, and all the rest of our delegation from the Inland Empire of southern California, for their hard work on this issue. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. I also extend my thanks to the gentlewoman from Nevada for her support.

I strongly urge a “yes” vote on this bill.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no further speakers. I just want to say that I support this legislation. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I also admonish them to show the same degree of urgency when it comes to reauthorizing the FAA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill of my colleague, Mr. CALVERT.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4369, “A bill that authorizes the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.”

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I strongly support this commonsense measure to improve and sustain airport security.

Since its inception, Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) have been used to improve safety, enhance security, and increase the capacity of airports to serve the traveling public.

A Passenger Facility Charge is a service fee and is also an additional fee charged to departing and connecting passengers at an airport.

H.R. 4369 clarifies and streamlines opportunities that will help ease travel through our nation’s airports while improving our national security.

For example this bill will enable:

The preservation and protection of the nation’s air transportation system;

Enhanced competition between and among air carriers;

Funding projects that benefit local communities; and

Meeting airline and passenger demands to accommodate future growth for our nation’s economy.

In 2015, more than 700 million passengers and 400 million checked bags were screened by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

Each day, TSA processes an average of 1.7 million passengers at more than 450 airports across the nation.

In 2012, TSA screened 637,582,122 passengers.

The Bush International and the William P. Hobby Airports are essential hubs for domestic and international air travel for Houston and the region.

Nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush International Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU).

More than 650 daily departures occur at IAH.

IAH is the 11th busiest airport in the U.S. for total passenger traffic.

IAH has 12 all-cargo airlines and handled more than 419,205 metric tons of cargo in 2012.

Airlines and airports are expected to experience a significant increase in passenger traffic coming into the 2016 summer peak travel months across the nation’s largest airports.

As a result of the Passenger Facility Charges airports will continue to receive the needed funds to modernize and keep up with the growing traffic demands and safety and security challenges of our nation’s airports.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4369, which would allow for a local settlement agreement in Southern California between the City of Los Angeles and the new Ontario Airport Authority.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for bringing this bill to the House floor today, and I thank Congresswoman TITUS for managing the floor debate.

I would also like to thank my bipartisan colleagues from California, Rep. CALVERT and Rep. TORRES, for their leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, after 5 years of negotiations the City of Los Angeles has agreed to transfer its ownership of the Ontario Airport to a new airport authority created by the City of Ontario and San Bernardino County.

This deal has been supported by all stakeholders in order to give the people of the Inland Empire in Southern California control over their own airport.

The residents, businesses, and cities in my district in the San Gabriel Valley are also very supportive of this agreement. The Ontario Airport is only 15 miles from the center of my district, whereas Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is 40 miles from the center of my district, and there is constant traffic. San Gabriel Valley residents and businesses would much rather use Ontario Airport than LAX if it had better flight options to more locations, which this bill will help accomplish. Allowing for local control of the airport puts the best interest of our region first in improving and managing the airport. I am also appreciative that this agreement makes sure that airport workers will not lose their jobs during and after the transition.

The major point in this local agreement was providing for the repayment of passenger facility charge fees (PFCs) that Los Angeles had collected at LAX in the 1990s and used to construct a new terminal at Ontario Airport.

The settlement agreement requires Ontario Airport to pay back LAX with future PFCs collected at Ontario. The problem is that federal law only allows the transfer of PFCs from one airport to another airport if they are owned by the same airport authority. This is the current law that allowed LAX to transfer PFCs to Ontario.

Since the new agreement transfers control of Ontario Airport to a new airport authority, without our legislation the new Ontario Airport authority is prohibited from paying back the PFCs to LAX.

Mr. Speaker, our bill today is a narrow change in the use of PFCs to allow those collected at Ontario International Airport to be used for projects at LAX. This amendment was carefully written as to only apply to Ontario Airport and LAX. There are no federal funds used in this amendment, and it does not change any of the policy requirements of the use of PFCs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of my colleagues for H.R. 4369.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4369.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR RAPID INNOVATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5388) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5388

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 319. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support the research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of cybersecurity technologies, including fundamental research to improve the sharing of information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with current law.

“(b) ACTIVITIES.—The research and development supported under subsection (a) shall serve the components of the Department and shall—