

This amendment would require FERC to issue a supplemental environmental impact statement if there is critical new information relevant to a pipeline proposal, and to require mitigation plans for adverse impacts if not already provided.

The case of the Mountain Valley Pipeline demonstrated how the current FERC process has failed us and why this amendment is necessary.

I recently wrote a letter to FERC on this very issue, asking that they initiate a supplemental environmental impact statement before moving forward with the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity.

Quite simply, the process was flawed.

In response to a September 2016 draft environmental impact statement, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, had to present more information and an updated route for the pipeline proposal to FERC. Originally, Mr. Chairman, they offered 1,000 pages of updates for public comment, but then their updates extended beyond the public comment period, which ended in December 2016, and included thousands of additional pages of crucially important information—20,000 pages of crucially important information. Think about how long it would take to read 20,000 pages.

What is most egregious is that, because this document dump came after the public comment period had ended, affected stakeholders weren't able to offer their comments for FERC consideration. They had already closed the public comment period, but the pipeline company was still submitting thousands of pages.

Even more ridiculous, the developers have continued to add more documents, even after FERC issued the final environmental impact statement. So apparently it wasn't final in the eyes of the developers.

For many, FERC's recent decision to issue this final statement for the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline is patently alarming.

The appropriate course would be to issue a supplemental environmental impact statement and allow for public comment on those 20,000 pages.

Let's fix this woefully incompetent process.

Local communities affected most by proposed energy infrastructure projects naturally have concerns regarding the projects near them.

On my extensive visits to southwest Virginia last summer, there were two kinds of signs everywhere, Mr. Chairman. There were "Make America Great Again, Donald Trump for President," and there were "No Mountain Valley Pipeline."

They deserve the opportunity to express their views fully and to participate in a robust public engagement process, especially for projects which will use eminent domain to seize their private land from homeowners and farmers.

If there are major changes offered after the public comment period is

open, let's make sure the public has the ability to weigh in with their proposals.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, FERC is the lead agency for siting interstate natural gas pipelines. We all know that. But there are a number of other Federal and State agencies that also have to issue associated permits for large-scale projects.

□ 1530

Through the FERC prefile process, sponsors engage with landowners, local communities, and government agencies to educate stakeholders and collect the information about the best location for siting that pipeline.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2910, brings much-needed certainty and transparency to the process by encouraging the stakeholders to participate in good faith early in the process. Unfortunately, this amendment, the way that we read it, would create more uncertainty and create more opportunities for delays.

The overwhelming majority of Americans strongly support expanding the infrastructure. Creating the jobs, the pipelines, ensures stable and affordable supplies. Flexibility, affordable, and reliable energy is important for American families and businesses to thrive.

I would note, at this point we still don't have a quorum with FERC, and we want that to change. That will be an issue that goes through the confirmation process in the Senate, but consumers really only benefit from domestic energy if we can get it to them.

Investing in infrastructure is a smart investment, so I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I very much agree with the lead sponsor of the bill, Mr. UPTON, that we don't want any more uncertainty, and we certainly don't want more delays.

In fact, this amendment was originally in a bipartisan bill sponsored by my Republican friend from Virginia, MORGAN GRIFFITH. I literally lifted it word for word.

What we want to do is make sure that all of the information is on the table at the beginning. It is just not fair to the people who are affected by a pipeline that an environmental impact statement is issued and they wouldn't have a chance to comment on it.

So let's make sure that the developers are putting all of the information out first. And if they put it out and the public comment period closes and then they give you the rest of the information, then, clearly, FERC has made the

decision without all that, and the public has been cheated out of the ability to comment on what is going to happen to their land and to their homes. It is just not fair.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this good, bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLORES) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2883.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution H.R. 2883 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2883.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1534

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

This legislation continues the great tradition of bipartisan legislation coming out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Our focus has been and will continue to be building America's infrastructure, creating jobs, and strengthening our economy.

I want to congratulate my colleagues and sponsors of this bill, particularly Mr. MULLIN and Mr. GENE GREEN, Republican and Democrat, for their work on this legislation.

H.R. 2883 would establish coordinated procedures to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas, and the transmission of electricity. That is what the bill does.

The legislation would replace the requirements established under executive order that persons obtain a Presidential permit before constructing an oil and gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that crosses the border between the U.S., Mexico, and Canada.

To date, Congress has not asserted its authority to establish proceedings for permitting cross-border energy infrastructure. In the absence of a statutorily directed process, agencies have made decisions regarding cross-border energy infrastructure within the context of their interpretation of a series of executive orders dating back to the 1950s.

Recent proposals, most notably the Keystone XL pipeline, have faced significant and unnecessary delays as a result of political interference in what should have been a straightforward review. There is bipartisan agreement that we should have a free flow of energy in North America.

This bill is going to level the playing field for energy infrastructure projects located at the international border. The legislation takes important steps to bring fairness to the process and provide certainty to countries whom we already have a free trade agreement with and businesses that want to create jobs in the U.S. It is going to strengthen our effort to improve and update NAFTA and enhance our trilateral trading relationships.

It is time Congress exercised its constitutional authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and replace the Presidential permit requirement with a more transparent, efficient, and effective review process.

Establishing the cross-border permitting process in law would lead to more objective and timely decisions, which,

in turn, is going to create the jobs, strengthen our Nation's energy security, and support affordable and reliable energy for all Americans.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for their efforts on this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act. My Republican colleagues argue that we need more bills like H.R. 2883 to extract and transport more oil and gas as quickly as possible. But building a modern energy infrastructure for the 21st century requires a lot more than drilling wells, laying more pipelines, filling more railcars with crude oil, and putting more tanker trucks on our highways.

A modern, American, 21st century energy infrastructure plan must address the threat of climate change. This is the biggest energy challenge that we face as a country. We cannot have a meaningful conversation about America's energy infrastructure without also having a conversation about the changing climate and the huge costs heaped on hardworking American families and businesses because of the change in climate.

I am proud to represent the State of Florida, but here is what my neighbors are experiencing now: higher AC bills, more extreme weather events, heat waves, higher cost for flood insurance and property insurance, and property taxes that are having to go now to repair our water and wastewater infrastructure on the coast.

We have a rapidly diminishing window to act to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change are irreversible. The energy infrastructure decisions that we make today will have a real impact on whether we can mitigate climate change in the future. We need to understand this risk before we lock in infrastructure that will produce carbon pollution for decades to come.

This bill's supporters don't like to be reminded of the daunting challenges of the changing climate. That is reflected in our discussion today, and, frankly, it is reflected in the glaring inaction of this Republican Congress to address climate change.

If enacted into law, H.R. 2883 would move us backwards in our fight for the clean energy economy and the jobs of the future. H.R. 2883 would rubber-stamp permits for pipelines to carry oil, natural gas, even tar sands crude into the United States.

Tar sands crude is the dirtiest fuel on the planet from a climate perspective, and this bill creates a permitting process for cross-border pipelines that make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Federal Government to say no to any of these projects.

This bill asserts that every cross-border energy project is always in the pub-

lic interest. It is up to a project's opponent to try to prove otherwise. The bill even allows the oil industry to make major modifications to its pipelines without getting any approval at all. That means, if a company wants to increase its pipeline capacity or reverse an existing pipeline to carry more oil, natural gas, or tar sands crude into the United States, the company can do just that, no questions asked.

Building new pipelines or expanding existing ones could have a profound environmental impact, but the bill allows for no meaningful environmental review for a cross-border pipeline. The bill says the Federal Government can only examine the cross-border segment of the project.

Who thought that up? That is very creative.

It is almost hard to believe that this is what the bill does, but it is true. For a pipeline spanning hundreds of miles, the environmental review will focus on only that tiny part that crosses the U.S. border. That is irresponsible. That would eliminate the possibility of any meaningful examination of the carbon pollution impacts of these pipelines.

We should be examining the carbon impact of every pipeline before we approve it. Many are very important. But to do so without important environmental reviews in this day and age is frightening.

The future will belong to the country that builds an energy infrastructure to support a cleaner, lower carbon economy, and it is our responsibility to lead the country in the clean energy future with all of the jobs, consumer savings, and economic growth that would be provided.

This bill also provides more proof of what is plain: In this Republican-led Congress, it is, unfortunately, likely to go down in history as having failed to meet one of its greatest responsibilities of this time—the challenge of the changing climate. Our children and grandchildren will be poorer for it, and they will ask us, and especially my Republican colleagues: Why didn't you act when you had the chance?

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee for yielding me the time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

The Presidential permitting process dates back through many administrations, beginning with the administration of Ulysses S. Grant. The executive branch has taken the necessary steps to ensure our cross-border infrastructure with Canada and Mexico was constructed.

These past administrations, and even the current administration, were

forced to issue executive orders because Congress failed to act. Congress has the duty to regulate the commerce of the United States, and cross-border energy infrastructure projects fall well within that space.

Opponents of this bill argue the executive permitting process has worked well in the past. It is true that in the past the process has been proven effective. Unfortunately, cross-border decisions have now fallen victim to election year-cycle politics.

We cannot build infrastructure in this country or on the continent based on who sits in the White House, whether they be Democrat or Republican. It is Congress' responsibility to create regulatory rules by which infrastructure is constructed.

□ 1545

This bill will create a regulatory process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Department of State, and the Department of Energy to permit cross-border infrastructure. It is not different than building roads, bridges, or railways. The Department of Transportation coordinates with the Federal, State, and local agencies to ensure projects are completed and the environment is protected. We will do the same thing for pipes and wires. We need to build electric transmission lines and pipelines to move resources from where they are to where they are needed.

The bill complies with the National Environmental Policy Act and requires a full environmental review of any cross-border facility including analysis of climate change impacts. More so, the entire length of the pipeline or electric transmission line will be reviewed for environmental impacts not just for the cross-border pipeline.

While there is some confusion on this issue, opponents of the bill talk about how we will gut the NEPA process—the National Environmental Policy Act. This is simply not the case. My colleague from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) will offer a bipartisan amendment to the bill clarifying that the scope of the National Environmental Policy Act review shall not be limited in any way by this act.

The bill is about the future and how to meet energy demands for the 21st century. We should embrace the changes taking place in North America and harmonize our policies with those of our neighbors both to the north with Canada and to the south with Mexico, and this bill, if it becomes law, will do that.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are here talking about how to take politics out of our infrastructure. As we just heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), this is a bipartisan bill. We hear a lot of stuff about it damaging the environment; it doesn't. We are talking about crossing a border and taking a situation that was held up for

8 years with the Keystone pipeline and making sure it has the transparent and consistent approach on how we regulate these permits.

The United States is a powerhouse around the world. We want to keep it that way. We want our country to compete freely in the global market and continue to positively benefit our economy. My bill, H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, supports the construction of energy infrastructure across our North America borders.

Simply put, this bill takes the politics out of energy infrastructure projects. The construction of these border-crossing facilities should be done effectively and efficiently without getting caught up in our Nation's politics. These facilities are used for importing and exporting oil, natural gas, and electricity that enhance the trade of our energy products that benefit our economy.

This bipartisan piece of legislation allows a transparent and efficient process to be followed the same way every time and for every project. Most importantly, it provides regulatory certainty to those charged with carrying out these projects. I want to thank this House for allowing such bills to come forth and the opportunity to allow this bill to be heard.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, lest anyone be left with the impression that there is a problem with cross-border pipeline approvals, the U.S. Energy Information Administration, from a December 2016 report, says that over the last 5 years, natural gas pipeline capacity between the U.S. and Mexico has grown substantially and is projected to double through 2018.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

This bill would enact crucial reforms allowing efficient trade of energy products with our North American friends and allies. Unfortunately, the existing process has politicized vital cross-border energy infrastructure.

H.R. 2883 offers a narrowly crafted, sensible solution to this problem. The bill will create a process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, State Department, and the Department of Energy to permit cross-border infrastructure projects.

This new procedure will bring regulatory certainty while ensuring these projects are environmentally sound and within public interest. These projects create jobs in my district in south Texas and across the country.

I congratulate and thank Mr. GREEN and Mr. MULLIN for this important piece of legislation. Energy security, targeted regulatory reforms, and smart infrastructure investments are things

we can all support, and we should all support.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on this sensible bipartisan legislation.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, as you have heard, two of my colleagues from Texas have just come out, obviously, in support of this bill. There is not a lot that Texas and Oklahoma agree on, especially this time of the year when we enter football season. Other than that, we agree that Oklahoma is better at football than Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman MULLIN for partnering together.

Like he said, Texas and Oklahoma have a lot of things in common. We both are energy States. But believe me, the Red River does divide us on football.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Union of Operating Engineers, a letter from Edison Electric Institute, a letter from the IOSA, and a letter from the Plains All American Pipeline all in support of this bill.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS, AFFILIATED WITH THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

July 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) supports H.R. 2883, the Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, legislation that provides clear congressional authority to the process of evaluating transnational pipeline projects. Further, the IUOE endorses H.R. 2910, a bill Promoting Inter-Agency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act.

We respectfully request that you support both of these pieces of legislation when they come to the floor of the House of Representatives this week.

The International Union of Operating Engineers represents 400,000 working men and women in the United States and Canada, thousands of whom build and maintain the nation's energy infrastructure. We are one of four unions that are signatory to the National Pipeline Agreement. Operating Engineers perform millions of hours of work on pipeline projects around the United States every year; millions of additional hours were performed on pipeline work by IUOE members in Canada.

North America's energy network is inextricably linked. Eliminating legal and regulatory uncertainty regarding the permitting of cross-border energy facilities will promote investment and job creation in North America, and that is why the IUOE supports H.R. 2883. Removing these regulatory barriers will ultimately increase the interconnection of the North American energy network and at the same time improve reliability, security, and affordability.

Today, the process for permitting this energy infrastructure lives only through Executive Order. North America's energy future is simply too important to leave to the ambiguity and imprecision of administrative fiat.

Granting clear legislative authority and delegating responsibility to an agency experienced with the National Environmental Policy Act and permitting processes, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), rather than the Department of State, will increase the competency and capacity of the review of cross-border energy projects. It is a clear improvement in the administration of major project permitting.

Updating the American domestic permitting and regulatory framework for natural-gas pipelines is also essential. Several steps are necessary in this regard, and H.R. 2910 is one of them. Domestic energy production provides good-paying jobs for members of the IUOE and other construction craftworkers and continues to employ thousands of our members. Uncertainty and delay during environmental reviews, however, hinder the growth of jobs related to the nation's energy infrastructure. Congress should give FERC additional tools to keep federal agencies accountable and maximize coordination in the permitting process.

H.R. 2910 requires reporting and transparency in the review of major projects. These requirements raise the bar for regulators and provides the public with a better understanding of the environmental impacts that are receiving particular rigor and examination—or perhaps needlessly delaying the overall project-review timeline. Democrats and Republicans supported similar reporting and transparency in the FAST Act. Enactment of H.R. 2910 is a necessary step to help place the booming energy sector on a sound footing for the future.

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports both H.R. 2883 and H.R. 2910 and respectfully requests that you support the legislation this week when it comes before you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE,
July 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Edison Electric Institute supports H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, which is scheduled for floor action this week.

Timely decisions for the siting and permitting of energy infrastructure are essential to building the smarter and more resilient infrastructure that electric companies need to deliver reliable, affordable, safe, and increasingly clean energy to Americans. H.R. 2883 would replace the need for a presidential permit for transmission lines or pipelines that cross a U.S. border with a certificate of crossing to be approved by the Department of Energy for electric transmission facilities, or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for oil or natural gas pipelines. The National Environmental Policy Act and other federal laws that apply to the project would not be affected.

H.R. 2883 would improve the process for decisions on cross-border projects while protecting the public's interest in such projects. We urge the House to pass H.R. 2883.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. KUHN,
President.

Rep. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Energy Subcommittee,
Washington, DC.
Rep. BOBBY RUSH,
Ranking Member,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND RANKING MEMBER RUSH: The In Situ Oil Sands Alliance (IOSA) offers strong support for the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act reintroduced by Congressman Markwayne Mullin (R-OK) and Congressman Gene Green (D-TX) and urges you to back its timely passage. IOSA is an alliance of Canadian oil sands developers dedicated to the responsible development of the resource using drilling technologies. We support this legislation as it establishes greater predictability in the process of developing additional energy transportation links between our two countries which will serve a critical role in continuing towards North American energy independence and reducing dependence on unstable overseas suppliers. These links will help to ensure that growing Canadian oil sands production remains a secure, affordable, environmentally responsible and economically beneficial source of supply for the United States.

Historically, Canada and the United States have enjoyed a mutually beneficial energy trade relationship. The Canadian oil sands provide substantial economic benefits to U.S.—for every two oil sands jobs created in Canada, one job is created in the U.S. Nearly 1,600 U.S. companies directly supply the oil sands, representing \$1.9 billion in sales in 2014 and 2015. Canada is the United States' most trusted trading partner, providing 41% of U.S. oil imports in 2016.

Canada's oil sands represent the third largest reserves in the world and are well-positioned to provide a secure and affordable supply for American refining and consumption for years to come. However, the benefits accruing to the United States from Canadian oil sands development depend on sufficient energy transportation infrastructure capacity. The Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act proposes four key modernizations of the cross-border infrastructure regulatory process that can ensure the timely development of projects:

Introduction of a Definitive Decision Timeline: Introducing timing and development certainty currently absent from the approval process, the Act requires a decision no later than 120 days after any applicable environmental review is complete.

Determination of National Interest: Lead agencies would be able to make national interest determination for cross border energy infrastructure projects but the assumption would be that cross border energy projects are in the national interest unless determined otherwise by that lead agency.

Agency Decision-Making: By removing the requirement for a Presidential permit, the relevant official or agency would serve as final authority, further streamlining the process while assuring that the lead agency is the Federal agency with relevant subject-matter expertise. The bill would designate FERC as the responsible official for oil and gas pipelines and the Secretary of Energy for electric transmission lines. These agencies already have responsibility for evaluating aspects affecting the national interest with respect to these types of projects. The only change from current practice is to substitute FERC for the Secretary of State as lead with respect to oil pipelines. This change is appropriate given the level of expertise at FERC for review and approval of liquid pipeline projects, including rate setting and ensuring equal access.

IOSA,
June 19, 2017.

Streamlining of the approval process: New certificates of crossings and Presidential permits would not be required for modifications to existing border-crossing projects that are operating or for which approvals have previously been issued.

The Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act will serve to enhance the existing mutually beneficial Canada-U.S. energy partnership. Thank you for your consideration and support for the Act.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA NELSON,
Vice Chair, In Situ Oil Sands Alliance.

PLAINS ALL AMERICAN
PIPELINE, L.P.
July 18, 2017.

Hon. MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GENE GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULLIN AND CONGRESSMAN GREEN: I am writing on behalf of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. in support of your legislation, H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

This legislation will provide the needed reform of the existing Presidential Permit process for liquid pipeline projects crossing international borders. As you know, there is no authorizing statute from the Congress laying out the requirements for this program. There is no guidance in the law on what should be reviewed, and what can be exempted because it is too small to make a difference. There are no laws on what criteria to use, what to examine, or a time certain for completing a review. The unfortunate result of the lack of clear guidance is uncertainty and delay. In fact, the sum total of State Department rules and procedures for this process is one single page, so almost all applications can be dealt with subjectively, which results in a lack of certainty for our business.

Plains All American experienced this uncertainty first hand when we purchased seven pipelines crossing the U.S.-Canadian border. The guidelines used by the State Department triggered our need to apply for a new presidential permit in 2012. These pipelines already had an ownership "name change" permit application that remained pending from their previous change of ownership in 2007. Plains applications for "name change" permits remained pending until 2016. So, for 4 years, the State Department had been considering whether to issue a presidential permit for something almost as simple as a name change at the top of the permit. There were no operational changes of the pipelines, no change in materials or any physical or environmental impacts.

Hopefully, having this process come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will provide an objective standard with set timelines that will provide greater certainty.

Thank you for your work,
Best,

HARRY N. PEFANIS,
President & COO,
Plains All American
Pipeline.

Mr. MULLIN. Once again, I understand that there is opposition to the bill because of a fear. But the true fear is: Are we willing to hold up the infrastructure needs of this country for political gain? For the years that we had from the previous administration, that is exactly what happened. It was political.

What we are trying to do when we take it out of the State Department's hands and put it with FERC is put it with a bipartisan oversight agency that takes an approach to looking at the infrastructure needs that this country has and saying: Is this in the country's best interest?

They have been doing it, and they do it well.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters from a number of environmental and other organizations in opposition to the bill.

They write, in part: "On behalf of the undersigned organizations and our millions of members and supporters across the country, we write today to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2883, the 'Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.' This bill represents a fourth irresponsible attempt to pass the previously titled 'North American Energy Infrastructure Act' in as many years. For the reasons below, we are opposed to the passage of this legislation and its attempt to ram through permits for new cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful environmental review or public participation."

JUNE 26, 2017.

Re Please Oppose H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act".

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations and our millions of members and supporters across the country, we write today to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act." This bill represents a fourth irresponsible attempt to pass the previously titled "North American Energy Infrastructure Act" in as many years. For the reasons below, we are opposed to the passage of this legislation and its attempt to ram through permits for new cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful environmental review or public participation.

Our reasons for opposing H.R. 2883 are as follows:

It is unnecessary and eliminates longstanding procedure. Executive Order 13337 established a longstanding process that has been used by both Republican and Democratic administrations for decades to ensure that energy transmission projects crossing our international borders from Canada and Mexico are in the national interest.

It eliminates critical environmental and economic analysis. H.R. 2883 eliminates the current requirement that proposed oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines that cross the U.S. border with Mexico or Canada obtain a presidential permit, after an environmental review and determination that the project is in the national interest.

It irresponsibly narrows the scope of environmental review. HR 2883 replaces existing processes with one that limits environmental review to a narrow portion of the project, exempts certain types of projects from any permit requirement, and shifts the burden of proof to make it difficult to not approve a project.

It undermines the National Environmental Policy Act. The bill effectively exempts

cross-border projects from meaningful environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by dramatically narrowing the focus of that review. Under the bill, the permit requirement and NEPA review apply only to the cross-border segment of the project. Trans-boundary pipelines and transmission lines are multi-billion dollar infrastructure investments that stretch hundreds of miles, last for decades, and pose environmental risks well beyond their border crossings. However, contrary to NEPA, the bill precludes review of the project's full impacts, such as oil spills and the consequences for landowners, public safety, drinking water, climate change, and wildlife.

It eliminates the need to justify projects as in the national interest. The bill eliminates the requirement that to issue a permit, the federal permitting agency must find the project to be in the national interest. Instead, the bill requires an agency to approve the project, unless it finds that the narrow segment that crosses the border "is not in the public interest of the United States." By shifting the burden of proof to require a showing that the project is contrary to the public interest and sharply narrowing the focus of that inquiry, this provision makes it extremely difficult for an agency to ever deny a permit, and it largely eliminates the ability to approve a permit subject to protective conditions.

Large, complicated, risky projects like oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities are precisely the types of activities that ought to be well-planned and reviewed before they are built. Failure to do so not only results in threats to public safety, but can also harm our economy and environment.

Instead of improving responsible siting, construction, and operation of oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities, this bill goes in the opposite direction by forcing these projects through no matter what the costs may be. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

350.org; Bold Alliance; Clean Water Action; Defenders of Wildlife; Greenpeace USA; Indigenous Environmental Network; League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Oil Change International; Power Shift Network; Seeding Sovereignty; Sierra Club.

JULY 18, 2017.

Re Oppose H.R. 2910 and H.R. 2883, Dangerous Handouts to the Oil and Gas Industry.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, and H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

H.R. 2910 sacrifices public input and thorough environmental review in favor of giving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) more power to fast-track approval of interstate natural gas pipelines. FERC has no accountability to the public or the environment, yet this bill would allow it to limit the participation and input of other state and federal agencies with relevant expertise in reviews required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Additionally, H.R. 2910 would allow FERC to establish the

scope of the environmental review and conditionally approve projects with incomplete environmental impact analysis, which could result in irreversible harm to our environment and public health. Given FERC's history of rash approval of pipelines, H.R. 2910 is unnecessary, dangerous, and nothing more than a handout to the oil and gas industry at the expense of the health and safety of our communities.

H.R. 2883 would greenlight permitting of new, potentially harmful cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful and thorough review and oversight. It eliminates many important longstanding procedures, undermining critical environmental and economic review by abolishing the requirement that a project obtain a presidential permit and be affirmatively determined to be in the public interest. H.R. 2883 also narrows the scope of environmental review under NEPA, exempting certain projects altogether and severely limiting the review of these massive, expensive, long-lasting infrastructure projects to only the section that crosses the border, ignoring the potential damaging impacts from the project as a whole. By only reviewing a small portion of these projects and essentially erasing the national interest requirement, this bill would make it almost impossible for an agency to ever deny a permit and could result in irreversible damage to our health, public safety, climate, environment, and economy.

Again, we urge you to REJECT H.R. 2910 and H.R. 2883, and will consider including votes on these bills in the 2017 Scorecard.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

JULY 18, 2017.

Re Please Oppose H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act".

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations and our millions of members and supporters across the country, we write today to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act." This bill represents a fourth irresponsible attempt to pass the previously titled "North American Energy Infrastructure Act" in as many years. We are opposed to the passage of this legislation and its attempt to ram through permits for new cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful environmental review or public participation.

Our reasons for opposing H.R. 2883 are as follows:

It is unnecessary and eliminates longstanding procedure. Executive Order 13337 established a longstanding process that has been used by both Republican and Democratic administrations for decades to ensure that energy transmission projects crossing our international borders from Canada and Mexico are in the national interest.

It eliminates critical environmental and economic analysis. H.R. 2883 eliminates the current requirement that proposed oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines that cross the U.S. border with Mexico or Canada obtain a presidential permit, after an environmental review and determination that the project is in the national interest.

It irresponsibly narrows the scope of environmental review. H.R. 2883 replaces existing processes with one that limits environmental review to a narrow portion of the project, exempts certain types of projects from any permit requirement, and shifts the burden of proof to make it difficult to not approve a project.

It undermines the National Environmental Policy Act. The bill effectively exempts cross-border projects from meaningful environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by dramatically narrowing the focus of that review. Under the bill, the permit requirement and NEPA review apply only to the cross-border segment of the project. Trans-boundary pipelines and transmission lines are multi-billion dollar infrastructure investments that stretch hundreds of miles, last for decades, and pose environmental risks well beyond their border crossings. However, contrary to NEPA, the bill precludes review of the project's full impacts, such as oil spills and the consequences for landowners, public safety, drinking water, climate change, and wildlife.

It eliminates the need to justify projects as in the national interest. The bill eliminates the requirement that to issue a permit, the federal permitting agency must find the project to be in the national interest. Instead, the bill requires an agency to approve the project, unless it finds that the narrow segment that crosses the border "is not in the public interest of the United States." By shifting the burden of proof to require a showing that the project is contrary to the public interest and sharply narrowing the focus of that inquiry, this provision makes it extremely difficult for an agency to ever deny a permit, and it largely eliminates the ability to approve a permit subject to protective conditions.

Large, complicated, risky projects like oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities are precisely the types of activities that ought to be well-planned and reviewed before they are built. Failure to do so not only results in threats to public safety, but can also harm our economy and environment.

Instead of improving responsible siting, construction, and operation of oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities, this bill goes in the opposite direction by forcing these projects through no matter what the costs may be. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

350.org; Bold Alliance; Center for Biological Diversity; Clean Water Action; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Environment America; Greenpeace USA; Indigenous Environmental Network; League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Oil Change International; Power Shift Network; Public Citizen; Seeding Sovereignty; Sierra Club.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2883 eliminates the current requirement that proposed oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines that cross the U.S. border obtain a Presidential permit. That only happens after an environmental review and a determination that the project is in the national interest. I know this might be tempting to some of my colleagues, but I encourage you to have a closer look at what this bill really does.

The bill replaces this process with a new process that limits environmental review to a narrow portion of the project, just the portion that crosses the border. It exempts certain types of projects from any permit requirement and shifts the burden of proof to make it difficult to disapprove a project.

The bill also allows a project that is rejected under current law to reapply

under the new, weaker process and exempts all modifications to existing cross-border projects from any requirement for Federal review or approval.

In essence, it grants a get-out-of-jail-free card, or, actually, I guess it is more akin to whatever you roll, you get to pass go, and you get to collect your \$200. That is not okay for some international oil pipelines, natural gas pipelines, and electric transmission lines. These are major infrastructure projects, and we have got to maintain the ability to have a meaningful review; otherwise, we are going to suffer significant incidents, accidents, fatalities, and more.

So let me close my remarks and my portion of the debate here today. I have enjoyed this debate, but I want to highlight again that the Congress is really missing an opportunity to address one of the most significant challenges that we face, and that is the challenge of climate change.

What is particularly troubling about this bill, as well, is it keeps the public in the dark. Think about it. If you live near a major international pipeline project, shouldn't you have the right to participate and understand what such project will allow in your backyard?

The bill would allow large and long-lived cross-border energy projects to be approved with no understanding or consideration of their environmental impact or to be exempted from any permitting requirement at all. The bill assumes that these projects are always in the public interest regardless of the merits. It is an unjustifiable giveaway. It elevates corporate profits over the public interest, and it is wrong.

The public, including communities and landowners directly affected by the projects, would have little or no information and no opportunity to object or request mitigating action except to the extent provided under limited State laws.

For all of these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the bills we are considering today which would short-circuit the approval process of fossil fuel projects at the expense of our environment and private property owners.

In my home State of New Hampshire, Granite Staters are all too familiar with the problems of siting natural gas projects and the disruption this can cause for small rural towns.

In 2015, energy giant Kinder Morgan proposed a large natural gas pipeline project that would have cut through 17 New Hampshire towns in my district which are home to numerous environmentally sensitive areas that would have been negatively impacted by this project.

Throughout the review process, I heard from thousands of my constituents whose concerns were not being

heard by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Thanks to the commitment and tireless efforts of these advocates, Kinder Morgan eventually pulled the plug on the project, but there is so much more that needs to be done to give average citizens a seat at the table during FERC's review process.

The bills we are considering today would do nothing to elevate the concerns of impacted communities during the FERC proceedings, and these bills aim to jam through risky pipeline projects while constraining other agencies from concluding important environmental reviews.

We all know that FERC acts as a rubber stamp for fossil fuel projects, and the bills we are considering today further narrow the opportunities for private landowners to push back against projects and try to protect their land from eminent domain.

□ 1600

At a time when pipeline expansion has increased dramatically, we should be working on bipartisan solutions that increase public participation during FERC proceedings. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to create an Office of Public Participation within FERC that would level the playing field for average citizens and give them a seat at the table.

H.R. 2910, which we just debated, does nothing to achieve this goal and will only lead to more communities being left in the dark during FERC proceedings.

H.R. 2883 would eliminate the need for a Presidential permit for cross-border energy projects and dramatically narrow the environmental review to the narrow portion of the project that crosses the border. These cross-border projects are oftentimes hundreds of miles long. It simply makes no sense to conduct an environmental review on the small portion that crosses the border. That is just common sense.

For the good of our environment, for the good of our communities and public lands, I urge my colleagues to oppose these harmful pieces of legislation.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I actually have a couple of more speakers.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida may reclaim her time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I was under the impression the other side had yielded back the balance of her time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is correct, but by unanimous consent, the gentlewoman may reclaim the time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to allow the minority to reclaim the balance of her time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, introduced by my friend and Great Plains colleague to the south, MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

This bill could not come at a better time. As we continue to have discussions in this country about both our future as an energy leader and our trading relationship with Mexico and Canada, it is time to review bureaucratic permitting processes that constrain new energy transportation projects. This bill does just that. It improves and streamlines the permitting process for pipelines and energy transmission equipment when they are crossing U.S. international borders.

Energy trade within North America is a nearly \$150 billion business that provides significant benefits here at home. This bill shows that we can focus on protecting our environment and being an energy leader. It maintains full environmental reviews and continues compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

We saw how broken our current regulatory structure was when politics and personal interests nearly ended the Keystone XL pipeline without any regard to science, facts, or the livelihoods of the people who needed those jobs. This legislation will allow American entrepreneurs to stop fighting endless red tape and uncertain timelines and get back to doing what we do best: creating jobs, innovating, and making North America a leader in energy production.

Voters have told us time and time again to get the bureaucratic morass of Big Government out of the way. They have asked us to promote an all-of-the-above energy strategy that includes oil and gas and to unleash the power of free trade and American innovation. They have asked for good jobs and more energy security.

I thank my good friend from Oklahoma for sponsoring this. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2838, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I stand up to oppose H.R. 2883.

Basically, what this bill does is preapproves border-crossing energy products by making it extremely difficult to put a stop to them on any grounds.

As a general matter, specifically for oil pipelines, within the United States, oil pipelines don't need Federal approval. No Federal reviews or permits on these projects are required. If the pipeline harms endangered species, the ESA will apply. If the construction destroys wetlands, a project permit may be needed from the Corps of Engineers. But generally, neither of these require-

ments trigger a broader evaluation of the project. Currently, the only reason to prepare an environmental assessment or impact for cross-border pipelines or transmission lines is because the existing Presidential permit requirement triggers NEPA.

Under this bill, there would be no projectwide Federal environmental assessment for all these projects. State laws don't substitute for NEPA. Many States don't have approval authority over pipelines within their States.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Even those States with some instate authority don't have the resources or expertise to develop the information provided by a Federal environmental impact statement. No State has permitting authority over the portions of a pipeline located in other States. Without NEPA, there would be no broad Federal environmental review of cross-border transmission lines.

Mr. Chair, we need these protections, and I ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2883.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my good friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, there seems to be some confusion here that this bill takes away National Environmental Policy Act enforcement. That is just not true. In fact, during a committee hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we produced a Congressional Research Service report that said that nothing in this bill will take away the responsibility for the NEPA process, the National Environmental Policy Act.

To make sure that every inch of those pipelines will be studied for environmental issues is not our intention. Our intention is just to move product. We will go through all the efforts.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a report from the Congressional Research Service that we got in committee.

[From the Congressional Research Service, May 2, 2017]

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Gene Green; Attention: Justin Ackley

From: Linda Luther, Analyst in Environmental Policy, ext. 7-6852

Subject: Scope of NEPA Review Required for Federal Agency Approvals

This memorandum responds to your request asking CRS to clarify the scope of an environmental review prepared by federal agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). More specifically, you asked CRS to identify the scope of environmental impacts that a federal agency would be likely to evaluate before making a final decision on a request to approve certain energy infrastructure projects that would cross a United States border, such as the issuance of a "certificate of crossing" that would be required in the Promoting Cross-Border En-

ergy Infrastructure Act (discussion draft released April 25, 2017). This memorandum identifies the range of environmental impacts that federal agencies currently evaluate when demonstrating compliance with NEPA. It also discusses current agency practices, for similar projects, that generally involve the evaluation of the environmental impacts of any new facilities constructed in the United States (i.e., impacts that may occur as a result of approving a cross-border energy infrastructure project). Information in this memorandum may be used or may have been used in other CRS products.

Before a federal agency can make a final decision on a proposed federal action, NEPA requires that agency to identify the proposal's effects on the "quality of the human environment." The scope and level of review required under NEPA depends on whether those effects will be "significant." To make that determination, each agency must identify and evaluate the proposal's—

Direct effects—impacts caused by the project and occurring at the same time and place, including impacts directly associated with the construction and operation of the facilities.

Indirect effects—impacts that are later in time or farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable; and

Cumulative effects—impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impacts of the action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes that other action.

If an agency is authorized to approve a cross-border facility (e.g., issue a certificate of crossing for certain energy infrastructure projects as in the proposed bill), that agency's decision must be informed by appropriate environmental review required under NEPA. As federal agencies currently implement NEPA, the requirement to identify and consider direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts has meant that the agency evaluates the effects of siting, building and operating the entire structure in the United States (not just the cross-border segment they are authorized to approve). That is, if a federal agency is authorized to approve a cross-border project, that agency's existing NEPA practices would likely continue to involve analysis of impacts associated with the approval of the facility that physically crosses the border, as well as any new facilities constructed in the United States.

I hope this information is useful to you. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, the other issue, though, is we are going to do belts and suspenders. That is an old saying I heard. We already had a belt, but now we are going to deal with an amendment from Congressman VEASEY. We will make sure it is belts and suspenders and that the National Environmental Policy Act is applied to these pipelines, because that is not our intent.

So we not only have the Congressional Research Service saying it is, we are going to put language into this bill, and I understand it will be accepted by our side, to make sure that is there.

What we need to do is make sure that our closest neighbors, Canada and Mexico—right now, Mexico needs the natural gas that we are producing in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and New Mexico; but 20 years from now, our wells may be dry for natural gas, and

we will need that natural gas that Mexico will be producing when they work in northern Mexico.

So that is why we need to structuralize this, if we are really going to have a North American energy market for electric transmission like they do up in the New England States or electric transmissions even along the border in Texas. I know they do the same thing in southern California. We need to have some certainty with our closest neighbors.

We have a free trade agreement with these two countries. It is already decided it is in our national interest. Why would we set aside energy as something different? That is why this bill is so important.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote for this legislation.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, introduced by my friend and Western Caucus member MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

H.R. 2883 streamlines the permitting process for pipelines and electricity transmission equipment that crosses the United States’ international borders.

Energy trade between the U.S., Mexico, and Canada is nearly a \$150 billion business that provides significant benefits to America. This bill will prevent another Keystone XL-like delay and takes politics out of the decision-making process.

Cross-border oil and gas pipelines and cross-border electric transmission facilities should not be held up by government bureaucracies. Without this legislation, important projects that provide benefits to our economy will continue to incur unnecessary delays and government red tape.

Edison Electric Institute supports H.R. 2883, stating:

Timely decisions for the sifting and permitting of energy infrastructure are essential to building more resilient infrastructure that electric companies need to deliver reliable, affordable, safe, and increasingly clean energy to Americans.

The National Taxpayers Union supports the bill, stating:

This legislation would streamline the archaic cross-border permitting process for energy facilities that stretch across the borders we share with Mexico and Canada.

The current Presidential permit regime is far from clear and can leave projects in regulatory limbo for years to come. Creating a consolidated and standardized approval process would increase the congressional accountability provided for in Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

The bill requires a full environmental review and complies with NEPA. This legislation makes so much sense that even labor unions support it.

Let’s fulfill our constitutional obligations, streamline important energy infrastructure projects, and advance a true all-of-the-above energy strategy.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge the Members of this body to oppose this misguided bill so that the Congress can turn its attention to the most daunting challenge of our time: climate change, our clean energy future, and the clean energy economy and all of the jobs it entails.

Mr. Chair, again, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this bill has absolutely no effect on any environmental law. The bill expressly provides that approval of a project under this act does not affect the application of any other Federal laws that are applicable to the construction, operation, or maintenance of a project. The Congressional Research Service has reviewed the legislation and has confirmed that fact.

My point is, other than the fact that they just want to oppose this because, maybe, people oppose fossil fuels as a whole, this makes sense. This is a bill that moves forward. As we stated earlier, it takes politics out of our permitting process. It brings structure and certainty to those that are providing our infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2883

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 “Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act”.

SEC. 2. APPROVAL FOR BORDER-CROSSING FACILITIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT AN INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (e), no person may

construct, connect, operate, or maintain a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity, across an international border of the United States without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility under this subsection.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken, by the relevant official or agency identified under subparagraph (B), under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a border-crossing facility for which a person requests a certificate of crossing under this subsection, the relevant official or agency, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility unless the relevant official or agency finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the border-crossing facility is not in the public interest of the United States.

(B) RELEVANT OFFICIAL OR AGENCY.—The relevant official or agency referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil or natural gas pipelines; and

(ii) the Secretary of Energy with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of electric transmission facilities.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), that the border-crossing facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(i) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(ii) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the border-crossing facility.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity—

(A) if the border-crossing facility is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) if a permit described in subsection (d) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(C) if an application for a permit described in subsection (d) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which such application is denied; or

(ii) two years after the date of enactment of this Act, if such a permit has not been issued by such date.

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.

(B) NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

(C) OIL PIPELINES.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the authority of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to oil pipelines under section 60502 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Section 3(c)

of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "In the case of an application for the importation of natural gas from, or the exportation of natural gas to, Canada or Mexico, the Commission shall grant the application not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives the complete application."

(c) TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking "insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)".

(B) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a-4(b)) is amended by striking "the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary."

(d) NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order No. 12038, Executive Order No. 10485, or any other Executive order shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof.

(e) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No certificate of crossing under subsection (a), or permit described in subsection (d), shall be required for a modification to—

(1) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility for which a permit described in subsection (d) has been issued; or

(3) a border-crossing facility for which a certificate of crossing has previously been issued under subsection (a).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) through (e), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official or agency described in subsection (a)(2)(B) shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a); and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "border-crossing facility" means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at an international boundary of the United States;

(2) the term "modification" includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, change in flow volume, addition or removal of an interconnection, or an adjustment to main-

tain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations);

(3) the term "natural gas" has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a);

(4) the term "oil" means petroleum or a petroleum product;

(5) the terms "Electric Reliability Organization" and "regional entity" have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o); and

(6) the terms "Independent System Operator" and "Regional Transmission Organization" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-235. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-235.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 16, insert the following:

(i) the Secretary of State with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil pipelines;

Page 2, line 17, strike "(i)" and insert "(ii)".

Page 2, line 19, strike "oil or".

Page 2, line 21, strike "(ii)" and insert "(iii)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, since 1968, oil pipelines that cross international borders have been reviewed and authorized by the Department of State. That is nearly 50 years. This is common sense. After all, the State Department handles diplomacy, the State Department manages treaties related to our international boundaries, and the State Department is responsible for the security of pathways for our pipelines.

But the bill we are considering today would shift decisionmaking authority for those pipelines from the State Department, which is equipped to handle all aspects of this issue, to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which isn't equipped.

So it just doesn't make any sense to me, Mr. Chairman. It seems quite arbitrary and quite foolish and moving in the wrong direction. This is change for change's sake, and it wouldn't improve the process.

My amendment would prevent this mistake. It would simply ensure that permitting authority for cross-border oil pipelines remains with the Department of State. That is the permitting authority for cross-border oil pipelines to remain with the Department of State.

In each of the past two Congresses, my friends in the majority agreed. They passed substantially similar legislation to change the cross-border pipeline permitting process, but they kept the final approval authority where it belongs, with the Department of State.

Cross-border oil pipelines are matters of international diplomacy and national security, and oversight should remain with the State Department. The old adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," I don't know what we are trying to do here. So I urge support for my amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2883 was designated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the lead agency of the permitting cross-border oil pipelines.

FERC is an independent agency made up of a bipartisan commission that regulates interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil. FERC also reviews proposals to build liquefied natural gas terminals, interstate natural gas pipelines, and cross-border natural gas facilities.

FERC has a proven track record of working with a wide array of stakeholders on complex pipeline projects to balance the public interest. It is clearly the best suited agency for the job of permitting cross-border oil pipelines.

As we learned from the Keystone XL experience during the Obama administration, the State Department lacks the ability to pull out politics from our Nation's infrastructure. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent the State Department from being consulted about an application, but FERC should take the lead on cross-border oil pipelines.

H.R. 2883 would provide the permitting process with much-needed consistency and transparency. The gentleman's amendment would double down on the failures of the past and reinject bipartisan politics into the process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-235.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:

(D) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR OIL AND NATURAL GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an oil or natural gas pipeline facility, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may not issue a certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A) if any part of the oil or natural gas pipeline project is to be located on lands required under Federal, State, or local law to be managed for purposes of natural resource conservation or recreation.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment protects a robust public review process for any proposed pipeline that seeks to cross protected conservation and recreation lands, this time for pipelines that includes a crossing with Canada or Mexico. The legislation before us today, with its narrowly defined environmental reviews and limited public input, puts treasured public resources at risk.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces real energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and increase reliability and resiliency.

However, as with H.R. 2910 that we considered earlier this afternoon, H.R. 2883 moves us in the wrong direction. In fact, it doesn't allow any careful or strategic planning when it comes to fossil fuel pipelines.

Cross-border and natural gas pipeline interests should not be permitted to cavalierly tread on public lands, lands expressly set aside by Federal taxpayers, State and local communities for the benefit of conservation and public recreation.

Our Nation has a longstanding history of preserving natural habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested significant public resources toward these goals. These lands and the decisions behind them deserve to be honored.

The potential negative environmental impacts of an oil or natural gas pipeline are too great to risk such treasured investments by Federal taxpayers and State and local communities, and we should not quickly forego the essential public review process that has helped ensure these public treasures are available to future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I don't have any additional speakers.

I would just like to say that energy infrastructure is critical to our economy, yet we cannot simply give the fossil fuel industry a carte blanche to build pipelines that adversely impact conservation and recreation lands.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. In the United States today, there is 150 million acres of protected land set aside in the National Wildlife Refuge System for protected designation for America's fish, wildlife, and plants.

Conservation efforts like the National Wildlife Refuge System build up America's great conservation legacy that began with Teddy Roosevelt. Ensuring that future generations of Americans have access to these great traditions must be our priority as a body going forward.

In this 150 million acres of National Wildlife Refuge System land, though, there currently stretches 1,339 miles of pipeline already. Protecting our natural resources and building much-needed infrastructure are not mutually exclusive goals.

These pipelines are already there. They are not destroying the lands or their ecosystem or prohibiting the American people from enjoying access to this public land. Companies must pay the government for use of the land for pipelines. That money, in turn, goes into acquiring more land for conservation efforts and recreational use.

The Department of Transportation's review of safety accidents conducted under President Obama's administration showed that in addition to providing a substantial cost advantage, pipelines result in fewer spillage incidents and personal injuries than either road or rail.

As coal-fired power plants continue to shut down, the demand for natural gas, a lower emission alternative, is going to keep going up. Whether the gas is produced in Canada, Alaska, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, or the Gulf of Mexico, it will be used all over the country, and we need to ensure that a regulatory framework is in place that allows us to get this supply to where it is needed.

The amendment is a backhanded way to prevent any pipelines or electrical transmission infrastructure from being built.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2883 strikes a right balance for wise management of our multiuse public lands and natural resources. The amendment would upset this careful balance.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GENE GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115-235.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. VEASEY, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

(D) SCOPE OF NEPA REVIEW.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall affect the scope of any review required to be conducted under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, again, this is Congressman VEASEY's idea, and I am doing it for him because he couldn't be here.

Our intent when crafting the bill was never to reduce or limit the National Environmental Policy Act applicability when considering whether to approve a cross-border project.

Before a Federal agency can make a final determination on a proposed Federal action, the National Environmental Policy Act requires that the agency identify the proposal's effects on the quality of human environment and whether these effects will be significant.

To make this determination, Federal agencies identify and evaluate the direct and indirect cumulation of effects of the proposal. Direct effects are the impacts caused by the project occurring at the same time and place. Indirect effects are the impacts that are later in time or further removed but still reasonably foreseeable. And cumulative effects are impacts on the environment that result with incremental

impacts on the action, regardless of what person or agency undertakes that action.

The Federal agencies currently implement NEPA. The requirement to identify all three of these impacts has required the analysis of impacts to include not just the cross-border section of the project, but any new facility or structure constructed within the United States.

Our office had the bill analyzed by the experts at the Congressional Research Office, who confirmed that the underlying bill did not in any way limit the scope of future National Environmental Policy Act reviews under it. Under our language, they will continue to involve reviews of the entire project, not just that part that crosses the border section.

With that said, I have heard concerns from Members who are worried that the bill will limit the NEPA in some way. I am happy to support this bipartisan amendment with my colleague, Mr. VEASEY, which unequivocally states that nothing in this act or the amendments made by this act shall affect the scope of any review required to be conducted by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

I support this good faith amendment—and like I said earlier, it is belts and suspenders, but sometimes we need them to pass legislation—and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, which would clarify the intent of the legislation not to affect the application of any or other Federal laws that are applicable to the construction, operation, or maintenance of the project.

Despite the talking points used by some of my friends, nothing in this bill would exempt a project from complying with applicable environmental laws or restrict the scope of environmental review.

The gentleman from Texas' amendment makes this abundantly clear. H.R. 2883 would lead to a more objective and timely decision, create jobs, strengthen our Nation's energy security, and support affordable and reliable energy for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1630

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments

printed in part B of House Report 115–235 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ENGEL of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 246, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—182

Adams	Frankel (FL)
Aguilar	Fudge
Barragan	Gabbard
Bass	Gallego
Beatty	Garamendi
Bera	Gomez
Beyer	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa
Bonamici	Hastings
Boyle, Brendan	Heck
F.	Higgins (NY)
Brown (MD)	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer
Bustos	Huffman
Butterfield	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Jayapal
Carbajal	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Keating
Castro (TX)	Quigley
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen
Clay	Kildee
Cleaver	Kilmer
Clyburn	Kind
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi
Conyers	Kuster (NH)
Cooper	Langevin
Courtney	Larsen (WA)
Crist	Larson (CT)
Crowley	Lawrence
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)
Davis, Danny	Lee
DeFazio	Levin
DeGette	Lewis (GA)
Delaney	Lieu, Ted
DeLauro	Lipinski
DelBene	Loebbeck
Demings	Lofgren
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal
Deutch	Lowe
Dingell	Lujan Grisham,
Doggett	M.
Doyle, Michael	Lujan, Ben Ray
F.	Lynch
Ellison	Maloney,
Engel	Carolyn B.
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean
Españillat	Matsui
Esty (CT)	McCollum
Evans	McEachin
Foster	McGovern
	McNerney

Torres	Walz
Tsongas	Wasserman
Vargas	Schultz
Velázquez	Waters, Maxine
Visclosky	Watson Coleman

NOES—246

Abraham	Gibbs	Noem
Aderholt	Gohmert	Norman
Allen	Gonzalez (TX)	Nunes
Amash	Goodlatte	Olson
Amodei	Gosar	Palazzo
Arrington	Gottheimer	Palmer
Babin	Gowdy	Paulsen
Bacon	Granger	Pearce
Banks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Perry
Barletta	Graves (LA)	Peterson
Barr	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Barton	Green, Gene	Poe (TX)
Bergman	Griffith	Poliquin
Biggs	Grothman	Posey
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Handel	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Renacci
Black	Harris	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hartzler	Roby
Blum	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brady (PA)	Hice, Jody B.	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Rohrabacher
Brat	Hill	Rokita
Bridenstine	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Thomas
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	J.
Buchanan	Huizenga	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Hultgren	Roskam
Bucshon	Hunter	Ross
Budd	Hurd	Rothfus
Burgess	Issa	Rouzer
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Russell
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Schrader
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Cheney	Jones	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Joyce (OH)	Sessions
Cole	Katko	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Comer	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Comstock	King (NY)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Kinzing	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Knight	Smith (TX)
Correa	Kustoff (TN)	Snucker
Costa	LaHood	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Stewart
Cramer	Lamborn	Stivers
Crawford	Lance	Taylor
Cuellar	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Thornberry
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Tiberi
Davidson	Long	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Trott
Denham	Love	Turner
Dent	Lucas	Upton
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Veasey
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Vela
Donovan	Marino	Wagner
Duffy	Marshall	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Walden
Duncan (TN)	Mast	Walker
Dunn	McCarthy	Walorski
Emmer	McCaul	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Faso	McKinley	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McMorris	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Williams
Fleischmann	McSally	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meadows	Wittman
Fortenberry	Meehan	Womack
Fox	Messer	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Mitchell	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Mullin	Young (IA)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Zeldin
Gianforte	Newhouse	

NOT VOTING—5

Cummings	Napolitano	Tenney
Labrador	Scalise	

□ 1658

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. VELA, GOTTHEIMER, PALAZZO, BURGESS,

VEASEY, CHABOT, CUELLAR, WALBERG, and MEADOWS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. FUDGE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—179

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Aguilar	Fudge	Meng
Barragán	Gabbard	Moore
Bass	Gallego	Moulton
Beatty	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Bera	Gomez	Nadler
Beyer	Gottheimer	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nolan
Blumenauer	Grijalva	O'Halleran
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pallone
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Panetta
F.	Heck	Pascarell
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pelosi
Bustos	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Huffman	Peters
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Carbajal	Jayapal	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Polis
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Raskin
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rosen
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Ruiz
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kilmer	Rush
Clyburn	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Conyers	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Correa	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Courtney	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Crist	Lee	Scott, David
Crowley	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	Loeb	Sires
Delaney	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeBene	Lowey	Soto
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Speier
DeSaulnier	M.	Suozi
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Takano
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Eshoo	Matsui	Tonko
Espallat	McCollum	Torres
Esty (CT)	McEachin	Tsongas
Evans	McGovern	Vargas
Foster	McNerney	Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—247

Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Norman

Yarmuth

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained from the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 396 (Tsongas Amendment to H.R. 2833).

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2833) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity, and, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HALLERAN. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'Halleran moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2833 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:

(D) AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL.—As a condition of issuing a certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), the relevant official or agency shall require that all of the iron and steel products used in the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the border-crossing facility are produced in the United States, as determined by the relevant official or agency in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

Mr. MULLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

NOT VOTING—7

Cummings
Hudson
Labrador

Napolitano
Scalise
Tenney

□ 1703

So the amendment was rejected.

to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking families across Arizona and across our country are sick and tired of Congress putting partisan politics ahead of creating jobs at home.

As I travel across rural Arizona and speak to workers, miners, farmers, and families, I am asked the same questions: "When is Congress going to get serious about helping rural America?"

"When are you guys going to work together and create good-paying jobs?"

"When are we going to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and roads?"

"When are we finally going to get reliable broadband?"

In my 7 months in Congress, I have seen firsthand the failure to address these problems in a truly bipartisan manner. American workers are counting on all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to focus on bringing back jobs to our country.

The underlying bill before us does not go far enough to ensure pipelines, which involve major investments and can span hundreds of miles across sensitive areas, are made with quality, reliable, American-made materials.

My commonsense amendment simply requires Federal agencies to certify that all of the iron and steel products used in any cross-border pipelines are produced in the United States before they can be approved.

Mr. Speaker, foreign steelmakers now supply half the oil and gas drilling and extraction pipes used in the United States, and it is only getting worse. The American Iron and Steel Institute estimates that imports of steel pipes for the oil and gas industry are up 237 percent in the first half of 2017 from a year earlier.

Earlier this year, President Trump signed an executive order instructing the Secretary of Commerce to develop a plan that would require any company building a pipeline within U.S. borders to use American-made materials and equipment. My amendment mirrors the spirit of that executive order by applying the same rules to any proposed cross-border pipelines.

Mr. Speaker, we need to rebuild America. We need to rebuild America's infrastructure. We need to rebuild America's energy infrastructure, but we need to rebuild America by creating American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better message to send during President Trump's "Made in America Week"

than by standing up for American workers and supporting this common-sense amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, this is just a procedural motion to deny the important benefits of this legislation to the American workers, businesses, and our collective energy security. It fits a pattern of delay and obstruction that we simply cannot support. I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and vote "yes" on final passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—193

Adams	Courtney	Hanabusa
Aguilar	Crist	Hastings
Barragán	Crowley	Heck
Bass	Cuellar	Higgins (NY)
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Himes
Bera	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Beyer	DeFazio	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Delaney	Jayapal
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Jeffries
Bonamici	DeBene	Johnson (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Demings	Johnson, E. B.
F.	DeSaulnier	Jones
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Kaptur
Brown (MD)	Dingell	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Bustos	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Butterfield	F.	Khanna
Capuano	Duncan (TN)	Kihuen
Carbajal	Ellison	Kildee
Cárdenas	Engel	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kind
Cartwright	Españat	Krishnamoorthi
Castor (FL)	Esty (CT)	Kuster (NH)
Castro (TX)	Evans	Langevin
Chu, Judy	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Cicilline	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Lawrence
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Lawson (FL)
Clay	Gallo	Lee
Cleaver	Garamendi	Levin
Clyburn	Gomez	Lewis (GA)
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Lieu, Ted
Connolly	Gottheimer	Lipinski
Conyers	Green, Al	Loeb
Cooper	Green, Gene	Lofgren
Correa	Grijalva	Lowenthal
Costa	Gutiérrez	Lowey

Lujan Grisham, M.	Peters	Sinema
Luján, Ben Ray	Peterson	Sires
Lynch	Pingree	Slaughter
Maloney,	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Carolyn B.	Polis	Soto
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Speier
Matsui	Quigley	Suozi
McCollum	Raskin	Swalwell (CA)
McEachin	Rice (NY)	Takano
McGovern	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Rosen	Thompson (MS)
Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Meng	Ruiz	Tonko
Moore	Ruppersberger	Torres
Moulton	Rush	Tsongas
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vargas
Nadler	Sánchez	Veasey
Neal	Sarbanes	Vela
Nolan	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Norcross	Schiff	Visclosky
O'Halleran	Schneider	Walz
O'Rourke	Schrader	Wasserman
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Panetta	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine
Pascrell	Serrano	Watson Coleman
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Perlmuter	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)
	Sherman	Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham	Fortenberry	Mast
Aderholt	Fox	McCarthy
Allen	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Amash	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Amodel	Gaetz	McHenry
Arrington	Gallagher	McKinley
Babin	Garrett	McMorris
Bacon	Gianforte	Rodgers
Banks (IN)	Gibbs	McSally
Barletta	Gohmert	Meadows
Barr	Goodlatte	Meehan
Barton	Gosar	Messer
Bergman	Gowdy	Mitchell
Biggs	Granger	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Black	Griffith	Newhouse
Blackburn	Grothman	Noem
Blum	Guthrie	Norman
Bost	Handel	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Harper	Olson
Brat	Harris	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Palmer
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Paulsen
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Perry
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Pittenger
Bucshon	Hill	Poe (TX)
Budd	Holding	Poliquin
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Posey
Byrne	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Calvert	Huizenga	Reichert
Carter (GA)	Hultgren	Renacci
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Hurd	Roby
Cheney	Issa	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Rokita
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Comer	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Thomas
Comstock	Jordan	J.
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Katko	Roskam
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Ross
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Crawford	King (IA)	Rouzer
Culberson	King (NY)	Royce (CA)
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzinger	Russell
Davidson	Knight	Rutherford
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Sanford
Denham	LaHood	Schweikert
Dent	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Lance	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Shimkus
Donovan	Lewis (MN)	Shuster
Duffy	LoBiondo	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Long	Smith (MO)
Dunn	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Love	Smith (NJ)
Estes (KS)	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Smucker
Faso	MacArthur	Stefanik
Ferguson	Marchant	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stivers
Fleischmann	Marshall	Taylor
Flores	Massie	Tenney

Thompson (PA) Walden Wilson (SC)
 Thornberry Walker Wittman
 Tiberi Walorski Womack
 Tipton Walters, Mimi Woodall
 Trott Weber (TX) Yoder
 Turner Webster (FL) Yoho
 Upton Webster Young (AK)
 Wagner Westerman Young (IA)
 Walberg Williams Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Cummings Pelosi Scalise
 Labrador Reed Valadao
 Napolitano Rogers (KY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1718

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 397.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 175, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—254

Abraham Comstock Gosar
 Aderholt Conaway Gottheimer
 Allen Conyers Gowdy
 Amash Cook Granger
 Amodei Correa Graves (GA)
 Arrington Costa Graves (LA)
 Babin Costello (PA) Graves (MO)
 Bacon Cramer Green, Gene
 Banks (IN) Crawford Griffith
 Barletta Cuellar Grothman
 Barr Culberson Guthrie
 Barton Curbelo (FL) Handel
 Bergman Davidson Harper
 Biggs Davis, Rodney Harris
 Bilirakis Denham Hartzler
 Bishop (GA) Dent Hensarling
 Bishop (MI) DeSantis Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (UT) DesJarlais Hice, Jody B.
 Black Diaz-Balart Higgins (LA)
 Blackburn Donovan Hill
 Blum Duffy Holding
 Bost Duncan (SC) Hollingsworth
 Brady (PA) Duncan (TN) Hudson
 Brady (TX) Dunn Huizenga
 Brat Emmer Hultgren
 Bridenstine Estes (KS) Hunter
 Brooks (AL) Farenthold Hurd
 Brooks (IN) Faso Issa
 Buchanan Ferguson Jackson Lee
 Buck Fitzpatrick Jenkins (KS)
 Bucshon Fleischmann Jenkins (WV)
 Budd Flores Johnson (LA)
 Burgess Fortenberry Johnson (OH)
 Byrne Foxx Johnson, Sam
 Calvert Franks (AZ) Jones
 Carter (GA) Frelinghuysen Jordan
 Carter (TX) Gaetz Joyce (OH)
 Chabot Gallagher Katko
 Cheney Garrett Kelly (MS)
 Coffman Gianforte Kelly (PA)
 Cole Gibbs King (IA)
 Collins (GA) Gohmert King (NY)
 Collins (NY) Gonzalez (TX) Kinzinger
 Comer Goodlatte Knight

Kustoff (TN) Palazzo
 LaHood Palmer
 LaMalfa Paulsen
 Lamborn Pearce
 Lance Perry
 Larsen (WA) Peterson
 Latta Pittenger
 Lewis (MN) Poe (TX)
 LoBiondo Poliquin
 Long Reedy
 Loudermilk Ratcliffe
 Love Reed
 Lucas Reichert
 Luetkemeyer Renacci
 MacArthur Rice (SC)
 Marchant Richmond
 Marino Roby
 Marshall Roe (TN)
 Massie Rogers (AL)
 Mast Rogers (KY)
 McCarthy Rohrabacher
 McCaul Rokita
 McClintock Rooney, Francis
 McHenry Rooney, Thomas
 McKinley J.
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen
 Rodgers Roskam
 McSally Ross
 Meadows Rothfus
 Meehan Rouzer
 Messer Royce (CA)
 Mitchell Russell
 Moolenaar Rutherford
 Mooney (WV) Sanford
 Mullin Schrader
 Murphy (PA) Schweikert
 Newhouse Scott, Austin
 Noem Sensenbrenner
 Norcross Sessions
 Norman Shimkus
 Nunes Shuster
 Olson Simpson

NAYS—175

Adams Evans
 Aguilar Foster
 Barragán Frankel (FL)
 Bass Fudge
 Beatty Gabbard
 Bera Gallego
 Beyer Garamendi
 Blumenauer Gomez
 Blunt Rochester Green, Al
 Bonamici Grijalva
 Boyle, Brendan Gutiérrez
 F. Hanabusa
 Brown (MD) Hastings
 Brownley (CA) Heck
 Bustos Higgins (NY)
 Butterfield Himes
 Capuano Hoyer
 Carbajal Huffman
 Cárdenas Jayapal
 Carson (IN) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Castro (TX) Kaptur
 Chu, Judy Keating
 Cicilline Kelly (IL)
 Clark (MA) Kennedy
 Clarke (NY) Khanna
 Clay Kihuen
 Cleaver Kildee
 Clyburn Kilmer
 Cohen Kind
 Connolly Krishnamoorthi
 Cooper Kuster (NH)
 Courtney Langevin
 Crist Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lawrence
 Davis (CA) Lawson (FL)
 Davis, Danny Lee
 DeFazio Levin
 DeGette Lewis (GA)
 Delaney Lieu, Ted
 DeLauro Lipinski
 DelBene Loeb sack
 Demings Lofgren
 DeSaulnier Lowenthal
 Deutsch Lowey
 Dingell Lujan Grisham,
 Doggett M.
 Doyle, Michael Luján, Ben Ray
 F. Lynch
 Ellison Maloney,
 Engel Carolyn B.
 Eshoo Maloney, Sean
 Espallat Matsui
 Esty (CT) McCollum

Titus Velázquez Waters, Maxine
 Tonko Visclosky Watson Coleman
 Torres Walz Welch
 Tsongas Wasserman Wilson (FL)
 Vargas Schultz Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Cummings Napolitano
 Labrador Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1724

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 454 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2910.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1725

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-235 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 115-235 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.