

also work in far-off places, including Guam. This amendment requires the FAA workers to work with the Department of Defense so that these folks and their families can get good medical care on the island of Guam;

Finally, the amendment establishes the Youth in Aviation Task Force to attract young people to aviation jobs. This is critical to ensure that our aviation system prospers in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a good amendment, it has bipartisan support and will improve the underlying bill. I urge all Members to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment offered by the gentleman. He listed a number of provisions. I don't want to be repetitive, but I think the call to action regarding uncontained airliner engine failures is critical. That is actually the second uncontained failure of that engine with Southwest Airlines in 18 months, which means that somewhere turbine blades are not a life-limited part. There is something amiss in the manufacturing process, and we need to get to the bottom of that.

We also need to be sure that the proper testing is being done to ensure their integrity as the planes continue to fly.

It also has some language regarding incidents of sexual misconduct on flights I support, but I am preparing and will offer a broader stand-alone provision bill on that subject in the near future.

It modestly increases funding levels for aviation programs and includes a \$1 billion annual infusion from the general fund for certain AIP projects, principally for small airports in rural communities.

This falls far short of meeting the needs of all airports and all the gates and terminal work we need, as I mentioned earlier in discussing the lack of a PFC in this bill.

Finally, it creates a newly named position in the FAA, that would be chief technology officer. Currently, the department administrator acts as the chief technology officer. So I am not quite certain what that accomplishes, but I will certainly look forward to monitoring that position and the progress and reports on NextGen that that person produces in the near future.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, our general aviation pilot.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his

work on putting together a long-term bill.

Mr. Chairman, one of the priorities which was included in the manager's amendment is a program to invest in our small airports.

As part of the increased investment in transportation programs that was provided in the fiscal year 2018 omnibus, we provided an additional \$1 billion to the FAA in discretionary grants to small airports. Now airports across the country are going to have the opportunity to compete for additional dollars to carry out the larger projects.

We also have some very important accountability measures. As such, we are asking to review all the FAA's efforts to date on NextGen. This is pure and simple accountability to ensure our tax dollars are being spent to execute the important goals of NextGen.

Mr. Chairman, I ask all of my colleagues to support the manager's amendment, obviously, and the underlying bill. This is a good bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the leadership of this committee for their work.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the en bloc amendment, and I wanted to specifically mention a provision that is very important to the folks who are in Palm Beach County and also Bedminster, New Jersey, which is this constituency of Mr. LANCE.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what your political ideology is, it is very important for the President to be safe whenever he travels, and this often results in travel restrictions in the locality he visits.

In terms of my locality, Palm Beach County, Florida, Mr. Trump has spent 70 days this year at Mar-a-Lago, dubbed as the winter White House. But here is what happens when he visits a small business operating airport called Lantana Airport, which is 10 miles from Mar-a-Lago: It is completely shut down, which means basically there is a lot of lost income. It is estimated almost \$1 million a year.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if you translate that out, that would be \$4 million.

As I said, the President's safety is paramount, and the impact to the local business is a problem. So there is a provision in this amendment that requires the FAA to study the economic impact of flight restrictions, which I think is a good thing, and to analyze the possibilities of some other options.

Mr. Chairman, again, I do support this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2758. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to provide for the display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag at the World War I Memorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 839, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 printed in part A of House Report 115-650, offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

Page 11, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1. USE OF FUNDS FROM PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES TO PREVENT POWER OUTAGES.

Section 40117(a)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) An on-airport project to purchase and install generators to prevent power outages in passenger areas of the airport, to separate an airport's redundant power supply and its main power supply, or for any other on-airport project to prevent power outages or damage to the airport's power supply.”

Page 32, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 1. USE OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT FUNDS TO PREVENT POWER OUTAGES.

Section 47102(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(P) an on-airport project to purchase and install generators to prevent power outages in the passenger areas of the airport, separate an airport's redundant power supply and its main power supply, or prevent power outages in the airport or damage to the airport's power supply.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

Page 12, line 23, insert “a sink or sanitizing equipment,” after “surface.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. WATSON COLEMAN OF NEW JERSEY

Page 13, line 19, strike “building.” and insert “building and will maintain a baby

changing table in 1 men's and 1 women's restroom in each passenger terminal building of the airport."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS OF WASHINGTON

Page 25, strike lines 13 through 18 and insert the following:

(2) EXEMPTION.—Section 47124(b)(3)(D) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "Airports with air service under part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, and more than 25,000 passenger enplanements in calendar year 2014 shall be exempt from any cost-share requirement under this subparagraph."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN OF ARKANSAS

Page 32, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 137. GENERAL WRITTEN ASSURANCES.

Section 47107(a)(17) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "each contract" and inserting "if any phase of such project has received funds under this subchapter, each contract".

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY OF ILLINOIS

Page 37, line 1, insert "AND ECONOMIC" after "HEALTH".

Page 38, line 5, strike "and" at the end.

Page 38, line 12, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 38, after line 12, insert the following:

(5) consider the economic harm or benefits to businesses located party or wholly underneath flight paths most frequently used by aircraft flying at an altitude lower than 10,000 feet, including during takeoff or landing.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 37, line 23, strike "or" at the end.

Page 37, after line 23, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraph accordingly):

(H) Seattle; or

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN CONTROL TOWERS.

Section 47116(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended adding at the end the following:

"(3) CONTROL TOWER CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 47124(b)(4)(A), the Secretary may provide grants under this section to an airport sponsor for the construction or improvement of a nonapproach control tower, as defined by the Secretary, and for the acquisition and installation of air traffic control, communications, and related equipment to be used in that tower. Such grants shall be subject to the distribution requirements of subsection (b) and the eligibility requirements of section 47124(b)(4)(B)."

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEBRASKA

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____ . SMALL AIRPORT REGULATION RELIEF.

Section 47114(c)(1) is amended by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

"(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 THROUGH 2020.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) and subject to subparagraph (G), the Secretary shall apportion to a sponsor of an airport under that subparagraph for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2020 an amount based on the number of passenger boardings at the airport during calendar year 2012 if the airport—

"(i) had 10,000 or more passenger boardings during calendar year 2012;

"(ii) had fewer than 10,000 passenger boardings during the calendar year used to calculate the apportionment for fiscal year 2018, 2019, or 2020, as applicable, under subparagraph (A); and

"(iii) had scheduled air service at any point in the calendar year used to calculate the apportionment."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 42, line 17, insert the following:

(k) AUTHORIZATION FOR THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may accept funds from the Secretary of Defense to increase the authorized funding for this section by the amount of such transfer only to carry out projects designed for environmental mitigation at a site previously, but not currently, managed by the Department of Defense.

(2) ADDITIONAL GRANTEES.—If additional funds are made available by the Secretary of Defense under paragraph (1), the Administrator may increase the number of grantees under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

Page 46, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LEAD EMISSIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine under which the National Research Council will conduct a study and develop a report on aviation gasoline.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an assessment of—

(1) existing non-leaded fuel alternatives to the aviation gasoline used by piston-powered general aviation aircraft;

(2) ambient Pb concentrations at and around airports where piston-powered general aviation aircraft are used; and

(3) mitigation measures to reduce ambient Pb concentrations, including increasing the size of run-up areas, relocating run-up areas, imposing restrictions on aircraft using aviation gasoline, and increasing the use of motor gasoline in piston-powered general aviation aircraft.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress the report developed by the National Research Council pursuant to this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 46, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AIRCRAFT NOISE, EMISSION, AND FUEL BURN REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may carry out an aircraft noise, emission, and fuel burn reduction research and development program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(1) support efforts to accelerate the development of new aircraft, engine technologies, and jet fuels;

(2) pursue lighter and more efficient turbine engine components, advanced aircraft wing designs, fuselage structures for innovative aircraft architectures, and smart aircraft and engine control systems; and

(3) partner with private industry to accomplish the goals of the program.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1 ____ . TERMINAL SEQUENCING AND SPACING.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the status of Terminal Sequencing and Spacing (TSAS) implementation across all completed NextGen Metroplexes with specific information provided by airline regarding the adoption and equipping of aircraft and the training of pilots in its use.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title I of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . NOISE AND HEALTH IMPACT TRAINING.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on—

(1) while maintaining safety as the top priority, whether air traffic controllers and airspace designers are trained on noise and health impact mitigation in addition to efficiency; and

(2) the prevalence of vectoring flights due to over-crowded departure and arrival paths and alternatives to this practice.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY OF ARIZONA

Page 51, after line 24, insert the following:

(x) Airport owners and operators.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle A of title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2 ____ . PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR FIREFIGHTING FOAMS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the FAA, using the latest version of National Fire Protection Association 403, "Standard for Aircraft Rescue and Fire-Fighting Services at Airports", and in coordination with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, aircraft manufacturers and airports, shall not require the use of fluorinated chemicals to meet the performance standards referenced in chapter 6 of AC No: 150/5210-6D and acceptable under 139.319(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. ESTES OF KANSAS

Page 72, line 20, strike "and".

Page 72, after line 20, insert the following:

(H) aircraft manufacturers; and

Page 72, line 21, strike "(H)" and insert "(I)".

Page 73, after line 7, insert the following:

(4) ensuring adequate and timely provision of Flight Standards activities and responses necessary for type certification, operational evaluation, and entry into service of newly manufactured aircraft;

Page 73, line 8, strike "(4)" and insert "(5)".

Page 73, line 10, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 73, lines 13 through 14, strike "the date of enactment of this Act" and insert "the date of the establishment of the Task Force".

Page 73, lines 23 through 24, strike "action or cost-effective legislative action" and insert ", policy, or cost-effective legislative action to improve the efficiency of agency activities".

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

Page 104, line 10, insert "and pregnant women" after "children".

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 109, after line 15, insert the following:
 (a) **WORKFORCE READINESS.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall coordinate with government, educational institutions, labor organizations representing aviation maintenance workers, and businesses to develop guidance or model curricula for aviation maintenance technician schools certificated under part 147 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations to ensure workforce readiness for industry needs, including curricula related to training in avionics, troubleshooting, and other areas of industry needs.

(1) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall publish the guidance or model curricula.

(2) The Administrator shall publish updates to the guidance or model curricula at least once every 2 years from the date of initial publication.

Page 109, line 16, strike “(a)” and insert “(b)”.

Page 109, line 19, strike “(b)” and insert “(c)”.

Page 110, line 18, strike “and”.

Page 110, line 22, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 110, after line 22, insert the following:

(7) develop recommendations for addressing the needs for government funding, private investment, equipment for training purposes, and other resources necessary to strengthen existing training programs or develop new training programs to support workforce growth in the aviation industry.

Page 110, line 23, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

Page 111, line 4, strike “(d)” and insert “(e)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MISSOURI

At the end of subtitle A of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . . . EXIT ROWS.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a review of current safety procedures regarding unoccupied exit rows on a covered aircraft in passenger air transportation during all stages of flight.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out the review, the Administrator shall consult with air carriers, aviation manufacturers, and labor stakeholders.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the review.

(d) **COVERED AIRCRAFT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered aircraft” means an aircraft operating under part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. CRIST OF FLORIDA

Page 112, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 319. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON FAA ENFORCEMENT POLICY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study, and report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the United States Senate on the results thereof, on the effectiveness of Order 8000.373, Federal Aviation Administration Compliance Philosophy, announced on June 26, 2015. Such study shall include information about—

(1) whether reports of safety incidents increased following the order;

(2) whether reduced enforcement penalties increased the overall number of safety incidents that occurred; and

(3) whether FAA enforcement staff registered complaints about reduced enforcement reducing compliance with safety regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . . . SPECIAL RULES FOR MODEL AIRCRAFT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the incorporation of unmanned aircraft systems into Federal Aviation Administration plans and policies, including this subtitle, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may not promulgate any rule or regulation regarding a model aircraft or an aircraft being developed as a model aircraft; except for—

(1) rules regarding the registration of certain model aircraft pursuant to section 44103; and

(2) rules regarding unmanned aircraft that by design provide advanced flight capabilities enabling active, sustained, and controlled navigation of the aircraft beyond the visual line of sight of the operator, if—

(A) the aircraft is flown strictly for hobby or recreational use;

(B) the model aircraft operator is a current member of a community-based organization and whose aircraft is operated in accordance with the organization’s safety rules;

(C) the aircraft is limited to not more than 55 pounds unless otherwise certified through a design, construction, inspection, flight test, and operational safety program administered by a community-based organization;

(D) the aircraft is operated in a manner that does not interfere with and gives way to any manned aircraft;

(E) the aircraft is not operated over or within the property of a fixed site facility that operates amusement rides available for use by the general public or the property extending 500 lateral feet beyond the perimeter of such facility unless the operation is authorized by the owner of the amusement facility; and

(F) when flown within 3 miles of an airport, the operator of the aircraft provides the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport) with prior notice of the operation (model aircraft operators flying from a permanent location within 3 miles of an airport should establish a mutually agreed upon operating procedure with the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport)).

(b) **AUTOMATED INSTANT AUTHORIZATION.**—When the FAA has established a fully operational and functional automated instant authorization and notification system, the model aircraft operator shall use this system for access to controlled airspace unless flown at a permanent location made known to the Administrator (model aircraft operators flying from a permanent location should establish a mutually agreed upon operating procedure with the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport)).

(c) **COMMERCIAL OPERATION FOR INSTRUCTIONAL OR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.**—A flight of an unmanned aircraft shall be treated as a flight of a model aircraft for purposes of subsection (a) (regardless of any compensation, reimbursement, or other consideration exchanged or incidental economic benefit gained in the course of planning, operating, or supervising the flight), if the flight is—

(1) conducted for instructional or educational purposes; and

(2) operated or supervised by a member of a community-based organization recognized pursuant to subsection (e).

(d) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator to pursue enforcement action against persons operating model aircraft who endanger the safety of the national airspace system.

(e) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “community-based organization” means a nationwide membership-based association entity that—

(1) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(3) the mission of which is demonstrably the furtherance of model aviation;

(4) provides a comprehensive set of safety guidelines for all aspects of model aviation addressing the assembly and operation of model aircraft and that emphasize safe aeromodelling operations within the national airspace system and the protection and safety of individuals and property on the ground, and may provide a comprehensive set of safety rules and programming for the operation of unmanned aircraft that have the advanced flight capabilities enabling active, sustained, and controlled navigation of the aircraft beyond visual line of sight of the operator;

(5) provides programming and support for any local charter organizations, affiliates, or clubs; and

(6) provides assistance and support in the development and operation of locally designated model aircraft flying sites.

(f) **RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.**—In collaboration with aeromodelling stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish an advisory circular within 180 days of enactment that identifies the criteria and process required for recognition of nationwide community-based organizations. This recognition shall be in the form of a memorandum of agreement between the FAA and each community-based organization and does not require regulatory action to implement.

(g) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except for rules to implement remote identification for unmanned aircraft that by design provide advanced flight capabilities enabling active, sustained, and controlled navigation of the aircraft beyond the visual line of sight of the operator and for rules regarding the registration of certain model aircraft pursuant to section 44103, this section shall become effective when the rule, referred to in section 532 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, regarding revisions to part 107 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, becomes final.

SEC. 3 . . . RECREATIONAL UAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue rules and regulations relating to small UAS flown for recreational or educational use, and that are not operated within all of the criteria outlined in the special rule for model aircraft in section 45505 of title 49, United States Code, or the requirements of part 107 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—When issuing the rules and regulation pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall—

(1) require the completion of an online or electronic educational tutorial that is focused on knowledge of the primary rules necessary for the safe operation of such UAS and whose completion time is of reasonable length and limited duration;

(2) include provisions that enable the operation of such UAS by individuals under the age of 16 without a certificated pilot;

(3) require UAS operators within Class B, C, D and E airspace to obtain authorization, as the Administrator may determine to be necessary within that airspace, but only after a near-instantaneous automated airspace authorization capability is available for the airspace in which the operator wants to operate; and

(4) include provisions that provide specific operational rules for UAS operating in close proximity to airports in class G airspace.

(c) MAINTAINING BROAD ACCESS TO UAS TECHNOLOGY.—When issuing rules or regulations for the operation of UAS under this section, the Administrator shall not—

(1) require the pilot or operator of the UAS to obtain or hold an airman certificate;

(2) require a practical flight examination, medical examination, or the completion of a flight training program;

(3) limit such UAS operations to pre-designated fixed locations or uncontrolled airspace; or

(4) require airworthiness certification of any UAS operated pursuant to this section.

(d) COLLABORATION.—The Administrator shall carry out this section in collaboration with industry and community-based organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO OF OREGON

Page 138, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 9 on page 141 and insert the following (and update the table of contents accordingly):

“§ 45509. Exception for limited recreational operations of unmanned aircraft

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (e), and notwithstanding chapter 447 of title 49, United States Code, a person may operate a small unmanned aircraft without specific certification or operating authority from the Federal Aviation Administration if the operation adheres to all of the following limitations:

“(1) The aircraft is flown strictly for recreational purposes.

“(2) The aircraft is operated in accordance with or within the programming of a community-based set of safety guidelines that conform with published Federal Aviation Administration advisory materials.

“(3) The aircraft is flown within the visual line of sight of the person operating the aircraft or a visual observer co-located and in direct communication with the operator.

“(4) The aircraft is operated in a manner that does not interfere with and gives way to any manned aircraft.

“(5) In Class B, Class C, or Class D airspace or within the lateral boundaries of the surface area of Class E airspace designated for an airport, the operator obtains prior authorization from the Administrator or designee before operating and complies with all airspace restrictions and prohibitions.

“(6) In Class G airspace, the aircraft is flown from the surface to not more than 400 feet above ground level and complies with all airspace restrictions and prohibitions.

“(7) The operator has passed an aeronautical knowledge and safety test described in subsection (g) and administered by the Federal Aviation Administration online for the operation of unmanned aircraft systems and maintains proof of test passage to be made available to the Administrator or law enforcement upon request.

“(8) The aircraft is registered and marked in accordance with chapter 441 of this title and proof of registration is made available to the Administrator or a designee of the Administrator or law enforcement upon request.

“(b) OTHER OPERATIONS.—Unmanned aircraft operations that do not conform to the limitations in subsection (a) must comply with all statutes and regulations generally applicable to unmanned aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems.

“(c) OPERATIONS AT FIXED SITES.—

“(1) OPERATING PROCEDURE REQUIRED.—Persons operating unmanned aircraft under subsection (a) from a fixed site within Class B, Class C, or Class D airspace or within the lateral boundaries of the surface area of Class E airspace designated for an airport, or a community-based organization conducting a sanctioned event within such airspace, shall establish a mutually agreed upon operating procedure with the air traffic control facility.

“(2) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT WEIGHING MORE THAN 55 POUNDS.—A person may operate an unmanned aircraft weighing more than 55 pounds, including the weight of anything attached to or carried by the aircraft, under subsection (a) if—

“(A) the unmanned aircraft complies with standards and limitations developed by a community-based organization and approved by the Administrator; and

“(B) the aircraft is operated from a fixed site as described in paragraph (1).

“(d) UPDATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with government and industry stakeholders, including community-based organizations, shall initiate a process to periodically update the operational parameters under subsection (a), as appropriate.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In updating an operational parameter under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consider—

“(A) appropriate operational limitations to mitigate risks to aviation safety and national security, including risk to the uninformed public and critical infrastructure;

“(B) operations outside the membership, guidelines, and programming of a community-based organization;

“(C) physical characteristics, technical standards, and classes of aircraft operating under this section;

“(D) trends in use, enforcement, or incidents involving unmanned aircraft systems;

“(E) ensuring, to the greatest extent practicable, that updates to the operational parameters correspond to, and leverage, advances in technology; and

“(F) equipment requirements that facilitate safe, efficient, and secure operations and further integrate all unmanned aircraft into the National Airspace System.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as expanding the authority of the Administrator to require a person operating an unmanned aircraft under this section to seek permissive authority of the Administrator, beyond that required in subsection (a) of this section, prior to operation in the National Airspace System.

“(e) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator to pursue an enforcement action against a person operating any unmanned aircraft who endangers the safety of the National Airspace System.

“(f) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Administrator from promulgating rules generally applicable to unmanned aircraft, including those unmanned aircraft eligible for the exception set forth in this section, relating to—

“(1) updates to the operational parameters for unmanned aircraft in subsection (a);

“(2) the registration and marking of unmanned aircraft;

“(3) the standards for remotely identifying owners and operators of unmanned aircraft

systems and associated unmanned aircraft; and

“(4) other standards consistent with maintaining the safety and security of the National Airspace System.

“(g) AERONAUTICAL KNOWLEDGE AND SAFETY TEST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with manufacturers of unmanned aircraft systems, other industry stakeholders, and community-based aviation organizations, shall develop an aeronautical knowledge and safety test that can be administered electronically.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall ensure the aeronautical knowledge and safety test is designed to adequately demonstrate an operator’s—

“(A) understanding of aeronautical safety knowledge; and

“(B) knowledge of Federal Aviation Administration regulations and requirements pertaining to the operation of an unmanned aircraft system in the National Airspace System.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA OF HAWAII

Page 157, line 2, strike the semicolon and insert “, including during emergency situations that may threaten public safety;”

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

Page 161, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 342. UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Transportation may establish a pilot program to enable enhanced drone operations as required in the October 25, 2017 Presidential Memorandum entitled “Unmanned Aircraft Systems Integration Pilot Program” and described in 82 Federal Register 50301.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall accept applications from State, local, and Tribal governments, in partnership with unmanned aircraft system operators and other private-sector stakeholders, to test and evaluate the integration of civil and public UAS operations into the low-altitude national airspace system.

(c) OBJECTIVES.—The purpose of the pilot program is to accelerate existing UAS integration plans by working to solve technical, regulatory, and policy challenges, while enabling advanced UAS operations in select areas subject to ongoing safety oversight and cooperation between the Federal Government and applicable State, local, or Tribal jurisdictions, in order to—

(1) accelerate the safe integration of UAS into the NAS by testing and validating new concepts of beyond visual line of sight operations in a controlled environment, focusing on detect and avoid technologies, command and control links, navigation, weather, and human factors;

(2) address ongoing concerns regarding the potential security and safety risks associated with UAS operating in close proximity to human beings and critical infrastructure by ensuring that operators communicate more effectively with Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement to enable law enforcement to determine if a UAS operation poses such a risk;

(3) promote innovation in and development of the United States unmanned aviation industry, especially in sectors such as agriculture, emergency management, inspection, and transportation safety, in which there are significant public benefits to be gained from the deployment of UAS; and

(4) identify the most effective models of balancing local and national interests in UAS integration.

(d) APPLICATION SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall establish application requirements and require applicants to include the following information:

- (1) Identification of the airspace to be used, including shape files and altitudes.
- (2) Description of the types of planned operations.
- (3) Identification of stakeholder partners to test and evaluate planned operations.
- (4) Identification of available infrastructure to support planned operations.
- (5) Description of experience with UAS operations and regulations.
- (6) Description of existing UAS operator and any other stakeholder partnerships and experience.
- (7) Description of plans to address safety, security, competition, privacy concerns, and community outreach.

(e) REASONABLE TIME, MANNER, AND PLACE LIMITATIONS.—

- (1) IN GENERAL.—
- (A) REQUESTS.—The Lead Applicant may request reasonable time, place and manner limitations on low-altitude UAS operations within its jurisdiction to facilitate the proposed development and testing of new and innovative UAS concepts of operations in addition to other selection criteria.
- (B) SELF-IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS.—The Secretary shall require jurisdictions to ensure that any time, place and manner limitations, including those adopted through means such as legislation or regulation, include self-implementing provisions that automatically terminate those restrictions upon the termination of the Memorandum of Agreement.

(C) MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Monitoring and enforcement of any limitations enacted pursuant to this pilot project shall be the responsibility of the jurisdiction.

(ii) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in clause (i) may be construed to prevent the Secretary from enforcing Federal law.

(2) EXAMPLES.—Examples of reasonable time, manner, and place limitations may include—

- (A) prohibiting flight during specified morning and evening rush hours or only permitting flight during specified hours such as daylight hours, sufficient to ensure reasonable airspace access;
 - (B) establishing designated take-off and landing zones, limiting operations over moving locations or fixed site public road and parks, sidewalks or private property based on zoning density, or other land use considerations;
 - (C) requiring notice to public safety or zoning or land use authorities before operating;
 - (D) limiting UAS operations within designated altitudes within airspace over the jurisdiction;
 - (E) specifying maximum speed of flight over specified areas;
 - (F) prohibiting operations in connection with community or sporting events that do not remain in one place (for example, parades and running events); and
 - (G) mandating equipage.
- (f) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In making determinations, the Secretary shall evaluate whether applications meet or exceed the following criteria:
- (1) Overall economic, geographic, and climatic diversity of the selected jurisdictions.
 - (2) Overall diversity of the proposed models of government involvement.
 - (3) Overall diversity of the UAS operations to be conducted.
 - (4) The location of critical infrastructure.
 - (5) The involvement of commercial entities in the proposal and their ability to advance objectives that may serve the public interest

as a result of further integration of UAS into the NAS.

- (6) The involvement of affected communities in, and their support for, participating in the pilot program.
- (7) The commitment of the governments and UAS operators involved in the proposal to comply with requirements related to national defense, homeland security, and public safety and to address competition, privacy, and civil liberties concerns.
- (8) The commitment of the governments and UAS operators involved in the proposal to achieve the following policy objectives:
 - (A) Promoting innovation and economic development.
 - (B) Enhancing transportation safety.
 - (C) Enhancing workplace safety.
 - (D) Improving emergency response and search and rescue functions.
 - (E) Using radio spectrum efficiently and competitively.

(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall use the data collected and experience gained over the course of this pilot program to—

- (1) identify and resolve technical challenges to UAS integration;
- (2) address airspace use to safely and efficiently integrate all aircraft;
- (3) inform operational standards and procedures to improve safety (for example, detect and avoid capabilities, navigation and altitude performance, and command and control link);
- (4) inform FAA standards that reduce the need for waivers (for example, for operations over human beings, night operations, and beyond visual line of sight); and
- (5) address competing interests regarding UAS operational expansion, safety, security, roles and responsibilities of non-Federal Government entities, and privacy issues.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

- (1) The term “Lead Applicant” means an eligible State, local or Tribal government that has submitted a timely application.
- (2) The term “NAS” means the low-altitude national airspace system.
- (3) The term “UAS” means unmanned aircraft system.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . ENFORCEMENT.

(a) UAS SAFETY ENFORCEMENT.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall establish a program to utilize available remote detection and identification technologies for safety oversight, including enforcement actions against operators of unmanned aircraft systems that are not in compliance with applicable Federal aviation laws, including regulations.

(b) REPORTING.—As part of the program, the Administrator shall establish and publicize a mechanism for the public and Federal, State, and local law enforcement to report suspected operation of unmanned aircraft in violation of applicable Federal laws and regulations.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

- (1) The number of unauthorized unmanned aircraft operations detected in restricted airspace, including in and around airports, together with a description of such operations.
- (2) The number of enforcement cases brought by the Federal Aviation Administration or other Federal agencies for unauthorized operation of unmanned aircraft detected through the program, together with a description of such cases.

(3) Recommendations for safety and operational standards for unmanned aircraft detection and mitigation systems.

(4) Recommendations for any legislative or regulatory changes related to mitigation or detection or identification of unmanned aircraft systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN OF WISCONSIN

At the end of subtitle B of title III of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . ACTIVELY TETHERED PUBLIC UAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue such regulations as are necessary to authorize the use of certain actively tethered public unmanned aircraft system by government public safety agencies without any requirement to obtain a certificate of waiver, certificate of authorization, or other approval by the Federal Aviation Administration.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall establish risk-based operational conditions for operation of actively tethered public unmanned aircraft systems by government public safety agencies that recognize and accommodate the unique operational circumstances of such systems, including the requirements that the aircraft component may only be operated—

- (1) within the line of sight of the operator;
- (2) less than 200 feet above the ground;
- (3) within class G airspace; and
- (4) at least 5 statute miles from the geographic center of a tower-controller airport or airport denoted on a current aeronautical chart published by the Federal Aviation Administration, except that an actively tethered public unmanned aircraft system may be operated closer than 5 statute miles to the airport if—

(A) the operator of the actively tethered public unmanned aircraft system provides prior notice to the airport operator and receives, for a tower-controlled airport, prior approval from the air traffic control facility located at the airport; or

(B) the exigent circumstances of an emergency prevent the giving of notice contemplated by clause (i) and the actively tethered public unmanned aircraft system is operated outside the flight path of any manned aircraft.

(c) DEFINITION OF ACTIVELY TETHERED PUBLIC UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.—The term “actively tethered public unmanned aircraft system” means public unmanned aircraft system in which the unmanned aircraft component—

- (1) weighs 4.4 pounds or less, including payload;
- (2) is physically attached to a ground station with a taut, appropriately load-rated tether that provides continuous power to the unmanned aircraft; and
- (3) is capable of being controlled and retrieved by such ground station through physical manipulation of the tether.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GOSAR). Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 25 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 25 printed in part A of House Report No. 115-650 offered by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

The amendment is modified as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 — SPECIAL RULES FOR MODEL AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the incorporation of unmanned aircraft systems into Federal Aviation Administration plans and policies, including this subtitle, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may not promulgate any rule or regulation regarding a model aircraft or an aircraft being developed as a model aircraft, except for—

(1) rules regarding the registration of certain model aircraft pursuant to section 44103; and

(2) rules regarding unmanned aircraft that by design provide advanced flight capabilities enabling active, sustained, and controlled navigation of the aircraft beyond the visual line of sight of the operator, if—

(A) the aircraft is flown strictly for hobby or recreational use;

(B) the model aircraft operator is a current member of a community-based organization and whose aircraft is operated in accordance with the organization's safety rules;

(C) the aircraft is limited to not more than 55 pounds unless otherwise certified through a design, construction, inspection, flight test, and operational safety program administered by a community-based organization;

(D) the aircraft is operated in a manner that does not interfere with and gives way to any manned aircraft;

(E) the aircraft is not operated over or within the property of a fixed site facility that operates amusement rides available for use by the general public or the property extending 500 lateral feet beyond the perimeter of such facility unless the operation is authorized by the owner of the amusement facility; and

(F) when flown within 5 miles of an airport, the operator of the aircraft provides the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport) with prior notice of the operation (model aircraft operators flying from a permanent location within 5 miles of an airport should establish a mutually agreed upon operating procedure with the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport)).

(b) AUTOMATED INSTANT AUTHORIZATION.—When the FAA has developed and implemented an automated airspace authorization system for the airspace in which the operator wants to operate, the model aircraft operator shall use this system for authorization to controlled airspace unless flown—

(1) at a permanent location agreed to by the Administrator; and

(2) in accordance with a mutually agreed upon operating procedure established with the airport operator and the airport air traffic control tower (when an air traffic facility is located at the airport).

(d) COMMERCIAL OPERATION FOR INSTRUCTIONAL OR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.—A flight of an unmanned aircraft shall be treated as a flight of a model aircraft for purposes of subsection (a) (regardless of any compensation, reimbursement, or other consideration exchanged or incidental economic benefit

gained in the course of planning, operating, or supervising the flight), if the flight is—

(1) conducted for instructional or educational purposes; and

(2) operated or supervised by a member of a community-based organization recognized pursuant to subsection (e).

(e) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator to pursue enforcement action against persons operating model aircraft who endanger the safety of the national airspace system.

(f) COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “community-based organization” means a nationwide membership-based association entity that—

(1) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(3) the mission of which is demonstrably the furtherance of model aviation;

(4) provides a comprehensive set of safety guidelines for all aspects of model aviation addressing the assembly and operation of model aircraft and that emphasize safe aeromodelling operations within the national airspace system and the protection and safety of individuals and property on the ground, and may provide a comprehensive set of safety rules and programming for the operation of unmanned aircraft that have the advanced flight capabilities enabling active, sustained, and controlled navigation of the aircraft beyond visual line of sight of the operator;

(5) provides programming and support for any local charter organizations, affiliates, or clubs; and

(6) provides assistance and support in the development and operation of locally designated model aircraft flying sites.

(g) RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.—In collaboration with aeromodelling stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish an advisory circular within 180 days of enactment that identifies the criteria and process required for recognition of nationwide community-based organizations. This recognition shall be in the form of a memorandum of agreement between the FAA and each community-based organization and does not require regulatory action to implement.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except for rules to implement remote identification for unmanned aircraft that by design provide advanced flight capabilities enabling active, sustained, and controlled navigation of the aircraft beyond the visual line of sight of the operator and for rules regarding the registration of certain model aircraft pursuant to section 44103, this section shall become effective when the rule, referred to in section 532 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, regarding revisions to part 107 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, becomes final.

SEC. 3 — RECREATIONAL UAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue rules and regulations relating to small UAS flown for recreational or educational use, and that are not operated within all of the criteria outlined in the special rule for model aircraft in section 45505 of title 49, United States Code, or the requirements of part 107 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—When issuing the rules and regulation pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall—

(1) require the completion of an online or electronic educational tutorial that is focused on knowledge of the primary rules necessary for the safe operation of such UAS

and whose completion time is of reasonable length and limited duration;

(2) include provisions that enable the operation of such UAS by individuals under the age of 16 without a certificated pilot;

(3) require UAS operators within Class B, C, D and E airspace to obtain authorization, as the Administrator may determine to be necessary within that airspace, but only after the Federal Aviation Administration has developed and implemented an automated airspace authorization system for the airspace in which the operator wants to operate; and

(4) include provisions that provide specific operational rules for UAS operating in close proximity to airports in class G airspace.

(c) MAINTAINING BROAD ACCESS TO UAS TECHNOLOGY.—When issuing rules or regulations for the operation of UAS under this section, the Administrator shall not—

(1) require the pilot or operator of the UAS to obtain or hold an airman certificate;

(2) require a practical flight examination, medical examination, or the completion of a flight training program;

(3) limit such UAS operations to pre-designated fixed locations or uncontrolled airspace; or

(4) require airworthiness certification of any UAS operated pursuant to this section.

(d) COLLABORATION.—The Administrator shall carry out this section in collaboration with industry and community-based organizations.

Mr. SHUSTER (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support considering these amendments en bloc, all of which have been approved by both the majority and the minority.

These Members put forth thoughtful amendments, and I am pleased to be able to support moving them en bloc.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the adoption of these amendments en bloc. This grouping includes many Democratic and Republican amendments, and each, as the chairman has said, has been approved by the majority and the minority for consideration en bloc.

Among the amendments in this package is my comprehensive solution to the ever-growing list of safety and security concerns that have resulted from an unwise provision of law adopted in 2012.

That law prohibits the Federal Aviation Administration from promulgating any rule or regulation relating to drones flown for hobby or recreational purposes.

Let me repeat: any rule or regulation relating to drones flown for hobby or recreational purposes.

This was put in at the behest of model aircraft folks, who have a long

and very responsible history, know the rules of the road in the air, but now there are millions of other people now operating relatively inexpensive drones. Things have changed pretty dramatically in that time period, and we sorely need some reasonable regulations.

There are very strong national security concerns expressed by Homeland and Secret Service and others, and they are saying that basically they are going to hold back any rules regarding drones until they can be assured that the operators and the drone can be identified, which the commercial people can easily do.

□ 1345

It would be an expense for the recreational manufacturers so there is a competing amendment that is more conciliatory toward the Chinese drone manufacturers, which is a concern I don't have.

Sooner or later, one of these little toy drones is going to take down an aircraft and people are going to die. Plain and simple. They have already conducted tests on the hull, and they have found that a small quadcopter can cause fatal damage to aircraft controls. And they haven't even done the ingestion test yet into a jet engine, a turbine engine, where you will see more uncontained failures like the one we saw last week.

So it is critical that we get a handle on this and the proliferation of these with people with little or no experience or knowledge of aviation rules. Countless stakeholders are supporting my version, which would be the commercial drone industry, U.S. airlines and pilots, air traffic controllers, aircraft manufacturers, State and local entities.

They have all been asking for modification or repeal of that provision prohibiting the FAA from regulating recreational drone users. Until this is done, our skies will be less safe and the true potential of the commercial drone industry will never be unlocked because of the security concerns that I already mentioned.

My amendment, among other things, grants the FAA the authority to impose standards on recreational users as needed, ensure the safety of our airspace system going forward, including requirements remotely identifying and tracking drone operators. That first step is critical to protecting sensitive facilities, assets, and addressing the concerns of Homeland Security, Secret Service, and others.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment en bloc, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds all Members not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am proud to speak in support of this en bloc amendment, and then also in support of H.R. 4.

It is finally a long-term reauthorization of the FAA. Two programs of vital importance to my district are the Essential Air Service program and the Contract Tower Program. Both programs are critical to rural areas and are protected in this bill.

The bill also includes a provision I authorized and authored to ensure small low-risk microdrones can be operated safely, but also under different operational requirements than larger drones. Safely and more appropriately integrating microdrones into the airspace will foster innovation at companies like Horizon Hobby in my district and incentivize better operator compliance.

H.R. 4 also includes important customer service provisions. It prohibits involuntary bumping of passengers once they have already boarded an aircraft. It makes fees and taxes more transparent, and when consumers have complaints about their flying experience, this bill will allow them to call a hotline or use an app on their smartphone.

I also want to mention the disaster title of this bill. It is actually a shame that I have to speak about this again today because this House already passed this legislation last December. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate stripped these provisions out of the disaster supplemental package we passed earlier this year, but now we have an opportunity to finally get this crucial legislation signed into law.

Included in this package is my bill, the Disaster Declaration Improvement Act, which requires FEMA to place a greater weight and consideration on severe, localized impact of damage following a disaster. Passing this bill will have real impact in States like Illinois where a large portion of our population is concentrated in a small geographical area in the northeast portion of our State.

Enacting this language into law will help level the playing field, and help ensure rural areas like my district are given a fair shake when disasters happen and help is needed.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for working to include this disaster package in this bill, and for all of the hard work on the underlying bill, and I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), a member of the committee.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and Chairman SHUSTER for their work on this bill, on this block of amendments, in which I have an amendment that I drafted that would allow airports to apply for grants from the small airport fund to construct air traffic control towers for participation in the Federal Contract Tower Program.

This provision will ensure that our airspace remains the gold standard for safety by helping small airports currently operating without towers to invest in lifesaving safety infrastructure.

It is my understanding that because this will be a new eligibility, the FAA will need to classify the construction of an air traffic control tower under the Airports Capital Improvement Plan to ensure that it is scored properly for purposes of determining grant awards through the national priority ranking system.

Mr. Chair, I ask the chairman if he will agree with me that: first, the FAA has never classified control towers under ACIP before; second, that the FAA should plan to ensure that these high-priority projects are classified properly for consideration in grant decisions; and third, that they should be classified in a manner that provides them with an appropriate, level playing field with other projects to ensure competitiveness, and I ask the chairman if he agrees on these three provisions.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, we will be committed to working with the gentleman as we move forward.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), a member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for all of his hard on H.R. 4.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased that my amendment to codify the FAA's Unmanned Aircraft Systems Integrated Pilot Program is included in this en bloc package.

Drones are an innovation that I know our country is anxious to take advantage of. However, it brings with it a need to rethink and redefine some current policies. Aviation regulations that manage the flow of air traffic at 30,000 feet, or even 1,000 feet, do not make sense when managing the operation of a UAS 5 feet off the ground.

Congress should formally support this pilot program and learn from the data gathered here. We must also recognize the importance of non-Federal bodies like States, municipalities, and Tribal governments to be part of the drone oversight. This pilot program, which my amendment codifies and which stem from a White House proposal, will help us do just that, and it has been widely supported.

In fact, drone associations, traditional aviation groups, and large companies wrote in support of the pilot program. We hope that by Congress codifying the pilot program, the Department of Transportation will now expand the pilot program to further participation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for including two of my amendments in the en bloc package. The gentlemen have set a high bar for leadership and collegiality through this process, and I look forward to working with them as the FAA implements this bill.

My amendments focus on two issues important not only to the residents of Washington's Seventh District, but across the country; namely, the issue of airplane noise and infrastructure needs of fast-growing airports like Sea-Tac.

Many of our communities with large and medium airports are growing by leaps and bounds. According to Airports Council International, over the last 10 years, Sea-Tac's passenger traffic has grown by 52.6 percent, second only to San Francisco. We need to be certain that our communities are able to prepare for that growth, while still ensuring that they remain livable.

These amendments will help to build that evidence base, and I deeply appreciate the consideration.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to propose an amendment to section 232 of H.R. 4, the FAA Reauthorization Act.

As a Representative of the Fourth District of Kansas, which includes Wichita, also known as the Air Capital of the World, I have a deep appreciation for the importance of the aviation industry in our region and country.

For more than 100 years, our community has pioneered aviation and manufacturing. Today, the greater Wichita area is home to many of the world's largest aviation manufacturers and produces nearly 50 percent of all general aviation planes built.

Without question, aviation is a great source of pride for all Kansans, and I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their efforts to support the industry and modernize the FAA.

As part of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, Congress has tasked the FAA administrator to establish a task force on flight standards reform. I believe creating this task force to improve aviation safety standards is a needed and overdue initiative.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. H.R. 4 mandates the task force be comprised of representatives from air carriers, general and business aviation, repair stations, unmanned aviation systems, flight schools, and aviation safety inspectors.

Today, I am offering an amendment to the task force to also include representatives of aircraft manufacturers. I believe those responsible for pro-

ducing our Nation's aircraft can play a valuable role in updating aviation standards and should have a voice.

I want to thank our colleagues for their attention to the industry and consideration of this amendment, and ask that they support the FAA Reauthorization Act.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and ranking member for including my amendment in the en bloc.

My amendment would require the FAA to study the economic harm caused by excessive aircraft noise on communities and businesses near major airports.

Companies adjacent to airports, such as O'Hare International Airport in my district, see that flight paths have to contend with the economic activity in that region, and noise disrupts their customers and interferes with business, in addition to the physiological effects that constant noise has on employees.

Under my amendment, the FAA will study what happens to businesses when they are subject to excessive noise throughout the workday. This will include, but is not limited to, employee productivity and retention, workplace morale and satisfaction, and other data to help policymakers grasp the full effect of airport noise on neighborhoods.

This is a bipartisan, commonsense amendment, and again, I thank the committee for including it in the en bloc.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership and bipartisanship on this bill.

Americans who watched 60 Minutes last weekend or who read the Tampa Bay Times were shocked by serious airline safety concerns—specifically with Allegiant Airlines, a carrier that operates 95 percent of the traffic at my hometown airport. It raises questions about the FAA's "compliance philosophy," focused on fewer enforcement actions, more working quietly with the airlines behind the scenes on safety issues.

I sure hope it is true that airlines are more likely to self-report safety incidents if they do not fear retribution, but lives are at stake, and we must get the facts. My amendment would require an investigation into whether this hands-off approach is, in fact, working. Profits can never trump passenger safety.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this straightforward amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wash-

ington (Mr. KILMER), my neighbor to the north.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of my amendment, which would modify the Airport Improvement Program to require the FAA to explicitly consider the emergency preparedness needs of the communities served when reviewing an airport's master plan.

Currently, the FAA relies primarily on a number of enplanements when making their funding determinations under the AIP. That disadvantages rural airports like William R. Fairchild International Airport in my district, which serves as a critical component of the State's and FEMA's emergency response plan for the region, but has relatively few enplanements.

This commonsense improvement would help ensure that Fairchild and other airports like it will be able to secure the funding necessary to maintain their runway and other critical infrastructure so that the resources are available when disaster strikes.

This matters to folks in my neck of the woods who live in the shadow of the Cascadia subduction zone. When the big one hits, the Fairchild Airport will be essential to deploying emergency supplies, as well as for evacuating people to safety.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their support of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on it.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of my colleagues to support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, Soto amendment number 3 to H.R. 4, FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, would require a sink or sanitizing equipment in the lactation area in commercial service airports.

This small but significant change would benefit traveling mothers and children. A 2014 study in Breastfeeding Medicine showed that only 62 of the top 100 passenger-volume U.S. airports labeled themselves as "breastfeeding friendly". However, they found that only eight of the 100 surveyed airports provided the minimum requirements for a lactation room, as set forth under Section 122 of this bill.

I am pleased to see that this bill would require medium or large hub airports to maintain lactation areas in each passenger terminal building with minimum requirements of a chair, table, and electrical outlet. With the inclusion of my amendment, traveling mother will now have access to sanitation equipment, too.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and the staff of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their support and for working with me on this amendment. I thank my colleagues for their support on this issue.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, Soto amendment, Soto number 21, to the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, H.R. 4, would require the FAA Administrator to also consider the potential emergency medical needs of pregnant women when evaluating the minimum contents of approved medical kits—currently the bill only

specifies the consideration of children's emergency medical needs.

Obstetrical symptoms, while rare causes of in-flight medical emergencies, should be given consideration when evaluating the adequacy of in-flight emergency medical kits.

I am pleased to see that this bill would require the consideration of the potential emergency medical needs of pregnant women. I thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and the staff of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, for their support and for working with me on this amendment. I also thank my colleagues for their support on this issue.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc #1 amendment package to H.R. 4, which includes my amendment (#2). I am proud to offer an amendment that responds to a key and grave local matter.

My amendment is simple: It would allow airports to use Federal funds to buy generators for passenger areas of the airport, something they currently are not able to do. It would also let airports separate backup power from the main power lines, and to complete other projects to prevent power outages using A.I.P. and P.F.C. funds.

As you know, Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, the world's busiest airport, is located in my Congressional district. Last December, an underground fire disabled both the airport's primary and backup power supplies. This caused a power outage that lasted for 11 hours, cancelling hundreds of flights and stranding passengers and employees on planes and in dark terminals.

Fortunately, no one was hurt, but this event raised important public safety questions. The City of Atlanta and Georgia Power are looking into what happened and what can be done to prevent a similar event from occurring in the future. I look forward to their report. My common-sense amendment will give airports the flexibility they need to keep the lights on and passengers safe.

Finally, and most importantly, Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to all the police, firefighters, electricians, and airport, airline, and MARTA employees for their work to assist stranded travelers. I would also like to thank the tens of thousands of passengers who remained calm and patient throughout this unprecedented ordeal.

I appreciate the support of the Chairman and the Ranking Member and thank them and their staffs for working with me on this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with them to keep the travelling public safe.

I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 46, after line 22, insert the following:
SEC. ____ AIRPORT NOISE MITIGATION AND SAFETY STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall initiate a study to review and evaluate existing studies and analyses of the relationship between jet aircraft approach and takeoff speeds and corresponding noise impacts on communities surrounding airports.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study initiated under subsection (a), the Administrator shall determine—

(1) whether a decrease in jet aircraft approach or takeoff speeds results in significant aircraft noise reductions;

(2) whether the jet aircraft approach or takeoff speed reduction necessary to achieve significant noise reductions—

(A) jeopardizes aviation safety; or

(B) decreases the efficiency of the National Airspace System, including lowering airport capacity, increasing travel times, or increasing fuel burn;

(3) the advisability of using jet aircraft approach or takeoff speeds as a noise mitigation technique; and

(4) if the Administrator determines that using jet aircraft approach or takeoff speeds as a noise mitigation technique is advisable, whether any of the metropolitan areas specifically identified in section 157(b)(2) would benefit from such a noise mitigation technique without a significant impact to aviation safety or the efficiency of the National Airspace System.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study initiated under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, briefly, the Roskam amendment does the following:

It recognizes that my constituency, and I think a lot of others, want the benefits of living near a large international airport but not as much of the burden. Here is the backstory about what is going on.

My constituency is right next door to O'Hare Airport, which, as an international airport, brings incredible convenience to my flying constituents and also incredible commerce and opportunity. That is a good thing.

The problem is the burdens of the noise of the airport rest disproportionately with some communities. These are communities that have found themselves with different flight patterns in different situations where, all of a sudden, a flight pattern from years ago is now something that they are seeing overhead.

One constituent of mine in Wayne, Illinois, complained that the noise sometimes is 30 seconds apart for hours on end. Another complained that their house actually shakes because of the planes that are flying so close. Mr.

Chairman, you can imagine how difficult this would be to live in this type of situation.

Realizing that we want the benefits of an international airport and also as quiet a situation as possible, I have worked with my Republican and Democratic colleagues to find common ground.

A scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has completed computer modeling and found that reducing plane takeoff speeds by 35 miles per hour would dramatically reduce the noise pollution and only lengthen flight time by a mere 30 seconds.

This commonsense amendment directs the FAA to study this proposal and report back to Congress on whether or not this will alleviate the nuisance that too many of my constituents have had to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from across the aisle, Congresswoman SPEIER, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am in favor of it.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I actually, recently, had a conversation with the Acting FAA Administrator on this very subject. I think it is something that could help mitigate. Since we have moved to performance-based navigation and changed for more efficient approaches to safe fuel, the airlines are benefiting tremendously, but it has concentrated the noise over a narrow area.

I have also asked the FAA if it would be possible to vary the approaches on performance-based so that you are not always, every day, every hour, every minute, going over exactly the same position. I think that is also something they should look at.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1. JUDICIAL REVIEW FOR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES.

Section 330(e) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking “2 years” and inserting “150 days as set forth in section 139(1)”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B)(i) by striking “2 years” and inserting “150 days as set forth in section 139(1)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the bipartisan Denham-Costa amendment which eliminates duplication of environmental reviews.

The MAP-21 highway bill created the NEPA assignment program in 2012, which allows States to assume responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and compliance of NEPA for Federal aid highway projects and other transportation projects. The program removes an entire layer of Federal bureaucracy from the NEPA process, allowing States and counties to operate more efficiently.

NEPA assignment has been a success, saving time and cost of infrastructure projects across six States: California, Texas, Florida, Ohio, Utah, and Alaska. Two more States, Arizona and Nebraska, are in the process of applying, and all 50 States are eligible to participate.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee built on the success of the NEPA assignment program in the 2015 FAST Act by establishing the NEPA reciprocity program. The NEPA reciprocity program allows States with environmental laws that are at least as stringent as NEPA to make the approval of reviews under State laws and regulations and in replacement of NEPA. This allows States to remove parallel and redundant NEPA requirements from their own environmental process, which will get projects built faster and at a lower cost. In other words, this not only allows one environmental review, but stops us from doing two.

As reasonable and promising as this program is, the judicial review period or window that litigants can challenge a record of decisions is nearly five times longer than for Federal aid highway projects that are subject to NEPA. The judicial review period for the reciprocity program is 2 years, substantially increasing the risk of litigation and dissuading States from pursuing the program.

This amendment harmonizes the statute of limitation for the program with other Federal highway projects to 150 days. Instead of delaying 2 years for lawsuits, we do it in 150 days, the same as all other Federal highway projects.

This commonsense change would render the program workable as originally intended in the FAST Act. This

program would allow States impacted by the 2017 major disasters to rebuild devastated communities faster and at a lower cost, saving taxpayer dollars.

Many wildfire-impacted counties in California have recognized the potential benefits of NEPA reciprocity for their recovery efforts and are pushing the State to participate. This amendment would allow California and other impacted States with major disasters, like Texas and Florida, to apply and rebuild in short order.

In September 2017, the Department of Transportation issued the notice of proposed rulemaking, and the comment period closed in November. DOT should issue the rule to establish the program soon, and this modification must be in place for the program to be workable at that time.

There has been a lot of discussion about environmental review and permitting reform being included in the infrastructure package, and for good reason: projects take too long and they cost way too much money. We have an opportunity to ensure streamlining programs that are already law are working correctly by passing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment being offered by Congressman DENHAM and me to H.R. 4, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Together, we have worked long and hard to reduce the duplicative environmental permitting requirements that contribute, as we all know, to delays in delivery of important transportation projects throughout the Nation and throughout California, as both Congressman DENHAM and I have experienced.

California remains at the forefront of finding innovative ways to streamline the transportation delivery project without compromising the natural environment and complying with environmental laws. As a matter of fact, we have a very big initiative that was passed last year to provide another \$52 billion in construction projects over the next 10 years. So this is an important amendment.

In 2015, Congress passed the FAST Act, which implemented a pilot program to provide reciprocity for environmental permitting for States like California that have laws that provide equal or greater environmental protection. That is the case with California. That is why this amendment is so applicable and why it makes such good common sense.

This amendment would further streamline the delegation process, as the gentleman noted, reduce project delivery times and costs, lead to more projects being constructed at a faster rate, and improve our deteriorating infrastructure.

For all these good reasons, we ought to adopt this amendment. I urge my colleagues to concur.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, although I rose in opposition, my principal concern is this was a very, very long, difficult negotiation as we adopted the FAST Act, and all parties agreed on these five pilot projects.

We gave the task, as we normally do, to the Department of Transportation to draw up a rule that will establish and implement the pilot program, but DOT has not yet acted to establish those rules. So I have concerns about putting strictures on the Department of Transportation before they have had an opportunity to implement the rule, which, hopefully, will be soon forthcoming. I assume it is not one of these rules that the President has held up from being issued, since it would be something beneficial, if properly done.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR.

SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 839, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, and 65 printed in part A of House Report 115-650, offered by Shuster of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER OF NORTH DAKOTA

In title III, at the end of subtitle B add the following:

SEC. 342. REPORT ON POSSIBLE UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS OPERATION ON SPECTRUM ALLOCATED FOR AVIATION USE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and after consultation with relevant stakeholders, the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report—

(1) on whether unmanned aircraft systems operations should be permitted on spectrum designated for aviation use, on an unlicensed, shared, or exclusive basis, for operations within the UTM system or outside of such a system;

(2) that addresses any technological, statutory, regulatory, and operational barriers to the use of such spectrum for unmanned aircraft systems operations; and

(3) that, if it is determined that spectrum designated for aviation use is not suitable for operations by unmanned aircraft systems, includes recommendations of other

spectrum frequencies that may be appropriate for such operations.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.—The term “unmanned aircraft system” means an unmanned aircraft and associated elements (including communication links and the components that control the unmanned aircraft) that are required for the pilot in command to operate safely and efficiently in the national airspace system.

(2) UTM.—The term “UTM” means an unmanned aircraft traffic management system or service.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____ U.S. COUNTER-UAS SYSTEM REVIEW OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION PROCESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after that date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with government agencies currently authorized to operate Counter-Unmanned Aircraft System (C-UAS) systems within the United States (including the territories and possessions of the United States), shall initiate a review of the following:

(1) The process the Administration is utilizing for interagency coordination of C-UAS activity pursuant to a relevant Federal statute authorizing such activity within the United States (including the territories and possessions of the United States).

(2) The standards the Administration is utilizing for operation of a C-UAS systems pursuant to a relevant Federal statute authorizing such activity within the United States (including the territories and possessions of the United States), including whether the following criteria are being taken into consideration in the development of the standards:

(A) Safety of the national airspace.

(B) Protecting individuals and property on the ground.

(C) Non-interference with avionics of manned aircraft, and unmanned aircraft, operating legally in the national airspace.

(D) Non-interference with air traffic control systems.

(E) Consistent procedures in the operation of C-UAS systems to the maximum extent practicable.

(F) Adequate coordination procedures and protocols with the Federal Aviation Administration during the operation of C-UAS systems.

(G) Adequate training for personnel operating C-UAS systems.

(H) Assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the coordination and review processes to ensure national airspace safety while minimizing bureaucracy.

(I) Such other matters the Administrator deems necessary for the safe and lawful operation of C-UAS systems.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date upon which the review in subsection (a) is initiated, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation in the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, a report on the Administration’s activities related to C-UAS systems, including—

(1) any coordination with Federal agencies and States, subdivisions and States, political authorities of at least 2 States that operate C-UAS systems; and

(2) an assessment of the standards being utilized for the operation of a counter-UAS

systems within the United States (including the territories and possessions of the United States).

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 151, before line 17, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

(6) the Administrator should—

(A) place particular priority in continuing measures, including partnering with non-governmental organizations and State and local agencies, to educate the public about the dangers to public safety of operating unmanned aircraft over areas that have temporary flight restrictions in place, for purposes such as wildfires, without appropriate approval or authorization from the Forest Service; and

(B) partner with State and local agencies to effectively enforce relevant laws so that unmanned aircrafts do not interfere with the efforts of emergency responders;

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 161, after line 11, insert the following:

(d) PROGRAM ALIGNMENT.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation within 90 days after enactment of this Act that describes how each of the following programs will be executed or implemented in a systematic and timely manner to avoid duplication, leverage capabilities learned across programs, and support the safe integration of UAS into the national airspace:

(1) Commercially-operated Low Altitude Authorization and Notification Capability.

(2) The Unmanned Aircraft System Integration Pilot Program.

(3) The Unmanned Traffic Management Pilot Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 181, after line 21, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(2) Compensation (regarding rebooking options, refunds, meals, and lodging) for flight diversions.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 182, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. ____ OVERBOOKING POLICIES OF AIR CARRIERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study on the overbooking policies of air carriers and how the policies impact the United States economy.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall assess the effects of the overbooking policies on increasing or decreasing the costs of passenger air transportation.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 182, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. ____ TRAINING POLICIES REGARDING RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND RELIGIOUS NON-DISCRIMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(1) each air carrier’s training policy for its employees and contractors regarding racial, ethnic, and religious nondiscrimination; and

(2) how frequently an air carrier is required to train new employees and contractors be-

cause of turnover in positions that require such training.

(b) BEST PRACTICES.—After the date the report is submitted under subsection (1), the Secretary of Transportation shall develop and disseminate to air carriers best practices necessary to improve the training policies described in subsection (a), based on the findings of the report and in consultation with—

(1) passengers of diverse racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds;

(2) national organizations that represent impacted communities;

(3) air carrier;

(4) airport operators; and

(5) contract service providers.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. 4 ____ AVIATION CONSUMER ADVOCATE AND COMPLAINT RESOLUTION IMPROVEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall review aviation consumer complaints received that allege a violation of law and, as appropriate, pursue enforcement or corrective actions that would be in the public interest.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In considering which cases to pursue for enforcement or corrective action under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the requirements of the Air Carrier Access Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-435; 100 Stat. 1080);

(2) unfair and deceptive practices by air carriers, foreign air carriers, and ticket agents;

(3) the terms and conditions agreed to between passengers and air carriers, foreign air carriers, or ticket agents;

(4) aviation consumer protection and tarmac delay contingency planning requirements for both airports and airlines; and

(5) any other applicable law.

(c) AVIATION CONSUMER ADVOCATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within the Aviation Consumer Protection Division of the Department of Transportation, there shall be established the position of Aviation Consumer Advocate.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Aviation Consumer Advocate shall—

(A) assist consumers in resolving carrier service complaints filed with the Aviation Consumer Protection Division;

(B) evaluate the resolution by the Department of Transportation of carrier service complaints;

(C) identify and recommend actions the Department can take to improve the enforcement of aviation consumer protection rules and resolution of carrier service complaints; and

(D) identify and recommend regulations and policies that can be amended to more effectively resolve carrier service complaints.

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary, acting through the Aviation Consumer Advocate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an annual report summarizing the following:

(1) The total number of annual complaints received by the Secretary, including the number of complaints by the name of each air carrier and foreign air carrier.

(2) The total number of annual complaints by category of complaint.

(3) The number of complaints referred in the preceding year for enforcement or correction action by the Secretary.

(4) Any recommendations under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (c)(2).

(5) Such other data as the Aviation Consumer Advocate considers appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN
OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 44. REGULATIONS ENSURING ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES IN AIR TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) review, and if necessary revise, applicable regulations to ensure that individuals with disabilities who request assistance while traveling in air transportation receive dignified, timely, and effective assistance at airports and on aircraft from trained personnel; and

(2) review, and if necessary revise, applicable regulations related to air carrier training programs for air carrier personnel, including contractors, who provide physical assistance to passengers with disabilities to ensure that training under such programs—

(A) occurs on an appropriate schedule for all new and continuing personnel charged with providing physical assistance; and

(B) includes, as appropriate, instruction by personnel, with hands-on training for employees who physically lift or otherwise physically assist passengers with disabilities, including the use of relevant equipment.

(b) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—The assistance referred to subsection (a)(1) may include requests for assistance in boarding or deplaning an aircraft, requests for assistance in connecting between flights, and other similar or related requests, as appropriate.

(c) AIR CARRIER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “air carrier” means an air carrier or foreign air carrier (as those terms are defined in section 40102(a) of title 49, United States Code).

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR.
O’HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 190, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

(b) REQUIRED ANALYSIS ON COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2)(E) the Comptroller General shall include, for each option for further reform, an analysis of the impact on local economies of communities with airports receiving Essential Air Service funding, access to air travel for residents of rural communities and the impact to local businesses in such communities.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. ESPAILLAT
OF NEW YORK

Page 266, line 25, strike the semicolon and insert “, including the fees charged to ground transportation providers for airport access;”.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. . STUDY ON AIRPORT REVENUE DIVERSION.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study of—

(1) the legal and financial challenges related to repealing the exception in section 47107(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, for those airports the Federal Aviation Administration has identified are covered by the exception; and

(2) measures that may be taken to mitigate the impact of repealing the exception.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall address—

(1) the level of revenue diversion at the airports covered by the exception described in subsection (a)(1) and the uses of the diverted revenue;

(2) the terms of any bonds or financial covenants an airport owner has issued relying on diverted airport revenue;

(3) applicable local laws or ordinances requiring use of airport revenue for non-airport purposes;

(4) whether repealing the exception would improve the long-term financial performance of impacted airports; and

(5) any other practical implications of repealing the exception for airports or the national aviation system.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR.
FLEISCHMANN OF TENNESSEE

At the end of title V add the following:

SEC. . GEOSYNTHETIC MATERIALS.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, to the extent practicable, shall encourage the use of durable, resilient, and sustainable materials and practices, including the use of geosynthetic materials and other innovative technologies, in carrying out the activities of the Federal Aviation Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF
NEW YORK

Add at the end of title V the following:

SEC. . RULE FOR ANIMALS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a rule to require each primary airport (as defined in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code) to provide a designated area for animals, traveling with their owners, to relieve themselves.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL
OF MICHIGAN

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . ENHANCED AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall establish a pilot program to provide air traffic control services on a preferential basis to aircraft equipped with certain NextGen avionics that—

(1) lasts at least 2 years; and

(2) operates in at 3 least suitable airports.

(b) DURATION OF DAILY SERVICE.—The air traffic control services provided under the pilot program established under subsection (a) shall occur for at least 3 consecutive hours between 0600 and 2200 local time during each day of the pilot program.

(c) AIRPORT SELECTION.—The Administrator shall designate airports for participation in the pilot program after consultation with aircraft operators, manufacturers, and airport sponsors.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) CERTAIN NEXTGEN AVIONICS.—The term “certain NextGen avionics” means those avionics and related software designated by the Administrator after consultations with aircraft operators and manufacturers.

(2) PREFERENTIAL BASIS.—The term “preferential basis” means—

(A) prioritizing aircraft equipped with certain NextGen avionics during a Ground Delay Program by assigning them fewer minutes of delay relative to other aircraft; and

(B) sequencing aircraft equipped with certain NextGen avionics ahead of other aircraft in the Traffic Flow Management System to the maximum extent consistent with safety.

(e) SUNSET.—The pilot program established under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2023.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program terminates, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the pilot program.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL
OF MICHIGAN

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. NEXTGEN DELIVERY STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall initiate a study of the potential impacts of a significantly delayed, significantly diminished, or completely failed delivery of the Next Generation Air Transportation System modernization initiative by the Federal Aviation Administration, including impacts to the air traffic control system and the national airspace system as a whole.

(b) SCOPE OF STUDY.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Inspector General shall assess the Administration’s performance related to the Next Generation Air Transportation System modernization initiative, including—

(1) the potential impacts on the operational efficiency of our aviation system;

(2) an analysis of potential economic losses and stranded investments directly related to NextGen;

(3) an analysis of the potential impacts to our international competitiveness in aviation innovation;

(4) an analysis of the main differences that would be seen in our air traffic control system;

(5) the potential impacts on the flying public, including potential impacts to flight times, fares, and delays in the air and on the ground;

(6) the effects on supply chains reliant on air transportation of cargo;

(7) the potential impacts on the long-term benefits promised by NextGen;

(8) an analysis of the potential impacts on aircraft noise and flight paths;

(9) the potential changes in separation standards, fuel consumption, flight paths, block times, and landing procedures or lack thereof;

(10) the potential impacts on aircraft taxi times and aircraft emissions or lack thereof;

(11) a determination of the total potential costs and logistical challenges of the failure of NextGen, including a comparison of the potential loss of the return on public and private sector investment related to NextGen, as compared to other available investment alternatives, between December 12, 2003 and the date of enactment of this Act; and

(12) other matters arising in the course of the study.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of initiation of the study under subsection (a), the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE
OF COLORADO

At the end of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 543. LIMITED REGULATION OF NON-FEDERALLY SPONSORED PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), the Secretary of Transportation may not directly or indirectly regulate—

(1) the acquisition, use, lease, encumbrance, transfer, or disposal of land by an airport owner or operator;

(2) any non-Federal facility upon such land; or

(3) any portion of such land or facility.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) does not apply to any regulation—

(1) ensuring—

(A) the safe and efficient operation of aircraft and airports, including the safety of people and property on the ground;

(B) that an airport owner or operator receives not less than fair market value for the lease, use, encumbrance, transfer, or disposal of land, any facilities on such land, or any portion of such land or facilities; or

(C) that the airport pays not more than fair market value for the acquisition of land or facilities on such land; or

(2) imposed with respect to—

(A) any land or a facility acquired or modified using—

(i) Federal financial assistance, including Federal grants; or

(ii) passenger facility charge revenues collected under section 40117 of title 49, United States Code; or

(B) any land conveyed to the airport, including its predecessors or successors, by the United States or any agency thereof.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the applicability of section 47107(b) or 47133 of title 49, United States Code, to revenues generated by the use, lease, encumbrance, transfer, or disposal of land as described in subsection (a), facilities upon such land, or any portion of such land or facilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS OF INDIANA

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5 . NATIONAL AIRMAIL MUSEUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in 1930, commercial airmail carriers began operations at Smith Field in Fort Wayne, Indiana;

(2) the United States lacks a national museum dedicated to airmail; and

(3) the airmail hangar at Smith Field in Fort Wayne, Indiana—

(A) will educate the public on the role of airmail in aviation history; and

(B) honor the role of the hangar in the history of the Nation's airmail service.

(b) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The airmail museum located at the Smith Field in Fort Wayne, Indiana, is designated as the “National Airmail Museum”.

(2) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The national museum designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System and the designation of the National Airmail Museum shall not require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to that national memorial.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA OF ARIZONA

At the end of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5 . REVIEW OF APPROVAL PROCESS FOR USE OF LARGE AIR TANKERS AND VERY LARGE AIR TANKERS FOR WILDLAND FIREFIGHTING.

(a) REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT OF CURRENT APPROVAL PROCESS.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a review of its process to approve the use of large air tankers and very large air tankers for wildland firefighting for the purpose of—

(1) determining the current effectiveness, safety, and consistency of the approval process;

(2) developing recommendations for improving the effectiveness, safety, and consistency of the approval process; and

(3) assisting in developing standardized next-generation requirements for air tankers used for firefighting.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to Congress a report describing the outcome of the review conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS OF ARIZONA

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 . REPORT ON BAGGAGE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) study and publicize for comment a cost-benefit analysis to air carriers and consumers of changing the baggage reporting requirements of section 234.6 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, before the implementation of such requirements; and

(2) submit a report on the findings of the cost-benefit analysis to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 . SUPPORTING WOMEN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE AVIATION FIELD.

(a) ADVISORY BOARD.—To encourage women and girls to enter the field of aviation, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall create and facilitate the Women in Aviation Advisory Board (referred to in this Act as the “Board”), with the objective of promoting organizations and programs that are providing education, training, mentorship, outreach, and recruitment of women into the aviation industry.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall consist of members whose diverse background and expertise allows them to contribute balanced points of view and ideas regarding the strategies and objectives set forth in subsection (f).

(c) SELECTION.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall appoint members of the Board, including representatives from the following:

(1) Major airlines and aerospace companies.

(2) Nonprofit organizations within the aviation industry.

(3) Aviation business associations.

(4) Engineering business associations.

(5) United States Air Force Auxiliary, Civil Air Patrol.

(6) Institutions of higher education and aviation trade schools.

(d) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed to the Board for the duration of the existence of the Board.

(e) COMPENSATION.—Board members shall serve without compensation.

(f) DUTIES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Board shall present a comprehensive plan for strategies the Administration can take, which include the following objectives:

(1) Identifying industry trends that directly or indirectly encourage or discourage women from pursuing careers in aviation.

(2) Coordinating the efforts of airline companies, nonprofit organizations, and aviation and engineering associations to facilitate support for women pursuing careers in aviation.

(3) Creating opportunities to expand existing scholarship opportunities for women in the aviation industry.

(4) Enhancing aviation training, mentorship, education, and outreach programs that are exclusive to women.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Board shall submit a report outlining the comprehensive plan for strategies pursuant to subsection (f) to—

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

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

(C) the Administrator.

(2) AVAILABILITY ONLINE.—The Administrator shall make the report publicly available online and in print.

(h) SUNSET.—The Board shall terminate upon the submittal of the report pursuant to subsection (g).

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 . GAO STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF GRANTING AN EXCLUSIVE RIGHT OF AERONAUTICAL SERVICES TO AN AIRPORT SPONSOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the General Accountability Office shall conduct a study to examine the cases in which an airport sponsor exercised an exclusive right (commonly known as a “proprietary exclusive right”), as described in the Federal Aviation Advisory Circular 150/1590-6 published on January 4, 2007.

(b) REPORT.—At the end of the 2-year period under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit the findings of such report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 543. EVALUATION OF AIRPORT MASTER PLANS.

Section 47106 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) EVALUATION OF AIRPORT MASTER PLANS.—When evaluating the master plan of an airport for purposes of this subchapter, the Secretary shall take into account—

“(1) the role the airport plays with respect to medical emergencies and evacuations; and

“(2) the role the airport plays in emergency or disaster preparedness in the community served by the airport.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5 . STUDY REGARDING DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVELS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall evaluate alternative metrics to the current average day night level standard, such as the use of actual noise sampling and other methods, to address community airplane noise concerns.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including a description of the proposed structure of a recommended pilot program.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF ARKANSAS

At the end of title V (page 267, after line 10), insert the following:

SEC. 543. REPORT ON STATUS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN FAA AND LITTLE ROCK PORT AUTHORITY.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives

and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the agreement between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Little Rock Port Authority to relocate the Little Rock, Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range with Collocated Tactical Air Control and Navigation (LIT VORTAC).

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

(1) The status of the efforts by the Federal Aviation Administration to relocate the LIT VORTAC.

(2) The long-term and short-term budget projections for the relocation project.

(3) A description of and timeline for each phase of the relocation project.

(4) A description of and explanation for the required location radius.

(5) A description of work completed by the Federal Aviation Administration as of the date of the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY OF NEW YORK

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. . . STUDY ON ALLERGIC REACTIONS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(1) study the prevalence of allergic reactions on board flights, whether airlines universally report reactions to the Federal Aviation Administration, and the frequency of first aid inventory checks to ensure medicine to prevent anaphylactic shock is in an aircraft; and

(2) submit a report to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and Appropriations of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support considering these amendments en bloc, all of which have been approved by both the majority and the minority. These Members put forward thoughtful amendments, and I am pleased to be able to support moving them en bloc.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for including amendment No. 111 in this en bloc.

After the tragic fires that we have seen in California, we must do everything possibly to protect our communities. In San Diego, helicopters and air tankers had to be grounded during fire fights after recreational drones were spotted in the area. These drones can pose a risk to aircraft and emergency personnel flying overhead. That is why my amendment would protect emergency response efforts from interruptions by drones and direct the FAA to work with local agencies to inform the public about this issue.

I want to thank, again, the committee for their tireless work on this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

□ 1415

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the Northern Plains Unmanned Aircraft Systems Test Site in Grand Forks, North Dakota, is doing extensive work with private industry stakeholders in advancing this very important emerging industry. However, the growth of the UAS industry is reliant on receiving dedicated spectrum allocation to ensure the connection for beyond visual line of sight operations.

My amendment simply directs the FAA, the NTIA, and the FCC to submit to Congress a report on whether UAS operations of all sizes, at all altitudes, should be permitted to operate on spectrum that is designated for aviation use. It may also include recommendations of other licensed spectrum frequencies, such as LTE, that may be appropriate for flying UAS.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for my amendment to advance the UAS industry, and I look forward to working with stakeholders and Members of the Senate to take it across the finish line.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the en bloc amendment, which includes my amendment to H.R. 4. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this important bill, as well as the inclusion of a section that would require airlines to provide consumers with a one-page description of their rights as passengers.

My amendment will amend this section to ensure that passengers are notified of what compensation airlines provide—including rebooking options, refunds, meals, and lodging—if a passenger's flight is diverted.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including this and for their efforts, and urge adoption of this very pro-consumer amendment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member for taking our amendment and including it in the en bloc amendment. It is a GAO study of revenue diversion by airports.

I think it is important for three different reasons:

One, it ties to the very heart of equity or fairness, the idea of all entities under law being treated equally. What we have now is a 35-year tradition wherein 20 airports have been exempted in a way that the other 380 primary airports in this country are not.

Two, this is about recognizing that you can't use that which you divert. In 2015 alone, more than \$1 billion was di-

verted from airport operations to other, and if we are going to say we need more money, let's use first some money we have, which would bring me to my final point: You should always spend what you have before you go asking for more. I think this is particularly important when you talk about \$130 billion of need within the airport system; that you simply spend within the system first before you go to the taxpayer asking for yet more.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc package, which includes my amendment to the FAA Reauthorization Act relating to air passengers with disabilities. I also want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including an air passengers with disabilities bill of rights in the manager's amendment.

The Air Carrier Access Act was enacted in 1986 to prohibit discrimination based on disability in air travel. Despite progress, travelers with disabilities still encounter significant barriers. My amendment requires the Secretary of Transportation to review and, if necessary, revise regulations issued under the act. In particular, it focuses on providing timelier and more effective assistance to people with disabilities, including by improving hands-on training for airline personnel.

Inadequate assistance for people with disabilities can lead to unacceptable delays, missed flights, and even passenger injuries. We can and must do better. Mr. Chairman, I have traveled all over the world, and I have dealt with those airlines who do things the right way and treat people with disabilities with respect and have good processes in place and other airlines that need more improvement and need to work harder at this.

These amendments and this bill will help us to get there. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and my colleagues for their work on this underlying legislation.

My amendment is simple. It would designate the hangar at Smith Airfield in Ft. Wayne, in my district, as the National Airmail Museum. Currently, there is no such museum with this particular designation. I want to also make clear that my amendment prohibits any Federal funding to support this important initiative for the community. It is a zero-cost amendment.

The significance of hangar number 2, which is the only example of Clark W. Smith's patented carousel design, makes it a fine fit for this designation. In 1911, the United States Postal Service began airmail delivery, and in 1930,

commercial airmail service came to Smith Airfield.

Mr. Chairman, this recognition would be a great addition to my community and a vital tool to educate the American people on the significant role airmail played in the evolution of aviation. Furthermore, such recognition would propel the ongoing initiative to preserve and share the history of airmail.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the en bloc amendment and support the preservation of airmail history.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support of my commonsense, bipartisan amendment that strengthens our commitment to rural America.

The Essential Air Service is a critical link for residents and businesses in small and rural communities by linking service to hub airports in 36 States. EAS serves as an important economic tool in local communities.

Page and Show Low, Arizona, in my district, are two communities that benefit from EAS, which allows businesses there to access larger markets and compete on a level playing field. My amendment simply requires the comptroller general to analyze the impact any proposed reforms to EAS it reports to Congress would have on the local communities that depend on the program.

At a time when rural America is still recovering from economic recession, we should be working together to revitalize communities and create jobs. EAS is a vital resource in many of these communities across America, and we must continue to protect it. I thank Congressman DON YOUNG for cosponsoring this amendment and being a stalwart champion for EAS.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for including it in their en bloc package.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member DEFAZIO and Chairman SHUSTER. Our families have some history, but I also appreciate your friendship and leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4. My amendment will ensure that the FAA studies alternative ways to measure sound over a period of time, such as actual noise sampling, to properly capture the experience of those on the ground.

I offer this amendment for my constituents in Carmel Valley to Capitola to Santa Cruz. Those are people who lived in communities that were once quiet until the FAA NextGen changed

the routes over their houses back in 2015. Their health, their sleep, their pets, their well-being were all affected by the sound of jet engines, air brakes, and landing gear.

I appreciate the work that FAA has done to get us close to quieter skies in my community, as well as the Select Committee on these issues and their work with the FAA. However, like many Members who have districts who have faced these types of airplane noise concerns, I believe that the existing day-night level 65-decibel standard is out of date, out of touch, and inadequate to measure the amount of sound pollution impacting our communities.

My amendment would ensure not just alternative ways, but proper ways to study noise sampling. I appreciate the committee for including this amendment en bloc.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward and simply requires the Department of Transportation to provide a cost-benefit analysis to Congress before moving forward with changes to what is commonly referred to as the mishandled baggage reporting rule. If DOT wants to alter a sensible reporting requirement that has been in place for decades, it should, at the very least, be asked to justify it with a cost-benefit analysis.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of this En Bloc amendment package, which contains two of my amendments to the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018.

It is no secret our Air Traffic Control system is antiquated. It relies on old technology and old techniques. It is a safe system, but it is ineffective and could be significantly improved.

Despite billions and billions of taxpayer dollars spent over the past 30 years to make it better, the system still largely relies on World War II era radar technology.

The Government Accountability Office and the Department of Transportation Inspector General have both said the FAA lags massively behind in bringing Air Traffic Control into the 21st Century. NextGen—the common name for these modernization efforts—has cost well over seven billion dollars already with no implementation date—still.

We all know the promise that Air Traffic Control modernization holds, but we also know NextGen has taken too long and cost too much money to fully implement.

My amendments today will help expedite full NextGen deployment and get taxpayers the return on investment they deserve and expect.

My first amendment to H.R. 4 would establish a pilot program to demonstrate the full promise of NextGen technologies. This pilot program could also show policy makers and the Federal Aviation Administration where we still have room for improvement in NextGen.

There are some airports and some planes that have begun to use the newest tech-

nologies. After this many years and this many dollars spent, it certainly makes sense that would be the case.

My amendment today would create a limited pilot program, with a sunset date and a reporting requirement, for planes and airports with the latest NextGen technologies.

This pilot program would allow for limited enhanced access for planes with the latest technology, at a limited number of airports.

The parameters for the pilot program would be developed by the Federal Aviation Administration after consultations with aircraft operators, manufacturers, and airport sponsors.

Here's what we can find out with such a program: How good can a fully implemented NextGen be? How will pilots and airports utilize the system? Where are areas that need more attention? How much more investment is necessary, and what will be the return on that investment?

These are all questions that make sense to ask, and have been asked. This amendment and this pilot program takes those questions and creates an opportunity that will show policy makers and the public real-world and tangible—and measurable—results.

To recap, my first amendment creates a limited pilot program to demonstrate what a fully implemented NextGen system could look like. It has an end date, so it's not an open-ended program. It requires the FAA to report to Congress once the pilot program is ended. After reviewing the results, policy makers and the FAA would have greater knowledge about how best to finish NextGen implementation, and how to run a fully modernized Air Traffic Control system.

My second amendment to the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, paired with the first one, will further ensure Air Traffic Control modernization stays on track.

Today's Manager's Amendment from Chairman SHUSTER requires the FAA to tell Congress and the public how much time, effort, and money has gone in to NextGen to date, and what the returns on that investment are so far. It also requires the DOT IG to examine that report from the FAA for accuracy and completeness.

My second amendment today builds upon these accountability measures put forward by Chairman SHUSTER.

My amendment requires the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation to study the potential impacts of a significantly delayed, significantly diminished, or completely failed delivery of the NextGen modernization initiative. My amendment is forward looking, and helps hold the FAA accountable to taxpayers.

This examination by the IG would ask some very straightforward but very important questions.

Questions like what are the potential impacts on the operational efficiency of our aviation system without NextGen; how would a failed NextGen delivery impact our international competitiveness; what would be the impact on the flying public; what would be the overall economic impact; how would it effect stakeholder use of the system; and more. These are all questions that we need answers for.

By having this information, Congress and the American people will know how much is at stake and where we need to make adjustments. NextGen is an opportunity, but if that

opportunity isn't fully realized, investments to date will be for naught, and all the benefits of a fully modernized Air Traffic Control system will not be realized. Failure is not an option, and Congress needs to do everything in our power to keep the FAA on track.

In sum, my amendment makes the DOT IG do a deep dive into the worst case scenarios for NextGen implementation. By having these answers, Congress and the taxpayers will have a full picture of the need to expedite Air Traffic Control modernization, and what more needs to be done to get our aviation system in to the 21st Century.

I am pleased both of my amendments are included in the En Bloc package, because I believe they will expedite NextGen deployment and will help modernize our Air Traffic Control systems.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IV, insert the following:
SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FLIGHTS BY STAGE 2 AIRPLANES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 47534 of title 49, United States Code, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall initiate a pilot program to permit the operator of a Stage 2 airplane to operate that airplane in revenue and nonrevenue service into medium hub airports or nonhub airports if—

- (1) the airport—
 - (A) is certified under part 139 of 14, Code of Federal Regulations;
 - (B) has a runway that—
 - (i) is longer than 8,000 feet and not less than 200 feet wide; and
 - (ii) is load bearing with a pavement classification number of not less than 38;
 - (C) has a maintenance facility with a maintenance certificate issued under part 145 of such title; and
- (D) certifies annually to the Administrator that the airport intends to continue participating in the pilot program;

(2) the operator of the Stage 2 airplane operates not more than 10 flights per month using that airplane; and

(3) revenue flights will be limited to flights transporting specific and necessary equipment to maintain or improve the vital industry of small rural communities.

(b) TERMINATION.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall terminate on the earlier of—

- (1) the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Act; or
- (2) the date on which the Administrator determines that no Stage 2 airplane remain in service.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MEDIUM HUB AIRPORT; NONHUB AIRPORT.—The terms “medium hub airport” and “nonhub airport” have the meanings given those terms in section 40102 of the title 49, United States Code.

(2) STAGE 2 AIRPLANE.—The term “Stage 2 airplane” has the meaning given that term in section 91.851 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. If adopted, it would require the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to initiate a 10-year pilot program to permit operators of State 2 airplanes to conduct operations in medium-hub or non-hub airports.

This pilot program would additionally require that participating airports certify each year that they wish to remain in the program. The whole purpose of my amendment is to allow rural airports that are located outside of more heavily populated areas to have the ability to conduct commercial and noncommercial activities that currently are not allowed.

Mr. Chairman, this is a pro-business and commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it and the passage of Chairman SHUSTER's underlying bill.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time.

We have already heard a lot today about noise complaints, and State 2 are very noisy aircraft. They were phased out of revenue service about 15 years ago. They are noisy. They consume more fuel. And I am not quite certain what uses these five or so airports might have and what this pilot program would look like. So I have a number of concerns about the amendment.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. HIGGINS for yielding.

I believe this amendment that initiates a pilot program allows small numbers of these aircraft to land in the United States for maintenance services. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, and I want to stress the next point, that no community would

have these older aircraft land at their airports unless they certify annually that they are willing to accept them.

I think the gentleman is trying to create jobs in a district, in a rural area, that the noise will not affect and that will put hardworking Louisianans to work fixing these planes that still operate around the Caribbean.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of this amendment, and I respect my colleague's concerns. I have communicated thoroughly with my constituents in rural areas that would benefit from this amendment and allow the further use of rural airports without interfering with neighborhoods. It has broad support, my friend, across the communities that I represent, and I urge my colleague to reconsider and to support my amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 42.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 214, strike lines 11 through 15.

Page 215, beginning on line 13, strike “Pursuant to section 828 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 44701 note), not” and insert “Not”.

Page 216, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) ICAO TECHNICAL INSTRUCTIONS.—The term “ICAO Technical Instructions” means the International Civil Aviation Organization Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air (as amended, including any amendments adopted after the date of enactment of this Act).

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. . UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP.

Section 828 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 44701 note), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents of such Act, is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, years ago, people used to refer to the tombstone mentality at the FAA, with a lack of oversight where fatal accidents happened, loss of rudder control and other things like that that could have been prevented with proper maintenance. We have moved beyond that point to a much more engaged and active FAA, except Congress has imposed a tombstone mentality on the FAA.

At the behest of Chinese battery manufacturers and large firms in the

U.S. who utilize those batteries, an amendment was placed into a previous bill that prohibits the FAA from exercising its judgment about the safety of the carriage of lithium batteries on airplanes. Instead, we are bound to an international convention, the ICAO, which is very responsive to third-world countries and China and others in terms of seeking lowest common denominator regulation of anything that they can.

Normally, we lead the world. Normally, we would say: No, get this stuff off aircraft. We have lost two 747s—two 747s. They were cargo aircraft. They went down because of lithium batteries. It only takes a very few lithium batteries.

Do we have the lithium battery picture?

This is packaging of lithium batteries. This is what happens with those lithium batteries if just one overheats and starts a spontaneous reaction—again, catastrophic to the aircraft.

Now we are temporarily under an ICAO rule that says that they should not be carried in passenger aircraft, but they are still being regularly carried in the holds of cargo aircraft.

Now, we have oceans. We have freighters. They have containers. You could plan ahead.

Let's say 2 months from now we are going to say these things don't go in the air anymore because, okay, yeah, you are right; there are only a couple of pilots who are going to lose their lives. It kind of concerns me. Well, what happens if the 747 comes down in a populated area? Oops, a lot more people lose their lives.

So you can say 2 months from now they are not going to be on aircraft anymore and the industry can set up a new supply chain of putting these things in containers and shipping them across the ocean in a way that will not endanger people on the ground and, in all probability, will not lead to fatalities if there were an uncontained spontaneous ignition of these batteries.

Even worse, this administration has designated that the—did you ever hear of this?—Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, which is a little tiny, pretty dysfunctional agency, will take over the authority for the regulation and the negotiation of the regulation of lithium batteries from the FAA.

What does PHMSA, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, know about aviation? Nothing. Zero. Nada. Nothing.

So I guess, again, we are seeing the clout of the manufacturers and the Chinese battery manufacturers. Theoretically, they are safer now because they can only be charged to 30 percent, but often the Chinese just kind of forget to do it that way and put them on the planes anyway.

So this is an accident waiting to happen. It is an imposition of a tombstone mentality on the FAA by Congress. It says, until there is another proven

crash due to lithium batteries, we can't regulate.

Come on. Really? Another proven crash, we can't regulate?

Let's give the FAA the authority to regulate these batteries. They could probably develop containers, maybe, that they could go in and still be on aircraft, but there are other ways of moving these batteries in world commerce.

So I would urge adoption of my amendment and the repeal of the tombstone mentality mandate on the FAA.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The amendment would repeal existing law that has been in place since 2012. The law generally prevents DOT from adopting lithium battery regulations that are not harmonized with international standards.

Existing law represents a balanced approach that allows DOT to issue regulations that exceed international requirements if the Secretary has credible evidence that lithium batteries would substantially contribute to on-board fires.

Billions of lithium batteries and lithium-battery containing products are shipped safely by air every year. Shipments by air into the U.S. in 2017 were valued at approximately \$120 billion, which also means there are thousands of jobs attached to these.

Aviation is a global industry, and it is very important there not be a patchwork of regulations. The international body studying the global standards for lithium battery transport requirements has been very active on the issue, and the United States has been centrally involved. In reality, the international effort on lithium batteries has been ahead of the DOT in terms of implementing requirements.

Additionally, H.R. 4 continues to focus on safely transporting the products that almost all Americans rely on. It assures expert participation in all panels and working groups of international test or standard-setting organizations in which the United States participates. It avoids creating a burdensome patchwork of regulations, provides the Secretary of Transportation with the authority to deal with this, and creates a Lithium Battery Air Safety Advisory Committee to ensure that the best and safest policy positions are developed and synchronized in the U.S.

This amendment also would put exclusive powers to represent the United States internationally on transport issues in the hands of the FAA, despite hazardous materials transportation affecting all modes of transportation.

Currently, the Secretary of Transportation is statutorily directed to represent the United States in inter-

national forums for transporting hazardous materials in international commerce. It is the Secretary's discretion to delegate this authority to her or his choice of agencies. Discretion appropriately rests with the Secretary.

Experts agree that uniform international transportation regulation is a key to safety, so I would urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this doesn't tell the FAA nor mandate the FAA to regulate lithium batteries. It would allow the status quo, which means the FAA would have the authority to determine whether they represent an inordinate risk and there should be strictures put upon their transport, whether it is containers or other strictures, as opposed to following the lowest common denominator international organization.

You know, airplane manufacturers see the risk. According to the International Coordination Council for Aerospace Industries Association, which includes Boeing and Airbus, they say: "Existing cargo compartment fire protection systems . . . are unable to suppress or extinguish a fire involving significant quantities of lithium batteries Therefore, continuing to allow the carriage of lithium batteries within today's transport category aircraft cargo compartments is an unacceptable risk to the air transport industry."

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's passion on this issue.

I would, again, say, having a system that is harmonized throughout the world is critical. ICAO has already said in their standard that they recommend that we don't carry them on passenger aircraft, so our industry in America has done that.

Further, the companies that ship cargo—UPS, FedEx—are working, and I have seen what they have done to make sure that the crews of cargo planes are protected. Again, the private industry understands this, and they are moving forward to develop these systems that contain it or suppression systems.

So, again, I believe that the best way forward is to, again, harmonize with the rest of the world and continue to ship billions of dollars of these batteries safely every year. Again, I urge my colleagues to not support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 44 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, to affirm what the chairman already knows, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. ACCESS OF AIR CARRIERS TO INFORMATION ABOUT APPLICANTS TO BE PILOTS FROM NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.

Section 30305(b)(8) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(8)(A) An individual who is seeking employment by an air carrier as a pilot may request the chief driver licensing official of a State to provide information about the individual under subsection (a) of this section to the prospective employer of the individual, the authorized agent of the prospective employer, or the Secretary of Transportation.

“(B) An air carrier that is the prospective employer of an individual described in subparagraph (A), or an authorized agent of such an air carrier, may request and receive information about that individual from the National Driver Register through an organization approved by the Secretary for purposes of requesting, receiving, and transmitting such information directly to the prospective employer of such an individual or the authorized agent of the prospective employer.

“(C) Information may not be obtained from the National Driver Register under this paragraph if the information was entered in the Register more than 5 years before the request unless the information is about a revocation or suspension still in effect on the date of the request.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 46 printed in part A of House Report 115-650 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 46 printed in part A of House Report 115-650 offered by Mr. COHEN:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. ACCESS OF AIR CARRIERS TO INFORMATION ABOUT APPLICANTS TO BE PILOTS FROM NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.

Section 30305(b)(8) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(8)(A) An individual who is seeking employment by an air carrier as a pilot may re-

quest the chief driver licensing official of a State to provide information about the individual under subsection (a) of this section to the prospective employer of the individual, the authorized agent of the prospective employer, or the Secretary of Transportation.

“(B) An air carrier that is the prospective employer of an individual described in subparagraph (A), or an authorized agent of such an air carrier, may request and receive information about that individual from the National Driver Register through an organization approved by the Secretary for purposes of requesting, receiving, and transmitting such information directly to the prospective employer of such an individual or the authorized agent of the prospective employer. A request for information shall be made in accordance with the requirements of section 44703(h)(2).

“(C) Information may not be obtained from the National Driver Register under this paragraph if the information was entered in the Register more than 5 years before the request unless the information is about a revocation or suspension still in effect on the date of the request.”.

Mr. COHEN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that we not listen to any more of the modification but continue on with debate.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan, bicameral amendment, offered with my colleague on the Aviation Subcommittee, Mr. WOODALL, and spearheaded in the Senate by former military pilot, mother, and great Member, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH of Illinois, and Senator PERDUE.

This amendment is common sense and ensures the safety of the flying public. Our bipartisan amendment streamlines an onerous process that has led to unintended burdens and delays on the State Department of Motor Vehicles across the country and delays in getting prospective pilots eligible for employment.

To be clear, this amendment does nothing to remove protections to pilots and their privacy already enshrined in Federal law.

In 1996, Congress passed the Pilot Records Improvement Act, which mandated the airlines obtain driving records of all prospective pilot employees from the National Driver Registry. An unintended consequence came about requiring only the chief State licensing official could approve such request. This has caused delays at DMVs, and currently, most employees have to request these records from Missouri, since they are the sole State still willing to access the National Driver Registry for requests from all parties. That is not what was intended, and it requires a simple and technical fix that this amendment does bring about.

That 1996 law also clearly and strictly stipulated the written consent that

airlines require from pilots before obtaining their records and spells out strict guidelines on the privacy and use of that information. They cannot sell that information.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and ask that it be voted on and approved, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

This amendment would streamline the process for airlines to obtain information from the National Driver Registry for airline pilots seeking employment.

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take my remaining time to thank Mr. SHUSTER for his work on this bill, and Mr. DEFAZIO for his work, too. They did bring about an excellent bill that I am proud to support.

I have been proud to be a member of the committee with Mr. SHUSTER as the chair. He has done an outstanding job and done his father's memory as a great chairman even greater honor.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TIPTON). The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

□ 1445

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I rise to speak in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title V the following:

SEC. 543. PROHIBITION REGARDING WEAPONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, a person may not operate an unmanned aircraft or unmanned aircraft system that is equipped or armed with a dangerous weapon.

(b) DANGEROUS WEAPON DEFINED.—In this section, the term “dangerous weapon” has the meaning given that term in section 930(g)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

(c) PENALTY.—A person who violates this section is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each violation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, today, I offer an amendment to prevent a person from operating an unmanned aircraft or an unmanned aircraft system in the national airspace if that aircraft is equipped or armed with a dangerous weapon, unless that equipment is authorized by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. I have introduced this important language as the No Armed Drones Act since the 112th Congress.

In 2015, an 18-year-old in Connecticut built a multirotor drone mounted with a .45-caliber semiautomatic handgun capable of firing live ammunition while flying. This individual demonstrated how easy it was for a private citizen to create and operate an armed drone in his YouTube video entitled “Flying Gun.”

Police did not arrest this person, saying that no violation of law had occurred. According to the then-chief of police in Clinton, Connecticut, where the drone video was made, this appeared to be a case of technology surpassing current legislation.

In response to this and other drone incidents, government agencies are developing counter-drone technology to redirect rogue drones. Police say their greatest fear, with the increase in the use of recreational drones, is their weaponization. In addition, North Dakota has allowed law enforcement to fly drones armed with “less than lethal” weapons since 2015, something many in law enforcement say they are not comfortable doing.

The use of drones for regular business operations is increasing, and that is a good thing. Farmers use drones to inspect their crops, security companies use drones to conduct surveillance over guarded properties, home repair companies use drones to assess damage on structures, and drones are even beginning to be used for home delivery services. While these abilities may prove convenient to our daily lives, we must not let the civilian applications of drone technology advance to weaponization.

Outside of the United States, terrorist groups in the Middle East have used small drones as weapons. There is real concern that homegrown extremists in the United States could do the same thing. It is imperative that we take steps to protect the public before death by armed drone becomes a headline.

There is no statute in the United States Code that affirmatively states that an unmanned aircraft system may not be used in the national airspace as a weapon. This amendment today protects the public from drones that have been weaponized, both lethal and non-lethal, by private citizens by preventing a person from flying an armed drone in the national airspace without

FAA authorization. A person who violates this requirement may be fined a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per violation under the statute.

I offer this language as an amendment to the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 in order to align current legislation with available technology. It is time we take a preemptive, rather than a reactive, step to protect all Americans.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. This seems very commonsense to me.

Earlier in the en bloc, my amendment was adopted, which would give the FAA authority to begin regulation of the small drones, which currently has been prohibited by a statute earlier adopted by Congress.

If this passes, that will allow the FAA, if my amendment stands in conference, to adopt this commonsense rule. Should my amendment not be adopted in conference with the Senate, and we pass this, the FAA would not have the authority to prohibit arming of small drones since they are prohibited from regulating them. Hopefully, both things will occur.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, 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. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5. HELICOPTER FUEL SYSTEM SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 447 of title 49, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 44738. Helicopter fuel system safety

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person may not operate a covered rotorcraft in United States airspace unless the design of the rotorcraft is certified by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to—

“(A) comply with the requirements applicable to the category of the rotorcraft under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of section 27.952(a), section 27.952(c), section 27.952(f), section 27.952(g), section 27.963(g) (but allowing for a minimum puncture force of 250 pounds if successfully drop tested in-structure), and section 27.975(b) or paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of section 29.952(a), section 29.952(c), section 29.952(f), section 29.952(g), section 29.963(b) (but allowing for a minimum puncture force of 250 pounds if successfully drop tested in-structure), and 29.975(a)(7) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment; or

“(B) employ other means acceptable to the Administrator to provide an equivalent level of fuel system crash resistance.

“(2) COVERED ROTORCRAFT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered rotorcraft’ means a rotorcraft not otherwise required to comply with section 27.952, section 27.963, and section 27.975, or section 29.952, section 29.963, and section 29.975 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations as in effect on the date of enactment for which manufacture was completed, as determined by the Administrator, on or after the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this section.

“(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—The Administrator shall—

“(1) expedite the certification and validation of United States and foreign type designs and retrofit kits that improve fuel system crashworthiness; and

“(2) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and periodically thereafter, issue a bulletin to—

“(A) inform rotorcraft owners and operators of available modifications to improve fuel system crashworthiness; and

“(B) urge that such modifications be installed as soon as practicable.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the operation of a rotorcraft by the Department of Defense.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 447 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“44738. Helicopter fuel system safety.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

First, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for working with me and Mr. POLIS, listening to our concerns, and I appreciate their assistance.

I rise today to offer an amendment we have been working on for almost 3 years, which is designed to improve helicopter fuel system safety for newly manufactured helicopters.

As the chairman knows, on July 3, 2015, a Flight for Life air ambulance helicopter took off in Frisco, Colorado. Just seconds later, the helicopter crashed in a parking lot next to the helipad. After impact, gasoline began to leak from the helicopter and a fire quickly erupted trapping the crew. The crash itself was largely survivable, but the post-crash fire contributed to the death of the pilot, Patrick Mahany, and severely burned the two flight nurses—Dave Repsher and Matthew Bowe. One of the flight nurses suffered burns on more than 90 percent of his body.

As we began learning what happened in Frisco, we discovered that a 1994

FAA rulemaking required all newly certified helicopter designs to incorporate crash resistant fuel systems. The problem is that helicopter designs are certified once and then can be manufactured for years. So new helicopters, like the 1-year-old helicopter which crashed in Frisco, Colorado, are being built to a now unsafe design from the 1970s.

Mr. Chairman, this is wrong. Since that 1994 rulemaking, there have been more than 175 post-crash fires and at least 80 deaths. We can do better, and we must do better.

Since 2015, the FAA has finally started to address the issue. They convened the Rotorcraft Occupant Protection Working Group and tasked them with determining what requirements to place on newly manufactured helicopters moving forward. That working group submitted their final report last month and made evidence-based recommendations about what safety features should be required.

My amendment today implements those recommendations of the working group by requiring all newly manufactured helicopters to be built with safer fuel systems within 18 months. We have known about this problem for decades, and it is past time we close the loophole from 1994 and improve the safety of these helicopters.

Two people deserve special thanks: Patrick Mahany's wife, Karen, for her tireless advocacy for safer helicopters; and Chris Vanderveen, from KUSA-Channel 9, for his diligent reporting about the dangers of these fragile and outdated fuel systems.

I would also like to thank Air Methods, the Air Medical Operators Association, the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, and Helicopter Association International for working with me and my staff.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support from Air Methods, Helicopter Association International, and Air Medical Operators Association.

AIR METHODS,

Greenwood Village, CO, April 24, 2018.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERLMUTTER: As the House of Representatives prepares to consider HR. 4, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Reauthorization Act of 2018, on behalf of Air Methods, I want to thank you for your dedication and attention to aviation safety, and in particular your tireless efforts to make helicopter fuel systems safer by equipping them with crash resistant fuel systems (CRFS).

At Air Methods, safety is our top priority. We have worked continuously to strengthen our practices, instill a culture of safety throughout our organization, and contribute to industry-wide advances in aviation safety. As part of Air Methods' dedication to the safety of its crews and patients, we have committed to retrofitting our Airbus H125 and H130 (formally known as EC130) fleet with the updated CRFS.

As you may know, in 2015 we partnered with Vector Aerospace to conduct CRFS testing and seek certification for a crash-resistant fuel system for all Airbus single-en-

gine helicopters we operate. The first H125 with the new system arrived at Air Methods' headquarters in Denver, CO on Dec. 30, 2017, following the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) supplemental type certificate approval. To date, Air Methods has received and completed the installation of 14 CRFS in our fleet. The Company intends to roll out an entire fleet of retrofitted Airbus H125 and H130 over the next two years.

We believe the CRFS program is critical to the air medical transportation industry and have been advocating for and supporting CRFS for several years. We look forward to continuing to work together with you and other legislators to support efforts to improve industry-wide safety standards in aviation safety and ensure the safety of those who fly with us.

Thank you for your leadership and willingness to engage Air Methods while working toward ensuring safety for our patients and crews. We look forward to working alongside you and your office to promote aviation safety.

Sincerely,

MR. AARON TODD,
*Chief Executive Officer,
Air Methods Corporation.*

HAI STATEMENT ON REPRESENTATIVE
PERLMUTTER'S AMENDMENT

WASHINGTON, DC, APRIL 25, 2018.—Helicopter Association International (HAI) commends Rep. Ed Perlmutter (D-Colo.) for his collaborative efforts in drafting Amendment 29 to improve helicopter fuel system safety.

Amendment 29 implements recommendations from the FAA Rotorcraft Occupant Protection Working Group to require all newly manufactured helicopters to meet certain standards to improve the crash resistance of helicopter fuel systems within 18 months.

HAI appreciates Rep. Perlmutter's work in addressing this important safety issue and for his commitment to work so closely with the working group's recommendations. As an advocate for safety in the helicopter industry, HAI has been an active participant in the FAA Rotorcraft Occupant Protection Working Group and is committed to the safety improvements the group's recommendation has brought before the industry.

HAI is the professional trade association for the civil helicopter industry. HAI's 1,500 plus organizational members and 1,800 individual members operate more than 4,500 helicopters approximately 2.3 million flight hours each year in 73 nations. HAI is dedicated to the promotion of the helicopter as a safe, effective business tool and to the advancement of the international helicopter community.

AIR MEDICAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,

Alexandria, VA, April 24, 2018.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERLMUTTER: On behalf of the Air Medical Operators Association (AMOA), I am writing today to express our support for your proposed amendment on "Helicopter Fuel System Safety". This amendment would codify the recommendations of the FAA's Rotorcraft Occupant Protection Working Group on Crash Resistant Fuel Systems (CRFS).

Since its founding in 2009, AMOA and its member companies have committed to an ongoing series of safety enhancements and investments. Our efforts include actions to comply with the FAA's Helicopter Air Ambulance rule, such as installing Helicopter Terrain Awareness and Warning Systems (HTAWS) and Flight Data Monitoring Sys-

tems (FDMS), and establishing Operations Control Centers (OCC). AMOA member companies have also gone above and beyond regulatory requirements by undertaking voluntary safety initiatives, including the use of Night Vision Goggles (NVGs).

In November, 2015, AMOA announced a commitment to the installation of CRFS in all new aircraft and equipping current aircraft with CRFS as those products become available. We also supported the inclusion of Section 2105 of the "FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016", which directed the FAA to "evaluate and update, as necessary, standards for crash-resistant fuel systems for civilian rotorcraft".

We are pleased to support your amendment as another positive step in the continuous effort to improve the safety of the life-saving transportation provided by AMOA's member companies. AMOA urges the House to adopt your amendment.

Thank you for your work on this very important issue.

Sincerely,

SALLY VEITH,
*EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
Air Medical Operators Association.*

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their help through this process.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering his amendment.

This amendment implements critical recommendations from the FAA's Rotorcraft Occupant Protection Working Group. Specifically the amendment will require newly manufactured helicopters meet specific safety standards to prevent post-crash fires from occurring.

In many cases, fatal helicopter accidents are due to post-crash fires rather than the impact itself. Equipping these new helicopters with crash resistant fuel systems is absolutely critical in preventing thermal injuries and fatalities.

I thank the gentleman for his continued leadership and persistence. When I say persistence, the gentleman has been working on this issue for a number of years, so, again, I congratulate him for that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to another gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Representative PERLMUTTER. I am proud to join him in offering this amendment, which comes in a direct response to a tragedy that occurred in the district I am honored to represent, and countless other tragedies across the country.

As Representative PERLMUTTER mentioned, back in 2015, there was a Flight for Life crash in Frisco, Colorado. The pilot, Patrick Mahany, died, and one person on board is still in the recovery process.

The death and damage was caused not directly from the crash, but from the lack of a crash resistant fuel system that is already mandated in military helicopters, but, for some ridiculous reason, it is not mandated in civilian aircraft like the Flight for Life helicopter.

I want to thank the widow of Patrick, Karen Mahany, for keeping this issue in front and foremost. I know how difficult it must be to go through a personal mourning process, but then to look above that and say: Let's stop this kind of tragedy from affecting other families. That is what Karen has done by putting herself out there.

I am honored to be supportive of this amendment here today that will save lives and make sure that Patrick is among the last to suffer from a loss of life from this lack of simple safety equipment in helicopters.

This important amendment simply requires the FAA to mandate crash resistant fuel systems in newly manufactured helicopters. I am also working on a tax credit to help fund retrofitting of existing helicopters. We can't let another tragedy lead to loss of life from an avoidable problem. All helicopters should be equipped with the best, most effective, and cost-effective technology available.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage my colleagues to adopt this amendment and ensure that this is part of the final bill that comes out of the House and Senate as well.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers on this. I would ask for an "aye" vote on amendment No. 49, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. COASTAL OVERFLIGHT.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall ensure that all aircraft transitioning from flight over ocean to flight over land shall fly at a safe altitude. Such altitude shall not be lower than specific flight operations require.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman DEFAZIO and, of course, Chairman SHUSTER for their hard work that they put into this.

Unfortunately, my amendment, as it indicates, is that a large part of the job that I would have hoped that would have been accomplished by the FAA reauthorization was not done in a way that handles what is, in my area, the most significant problem. There are a great many provisions there. But my amendment today, which I am advocating today, seeks to correct one area that has been given underwhelmingly little treatment in this legislation, and that is called: correcting the problems of air noise over our neighborhoods.

□ 1500

My amendment, the amendment we are discussing at this point, will ensure that aircraft transitioning from flight over ocean to flight over land be no lower than is absolutely necessary for safety.

Many times over our coastal communities, planes are flying much lower on approach, after taking off, and briefly climbing back over the ocean and then over the land.

There is no reason that some aircraft need to be at 1,600 feet when other aircraft can safely fly at 3,500 feet. This amendment will correct that problem. It will require those aircraft that are coming over the ocean and onto land and into some flight pattern in our local airports and nationally in those airports, that they fly at the highest altitude that is safe in this situation.

Unfortunately, I have had four amendments that were not permitted that would have corrected the noise problem altogether and it would have said that we would have then been able to address it.

The reason it wasn't addressed as the bill was being prepared is that this legislation and the regulations of the FAA say that safety will be the first priority, efficiency will be the second priority, and then community impact on those communities below have third priority.

Well, the fact is there is no reason why—number one, safety does have to be first, we know that—but there is no reason why the excessive noise and the impact of noise and pollution on the cities below a landing area or a taking-off area should not have more consideration than simply the efficiency of the airlines to save a few minutes.

I am very upset that those amendments that would have corrected this problem—number one, all we have to do is make sure that we are mandating the right priorities for the FAA; that efficiency is less important than the

communities that are being flown over, because every day, those people have to experience noise and pollution due to the fact that they live near an airport.

So those amendments, however, were not made in order, and I would officially hope that we can deal with that later, but that is a great disservice to those people around the country who are suffering excessive noise that didn't need to happen.

So this amendment goes far enough in terms of an issue like that, but we should be solving the problem by changing the priorities and mandating that all airplanes, when they are flying over populated areas, the people who they are flying over have to be given consideration by making sure that that plane is flying at the highest altitude that is safe.

Unfortunately, as I say, the amendments that I offered that would have mandated that actually were not made in order.

This amendment will come to grips a little bit on this issue, but we had an opportunity here to change and to solve one of the basic complaints that are being made throughout our country by American citizens when dealing with air traffic.

When we are here, our job isn't just to watch out for the airliners. That is not it. We have to be considerate about the American people, and especially those people whose homes are there underneath the flight patterns.

That is not what has happened in this legislation, and I am very disturbed about it, because I had five amendments that would have solved this problem once and for all, would have been fair to the airlines, would have made sure we were safe, that people were safe, but at the same time, we would see that the American people who live underneath these flight paths were treated fairly and that their families were not put at risk by excessive noise and by pollution that comes from airlines flying overhead.

Mr. Chair, I ask for my amendment to be accepted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is representing very well his constituents' concerns. We had an earlier discussion on the floor about the aircraft noise. An amendment was adopted to have the FAA study the speed of approach and take-off, which can dramatically reduce the noise impact.

I have also asked the FAA to look at establishing alternate performance-based navigation routes so they are not using the same route every day over the same houses and the same neighborhoods.

When I first saw this amendment, it seemed to me innocuous since it seems to follow the basic requirement in the

controller handbook, FAA Order 7110.65, section 561, which addresses this issue. However, we have been contacted by the National Air Traffic Controllers union, and they have expressed grave concerns that they think it may have unintended consequences.

Unfortunately, they just contacted us, so we haven't been able to get the details of their concerns. So in that case, I would have to oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE REQUIREMENTS.

None of the funds made available by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing rate of wage requirements in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that this House has seen before in different configurations, but it is known as the Davis-Bacon amendment.

What it does, it provides that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to implement, to administer, or enforce the prevailing rate of wage requirements, commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we know what this bill does. It was in 1931, it was established for, I will say, trade protectionism, labor protectionism, to lock the African-American labor from Alabama out of the construction trades in New York City that were unionized at that time and strongly protected, and still are, actually, but the substance of it is this.

I have a letter here that was written by Grover Norquist, the president of

Americans For Tax Reform, and in summary, it says this: Because the Davis-Bacon Act reduces the number of jobs, increases costs, and has a racist history, funds from the FAA Reauthorization Act should not be used to fulfill Davis-Bacon Act requirements. Americans For Tax Reform, therefore, strongly supports Congressman KING's amendment.

That is one version of description of this bill.

Here is another one I thought was a little bit more descriptive. This is an article written by George Will, and it is dated June 19, 2017. He references back to River City, and he says a quote from that, "The Music Man": You really ought to give Iowa a try, provided you are contrary.

He starts out this article this way, and the quote is from "Iowa Stubborn", a song in "The Music Man", Mr. Chairman. It says:

Contrary does not quite capture STEVE KING's astringency. The Iowa native and conservative Congressman was born, appropriately, in Storm Lake, Iowa, and carries turbulence with him. He also carries experience of actual life before politics, when he founded a construction company, which is one reason he has long advocated an excellent idea: repeal of the Davis-Bacon law.

King came to Congress in 2003, and has been stubbornly submitting repeal legislation since 2005. He would not have succeeded even if he were less of a prickly cactus and more of a shrinking violet.

Davis-Bacon is just another piece of government that is as indefensible as it is indestructible. And so today, when social hygienists are cleansing the public square of names and statues tainted by historical connections with racism, Davis-Bacon's durability is proof that a measure's racist pedigree will be forgiven if the measure serves a progressive agenda.

It is time to put an end to Davis-Bacon. We can do that here today, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this is a perpetual debate here on the floor whenever it comes to the expenditure of Federal tax dollars on projects that are covered by Davis-Bacon, as would be projects under the Airport Improvement Program and other related activities by the FAA.

The bottom line here is we can chase the lowest common denominator around the United States, or around the world sometimes, in terms of trade, and undermine the capability of Americans to make a decent living, to have a home and have a family, and live the American Dream.

The savings are illusory at best. In many cases, they would go to profits for nonunion shops and others, and we would return to the old days of basically exploiting those who work in construction and related activities.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. DEFAZIO both for yielding, but especially for his leadership on this issue.

As the ranking member said, this is something that comes up every year. Thankfully, Democrats and Republicans have stood together to protect this important worker protection.

Let's just be clear about this. This is about the desire to engage in this race to the bottom to pay working families less money.

The truth of the matter is coming from a community, a community like Flint, Saginaw, Bay City, where we have seen significant and continuing loss of earned income by working people, where we have a chance to say to the American people that when it is your tax dollars being spent, we are not going to use them to undermine the ability of a family to have a decent wage.

People work hard at these jobs, they have trained long for these jobs, going through apprenticeships or other skilled training, and the idea that we would reverse a decades-long commitment to the American worker that when it comes to federally funded projects, we are going to ensure that if you work hard, play by the rules, you get a decent wage, I support that, and we all should.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I hear these arguments constantly: lowest common denominator, nonunion shops.

We know it is union scale, there is a confession that it is, even though the law says that it is prevailing wage.

Exploiting workers, race to the bottom, people work hard. These are standard lines that come out every year, but I am the one that has lived this. We have met payroll for over 42 years, and we pay a competitive wage. We want to hire the best people we can and pay them the best wages that we can, and we want to have the lowest turnover possible. And we are in pretty good shape that way after 42 years. I think I know about this.

Davis-Bacon increases inefficiencies and it puts people in the wrong place doing the wrong thing for the wrong incentives.

And by the way, who is hardworking? The taxpayers are hardworking. The taxpayers are paying the bill for an extra 20 percent on every construction project in America. In a lot of cases, we are borrowing the money from China and putting the debt onto our children. That is what we are faced with here, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, look around the country. There are many States

that have not adopted a minimum wage that exceeds the Federal minimum wage of \$7.50 an hour. That is pretty pathetic.

My State is one of many that has chosen to far exceed that minimum wage, but if we do away with—this says that federally funded contracts must receive the local prevailing wage for their work. In Oregon, we have recognized that with a higher minimum wage, so our prevailing wages are going to be higher than some State that only follows the Federal minimum wage of \$7.50 an hour.

□ 1515

So what might some contractor do? Oh, I can go over here and hire people who are used to earning \$7.50 an hour. I am going to import them into Oregon. Of course, you are going to still have a problem with our minimum wage law, but this is what this is about is to find less expensive labor and move it around the country, and that, I believe, is a disservice to the working people of the United States.

I would urge Congress, as it has done every other time this amendment has been offered, to reject it on a broad bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but I would add for the body that the Federal minimum wage really is not relevant at all to this Davis-Bacon wage scale debate. There is nobody working under Davis-Bacon wage scales who is making minimum wage. And by the way, that Federal minimum wage is becoming irrelevant as competition for wages is driving things up.

But here is another way to think about this: I have long said that if it is a road construction, you can build 5 miles of road instead of 4 if you get rid of Davis-Bacon; five bridges instead of four if you get rid of Davis-Bacon.

If it happens to be river construction—we lost a lock and dam on the Mississippi going into the weekend, lock and dam No. 11. These things cost money. There are 29 of those. We could either fix 23 of them under Davis-Bacon, or all 29 of them without Davis-Bacon.

There are 45 major airports in America; and if we are going to renovate those airports, we can renovate all of them, or we can renovate 36 of them, depending on whether this amendment passes or fails.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from Americans for Tax Reform and an article from The Washington Post.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM,

Washington, DC, April 26, 2018.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: I am writing in support of Congressman Steve King's (R-IA) amendment (#63) to the FAA Reauthorization Act, H.R. 4. The amendment prohibits the usage of funds from the bill to "implement, administer, or enforce" the prevailing wage requirements in the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act is a 1931 federal law that has a history of high costs, lost jobs and racism. It requires contractors and subcontractors to pay the local "prevailing wage" on public works projects (over \$2,000) for laborers and mechanics. The "prevailing wage" is usually a wage set by unions and is typically much higher than the average wage for the job in the area. This leads to higher government project costs, hurting small non-unionized contractors and costing low-skilled jobs.

In fact, the Government Accountability Office (General Accounting Office) in 1979 urged the repeal of Davis-Bacon for these same reasons. Further, a 2011 study by the Heritage Foundation found that the Act added almost \$11 billion to the deficit in 2011 in unnecessary expenses, while suspending the Act would have added 155,000 construction jobs. Finally, the Congressional Budget Office reported in 2016 that repealing the act would reduce discretionary outlays by \$13 billion from 2018 through 2026.

In addition to raising costs and losing jobs, the Act also has racist origins and was passed during the Great Depression because minority migrant workers were taking jobs meant for white locals at lower wages.

Because the Davis-Bacon Act reduces the number of jobs, increases costs and has a racist history, funds from the FAA Reauthorization Act should not be used to fulfill Davis-Bacon Act requirements. Americans for Tax Reform, therefore, strongly supports Congressman King's amendment.

Sincerely,

GROVER NORQUIST,

President, Americans for Tax Reform.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 2017]

A RACIST VESTIGE OF THE PAST THAT PROGRESSIVES ARE HAPPY TO LEAVE IN PLACE

(By George F. Will)

"You really ought to give Iowa a try. Provided you are contrary."—Iowa Stubbhorn," from Meredith Wilson's "The Music Man"

"Contrary" does not quite capture Steve King's astringency. The Iowa native and conservative congressman was born, appropriately, in Storm Lake, and carries turbulence with him. He also carries experience of actual life before politics, when he founded a construction company, which is one reason he has long advocated an excellent idea—repeal of the Davis-Bacon law.

King came to Congress in 2003 and has been stubbornly submitting repeal legislation since 2005. He would not have succeeded even if he were less of a prickly cactus and more of a shrinking violet. Davis-Bacon is just another piece of government that is as indefensible as it is indestructible.

It is too secure to require defending because it benefits a muscular faction. Repeal would, however, reduce the cost of new infrastructure by many billions of dollars. And today, when social hygienists are cleansing the public square of names and statues tainted by historical connections with racism, Davis-Bacon's durability is proof that a measure's racist pedigree will be forgiven if the measure serves a progressive agenda.

Davis-Bacon was enacted in 1931 to require construction contractors to pay "prevailing wages" on federal projects. Generally, this means paying union wage scales. It was enacted as domestic protectionism, largely to protect organized labor from competition by African Americans who often were excluded from union membership but who were successfully competing for jobs by being willing to work for lower wages.

In 1927, Rep. Robert Bacon, a Long Island Republican, was miffed because the low bidder for a construction project in his district—a veterans' hospital—was an Alabama

contractor who used black labor. That year, when Bacon first introduced his legislation, he showed that he was not a narrow-gauge bigot. He inserted into the Congressional Record the following statement by 34 professors concerning immigration legislation:

"We urge the extension of the quota system to all countries of North and South America from which we have substantial immigration and in which the population is not predominantly of the white race . . . Only by this method can that large proportion of our population which is descended from the colonists . . . have their proper racial representation."

By 1931, the Depression had made government construction money especially coveted and Davis-Bacon passed with the support of the American Federation of Labor. The congressional debate that preceded enactment was replete with references to "unattached migratory workmen," "itinerant labor," "cheap, imported labor," "cheap bootleg labor" and "labor lured from distant places" for "competition with white labor throughout the country."

Hearings on Davis-Bacon brought out the drollery in Rep. William Upshaw, a Georgia Democrat. He said he hoped his Northern colleagues in Congress would permit a Southerner to smile about "your reaction to that real problem you are confronted with in any community with a superabundance or large aggregation of Negro labor."

In 1931, the unemployment rate of blacks was approximately the same as the rate for the general population. Davis-Bacon is one reason the rate for blacks began to deviate adversely. In 1932, generally there were about 3,500 workers building what became Hoover Dam. Never more than 30 were black.

In 1993, with Congress stoutly opposed to taking anything from something as powerful as organized labor, opponents of Davis-Bacon turned to the judiciary. A lawsuit on behalf of some minority contractors challenged the law's constitutionality, arguing that it burdened the exercise of a fundamental civil right—the right to earn a living. And that it had a disparate impact on minority workers and small minority-owned construction businesses. The suit languished in court for almost a decade before the plaintiffs lost, victims of excessive judicial deference to the legislature.

In 1992, to expedite cleanup after Hurricanes Andrew and Iniki, President George H.W. Bush suspended portions of Davis-Bacon in South Florida, coastal Louisiana and Hawaii. Bush's successor, Bill Clinton, promptly reversed Bush's policy.

A 2011 Heritage Foundation study estimated that Davis-Bacon would add almost \$11 billion to that year's construction costs. That sum will be eclipsed when—if—bold talk about making America's infrastructure great again is translated into spending. Then we build up the national debt while purchasing less infrastructure than the appropriated sums should purchase.

Davis-Bacon is rent-seeking, the use of political power to supplant the market as the allocator of opportunity and wealth. Rent-seeking is lucrative, which is why there is so much of it, even when its pedigree is repulsive.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 839, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, and 101 printed in part A of House Report 115-650, offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY OF NEBRASKA

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5 . SAFETY EQUIPMENT STORAGE FACILITIES.

Section 47102(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(P) Constructing storage facilities to shelter snow removal equipment or aircraft rescue and firefighting equipment that is owned by the airport sponsor and used exclusively to maintain safe airfield operations, up to the facility size necessary to accommodate the types and quantities of equipment prescribed by the FAA, regardless of whether Federal funding was used to acquire the equipment.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. SUOZZI OF NEW YORK

At the end of title V, add the following:
SEC. . . . REPORT ON AIRLINE AND PASSENGER SAFETY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on airline and passenger safety.

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

(1) the average age of commercial aircraft owned and operated by United States air carriers;

(2) the over-all use of planes, including average lifetime of commercial aircraft;

(3) the number of hours aircraft are in flight over the life of the aircraft and the average number of hours on domestic and international flights, respectively; and

(4) the impact of metal fatigue on aircraft usage and safety;

(5) a review on contractor assisted maintenance of commercial aircraft; and

(6) a re-evaluation of the rules on inspection of aging airplanes.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title V, add the following:
SEC. 543. REPORT ON AIRCRAFT DIVERSIONS FROM LAX TO HAWTHORNE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall issue and make available to the public a report on diversions of aircraft from Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) to Hawthorne Municipal Airport, also known as Jack Northrop Field, in the City of Haw-

thorne, California. This report shall cover at least the previous one-year period and include the total number of aircraft diversions, the average number of diversions per day, the types of aircraft diverted, and the reasons for the diversions.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SECTION . . . FORMER MILITARY AIRPORTS.

Section 47118(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C) by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the airport is—

“(A) a former military installation; and

“(B) a primary airport.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. FLEISCHMANN OF TENNESSEE

At the end of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 543. USE OF STATE HIGHWAY SPECIFICATIONS.

Section 47114(d)(5) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(5) USE OF STATE HIGHWAY SPECIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall use the highway specifications of a State for airfield pavement construction and improvement using funds made available under this subsection at nonprimary airports serving aircraft that do not exceed 60,000 pounds gross weight if—

“(A) such State requests the use of such specifications; and

“(B) the Secretary determines that—

“(i) safety will not be negatively affected; and

“(ii) the life of the pavement, with necessary maintenance and upkeep, will not be shorter than it would be if constructed using Administration standards.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5 . . . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary should produce a smart airports initiative plan that focuses on creating a more consumer-friendly and digitally connected airport experience. The plan should include recommendations on modernizing technologies to provide more efficient check-ins, shortened security lines, Wi-Fi and GPS upgrades, as well as improvements of aircraft turnaround for on-time boarding and flights. The purpose of the initiative is to invest in technologies and infrastructure toward better-connected airports while providing appropriate national security and cybersecurity for travelers.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5 . . . OXYGEN MASK DESIGN STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a study to review and evaluate the design and effectiveness of commercial aircraft oxygen masks. In conducting the study, the Administrator shall determine whether the current design of oxygen masks is adequate, and whether changes to the design could increase correct passenger usage of the masks.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS OF OHIO

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5 . . . STANDARDS FOR PILOTS.

(a) AGE ADJUSTMENT.—Section 44729(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by

striking “covered operations until attaining 65 years of age” and inserting “covered operations described under subsection (b)(1) until attaining 65 years of age and covered operations described under subsection (b)(2) until attaining 70 years of age”.

(b) COVERED OPERATIONS.—Section 44729(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “means operations under part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.” and inserting “means—

“(1) operations under part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(2) operations by a person that—

“(A) holds an air carrier certificate issued pursuant to part 119 to conduct operations under part 135 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(B) qualifies as a program manager under subpart K of part 91 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(C) performed an aggregate total of at least 150,000 turbojet operations in—

“(i) calendar year 2017; or

“(ii) any subsequent year.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of title V, add the following:
SEC. 5 . . . STUDY REGARDING TECHNOLOGY USAGE AT AIRPORTS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a study and report the findings of such study to the appropriate committees of Congress regarding—

(1) technology developed by international entities (including foreign nations and companies) that have been installed in American airports and aviation systems over the past decade, including the nation where the technology was developed and the any airports utilizing the technology; and

(2) aviation safety related technology developed and implemented by international entities with proven track records of success that may assist in establishing best practices to improve American aviation operations and safety.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title V, add the following:
SEC. . . . APPLICATIONS FOR DESIGNATION.

Section 2209 of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(C)—

(A) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v); and

(B) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) Railroad facilities.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DEADLINES.—

“(1) Not later than December 31, 2018, the Administrator shall publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to carry out the requirements of this section.

“(2) Not later than 12 months after publishing the notice of proposed rulemaking under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall issue a final rule.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. DOGGETT OF TEXAS

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 543. APPLICABILITY OF MEDICAL CERTIFICATION STANDARDS TO OPERATORS OF AIR BALLOONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Commercial Balloon Pilot Safety Act of 2018”.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall revise section 61.3(c) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to second-class medical certificates), to apply to an operator of an air balloon to the same extent such regulations apply to a pilot flight crewmember of other aircraft.

(c) AIR BALLOON DEFINED.—In this section, the term “air balloon” has the meaning given the term “balloon” in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF GEORGIA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 543. COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF EQUIPMENT RENTAL.

(a) COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF EQUIPMENT RENTAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any cost-effectiveness analysis for equipment acquisition conducted on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each executive agency shall consider equipment rental in such cost-effectiveness analysis.

(2) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to implement the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) STUDY OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a comprehensive report on the decisions made by the executive agencies with the highest levels of acquisition spending, and a sample of executive agencies with lower levels of acquisition spending, to acquire high-value equipment by lease, rental, or purchase pursuant to subpart 7.4 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EQUIPMENT RENTAL.—The term “equipment rental” means the acquisition of equipment by contract from a commercial source for a temporary period of use with no fixed duration.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of title 40, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE OF NEW JERSEY

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. . . . REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act (except as described in subsection (d)), the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the results of the study described in subsection (b).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Administrator shall make recommendations based on—

(1) an analysis of—
(A) the economic effects of temporary flight restrictions, particularly temporary flight restrictions issued pursuant to section 91.141 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, on airports or aviation-related businesses located or based in an area covered by the temporary flight restriction; and

(B) potential options and recommendations for mitigating identified negative economic effects on airports or aviation-related businesses located or based in an area frequently covered by a temporary flight restriction; and

(2) an analysis of the potential for using security procedures similar to those described

in the Maryland Three Program (allowing properly vetted private pilots to fly to, from, or between the three general aviation airports closest to the National Capital Region) during temporary flight restrictions in the following airports:

- (A) Solberg Airport.
- (B) Somerset Airport.
- (C) Palm Beach County Park Airport (also known as Lantana Airport).

(c) COLLABORATION.—In making the recommendations described in subsection (b), the Administrator shall consult with—

- (1) industry stakeholders; and
- (2) the head of any other agency that, in the Administrator’s determination, is a stakeholder agency.

(d) SPECIAL DEADLINE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the results of the portion of the study described in subsection (b)(1)(A).

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. . . . STUDY ON INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF FAST-GROWING AIRPORTS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education to conduct a study on the infrastructure needs of airports—

- (1) in metropolitan statistical areas with an average 5-year, year-to-year population growth rate between 6 and 13 percent; and
- (2) with an average 5-year, year-to-year passenger growth rate between 7 and 10 percent.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the infrastructure needs of the airports described in subsection (a);

(2) an examination of how such infrastructure needs are related to the population and economic growth of relevant metropolitan statistical areas;

(3) an assessment of the infrastructure funding and financing tools available to such airports;

(4) the development of recommendations on additional funding and financing tools that may provide significant new revenues and flexibility;

(5) an estimate of the population and economic growth rate of the relevant metropolitan statistical areas over the next 10 years; and

(6) the development of recommendations on how such airports can best fund the infrastructure necessary to accommodate—

- (A) increases in passenger growth; and
- (B) population and economic growth in the relevant metropolitan statistical areas.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. . . . AIRCRAFT NOISE RESEARCH AND MITIGATION STRATEGY.

Not later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a 5-year aircraft noise research and mitigation strategy.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. . . . ALTERNATIVE AIRPLANE NOISE METRIC EVALUATION DEADLINE.

Not later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall complete the ongoing evaluation of alternative metrics to the current Day Night Level (DNL) 65 standard.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. . . . PERFORMANCE-BASED STANDARDS.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall, to the maximum extent possible and consistent with Federal law, and based on input by the public, ensure that regulations, guidance, and policies issued by the Federal Aviation Administration on and after the date of enactment of this Act are issued in the form of performance-based standards, providing an equal or higher level of safety.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 543. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with the National Transportation Safety Board, shall issue a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that—

(1) provides a technical review of systems capable of detecting wrong surface alignment to determine whether the capability exists to detect imminent wrong-surface landings at each airport where such a system is in use; and

(2) includes information gathered from the use of Airport Surface Surveillance Capability System (ASSC) at San Francisco International Airport since July 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 543. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON CERTAIN AVIATION SAFETY RISKS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that—

(1) identifies safety risks associated with power outages at airports caused by weather or other factors, and recommends actions to improve resilience of aviation communication, navigation, and surveillance systems in the event of such outages; and

(2) reviews alerting mechanisms, devices, and procedures for enhancing the situational awareness of pilots and air traffic controllers in the event of a failure or an irregularity of runway lights, and provides recommendations on the further implementation of such mechanisms, devices, or procedures.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 543. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with the National Transportation Safety Board, shall issue a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that reviews the relative benefits and risks of requiring the use of runway awareness and advisory systems in turbine-powered airplanes

under the provisions of part 121 or part 129 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. — REVIEW OF FAA'S AVIATION SAFETY INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND SHARING SYSTEM.

(a) AUDIT BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall initiate a follow-up review of the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Aviation Safety Information Analysis and Sharing (ASIAS) System to assess FAA's efforts and plans to improve the system.

(2) REVIEW.—The review should include, at a minimum, an evaluation of FAA's efforts to improve the ASIAS system's predictive capabilities and solutions developed to more widely disseminate results of ASIAS data analyses, as well as an update on previous Inspector General recommendations to improve this safety analysis and sharing system.

(3) REPORT.—The Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of its review and any recommendations to improve FAA's ASIAS system.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE OF MICHIGAN

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 543. CYBERSECURITY AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE STANDARDS PLAN.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Committee on Technology of the National Science and Technology Council, transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that contains a cybersecurity and artificial intelligence standards plan for Federal Aviation Administration operations that takes into consideration the influence of cybersecurity on artificial intelligence and of artificial intelligence on cybersecurity.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. — SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HIRING VETERANS.

It is the sense of Congress that the aviation industry, including certificate holders under parts 121, 135, and 145 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, should hire more of the Nation's veterans.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. — GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report containing a review of the following:

(1) Direct and indirect effects on passengers, if any, resulting from significant computer network disruptions of 49 CFR Part 121 air carriers between January 1, 2014, and the date of enactment of this section, including—

- (A) systemwide delays;
- (B) flight cancellations; and
- (C) disrupted or broken itineraries.

(2) An estimate of any expenses incurred by passengers during significant computer network disruptions, including—

- (A) meals, lodging, and ancillary expenses per persons;
- (B) late hotel check-in or car rental fees;
- (C) missed cruise-ship departures; and
- (D) lost productivity.

(3) Air carriers' contracts of carriage and interline agreements to determine if and how air carriers accommodate passengers affected by significant computer network disruptions on other air carriers or foreign air carriers.

(4) Whether passengers who have been displaced by significant computer network disruptions are furnished with alternative transportation aboard another air carrier or foreign air carrier.

(5) Costs incurred by airports, if any, to meet the essential needs of passengers, including increased demands on utilities, food concessionaires, restroom facilities, and security staffing, during significant computer network disruptions.

(6) Other costs, if any, incurred by passengers, airports, and other entities as a direct result of significant computer network disruptions.

(7) Processes, plans, and redundancies in place at air carriers to respond to and recover from such network disruptions.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 267, after line 11, insert the following:
SEC. 543. PROMPT PAYMENTS.

(a) REPORTING OF COMPLAINTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall ensure that each airport that participates in the Program tracks, and reports to the Administrator, the number of covered complaints made in relation to activities at that airport.

(b) IMPROVING COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall take actions to assess and improve compliance with prompt payment requirements under part 26 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) CONTENTS OF ASSESSMENT.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall assess—

- (A) whether requirements relating to the inclusion of prompt payment language in contracts are being satisfied;
- (B) whether and how airports are enforcing prompt payment requirements;
- (C) the processes by which covered complaints are received and resolved by airports;
- (D) whether improvements need to be made to—

(i) better track covered complaints received by airports; and

(ii) assist the resolution of covered complaints in a timely manner;

(E) the effectiveness of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms with respect to resolving covered complaints;

(F) best practices that ensure prompt payment requirements are satisfied;

(G) the Federal Aviation Administration resources, including staff, that are dedicated to helping resolve covered complaints; and

(H) how the Federal Aviation Administration can enhance efforts to resolve covered complaints, including by using timelines and providing additional staffing and other resources.

(3) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall make available to the public on an appropriate website operated by the Administrator a report describing the results of the

assessment completed under this subsection, including a plan to respond to such results.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) COVERED COMPLAINT.—The term "covered complaint" means a complaint relating to an alleged failure to satisfy a prompt payment requirement under part 26 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) PROGRAM.—The term "Program" means the airport disadvantaged business enterprise program referenced in section 140(a) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47113 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support considering these amendments en bloc, all of which have been approved by both the majority and minority. These Members put forward thoughtful amendments, and I am pleased to be able to support moving them en bloc.

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

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

These amendments, en bloc, have been reviewed, both by the majority and the minority, and there is consensus on their merit. I urge my colleagues to support them.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), I would say first that I strongly support his amendment and tried to work with the former FAA Administrator to rectify this issue that led to this extraordinary and unnecessary loss of life.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on that and his help. I wish the FAA had listened. And I thank Mr. SHUSTER and the staffs on both sides of the committee for including this amendment with others that need to be part of this action.

It was about 2 years ago that the largest, most deadly crash of a commercial balloon in American history occurred just south of Austin, near Lockhart and Maxwell, Texas. It was, in fact, and remains the largest aviation disaster of any type in this decade. When that morning, that Saturday morning ended, this was all that was left, along with the bodies of the victims of this.

The Federal Aviation Administration had been asked, prior to this incident, by the National Transportation Safety Board, to take a closer look and come up with reasonable regulations for the commercial balloon industry. The FAA failed to do that. Since this accident, the Federal Aviation Administration has been asked, once again, by the National Transportation Safety Board to act on this matter, and the FAA has again failed.

The families of the victims launched a petition on their own to express their

concern about this. I have joined them, others have joined them, in asking for action, and it is clear that only legislative action by us will address this problem.

I am hopeful that, with the passage of this amendment, which is narrow, which is bipartisan, and is directed only to assuring that individuals who are flying these—lifting off in these balloons are medically fit to do so. Had that been in place, I believe that this incident would never have happened.

So the grief, the horror, that these families experienced, many of them want to channel it into seeing that no other family faces a similar crisis. This is an incident that had a widespread effect. I talked with the owner of the property where the crash occurred. There was a giant prayer circle around the Caldwell County Courthouse of concern of many people in the county for what happened here.

I just want to thank my colleagues for incorporating this amendment in because I think it will help save lives in the future.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the House FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018.

I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. SHUSTER, and the ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, for the opportunity to offer this amendment.

My amendment supports our Nation's more than 5,000 general aviation airports by providing a commonsense solution to reduce the cost and construction time for critical pavement projects, while maintaining the highest level of safety and quality.

Our general aviation airports provide critical access, vital emergency and medical services, economic activity, and many other important services, as vital lifelines, especially in rural areas.

However, the cost of building and maintaining runways at general aviation airports has become unnecessarily burdensome and costly, due to outdated pavement specification requirements that the FAA recognizes can and should be updated. As such, in consultation with key industry groups and agencies, I have introduced this amendment to address this issue.

Among many other things, this reform will better equip our dedicated network of State aviation officials, airports, and other good personnel, working on the front lines in maintaining and improving our Nation's airports. This amendment will allow them to undertake more projects efficiently and safely, with commonsense savings that frees up additional funding for other critical projects.

More specifically, after extensive field testing that has provided concrete evidence that States can and have utilized alternative pavement mixes, procured more conveniently and cost-ef-

fectively from local businesses on critical runway projects to safely maintain our Nation's runway systems of general aviation airports.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4 to ensure that the FAA is helping businesses that have been historically discriminated against when it comes to government contracting. And I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

Adoption of my amendment is a good start, but much more needs to be done to address discrimination and related barriers that still exist. This includes addressing the exclusion of any Federal DBE participation requirements or goals for Passenger Facility Charge-funded projects. It is critical that we don't miss the opportunity to address these barriers.

I want to remind everyone that billions of dollars of transportation contracts are at stake in this reauthorization. And for businesses that have been historically discriminated against in transportation contracting, they just want a chance to compete for these dollars.

In this reauthorization, Congress must continue to ensure that qualified minority and women-owned businesses in every congressional district can fairly compete for work.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, my thanks to Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO.

I rise today in support of this en bloc package that contains my bipartisan amendment requiring the FAA to study the economic impact of Temporary Flight Restrictions on local airports and to recommend ways to mitigate the negative effects, potentially including creating security procedures to allow limited use of certain airports during a TFR.

This is about fairness for New Jersey pilots and small businesses. The President and the First Family use Trump National Golf Course in Bedminster, New Jersey, in the district I serve, as a weekend residence during the late spring, the summer, and the early fall. During such visits to Bedminster, a TFR is imposed in the area, shuttering Solberg and Somerset airports, and grounding recreational and training flights.

The safety of the President and the First Family and the official visitors to Bedminster is, of course, paramount, but TFRs can be very challenging, and I want to find a compromise with the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secret Service so that pilots can be vetted, prescreened, and allowed to fly.

This is not a new idea. For some airports in Maryland, near Washington,

D.C., pilots are permitted limited operation after being properly vetted. I seek the same status for constituents I serve in New Jersey.

I thank the chairman for his interest and ask for further help in crafting this policy with the FAA. I further hope to work with him on establishing a temporary reimbursement program, as was done for the Maryland airports in the early 2000s. I urge a "yes" vote on this legislation.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support the amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chair, last year was the safest on record for commercial air travel, and the United States has one of the safest systems in the world.

However, last Tuesday's emergency landing by Southwest Airlines Flight 1380—and the tragic death of a passenger—Jennifer Rioridan—is a call to action when it comes to assuring airline and passenger safety.

Tuesday's incident on Southwest Flight 1380 was caused when the aircraft's left engine suddenly exploded mid-flight.

Metal weakness or "metal fatigue" was found in the left jet engine that failed during the flight of Southwest 1380.

This issue is one of the reasons I have introduced an amendment to H.R. 4, the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act.

The FAA needs to understand the full scope of any and all dangers connected to metal fatigue.

My amendment instructs the FAA Administrator to produce a report on airline and passenger safety within 180 days of House passage.

More specifically, my amendment instructs the FAA to study the issue of metal fatigue as well as the age and over-all use of U.S. commercial aircraft.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I imagine many in this room have seen the 60 Minutes report on Allegiant Air.

The report exposed numerous safety problems at Allegiant Air, a low-cost carrier that is more than three times as likely to have in-flight mechanical emergencies than any other major airline.

I'm deeply concerned about the issues at Allegiant.

I also worry about reports that the FAA has shied away from punishing airlines that cut corners with regards to passenger safety. That's just flat-out unacceptable.

Finally, Congress needs to be concerned about the practice of offshoring U.S. aircraft maintenance to foreign repair stations.

Today, approximately 24 percent of total heavy aircraft maintenance is offshored to repair facilities in other countries, more than triple the share offshored in 2003.

This offshoring has cost hardworking Americans thousands of aircraft maintenance jobs.

This practice has also raised real concerns regarding the level of U.S. oversight on offshored maintenance work.

Safety and security regulatory gaps persist, creating a double standard for domestic maintenance workers and workers overseas.

A dangerous double standard that could result in an airline—passenger tragedy.

That's why my amendment also instructs the FAA to review policies regarding maintenance performed by contractors.

Overall, our mission is simple, clear and all-important:

To empower the FAA to root out any problems in the hopes of preventing any further tragedies.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. —. NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION HELICOPTER FLIGHT PATHS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the National Capital Region, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall review and revise helicopter flight paths, including those used by the Department of Defense and all military helicopters, identifying and issuing new official paths for areas in which helicopters may be able to fly at higher altitudes.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the review and revision under subsection (a), the Administrator must consider—

- (1) residents living below the flight paths;
- (2) national security and emergency flight paths, which shall only be used in cases of emergency; and
- (3) fixed-wing plane flight paths.

(c) DEFINITION OF NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.—In this section, the term “National Capital Region” means—

- (1) the District of Columbia;
- (2) Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties in Maryland;
- (3) Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties in Virginia; and
- (4) all cities and towns included within the outer boundaries of the foregoing counties.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I consistently hear a great deal from my constituents about pervasive, intrusive helicopter noise. I have carefully listened to them for years, through community forums, townhalls, letters, emails, phone calls, and the like. I have also worked with both the FAA and the Department of Defense on possible solutions.

We certainly have a difficult balance to strike in the National Capital Region, but people shouldn't have to live under the constant thunder of helicopter noise. Helicopter noise, by all accounts, has gotten significantly worse year after year after year. Even those who are neighbors with the Pentagon have noticed it has gotten much worse.

□ 1530

Last year, I had an amendment to the NDAA for the Department of Defense to conduct a study on mitigating the helicopter noise. We had excellent conversations. Colonels and majors came out from the Air Force, the Army, the Marines, and the FAA came out. We had big townhall meetings. In those conversations, we moved forward with a now completed DOD noise study.

The Department of Defense has repeatedly informed me that they follow the FAA helicopter maps perfectly and that they fly at the required minimum altitudes. So as a solution, my amendment would require the FAA to simply review all the helicopter flight paths in the national capital region, including those used solely by the Department of Defense, to assess whether some of these helicopter trips could be safely flown at a higher altitude. If they can be, the amendment would also require the FAA to revise the official helicopter flight maps for this region to allow some relief for those communities that live below.

Progress has remained very slow on this issue—glacial—and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment so that we can move forward with a responsible way to mitigate this helicopter noise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

This amendment would interfere with national security, homeland security, and law enforcement operations.

As home to the Nation's Capital, the area serves a critical role for the country as home to the Federal Government. Each day, military pilots and other agencies use helicopters to conduct vital missions as part of our national defense and the operations of government. These agencies include the DOD, the Coast Guard, Park Police, Capitol Police, and other agencies. The missions they fly cannot be accomplished by any other means and are essential to our Nation's protection.

This amendment would add complexity to the airspace and could affect the safety of our servicemembers and law enforcement and affect the efficiency of the airspace.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concerns, and I hope we can find some way to address them, but I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the chairman of the committee, the many conversations I have had with the general who runs the Washington Military District, with the Air Force and Army colonels, with the Marine major, and with many of the

helicopter pilots, none of them have suggested for a moment that national security, homeland security, or law enforcement were at risk here. In fact, the pilots said: We would be happy to fly higher as long as we have permission from the FAA.

We are not interfering in the slightest with their ability to accomplish their mission. We understand their mission. We respect it.

No one is saying that we can't protect not only our Nation's top executives, but also the military officers who need to fly in and around this region. What we are simply saying is that, in many cases, 300 feet, 500 feet, 700 feet is a more logical place to fly.

We have had testimony that people have been in apartment buildings in Crystal City, looked out their window, and seen the helicopters fly below their window. This happens in Rosslyn, also.

What we are simply asking is that the FAA responsibly look at whether—with lots of feedback from the Army, Air Force, Marines, from law enforcement, from the Secret Service—they couldn't, in fact, fly a few hundred feet higher than they fly right now. If they can't, we will accept that and do our best to move some other way. But, really, this is at the recommendation of our military leaders that the FAA examine this and find a way to move forward.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. 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 gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEBRASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. —. GAO STUDY ON AVIATION WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study, based on previous studies, that looks at the current and future supply of individuals in the aviation workforce.

(b) REVIEW.—In carrying out the study, the Comptroller General shall review, at a minimum—

- (1) the current state of the aviation workforce;
- (2) barriers to entry into the aviation workforce; and

(3) options to increase the future supply of individuals in the aviation workforce.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study, including any findings and recommendations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would direct the Comptroller General to study the current and future availability of pilots in the aviation workforce.

Since the implementation of new pilot training requirements for first officers in 2013, two airlines which provided air service to my congressional district have filed for bankruptcy, citing the inability to find pilots as a primary factor in their financial struggles. Even before withdrawing from Nebraska, both airlines had poor flight cancellation records, which they indicated was caused by this issue, severely reducing enplanements at these airports.

In rural areas like Nebraska's Third District, commercial air service provides a vital economic link for communities which are several hours' drive from the nearest major airport.

In an effort to further address the concerns of the seven communities with passenger air service in my district and numerous others around the country, this amendment merely asks GAO to study what the current state of the aviation workforce is, where it is going in the future, and what, if anything, we can do to mitigate pilot shortages. We must do more to address these communities' concerns, and this study will provide valuable information as we seek to address this problem.

Beyond the direct economic impact on these communities from the loss of these flights, these cancellations have also caused overall enplanements at airports such as Kearney, North Platte, and Scottsbluff, Nebraska, and other airports in a number of other States, to fall below the minimum 10,000 required to qualify for full Airport Improvement Program funding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for moving my other amendment en bloc to provide regulatory relief to airports by treating them consistently with how they have been treated previously.

Again, I urge support of this amendment we are currently debating, which will direct GAO to study our current and future aviation workforce needs, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

This amendment would require the Comptroller General to conduct a study on the current and future supply of individuals for the U.S. aviation workforce. The study would review the current state of our aviation workforce as well as barriers to entry.

A strong and robust aviation workforce will ensure the U.S. remains the global leader and innovator in civil aviation; therefore, I support this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the ranking member, Mr. LARSEN. This amendment requesting the GAO study makes a lot of sense to me. The outlook of the future supply of individuals in the workforce, we know there are some shortages out there. This report will inform us about the current aviation workforce and needed actions to ensure we do have an adequate supply of workers in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and thank him for offering this amendment, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, again, this amendment just asks the Comptroller General to assess our current situation for aviation and pilot needs. Canceled flights have been a major problem for communities with the smaller airlines, and certainly we want to prevent something in a similar manner from impacting the larger airports around the country as well.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their support, and I urge others to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. — METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 134(d)(4) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking "Nothing" and

inserting "Except with respect to a metropolitan planning organization whose structure consists of no local elected officials, nothing".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, since 1991, Federal law has stated that metropolitan planning organizations around the country should have local elected officials on their boards.

In 2012, Congress passed MAP-21 and included a clause stating that these MPOs that were not in compliance had 2 years to conform.

Now, in the previous administration, there was a Federal clause that was used to grandfather the Twin Cities—Minneapolis-St. Paul—Metropolitan Council into compliance without having elected officials. So we now have, in the Minneapolis-St. Paul region, the only board in the country that is entirely nonelected, the only MPO that has the authority to independently raise taxes and is not elected.

Indeed, in Minneapolis-St. Paul, our metropolitan planning organization has a budget that dwarfs all the others in the country. In fact, it is larger than Houston; Dallas; Atlanta; Los Angeles; Phoenix; Seattle; Washington, D.C.; San Francisco; Boston; Philadelphia; Denver; Miami; Tampa; and Chicago combined.

Now, why does an entity of this magnitude not require local elected officials?

Now, I know some defending the status quo are now making misleading claims about this amendment, about our efforts here in Congress.

First, the Met Council does perform transportation work, and their transportation advisory board does include elected officials. But the Federal Highway Administration and FTA ruled in 2015 that the TAB is an advisory body to the council; it is not the MPO. Even the previous administration, the Obama administration, disagreed with the Met Council's assertion that the TAB would be equivalent to a local elected official.

Second, the defenders of the status quo are asserting that total chaos will ensue if this amendment passes. It will be a complete mess. Every other MPO was either formed in compliance with elected officials, or local elected officials on its board, or it came into compliance with this Federal law, and none gained widespread attention for chaos.

The defenders of the status quo, including the current council and even the Governor of the State, now assert that, well, this is too uncertain, that chaos would ensue. I would argue that having a 17-member board entirely appointed by the Governor is uncertainty. Uncertainty is a board that changes course every time there is a new election in the Governor's mansion.

Finally, the critics of my amendment have begun stirring up the masses by saying this singlehandedly stops Federal funding for any transportation project in the area, even up to \$2 billion by 2021. But in the past, when other MPOs have come into compliance, it hasn't had this effect. It simply hasn't happened. Besides, the congressional intent is that any MPO whose structure changes in order to adhere to Federal law will be given a transition period, a very generous one.

The point is this amendment does not put in jeopardy any current or future Federal investments and grants. In fact, my colleagues and I from Minnesota have been working with the DOD to make certain our region gets the Federal support we need. But it is vital, and it has been vital for years in our region, that we determine our own governance structure, that the local elected officials have a say.

If the Twin Cities Metropolitan Council thinks it would take too large an effort to find common ground in order to pursue an MPO that has elected officials, then that is the best indication that there is a serious problem with the status quo.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to give citizens power over their regional government. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concerns that he has with his local MPO. We all face our own challenges with local MPOs, but they are an important decisionmaking body that ensures local governments can take full advantage of Federal transportation programs in a coordinated manner.

This amendment is attempting to break apart the operating structure of a local MPO, seemingly to punish it. It does not achieve the outcome the gentleman is hoping to achieve except to create government dysfunction.

I would also note that some frequently argue that local decisions should be made by local decisionmakers. They say, "Keep the Federal Government out of our business," except this amendment declares, if the decisions are not made to the liking of one Federal official, he can step in and blow up that local decisionmaking body.

□ 1545

Mr. Chairman, I am urging my colleagues, therefore, to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. LEWIS and I thank the gentleman

for offering this amendment. The Metropolitan Planning Organizations were created to ensure that local officials drive the decisions about how Federal and highway transit funds are spent. Unfortunately, for the gentleman's district, a loophole in the law undermines elected officials.

This amendment ensures the structure of MPOs can consist of locally elected officials. This is a fair and commonsense amendment, so I urge all Members to support this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would note that of all of the opposition in this body, they are already in compliance with what I am proposing for the Metropolitan Council. So, clearly, it didn't induce chaos, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, we have no other speakers, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title V of the bill, the following:

SEC. 5 . INTERLINING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue a final rule requiring an air carrier to seek, in the event of a delay exceeding 3 hours, cancellation, or misconnection as a result of circumstances or an event within an air carrier's control, as determined by the Secretary of Transportation, alternative transportation for displaced passengers, including aboard another air carrier capable of transporting the passenger to his or her originally scheduled destination, and to accept, for a reasonable fee, the passengers of another air carrier who have been displaced by circumstances or an event within that air carriers control, as determined by the Secretary of Transportation, or if the passenger has been involuntarily denied boarding due to a lack of available seats.

SEC. 5 . IMPROVED ACCOMMODATION OF DISPLACED PASSENGERS.

Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall modify part 259 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations to include the following:

(1) ADOPTION OF PLAN.—Each covered carrier shall adopt a contingency plan for lengthy terminal delays for its scheduled flights at each large hub airport, medium hub airport, small hub airport and non-hub airport in the United States at which it operates or markets such air transportation service and shall adhere to its plan's terms.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—Each contingency plan for any delay, cancellation, or misconnection, affecting a passenger who has been involuntarily denied boarding as a result of circumstances or an event within an air carrier's control, as determined by the

Administration of the Federal Aviation Administration (except in the case in which the flight crew determines that a passenger poses a danger to the safety of the flight), shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) ESSENTIAL NEEDS.—An air carrier shall ensure that essential needs, including food, water, restroom facilities, and assistance in the case of a medical emergency are met. If the only available seating on the carrier's next flight to the passenger's destination is a higher class of service than purchased, the carrier shall transport the passenger on the flight at no additional cost.

(B) MEAL VOUCHER.—In the case of a delay exceeding 4 hours, the air carrier shall provide a meal voucher or, if at the request of the passenger, cash equivalent to the value of a meal voucher. An air carrier shall not be liable to reimburse the passenger for expenses related to meals if the passenger did not accept such compensation when offered.

(C) LODGING, TRANSPORTATION, AND OTHER VOUCHERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a delay, cancellation, or misconnection as a result of circumstances or an event within an air carrier's control, as determined by the Secretary of Transportation, of which any portion exceeding 2 hours occurs between the period of time between 10 p.m. and 3 a.m., local time, of the following day, and with no guarantee of reaccommodation aboard another flight to the passenger's destination within the following 2 hours after the initial 2-hour delay, an air carrier shall provide the passenger with lodging, transportation to and from the airport to the place of lodging, and meal expenses. At the request of the passenger, the carrier shall alternatively compensate such passenger with the cash equivalent to the value of the lodging, meals, and transportation, or a voucher of equivalent value for future travel on the carrier.

(ii) LODGING UNAVAILABLE.—If lodging is unavailable, a carrier shall compensate a passenger with the cash equivalent to the value of the lodging, meals, and transportation, or, at the request of the passenger, a voucher of equivalent value for future travel on the carrier.

(iii) PROXIMITY TO RESIDENCE.—The provisions of clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply to a passenger whose permanent residence is 60 miles or less from the airport where such delay, cancellation, or misconnection occurred.

(iv) FAILURE TO ACCEPT INITIAL COMPENSATION.—An air carrier shall not be liable to reimburse the passenger for expenses related to meals if the passenger did not accept such compensation when offered.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, while we have had some good news that airlines have improved their performance on various metrics in the past year, passengers continue to suffer frustrations.

According to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, in 2017, 285,000 flights were delayed due to circumstances within the airlines' control. And last year, even though bumpings were down, over 23,000 were involuntarily denied boarding.

When passengers are significantly delayed as a result of an event within the

airlines' control, it only makes sense that airlines be required to accommodate them better. But in a competitive climate where passengers' expectation of service quality has declined significantly, the airlines won't make these passenger-friendly changes, and that is why we need this commonsense amendment.

My amendment will require airlines to place a passenger who is delayed more than 3 hours onto another carrier, if that would be the quickest way to get the passenger to their destination. This would apply only to delays caused by an event within an air carrier's control, as defined by the Secretary of Transportation.

In order to make this easier for the airlines, it will require all carriers to accept such rebookings for a reasonable fee. At one time, this was a common practice. Some airlines still have these agreements—called interline agreements—with other airlines. And some have, in the past year, created new interline agreements. But many airlines still fall short and some require passengers to ask for this treatment in order to receive it.

This amendment also requires airlines to ensure that passengers have access to essential needs, such as medical care and restrooms, no matter when or where a delay occurs. It requires meal vouchers to be given in the event of delays longer than 4 hours, and it requires hotel accommodations during lengthy overnight delays that occur between 10 p.m. and 3 a.m.

These measures would go a long way to improving airline passenger protections. In order to make sure that this is done in the best possible manner, the Secretary of Transportation will engage in a rulemaking process, giving the airlines and the flying public an opportunity to have input.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is a re-regulation of the airlines that was soundly defeated in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. It would force airlines to interline, which refers to agreements among airlines to carry each other's passengers. Most airlines already have interline agreements with other airlines, and the freedom to do so is important to preserve.

Forcing all airlines unwilling into such deals will have unintended consequences. Customers will be punished and forced to bear the burden of the service fares of other airlines. The problems caused by this amendment would be most acute in smaller communities that have few flights per day.

H.R. 4 includes provisions requiring air carriers to prominently disclose to

passengers what services will be offered in the event of widespread disruption. The underlying bill contains a number of other consumer protections that are widely supported by stakeholders and Members alike.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, but I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. There is no doubt that time and time again, the airlines have a lot of work to do in the realm of customer service. With little competition in the U.S. airline industry, airlines are no longer required to compete on the quality of services they provide to consumers, yet, the industry has become the world's most profitable due in large part to countless ancillary fees they charge passengers.

I believe certainly that more must be done to restore basic rights and fairness in air travel. However, the amendment, as drafted, does take a one-size-fits-all approach to customer service that may not be appropriate for every situation.

Before legislating prescriptive requirements for the airlines when passengers are displaced, I think the committee should hold additional hearings and study these issues more thoroughly. I hope we can agree on that.

A recent lesson learned was with the Department of Transportation tarmac delay rule, a rule with great intentions that had several unintended consequences, such as passengers becoming stranded overnight at diversion airports hundreds of miles from their destination. Congress had to mitigate some of these issues in the 2016 FAA extension.

When we are proscriptive on the customer service front, we have to be sure we are getting it right. But I do want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for offering this amendment. I hope he will continue to work with the committee to perfect it, but I stand in opposition to it.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member LARSEN for his comments. I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his work on this bill. There are many good provisions in this bill, one that has to do with disclosure.

But it still does not give the flying public enough protection. That is why we need this amendment.

This amendment has been endorsed by the Consumers Union, Travelers United, the Consumer Federation of America, and Flyers Rights.

We expect when we buy a ticket on an airline that we will get that as quickly as possible. Glitches occur, but if it is something that is in the control

of the airline, I think we should expect to be put on another airline to get to our destination as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5 . FEDERAL AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14501(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) and (4)”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6) respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State, political subdivision of a State, or political authority of 2 or more States may not enact or enforce a law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law prohibiting employees whose hours of service are subject to regulation by the Secretary under section 31502 from working to the full extent permitted or at such times as permitted under such section, or imposing any additional obligations on motor carriers if such employees work to the full extent or at such times as permitted under such section, including any related activities regulated under part 395 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(B) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the provisions of paragraph (1).”;

(4) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated) by striking “Paragraph (1)—” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (2)—”; and

(5) in paragraph (4)(A) (as redesignated) by striking “Paragraph (1)” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (2)”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall have the force and effect as if enacted on the date of enactment of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-305).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, real quickly, let me just explain what the

F4A Denham amendment does. This clarifies the intent of the 1994 FAA bill; thus, how it got its name, the F4A.

It created one Federal regulatory standard for meal and rest breaks or hours of service for interstate freight and passenger motor carriers. This was originally in the FAA bill of 1994. It also included piece rate.

Now, we have passed this issue several times from the House over to the Senate—a very good bipartisan bill—but while we have had great bipartisanism in the past, to get greater bipartisanism, and to work with labor, we actually took out the piece rate issue.

Now, this bill only deals with meal and rest—the same as that piece of it that was in 1994 where Congress, where this body actually reported out saying: “State economic regulation of motor carrier operations causes significant inefficiencies, increased costs, reduction of competition, inhibition of innovation and technology, and curtails the expansion of markets.”

This is about interstate commerce, making sure that you can drive a truck transporting goods from one State to another without having challenges going from a patchwork of States across the entire country.

We want these professional drivers to be safe, meaning if you get tired, take a break. What we don’t want to do is say, at 2 hours, you need to pull over immediately—on the bridge, on the highway, wherever you are at, creating an unsafe condition.

Stop at the rest stop. Stop at the truck stop. Stop when it is convenient, when it is safe, and when you are tired.

We want to give these professional drivers flexibility in interstate commerce. That was in 1994. That was the law of the land until the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit reconvened and changed some of these motor carrier laws. The amendment and the Federal Standard only apply to interstate. What you do in your own State is up to your State.

But interstate, going across State lines, which the Constitution enumerated to the Federal Government in Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Commerce Clause. Interstate hours of service regulations would continue to be regulated by the States. But this has already been proven by the U.S. Department of Transportation who wrote the rule that this is the safest way for interstate commerce.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I rise today in support of this amendment offered by Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CUELLAR, and myself. Trucking companies and truck drivers are the backbone of our Nation in terms of transportation, and certainly, much of the San Joaquin Valley that I represent.

Agricultural products, fruits, nuts, and vegetables that are put on American’s dinner tables every night are

grown in the San Joaquin Valley, and they provide an important part of our sustenance.

Many of these truckers have one or two trucks, and they are literally small-business people. Sadly, because of the recent court decisions that were noted by the author of this amendment, these companies that operate across State lines have been exposed to unfair litigation that have been costly, and I know of cases where major motor carriers have gone out of business because of this.

The amendment would clarify that when operating across State lines, meals and rest break requirements will be governed by Federal law, not a patchwork of conflicting State laws. That just makes good common sense. This is consistent with action taken by the Congress—as was noted—in 1994, to provide uniform rules across the country for safety purposes.

Some of my colleagues have claimed time in opposition saying this amendment would overturn protections like minimum wage and vacation. This amendment in no way impacts minimum wage or vacation, or those issues that have been raised in this fashion. It is simply not true.

This amendment, I believe, is pro-safety, pro-worker, and pro-economy. The fact is, we have been dealing with this issue for a number of years, and it is time that we finally avoid the confusion and strengthen this measure out.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chair, I offered a narrow fix for this in what was true interstate commerce because of the potential confusion between Federal hours of service and State hours of service, and that was rejected.

□ 1600

This is an incredibly broad preemption. It is not as stated. For instance, we just heard you have to pull over, no matter where you are. No. If you don’t take your rest break, you have to be paid, but you don’t have to stop and pull over.

Beyond that, this would preempt paid rest breaks, paid meal breaks, paid sick leave, paid family leave, payment for time detained at a loading dock, payment for anything other than a flat rate by the load.

This is an extraordinary preemption that we have here. The drivers are already exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act. So they can’t get overtime. If we wipe out the State laws and there is no existing Federal law, truck drivers are really getting it stuck to them here.

In fact, this amendment would expand Federal preemption over trucking

operations to include, for the first time, wages and working conditions, something Congress never contemplated in 1994.

It is opposed by the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, the largest trucking organization; the Teamsters; American Association for Justice; and numerous safety groups. This is not as it is being presented. This is overly broad, and it should be opposed.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Denham amendment, which would overturn a Federal court decision that determined that California meal and rest break laws apply to truckers.

On July 4, 2014, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that trucking operators in California must allow for 30-minute meal breaks after 5 hours of work and a 10-minute rest break after 4 hours worked. This meal and rest break is very reasonable, when you consider that truck drivers can be subject to 14 hours of on-duty time.

This amendment would not only preempt California’s law, but would also preempt laws in 21 other States and territories that guarantee meal and rest breaks.

This amendment is further harmful as it includes broad preemption language, as Mr. DEFAZIO stated, that would prohibit State and local governments from enacting laws that “impose any additional obligation on motor carriers.” This preemption would attack State minimum wage laws, sick leave laws, family leave laws, and other laws that protect truck drivers’ pay and benefits.

Mr. Chairman, States should be allowed to set these important standards for truck driver working conditions as they see fit for the health and safety of their workers and for our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose the Denham amendment, and I include in the RECORD letters of opposition from the Teamsters, American Association for Justice, Truck Safety Coalition and others, and the National Employment Law Project.

TEAMSTERS LETTER OPPOSING DENHAM AMENDMENT REGARDING TRUCK DRIVER WAGE AND BENEFIT LAWS

This week, the US House of Representatives will consider legislation to reauthorize funding for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

The trucking industry is trying to hijack that bill. They want to insert language which takes away almost any protection truck drivers are granted under state law. This includes destroying the right to paid sick leave, paid vacations, FMLA, state guarantees of a lunch or rest break during a shift, and worse.

The language states the following:
“A State, political sub-division of a State or political authority of 2 or more States

may not enact or enforce a law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law prohibiting employees whose hours of service are subject to regulation by the Secretary under section 31502 from working to the full extent permitted or at such times as permitted under such section, or imposing any additional obligations on motor carriers if such employees work to the full extent or at such times as permitted under such section, including any related activities regulated, under part 395 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations."

Say you're a trucking company who doesn't want a driver taking a few hours off for a doctor's appointment this week. Now you're in luck! Under this provision, the driver isn't working to the "full extent permitted" under the minimal federal rules, so they lose any state protections guaranteeing them the right to go to the doctor!

What happens if that driver needs to take extended state-protected FMLA? Taking time off under state FMLA laws would mean that driver is not working to the "full extent" they otherwise could be under the federal rules, so it's not allowed!

What if a state decides that a truck driver should get paid while they wait in line for hours on end to drop off their load? Well, that's an additional obligation being put on the employer, and that won't be allowed either!

The House must not include this anti-safety, anti-worker provision in the FAA bill. This provision would overturn any state's law that goes above the bare minimum federal rules for truck drivers. No state could demand that drivers need to get paid for non-driving time or take action against companies who misclassify their drivers as independent contractors. Any state laws that raise wages or protect the working conditions of drivers would immediately be overturned. It refers to these state laws as "additional burdens" being placed on motor carriers and says that they need to be done away with. States couldn't even give drivers time off to go vote! What's worse, all these changes are made retroactive to 1994. All of the progress states have made over the past two decades would evaporate overnight.

Truck crashes are up 45% from 2009. Injuries are up 57%, and deaths from those crashes are also up 28%. Now is not the time to push drivers even further by taking away protections that make sure they are well-rested and alert.

We urge you to OPPOSE the Denham amendment (amendment #140 as filed with the rules committee) if it comes up on the floor during consideration of the FAA bill H.R. 4.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL P. LOESCHE,
Legislative Representative,
International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

[From the American Association for Justice] PROTECT TRUCK DRIVERS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY: OPPOSE PREEMPTION OF STATE PROTECTIONS IN THE FAA REAUTHORIZATION

AAJ strongly opposes the Denham amendment to H.R. 4, the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018. This amendment preempts state and local labor regulations, laws, and court decisions, many of which have been on the books for decades, protecting commercial truck drivers. What was originally offered to just preempt state labor protections, commonly known as the "meal and rest break" protections, morphed into something much broader and much worse in that it now preempts ANY "additional obligation on motor carriers." Therefore, this amendment will

provide for a sweeping exemption for commercial trucking drivers from being covered by all state and local wage and hour laws, including, but not limited to meal and rest break laws, paid sick leave, minimum wage, sick pay, jury duty, disability and medical leave, and even worker's compensation laws.

The Denham amendment would deny truck drivers, including many who exclusively work only within their home state, from state protections. Included in these protections is meal and rest break laws that allow truckers to take a lunch break and/or a rest break after driving on the road for a certain number of hours. In most cases, these breaks are no more than a ten-minute rest or a half hour lunch and often only occur when an employee works a full day, still allowing the employer the flexibility to determine when and how they are taken.

Meal and rest break protections are especially important for highway safety. Commercial truck drivers are a class of workers whose fatigue has been a consistent and proven cause of highway injuries and deaths. Commercial truck drivers often operate trucks exceeding 26,000 pounds and typically work up to 14 hours a day, which puts other drivers and pedestrians at serious risk of injury or death. In fact, nearly 4,000 people die in large truck crashes each year, with driver fatigue being the leading cause.

Protecting highway safety should be a top priority of Congress. Oppose the Denham Amendment.

By preempting state laws that protect workers, this amendment should be opposed because of the following:

The Denham amendment provides a sweeping exemption for motor carrier drivers from being covered by State and local wage and hour laws, including meal and rest break laws, paid sick leave, minimum wage, sick leave, jury duty, disability and medical leave, and even worker's compensation laws. It should be noted that the Federal government has NO policy on many of these protections including sick leave, paternity leave, or family leave meaning, that if these workers are exempt from coverage under State law, and there is no Federal law, they are left without any protections. In addition, the amendment prohibits any additional obligations on motor carrier employers—which gives these employers a blank check to continue the current unsustainable models of driver compensation and also pre-emptively stops any future reforms to improve driver wages and working conditions at the State and local level.

This is a clear violation of states' rights. This amendment would eliminate each state's ability to protect their workers and citizens, an area which has historically been recognized as part of a state's police powers. Under the 10th amendment, there has always been a presumption against preemption of state laws that protect the welfare, safety and health of the public, including a state's labor laws. If this amendment is adopted, Congress would be overturning hundreds of state laws that have provided its workers, including truck drivers, with employee protections they need to carry out their work in a safe and productive manner.

Congress has rejected numerous attempts to preempt similar state meal and rest protections in the past, repeatedly declining to overturn the ability of states to govern the work and safety conditions of their workers in this area. In addition, the Department of Transportation also opposed meal and rest break preemption in 2014, arguing that "there is a presumption against preemption in areas of traditional State 'police powers' or control, and that labor laws are a clear area of traditional State control. Currently, twenty states have versions of these types of

protections on the books which would immediately be wiped out by this amendment, including laws in CA, CO, CT, DE, IL, KY, ME, MA, MN, NE, NV, NH, NY, ND, OR, RI, TN, VT, WA, and WV.

If preempting meal and rest break laws in twenty states was not bad enough, the new Denham amendment is broader, preempting state employment and labor laws in ALL 50 States. Some of the state laws that would be impacted by this overly broad amendment are: minimum wage, sick pay, jury duty, disability, medical leave and even worker's compensation laws. If this Denham amendment passes, truck drivers, who frequently avail themselves of worker's compensation benefits based on the precarious nature of their job, will no longer be covered by their state worker's compensation laws. This is an atrocious and unfair attack on one class of workers.

Under Federal law there is no available remedy to a worker if a trucking company chooses to break the law and refuse a worker to take a meal or rest break. State laws, on the other hand, like the one in California, impose a monetary fine on the employer equal to one hour's pay if the employer violates the law. Therefore, if this amendment is adopted there will be no remedy and thus no incentive for trucking companies to allow drivers to take breaks, creating a serious public and highway safety issue. It should be noted that these breaks are not mandatory and are instead at the discretion of the individual driver.

By eliminating the incentive for trucking companies to follow the law and allow their truckers to take breaks, this amendment would result in a greater likelihood of crashes due to fatigue. Nearly 4,000 people die in large truck crashes each year and driver fatigue is the leading cause. This amendment not only harms the safety of commercial truck drivers, but the motoring public and pedestrians at large.

The amendment would also overturn state laws that require workers to be paid for all hours worked at the agreed upon minimum rate. Instead, companies would be allowed to only pay drivers for the time they spend driving, despite the fact that drivers are required to spend a great deal of time performing non-driving duties in the fulfillment of their employment such as pre and post trip inspections, maintenance and loading and unloading.

The amendment would preempt state law that limits the number of hours a regulated driver may work including state disability discrimination and workers' compensation provisions where an employer has discretion to return a driver to work with limited work hours following an accident or illness. Moreover, the amendment would eliminate the right to take any leave under state versions of the Family and Medical Leave Act or allow reasonable accommodation to provide an employee time off of work for prayer or religious practice under state religious discrimination laws.

The amendment applies retroactively: If wiping out worker and truck drivers' existing rights weren't bad enough, this amendment applies retroactively and would therefore wipe out lawsuits, settlements, and judgments won by truck drivers for employer violations going back to 1994. That's 23 years of jurisprudence and judgments that held trucking companies accountable for breaking the law and violating their employees' rights. The retroactivity provision is an affront to states' rights and state courts.

APRIL 18, 2018.

Re Preemption of State Rights in FAA Reauthorization.

Hon. MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to remind you of our continued opposition to the inclusion of any language in the FAA reauthorization bill that would preempt state regulations that protect commercial drivers. These essential, longstanding laws were specifically designed to reduce worker fatigue and to protect workers and the public from workplace crashes, injuries, and deaths.

As you know, previous Congresses have rejected such preemption language, commonly known as the “meal and rest break” provision, time after time because it would overturn the ability of states to govern the working conditions of their truck drivers. This amendment would deny truck drivers, including many who never leave that state, from taking the lunch break and/or a rest break which they are granted under state law. In most cases, these breaks are no more than a ten-minute rest break or a half hour break for lunch. They often only occur when an employee works a full day and the employer typically retains flexibility to determine the manner in which their employees take these breaks. Twenty states have versions of these laws on the books which would immediately be upended, including laws in CA, CO, CT, DE, IL, KY, ME, MA, MN, NE, NV, NH, NY, ND, OR, RI, TN, VT, WA, and WV.

In addition to being bad policy, Congress has not had a single public hearing on this issue or any meaningful discussion and analysis of its merits. This fundamental change to surface transportation policy clearly falls within the jurisdiction of a surface transportation bill, and yet it was rejected during the last highway bill. It has no place in any legislation reauthorizing of the FAA.

We urge you to continue to reject any language overturning basic state protections for truck drivers as you consider FAA reauthorization legislation. We greatly appreciate your support for protecting American workers and look forward to working with you to safeguard these important state laws.

Sincerely,

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters;

American Association for Justice;

Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association;

Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety;
Truck Safety Coalition;

Road Safe America;

Parents Against Tired Truckers;

Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways;
Center for Auto Safety;

Consumer Federation of America;

Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association;

SMART-TD (UTU);

KidsAndCars.org;

Trauma Foundation.

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAW PROJECT

Vote “NO” on Denham Amendment to H.R. 4
Congressman Denham has introduced an amendment to the Federal Aviation Administrative Authorization Act, (FAAAA) that would prohibit states from enacting or enforcing any law or regulation that imposes on interstate motor carriers any obligation beyond that covered in the so-called “hours of service” regulations under federal law.

The amendment provides that “A State, political sub-division of a State, or political authority of 2 or more States may not enact or enforce a law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law prohibiting employees whose hours of service are subject to regulation by the Secretary

under section 31502 from working to the full extent permitted or at such times as permitted under such section, or imposing any additional obligations on motor carriers. . . .” While the amendment specifically overrules state rest and meal breaks provisions, its broad language would reach even farther and deny truck drivers the protections of a wide range of state and local labor standards that have protected them for decades.

The bill represents an enormous overreach by the federal government and overrules decades of court precedents confirming that truck drivers are entitled to basic minimum and prevailing wages, paid sick days, and to be properly classified as employees. It would carve truck drivers out of traditional workplace protections like unemployment compensation and workers’ compensation as well as more recent standards that states and localities, have seen fit to afford their residents.

This big government overreach is the latest phase of the corporate “preemption” strategy, backed by industry front groups like ALEC and conservative donors like the Koch Brothers, that seeks to go over the heads of state and local governments to roll back a wide range of broadly popular worker protections. This sweeping rollback would reverse that eighty years of worker protections and leave truck drivers more vulnerable to long hours and abusive working conditions.

Here are some examples of how the law would affect millions of truck drivers across the country:

Workers compensation and truck safety. Truck drivers have the highest number and rate of fatal occupational injuries of any occupation in the United States. They also have the second highest rate of all occupations for non-fatal serious injuries and illnesses. Yet this amendment would deny workers’ compensation benefits to all drivers and deny states the right to establish safety and hazardous cargo controls, under the guise of providing uniform federal law.

Minimum wage. At a time when Congress has kept the federal minimum wage frozen at just \$7.25 since 2009, more and more states have been stepping in to fill the void. Currently, 31 states and more than 40 localities have approved minimum wage increases above the current federal level of \$7.25, affecting the pay of 15 million workers. But the amendment would strip truck drivers of these minimum wage protections.

Independent contractor abuses. Worker misclassification is a pressing issue for truck drivers across the country, and across the country, courts and administrative agencies are finding, applying state laws, that truck drivers have been illegally treated as independent contractors by the companies. The amendment would reverse these decisions and allow companies to continue to violate the law.

Paid family leave and paid sick days. Currently, the District of Columbia, 9 states (Connecticut, California, Massachusetts, Oregon, Vermont, Arizona, Washington, Rhode Island and Maryland) and dozens of local jurisdictions extend paid sick leave to workers. And California, New Jersey, New York and Washington State provide paid family leave to workers in those states. The amendment would take away that benefit from truck drivers in some of the highest trucking-dependent states in the country.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, Mr. DEFAZIO has said this is

very broad. It is very, very succinct. Title 49, section 31502 is the law. The regulation is 40 CFR 395.

This is very, very tight compared to 1994, when the Democrats had control of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. Mr. DEFAZIO, thankfully, supported it back then as a very broad measure dealing with all of these different issues. Now we are just dealing with meal and rest breaks only.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) on this very bipartisan measure.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, again, overall, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and the ranking member for bringing the FAA bill in. But I also support the Denham-Costa amendment because, again, it is a narrow fix on this, and it is only dealing with the interstate itself.

Again, this is a bill that we want to provide some sort of uniformity on. And that is all we are asking for is uniformity. If it crosses State lines, we are asking for that type of uniformity. Again, in the industry, those drivers cross State lines multiple times per day.

So I would ask that you support the Denham-Costa amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to preempt important State-level protections that help ensure truck drivers are treated fairly and that they are able to do their jobs safely.

This language would not just erase existing meal and rest break requirements for truckers, it would affect all State and local wage and hour laws, with adverse implications for everything from workers’ compensation to the minimum wage. Such changes would be deeply harmful, and I urge my colleagues to oppose them.

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

If you simply pick up a load in the Port of Los Angeles and drive 10 miles, that is deemed interstate commerce.

The problem I was trying to solve with a narrow amendment version was to say if someone is coming in from Nevada, crosses the State line, there would be confusion. That is truly interstate commerce.

What would apply?

The Federal hours of service, State hours of service, et cetera.

There could be a narrow fix to this issue. This is a preemption. If you read the law, basically, from working to the full extent permitted or at such times as permitted under such section, or imposing any additional obligations on motor carriers if such employees work to the full extent or at such times as permitted under such section.

So this would be a preemption in all 50 States of whatever additional conditions they have put in place.

Many truck drivers are horribly abused already. We have done away with detention time, and we have put time limits on when they can drive, for safety reasons. They are sitting at some warehouse facility for hours, earning nothing, unless we can have States with additional laws. If we aren't going to have Federal detention time, perhaps States can help with these problems. We do not want abused, tired truck drivers out on the road. We want them to be able to earn a living wage.

I have met with drivers out of the port numerous times who are in these endless deals to theoretically buy their truck that they never get to buy, and some of them are not even taking home \$100 a week and working many, many hours. We need to stop these abuses. This is only going to make things worse.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

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

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

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

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 67 to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. ____ . STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Comptroller General of the United States shall begin a study of international air cargo services among the United States and Central American, South American, and Caribbean Basin countries, that—

(1) analyzes the supply of and demand for air cargo transportation services among the United States and Central American, South American, and Caribbean Basin countries;

(2) analyzes the supply of and demand for air cargo transportation services between—

(A) the United States, Central American, South American, and Caribbean Basin countries; and

(B) Africa and Europe;

(3) identifies the busiest routes in terms of cargo capacity and frequency of air service;

(4) identifies any air carrier or foreign air carrier hubs in Central American, South American, and Caribbean Basin countries at which a significant amount of air cargo is sorted, handled, or consolidated for transportation to or from the United States;

(5) identifies any air carrier or foreign air carrier hubs in the United States at which a significant amount of air cargo is sorted, handled, or consolidated for transportation to or from Central American, South American, and Caribbean Basin countries.

(6) identifies any significant gaps in the air cargo services or cargo air carrier networks—

(A) among the countries described in paragraph (2)(A);

(B) between such countries and Africa; and

(C) between such countries and Europe; and

(7) assesses the possible impact of the establishment of an air carrier hub in Puerto Rico at which air cargo is sorted, handled, or consolidated for transportation to or from the United States, including the impact on—

(A) the employment rate and economy of Puerto Rico;

(B) domestic and foreign air transportation of cargo;

(C) United States competitiveness in the air transportation of cargo;

(D) air cargo operations at other airports in the United States; and

(E) domestic air carrier employment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study described in subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITION.—The term “Caribbean Basin countries” has the same meaning given the term “Caribbean Basin country” in section 501 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4 and, of course, the amendment that I am supporting and sponsoring today. I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER for providing me the opportunity to speak on behalf of this simple yet very important amendment that Congressman DON YOUNG has joined me in sponsoring.

A lack of reliable data on which Congress can make informed decisions is a recurring problem for Puerto Rico. The

bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Economic Growth in Puerto Rico, established by PROMESA, unanimously recognized this problem, back in 2016, and made numerous recommendations that were designed to include Puerto Rico in Federal statistical programs.

My amendment to H.R. 4 is consistent with the Task Force's recommendations to remove regulatory burdens inhibiting commerce between Puerto Rico, the U.S. mainland, and international markets.

Puerto Rico needs to reactivate and diversify its economic base in order to emerge not just from the current disaster situation, but to have stable, long-term economic growth.

My amendment simply seeks to evaluate Puerto Rico's potential as an air cargo hub and to obtain recommendations as to how to best achieve that potential. It does not change the current statutory regime over air cargo operations on the island. It simply seeks to provide the hard data required to make a sound decision about it.

It provides for evaluating the competitive situation in the Caribbean region, not just relative to Puerto Rico, but to other foreign and continental U.S. airport hubs serving it so that it also serves to provide a better picture for the overall future competitive environment in the region.

Puerto Rico has the necessary infrastructure in three international-capable airports with ample space and ports. The island also has a privileged geographic location that gives it high potential as a cargo hub between the Caribbean and northern South America, Europe, and Africa, as well as being at the southeasternmost corner of the U.S. domestic air transportation network.

The Puerto Rico Manufacturers Association, the largest business and employer organization on the island, supports this amendment and the potential development of the island as an air cargo hub. The island's pharmaceutical manufacturers would also benefit from Puerto Rico becoming an air cargo hub.

Mr. Chairman, it is the private sector and private investments that will play the leading role in rebuilding our island's economy. This is now, more than ever, critical as we continue to recover in the aftermath of the hurricanes.

The island of Puerto Rico's jobs are American jobs, and we look for new opportunities to grow our economy. This amendment will provide the data to evaluate what would be the capacity for developing this kind of business activity and what its potential impact would be on the local and national economy.

I want to thank Chairmen Shuster and LoBiondo for their support and guidance, and I urge that this amendment be adopted as part of this reauthorization bill.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I do support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). Without objection, the gentleman is recognize for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

This amendment requires the U.S. Government Accountability Office, or the GAO, study air cargo traffic in the Caribbean, including an assessment and data collection. This data and assessment are needed to help assess Puerto Rico's role as a cargo hub for international traffic. I look forward to seeing what the GAO reports.

Therefore, I support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

□ 1615

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, this bill will provide data that is important for the due recognition in terms of the capabilities of the island for the near future, and I hope this bill will pass and give Puerto Rico the opportunities we need to fulfill the opportunities in the region and the States.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. . . . SPACEPORTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON STATE SPACEPORT CONTRIBUTIONS.—It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) State government-owned and -operated spaceports have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure improvements to the national space launch infrastructure, providing the United States Government and commercial customers with world-class space launch and processing infrastructure that is necessary to support continued American leadership in space;

(2) State spaceports play a critical role in providing resiliency and redundancy in the national launch infrastructure to support national security and civil government capabilities, and should be recognized as a critical infrastructure in Federal strategy and planning;

(3) continued State and local government investments at Federal and non-Federal launch facilities should be encouraged and to the maximum extent practicable supported in Federal policies, planning and infrastructure investment considerations, including through Federal-State partnerships;

(4) there is currently no Federal infrastructure investment program funding or encour-

aging State and local government investment in spaceport infrastructure, unlike Federal grant programs to encourage continued investment in all other modes of transportation, including aviation, highways, ports, and rail, which limits opportunities for the Federal government to leverage and coordinate infrastructure investments with State and local governments;

(5) Federal investments in space infrastructure should enable partnerships between Federal agencies with state spaceports to modernize and enable expanded 21st century space transportation infrastructure, especially multi-modal networks needed for robust space transportation that support national security, civil, and commercial launch customers; and

(6) States that have made investments to build, maintain, operate, and improve capabilities for national security, civil, and commercial customers should be commended for their infrastructure contributions to both Federal and non-Federal launch sites, and encouraged through a variety of programs and policies to continue these investments in the national interest.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF SPACEPORTS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF SPACEPORTS.—Title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subtitle V the following:

“CHAPTER 515—OFFICE OF SPACEPORTS

“Sec.

“51501. Establishment of Office of Spaceports.

“§ 51501. Establishment of Office of Spaceports

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall identify, within the Office of Commercial Space Transportation, a centralized policy office to be known as the Office of Spaceports.

“(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Office of Spaceports shall be to support, promote, and enable infrastructure improvements at Federal Aviation Administration-licensed spaceports in the United States.

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—The Office of Spaceports shall—

“(1) support licensing activities for launch sites;

“(2) develop and implement policies that promote infrastructure improvements at licensed public launch sites;

“(3) provide technical assistance, guidance, and support to licensed public spaceports;

“(4) promote United States licensed spaceports within the Department; and

“(5) strengthen the Nation's competitiveness in launch infrastructure and increase resilience for the Federal Government and commercial customers.

“(d) RECOGNITION.—In carrying out the functions assigned in subsection (c), the Secretary shall recognize the unique needs and distinctions of spaceports that—

“(1) launch to orbit; and

“(2) are involved in suborbital launch activities.

“(e) DIRECTOR.—The Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation of the Federal Aviation Administration shall designate a Director of the Office of Spaceports.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘spaceport’ means a launch site that is licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration.

“(2) The term ‘public spaceport’ means a launch site that is licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration and is owned or operated by a State or local governmental entity, including political subdivisions of a State or local government.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subtitle V the following:

“515. Office of Spaceports 51501”.

(c) REPORT ON NATIONAL SPACEPORTS POLICY.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) A robust network of space transportation infrastructure, including spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration, is vital to the growth of the domestic space industry and America's competitiveness and access to space.

(B) Non-Federal spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration have significantly increased the launch infrastructure of the United States through significant investments by State and local governments, which have encouraged greater private investment.

(C) These spaceports have led to the development of a growing number of orbital and suborbital launch sites that are available to the national security, civil, and commercial space customers at minimal cost to the Federal Government.

(D) The Federal Government, led by the Secretary of Transportation, should seek to promote the growth, resilience, and capabilities of this space infrastructure through policies and through partnerships with State and local governments.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress a report that—

(A) evaluates the Federal Government's national security and civil space launch demands and the needs of the United States and international commercial markets;

(B) proposes policies and programs designed to ensure a robust and resilient orbital and suborbital spaceport infrastructure to serve and capitalize on these launch opportunities;

(C) reviews the development and investments made by international competitors in foreign spaceports;

(D) makes recommendations on how the Federal Government can support, encourage, promote, and facilitate greater investments in infrastructure at public spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(E) considers and makes recommendations about how spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration can fully support and enable the national space policy.

(3) UPDATES TO THE REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) update the previous report prepared under this subsection; and

(B) submit the updated report to Congress.

(4) CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED.—In preparing the reports required by this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with individuals including—

(A) the Secretary of Defense;

(B) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(C) the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(D) interested persons at spaceports, State and local governments, and industry.

(d) REPORT ON SPACE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE MATCHING GRANTS.—

(1) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding spaceport activities carried out pursuant to chapters 509 and 511 of title 51, United States Code, including—

(A) an assessment of potential mechanisms to provide Federal support to spaceports, including the airport improvement program

established under subchapter I of chapter 471 of title 49, United States Code, and the program established under chapter 511 of title 51, United States Code;

(B) recommendations for potential funding options, including funds that may be collected from launch providers or launch customers; and

(C) any necessary changes to improve the spaceport application review process.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study described in paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall consult with sources from each component of the launch process, including interested persons in industry and government officials at the Federal, State, and local levels.

(3) USER-FUNDED SPACEPORTS.—In reviewing funding options, the Comptroller General shall distinguish between spaceports that are funded by users and those that are not.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 84 be modified in the manner that I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 84 printed in part A of House Report 115-650 offered by Mrs. COMSTOCK:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. . . . SPACEPORTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON STATE SPACEPORT CONTRIBUTIONS.—It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) State government-owned and -operated spaceports have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure improvements to the national space launch infrastructure, providing the United States Government and commercial customers with world-class space launch and processing infrastructure that is necessary to support continued American leadership in space;

(2) State spaceports play a critical role in providing resiliency and redundancy in the national launch infrastructure to support national security and civil government capabilities, and should be recognized as a critical infrastructure in Federal strategy and planning;

(3) continued State and local government investments at Federal and non-Federal launch facilities should be encouraged and to the maximum extent practicable supported in Federal policies, planning and infrastructure investment considerations, including through Federal-State partnerships;

(4) there is currently no Federal infrastructure investment program funding or encouraging State and local government investment in spaceport infrastructure, unlike Federal grant programs to encourage continued investment in all other modes of transportation, including aviation, highways, ports, and rail, which limits opportunities for the Federal government to leverage and coordinate infrastructure investments with State and local governments;

(5) Federal investments in space infrastructure should enable partnerships between Federal agencies with state spaceports to modernize and enable expanded 21st century space transportation infrastructure, especially multi-modal networks needed for robust space transportation that support national security, civil, and commercial launch customers; and

(6) States that have made investments to build, maintain, operate, and improve capabilities for national security, civil, and commercial customers should be commended for their infrastructure contributions to both Federal and non-Federal launch sites, and encouraged through a variety of programs and policies to continue these investments in the national interest.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF SPACEPORTS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF SPACEPORTS.—Title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subtitle V the following:

“CHAPTER 515—OFFICE OF SPACEPORTS

“Sec.

“51501. Establishment of Office of Spaceports.

“§ 51501. Establishment of Office of Spaceports

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall identify, within the Office of Commercial Space Transportation, a centralized policy office to be known as the Office of Spaceports.

“(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Office of Spaceports shall—

“(1) support licensing activities for launch sites;

“(2) develop policies that promote infrastructure improvements at licensed public launch sites;

“(3) provide technical assistance and guidance to licensed public spaceports;

“(4) promote United States licensed spaceports within the Department; and

“(5) strengthen the Nation’s competitiveness in launch infrastructure and increase resilience for the Federal Government and commercial customers.

“(c) RECOGNITION.—In carrying out the functions assigned in subsection (b), the Secretary shall recognize the unique needs and distinctions of spaceports that—

“(1) launch to orbit; and

“(2) are involved in suborbital launch activities.

“(d) DIRECTOR.—The Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation of the Federal Aviation Administration shall designate a Director of the Office of Spaceports.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) SPACEPORT.—The term ‘spaceport’ means a launch site that is licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration.

“(2) PUBLIC SPACEPORT.—The term ‘public spaceport’ means a launch site that is licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration and is owned or operated by a State or local governmental entity, including political subdivisions of a State or local government.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters of title 51, United State Code, is amended by adding at the end of subtitle V the following:

“515. Office of Spaceports 51501”.

(c) REPORT ON NATIONAL SPACEPORTS POLICY.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) A robust network of space transportation infrastructure, including spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, is vital to the growth of the domestic space industry and America’s competitiveness and access to space.

(B) Non-Federal spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration have significantly increased the launch infrastructure of the United States through significant investments by State and local governments, which have encouraged greater private investment.

(C) These spaceports have led to the development of a growing number of orbital and suborbital launch sites that are available to the national security, civil, and commercial space customers at minimal cost to the Federal Government.

(D) The Federal Government, led by the Secretary of Transportation, should seek to promote the growth, resilience, and capabilities of this space infrastructure through policies and through partnerships with State and local governments.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress a report that—

(A) evaluates the Federal Government’s national security and civil space launch demands and the needs of the United States and international commercial markets;

(B) proposes policies and programs designed to ensure a robust and resilient orbital and suborbital spaceport infrastructure to serve and capitalize on these launch opportunities;

(C) reviews the development and investments made by international competitors in foreign spaceports;

(D) makes recommendations on how the Federal Government can support, encourage, promote, and facilitate greater investments in infrastructure at public spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(E) considers and makes recommendations about how spaceports licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration can fully support and enable the national space policy.

(3) UPDATES TO THE REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) update the previous report prepared under this subsection; and

(B) submit the updated report to Congress.

(4) CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED.—In preparing the reports required by this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with individuals including—

(A) the Secretary of Defense;

(B) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(C) the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(D) interested persons at spaceports, State and local governments, and industry.

(d) REPORT ON SPACE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE MATCHING GRANTS.—

(1) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding spaceport activities carried out pursuant to chapters 509 and 511 of title 51, United States Code, including—

(A) an assessment of potential mechanisms to provide Federal support to spaceports, including the airport improvement program established under subchapter I of chapter 471 of title 49, United States Code, and the program established under chapter 511 of title 51, United States Code;

(B) recommendations for potential funding options, including funds that may be collected from launch providers or launch customers; and

(C) any necessary changes to improve the spaceport application review process.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study described in paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall consult with sources from each component of the launch process, including interested persons in industry and government officials at the Federal, State, and local levels.

(3) USER-FUNDED SPACEPORTS.—In reviewing funding options, the Comptroller General shall distinguish between spaceports that are funded by users and those that are not.

(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

Mrs. COMSTOCK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modification be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The ACTING Chair. Is there objection to the original request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment reflects several policy recommendations that have been proposed in various forms over the last several years, including Representative BRIDENSTINE's Space Renaissance Act.

State spaceports have become increasingly important elements of our national space launch infrastructure, with States like Virginia, Florida, and Alaska contributing hundreds of millions in infrastructure improvements to launch sites to better support NASA, DOD, and commercial launch.

State spaceports like the Mid-Atlantic Regional Spaceport at Wallops Island in Virginia, which launches Orbital ATK's Antares and Minotaur rockets, have provided new, low-cost capabilities for NASA, Defense, and commercial users, while also improving resiliency and responsiveness. The recent NASA Reauthorization Act, which passed the House Science Committee by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote last week, included language urging NASA to fully leverage such State spaceport investments to meet infrastructure demands to support national missions.

As we now consider this FAA Reauthorization Act, it is also important to note that the FAA currently plays a critical role in licensing and working with these spaceports as they grow their infrastructure and capabilities to support a variety of missions. This amendment will help recognize the important role of these spaceports to our national launch infrastructure, establish an office of spaceports to better coordinate licensing, policy, and technical support for spaceports, as well as direct two important reports—one by the Secretary of Transportation and another by GAO—to address policy issues facing spaceports in our growing launch market.

The amendment is supported by a bipartisan group of my colleagues from

Virginia, Maryland, and Florida and is supported by Virginia Space, Space Florida, and the National Association of Spaceports, among others.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I support the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment being offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia.

This amendment would create within the FAA Commercial Space Transportation Office an office of spaceports, a centralized policy office that will support and promote infrastructure improvements at FAA-licensed spaceports.

This amendment also requires a report to Congress evaluating the Federal Government's national security and civil space launch demands, and offers recommendations on how we can further support and promote greater investment in commercial space infrastructure. It also requires the Comptroller General to study spaceport activities in the U.S.

Commercial space transportation and enabled industries includes satellite and ground equipment manufacturing, satellite services and remote sensing, and distribution industries. In 2015, the size of the global space industry was estimated to be \$335 billion; the size of the U.S. space industry was approximately \$126 billion, which includes \$89 billion in revenues generated by satellite services, manufacturing, ground equipment, and launch services.

The commercial launch of satellites is particularly important as these technologies offer us a range of services from television and radio broadcasts to high-speed internet and weather forecasting.

This amendment will strengthen the Nation's competitiveness in this nascent industry and offer us a better understanding of how we can maintain a robust and resilient network of space transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. ___. **INSTALLATION OF OVERFLIGHT NOISE MITIGATION DEVICES.**

To reduce the impact of overflight noise on local communities, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall engage and cooperate with air carriers to identify and facilitate opportunities for the air carriers to retrofit aircraft with devices that mitigate noise, including vortex generators.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their hard work, and also Mr. LARSEN as well.

I have to confess that mentally in my mind I have a list of Republicans I wish wouldn't run for office again, but I am proud and happy to say that, Mr. SHUSTER, you are not on that list. I just want to congratulate you on your good work not only on this bill, but in the past on a lot of issues that affect not only the constituents in your district, but also people across this country. Thank you for your service.

I was hoping that I might come to the floor today to talk about ways that we might prevent terrorists and criminal organizations from registering aircraft in the United States. There is a Department of Transportation Inspector General report that is well known to Members here that basically lays out the case for more closely scrutinizing the registration of U.S. aircraft. They came up with a few glaring examples that I will mention here.

Recently, it was discovered that Hezbollah, through a front person, also from Lebanon, registered an aircraft here in the United States with no landing permit. In addition, we had another aircraft registered through the FAA through Wells Fargo Bank, which we understand was located in Tripoli International Airport in Libya, with no landing permit, just hours before the U.N. Security Council met to approve a no-fly zone over that country.

Similarly, we had an aircraft owned by the brother of Ghana's president but registered by the Bank of Utah, which mysteriously appeared in Tehran, Iran, in 2014, bearing an American flag emblem. This occurred, obviously, in the midst of U.S. and international sanctions. Prohibiting the travel of U.S. aircraft to Iran was the law at that point. The FAA could not explain who was operating the plane or who owned it, and the lack of transparency and accountability in the FAA's registration system is a serious national security threat.

Now, there was a time when Democrats and Republicans could work on amendments like that and they would

be accepted. I am still mystified as to where the opposition came from.

Also, public health and safety demands that the FAA take immediate steps to mitigate the impact of concentrated flight paths which come in and out of major airports around the country. They have got a new system called a NextGen RNAV system that concentrates the flights over very narrow strips of neighborhoods and in the areas adjacent to those airports. And we can do a lot, Mr. Chairman, to mitigate that damage. But that is not in this bill.

What I am here to talk about is retrofitting aircraft with noise mitigation devices known as vortex generators. These devices are lightweight and divert wind from the vents on the underside of an aircraft's wing to significantly reduce noise during descent. European carriers such as Lufthansa, British Airways, and Air France have already adapted their older Airbus aircraft with these devices, and new models now come equipped with them. My amendment, which is cosponsored by several of my colleagues on the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus, would ensure that American air carriers are following suit.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and, actually, my classmate, Mr. LYNCH. You, myself, and JOE WILSON are the last of the special election eight that came in 2001, so with me leaving, it will just be up to you and JOE WILSON. But I appreciate working with you.

I appreciate the intent of your amendment. Again, I reluctantly oppose it because of my high regard for you and the work you have done here. I might add too that what you are talking about, the registration—your amendment, I am familiar with it; I think it might have had some unintended consequences. But I also believe that what they do in Oklahoma City at the registry would put some language in this bill to change that process out there. I intend to go out and see it firsthand, because there are problems out there with the way they operate out there in Oklahoma City. Again, I understand what you are talking about.

But I do rise, reluctantly, to oppose the amendment. The amendment would require the FAA to undertake a very unclear task, I believe, facilitating opportunities for air carriers to install noise reduction devices. If you come onto the House floor with an FAA bill, the number one amendment that we have—many, many amendments that we have deal with noise. So it is a prob-

lem out there. But the air carriers do have an incentive to, again, operate and reduce the noise of their aircraft, and each new generation of aircraft continues to reduce the noise.

I know that in Connecticut, I believe, Briggs & Stratton has a facility up there, United Technologies, and they were talking about a jet engine that will reduce noise by as much as 70 percent. Again, technology. A lot of smart people are out there trying to figure out innovative ways to reduce noise on these aircraft. Having the FAA involved in these air carrier business decisions, I believe, would stifle the innovation and would set back that development.

But again, I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I am well aware of the issue. I at this point would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

It would direct the FAA to engage and cooperate with airlines to identify and facilitate opportunities for them to retrofit their aircraft with devices that mitigate noise. Air traffic noise is an extremely important issue to those who live in communities surrounding our airports. This noise can be destructive to the well-being of the residents of these communities. This amendment would go a long way toward mitigating future noise issues around our airports.

I support this amendment and ask my colleagues to do the same.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

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

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

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 88 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. ____ GLOBAL-SCALE PROBABILISTIC CONVECTION GUIDANCE.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall develop global-scale probabilistic convection guidance capability.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple one. The entire text reads as follows:

The FAA Administrator shall develop global-scale probabilistic convection guidance capability.

In plain English, this means that the FAA would be required to develop the capability to predict where convection occurs so that aircraft can avoid it, if possible.

Atmospheric convection is thought to induce a significant proportion of turbulence experienced by commercial aircraft, and that turbulence, even if only moderate, can lead to passenger and crew injuries and can result in high insurance costs for airlines.

The FAA has been doing a commendable job of developing the capability to produce probabilistic forecasts of domestic oceanic convection over a 36-hour timeframe, but work remains to be done to improve this capability globally.

The FAA would like to pursue further work in this area and has the hope of possibly achieving this capability by the end of 2020. In order to support this effort, I believe Congress should fully authorize the development of this important capability, and after doing so, it should adequately appropriate funds to accomplish the mission. Should this amendment pass today, I am committed to fully supporting the FAA's work in this arena through my seat on the Appropriations Committee.

I know we would all like a smooth flight in and out of D.C. each week. Let's extend that possibility as often as possible to the American public seeking to cross an ocean or other continents on their travels. If you want your constituents to have smoother flights, I urge you to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment, but I do oppose it.

This amendment would require the FAA to develop a global-scale guidance system related to convection activity. The FAA already has extensive resources for obtaining necessary weather information for safe flight operations, including thunderstorm information, lightning, and so on. Additionally, the FAA is currently engaged in such weather-modeling development and is actively working towards deploying such capability in the future.

However, this amendment will likely require significant budgetary resources

from both the FAA and NOAA, and, unfortunately, the brevity of this amendment and the lack of details results in a vague mandate that may distract the FAA and NOAA from their ongoing efforts. If the intent is to improve forecasting efforts, then let's not distract them from those efforts they are currently involved in.

For these reasons, I urge all my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. ____ . MANDATORY USE OF THE NEW YORK NORTH SHORE HELICOPTER ROUTE.

(a) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall provide notice of, and an opportunity for, at least 60 days of public comment with respect to the regulations in subpart H of part 93 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) TIMING.—The public comment period required under paragraph (1) shall begin not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PUBLIC HEARING.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in the communities impacted by the regulations described in subsection (a)(1) to solicit feedback with respect to the regulations.

(c) REVIEW.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall initiate a review of the regulations described in subsection (a)(1) that assesses the—

(1) noise impacts of the regulations for communities, including communities in locations where aircraft are transitioning to or from a destination or point of landing;

(2) enforcement of applicable flight standards, including requirements for helicopters operating on the relevant route to remain at or above 2,500 feet mean sea level; and

(3) availability of alternative or supplemental routes to reduce the noise impacts of the regulations, including the institution of an all water route over the Atlantic Ocean.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my bipartisan amendment to address the deeply flawed North Shore Helicopter Route, which is impacting communities throughout Long Island, especially my constituents on the North Fork.

The FAA's North Shore Helicopter Route, which was made mandatory

through an FAA bureaucratic edict in 2010, represents everything that is wrong with our unaccountable Federal bureaucracy. It lacks fairness, transparency, and common sense. It is not a bright idea to mandate aircraft traffic bound for the tip of an island to make its transition over land when multiple all-water routes which mitigate the noise impact are available.

In addition to being ill-conceived and misguided, what makes this FAA mandate so extremely unfair is that it shifts the majority of air traffic in the area over Long Island's North Fork, which does not have a busy airport or helicopter pad, and, thus, doesn't get any of the economic benefit that the air traffic brings to neighboring communities on the South Fork that have an active seasonal airport.

To close these loopholes and address this unfairness, I offer this critical amendment that will force the FAA to reassess the North Shore Helicopter Route and work on replacing it with a true all-water route over the Atlantic Ocean.

This amendment also requires the FAA to hold public hearings on the North Shore Helicopter Route in the communities impacted by this flawed route and open up a public comment period so the people who live with aircraft noise season after season can have a voice.

The FAA has, for years, ignored my constituents and the law since long before I was even in Congress. By continuing to extend the North Shore Helicopter Route through emergency authority, the FAA has been waiving the requirements in the Administrative Procedure Act and other Federal laws and regulations that require public comment and the consultation of the impacted local governments before any major regulatory decisions are made.

I represent a district that is almost completely surrounded by water, so it is common sense that aircraft departing New York City bound for airports on the East End of Long Island can reduce noise by following true all-water routes.

My amendment also requires the FAA to enforce its own rules regarding altitude restrictions for the aircraft following this flawed route. This is not just an issue in my district, but also impacts residents who are impacted by noise in Nassau County and Queens. That is why I have partnered with my Democratic colleagues, Representatives GRACE MENG and TOM SUOZZI, on this amendment.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

This amendment directs the FAA Administrator to offer a public comment

period and public hearing with respect to the New York North Shore Helicopter Route and would then be required to review the applicable regulations related to the route and assess the noise impacts on communities and the availability of alternative or supplemental routes to reduce those impacts.

I oppose it on the grounds that it is really not good policy to legislate on noise in a piecemeal fashion, addressing each region and each airport one by one. That is not the best way to address air traffic noise. The community has been aware of this issue for some time and certainly of the occasionally unreasonable exposure to helicopter noise reported by residents in urban areas.

The Aviation Subcommittee held a roundtable on this in October of 2011 to explore this issue, and perhaps it is time to re-up that roundtable to get some movement on this issue.

Further, I have concern about possible unintended consequences of legislative proposals that could lead to the redistribution of aircraft noise. Although well-intentioned, such proposals have social justice ramifications and often can end up distributing noise over socially economically disadvantaged communities. We have to make sure that noise is distributed equitably if we are going to make these decisions.

I would be happy to work, and I think on our side we would be happy to work with the gentleman and the cosponsors to try to address these concerns by talking directly with the FAA, but I have to oppose taking the solution towards a legislative resolution.

I ask my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, first off, with respect to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, it is very important for my constituents to have a voice.

What is important to note here is that this route was extended by the FAA, put in the Federal Register, in the middle of a weekend. No one told me. No one told any of the local governments. There was no public hearing. There were no public comments accepted. Actually, the FAA, in this case, went out of their way to ensure that my constituents had zero voice whatsoever. That is under the current Federal law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in support of his amendment.

Again, this amendment does address the concerns of the people on Long Island. As the gentleman pointed out, this was put in place without public comment, without talking to the folks that live and have to live under these

overflights, so I applaud him for his efforts and commitment to his constituents on this issue. Again, he has worked tirelessly for the last two Congresses on this issue and been a tremendously effective advocate.

I thank the gentleman for his continued leadership, and I thank him for his amendment and encourage Members to support Mr. ZELDIN's amendment.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support of this amendment, for doing everything in his power to ensure that my constituents have a voice, that they are heard, that they are represented, that they are able to provide their public comments, that they are allowed to have a hearing with the FAA. It really is very much appreciated by the residents of my district.

And to my colleagues, Congressman GRACE MENG, Congressman SUOZZI, for everyone on the other side of the aisle who is showing leadership in supporting this effort, it is much appreciated, understanding that this was literally jammed through, in the Federal Register, without all sorts of not just courtesies provided, but worse, actually muzzling the voice of the people that they couldn't even share any—any—of their comments whatsoever.

Summer after summer, the quality of life of East End residents has suffered due to the persistent issue of this noise. The FAA and Department of Transportation have sole jurisdiction over the aircraft routes that have impacted these communities, but from the route's planning to its continued use, they have flat out ignored the residents directly affected. I am urging all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part A of House Report 115-650.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 267, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 543. STUDY ON DIVERSITY OF CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE OF FAA.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on the diversity of the cybersecurity workforce of the Administration in order to develop recommendations to increase the size, quality, and diversity of such workforce, including cybersecurity researchers and specialists.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the study conducted under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of such study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 839, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on the diversity of the cybersecurity workforce of the FAA in order to develop recommendations to increase the size, quality, and diversity of such workforce.

Every day, Federal departments and agencies across our Nation face a barrage of cybersecurity attacks that threaten our national and economic security. An attack in 2006 forced the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration to shut down one of its air traffic control systems in Alaska. Another attack that possibly involved malicious hacking and phishing targeted 75 airports in the United States in 2013.

Now, in recent years, the FAA has taken concrete steps to improve cybersecurity protection mechanisms; however, Congress needs to ensure that the FAA has the ability and resources to implement cybersecurity protocols across all segments of the National Airspace System.

The mission of the FAA is "to provide the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world," and one of the five values of the agency to execute on that mission includes, in their vision statement: "People are our strength. Our success depends on the respect, diversity, collaboration, and commitment of our workforce."

□ 1645

According to CyberSeek, a national program of National Institute of Standards and Technology in the Department of Commerce, in 2017, the U.S. employed nearly 800,000 people in cybersecurity positions. However, that same report goes on to add that approximately 350,000 jobs remain open in the cybersecurity space.

To ensure that FAA continues to safeguard the world's safest and most productive aviation sector, Congress needs to ensure that the FAA has all of the tools necessary to ready its workforce.

According to the FAA 2015 Performance and Accountability Report, the agency has over 45,000 employees who have diverse educational and career backgrounds. So when we look at our air traffic controllers, researchers, maintenance specialists, safety inspectors, and mechanical and electrical software engineers, innovative solutions to national cybersecurity chal-

lenges will come from a diversity of perspectives.

That is why my amendment will study the needs of the existing cybersecurity workforce of the FAA, and help identify and address any gaps that exist, and ensure that the size, quality, and diversity of such workforce at the FAA keep pace with the rapid technological advancements in the aviation sector.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO for their strength and their leadership. And I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership and emphasis on skills development and training.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. It is a good amendment. The cybersecurity workforce will play a greater role in the aviation industry in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of my colleagues to support Mrs. LAWRENCE's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for his support.

Our skilled trained workforce is one of the greatest challenges we have in America in supplying a workforce that is going to address the skilled needs of our workforce. If we don't address it and be proactive, it is going to be creating a challenge not only to filling jobs, but creating the workforce that will get the job done.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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 115-650 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:
Amendment No. 42 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 60 by Mr. ROHRBACHER of California.

Amendment No. 63 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 78 by Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. DENHAM of California.

Amendment No. 87 by Mr. LYNCH 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. 42 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) 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 192, noes 223, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

AYES—192

Adams	Gallego	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garamendi	Neal
Barragan	Gomez	Nolan
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beatty	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bera	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Panetta
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pascarella
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Payne
Bonamici	Hastings	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Perlmutter
F.	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jayapal	Quigley
Butterfield	Jeffries	Raskin
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cárdenas	Joyce (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cartwright	Kaptur	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Rush
Cicilline	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Connolly	Lamb	Schrader
Cooper	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Costa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Courtney	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Levin	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Speier
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Suozi
DeFazio	Loeb	Swaiwell (CA)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Takano
Delaney	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	M.	Titus
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Torres
Deutch	Maloney,	Tsongas
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Upton
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Massie	Veasey
F.	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Engel	McEachin	Visclosky
Eshoo	McGovern	Walden
Español	McKinley	Walz
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Wasserman
Evans	Meeks	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Nadler	

NOES—223

Abraham	Amash	Babin
Aderholt	Amodei	Bacon
Allen	Arrington	Banks (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—13

Black	Kustoff (TN)	Sewell (AL)
Blackburn	Labrador	Sires
Carson (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (FL)
Gowdy	Lofgren	
Kuster (NH)	Noem	

□ 1716

Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Messrs. MCHENRY, HILL, GOODLATTE, STEWART, BRADY of Texas, COHEN, GOHMERT, and GRAVES of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. CORREA, KIHUEN, and SERRANO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair advises all Members to stay close to the floor. The next series of votes will be a 2-minute vote. Please stay close to the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR.

ROHRBACHER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 37, noes 375, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—37

Aderholt	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Thomas
Bass	LaMalfa	J.
Beyer	Lamborn	Royce (CA)
Brady (TX)	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Calvert	Lowenthal	Schweikert
Davidson	Lynch	Sherman
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Stewart
Garrett	Moolenaar	Stivers
Gohmert	Peterson	Taylor
Harris	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi
Higgins (NY)	Posey	Webster (FL)
Hultgren	Raskin	Wilson (SC)
Hunter	Rohrabacher	

NOES—375

Abraham	Carbajal	DeLauro
Adams	Cárdenas	DelBene
Aguilar	Carter (GA)	Demings
Allen	Carter (TX)	Denham
Amash	Cartwright	Dent
Amodei	Castor (FL)	DeSantis
Arrington	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Babin	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bacon	Cheney	Deutch
Banks (IN)	Chu, Judy	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Barr	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Barragan	Clay	Donovan
Barton	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Beatty	Clyburn	F.
Bera	Coffman	Duffy
Bergman	Cohen	Duncan (TN)
Biggs	Cole	Dunn
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Collins (NY)	Emmer
Bishop (MI)	Comer	Engel
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Eshoo
Blum	Conaway	Español
Blumenauer	Connolly	Estes (KS)
Blunt Rochester	Cook	Esty (CT)
Bonamici	Cooper	Evans
Bost	Correa	Faso
Boyle, Brendan	Costa	Ferguson
F.	Courtney	Fitzpatrick
Brady (PA)	Cramer	Fleischmann
Brat	Crawford	Flores
Brooks (AL)	Crist	Fortenberry
Brooks (IN)	Crowley	Foster
Brown (MD)	Cuellar	Fox
Brownley (CA)	Culberson	Frankel (FL)
Buchanan	Cummings	Frelinghuysen
Buck	Curbelo (FL)	Fudge
Bucshon	Curtis	Gabbard
Budd	Davis (CA)	Gaetz
Burgess	Davis, Danny	Gallagher
Bustos	Davis, Rodney	Gallego
Butterfield	DeFazio	Garamendi
Byrne	DeGette	Gianforte
Capuano	Delaney	Gibbs

Gomez Lucas
 Gonzalez (TX) Luetkemeyer
 Goodlatte Lujan Grisham,
 Gosar M.
 Gottheimer Lujan, Ben Ray
 Granger MacArthur
 Graves (GA) Maloney,
 Graves (LA) Carolyn B.
 Graves (MO) Maloney, Sean
 Green, Al Marchant
 Green, Gene Marino
 Griffith Marshall
 Grijalva Massie
 Mast Sarbanes
 Grothman Scalise
 Guthrie Schakowsky
 Hanabusa McCarthy
 Handel McCaul
 Harper McCollum
 Hartzler McEachin
 Hastings McGovern
 Heck McHenry
 Hensarling McKinley
 Herrera Beutler McMorris
 Hice, Jody B. Rodgers
 Higgins (LA) McNeerney
 Hill McCally
 Himes Meadows
 Holding Meehan
 Hollingsworth Meeks
 Hoyer Meng
 Hudson Messer
 Huffman Mitchell
 Huizenga Mooney (WV)
 Hurd Moore
 Issa Moulton
 Jackson Lee Mullin
 Jayapal Murphy (FL)
 Jeffries Nadler
 Jenkins (KS) Napolitano
 Jenkins (WV) Neal
 Johnson (GA) Newhouse
 Johnson (LA) Nolan
 Johnson (OH) Norcross
 Johnson, E. B. Norman
 Johnson, Sam Nunes
 Jones O'Halleran
 Jordan O'Rourke
 Joyce (OH) Olson
 Kaptur Palazzo
 Katko Pallone
 Keating Palmer
 Kelly (IL) Panetta
 Kelly (PA) Pascrell
 Kennedy Paulsen
 Khanna Payne
 Kihuen Pearce
 Kildee Pelosi
 Kilmer Perlmutter
 Kind Perry
 King (IA) Peters
 King (NY) Pingree
 Kinzinger Pittenger
 Knight Pocan
 Krishnamoorthi Poliquin
 LaHood Polis
 Lamb Price (NC)
 Lance Quigley
 Langevin Ratcliffe
 Larsen (WA) Reed
 Larson (CT) Reichert
 Latta Renacci
 Lawrence Rice (NY)
 Lawson (FL) Rice (SC)
 Lee Richmond
 Levin Roby
 Lewis (MN) Roe (TN)
 Lipinski Rogers (AL)
 LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
 Loeb sack Rokita
 Long Rooney, Francis
 Loudermilk Ros-Lehtinen
 Love Rosen
 Lowey Roskam

NOT VOTING—16

Black Gutierrez
 Blackburn Kuster (NH)
 Carson (IN) Kustoff (TN)
 Cicilline Labrador
 Costello (PA) Lewis (GA)
 Gowdy Lofgren

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1720

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

AYES—172

Abraham Goodlatte
 Aderholt Gosar
 Allen Granger
 Amash Graves (GA)
 Arrington Graves (LA)
 Babin Griffith
 Banks (IN) Grothman
 Barr Guthrie
 Barton Handel
 Bergman Harper
 Biggs Harris
 Bilirakis Hartzler
 Babin Bishop (UT)
 Blum Herrera Beutler
 Brady (TX) Hice, Jody B.
 Brat Higgins (LA)
 Brooks (AL) Hill
 Brooks (IN) Holding
 Buchanan Hollingsworth
 Buck Hudson
 Budd Huizenga
 Burgess Hurd
 Byrne Issa
 Calvert Jenkins (KS)
 Carter (GA) Jenkins (WV)
 Carter (TX) Johnson (LA)
 Chabot Johnson, Sam
 Cheney Jones
 Coffman Jordan
 Cole Kelly (MS)
 Collins (GA) King (IA)
 Collins (NY) Knight
 Comer LaMalfa
 Comstock Lamborn
 Conaway Latta
 Cramer Loudermilk
 Crawford Love
 Culberson Lucas
 Curtis Luetkemeyer
 Davidson Marchant
 Dent Marshall
 DeSantis Massie
 DesJarlais McCarthy
 Duncan (SC) McCaul
 Duncan (TN) McClintock
 Dunn McHenry
 Estes (KS) McMorris
 Ferguson Rodgers
 Fleischmann McSally
 Flores Meadows
 Fortenberry Messer
 Foxx Mitchell
 Frelinghuysen Moolenaar
 Gaetz Mooney (WV)
 Gallagher Mullin
 Garrett Norman
 Gibbs Nunes
 Gohmert Olson

Adams Adams
 Aguilar Aguilar
 Amodei Amodei
 Bacon Bacon
 Barletta Barletta
 Barragan Barragan
 Bass Bass
 Beatty Beatty
 Bera Bera
 Beyer Beyer
 Bishop (GA) Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI) Bishop (MI)
 Blumenauer Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici Bonamici
 Bost Bost
 Boyle, Brendan Boyle, Brendan
 F. F.
 Brady (PA) Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD) Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA) Brownley (CA)
 Bucshon Bucshon
 Bustos Bustos
 Butterfield Butterfield
 Capuano Capuano
 Carbajal Carbajal
 Cardenas Cardenas
 Cartwright Cartwright
 Castor (FL) Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX) Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy Chu, Judy
 Cicilline Cicilline
 Clark (MA) Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY) Clarke (NY)
 Clay Clay
 Cleaver Cleaver
 Clyburn Clyburn
 Cohen Cohen
 Connolly Connolly
 Cook Cook
 Cooper Cooper
 Correa Correa
 Costa Costa
 Costello (PA) Costello (PA)
 Courtney Courtney
 Crist Crist
 Crowley Crowley
 Cuellar Cuellar
 Cummings Cummings
 Curbelo (FL) Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA) Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio DeFazio
 DeGette DeGette
 Delaney Delaney
 DeLauro DeLauro
 DelBene DelBene
 Demings Demings
 Denham Denham
 DeSaulnier DeSaulnier
 Lynch Lynch
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart
 Dingell Dingell
 Doggett Doggett
 Donovan Donovan
 Doyle, Michael Doyle, Michael
 F. F.
 Duffy Duffy
 Ellison Ellison
 Emmer Emmer
 Engel Engel
 Eshoo Eshoo
 Espallat Espallat
 Esty (CT) Esty (CT)
 Evans Evans
 Faso Faso
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick
 Foster Foster
 Frankel (FL) Frankel (FL)
 Fudge Fudge
 Gabbard Gabbard
 Gallego Gallego

NOES—243

Garamendi Garamendi
 Gianforte Gianforte
 Gomez Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX) Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer Gottheimer
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
 Green, Al Green, Al
 Green, Gene Green, Gene
 Grijalva Grijalva
 Gutierrez Gutierrez
 Hanabusa Hanabusa
 Hastings Hastings
 Heck Heck
 Higgins (NY) Higgins (NY)
 Himes Himes
 Hoyer Hoyer
 Huffman Huffman
 Hultgren Hultgren
 Hunter Hunter
 Jackson Lee Jackson Lee
 Jayapal Jayapal
 Jeffries Jeffries
 Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B.
 Joyce (OH) Joyce (OH)
 Kaptur Kaptur
 Katko Katko
 Keating Keating
 Kelly (IL) Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy Kennedy
 Khanna Khanna
 Kihuen Kihuen
 Kildee Kildee
 Kilmer Kilmer
 Kind Kind
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kinzinger Kinzinger
 Krishnamoorthi Krishnamoorthi
 LaHood LaHood
 Lamb Lamb
 Lance Lance
 Langevin Langevin
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Lawrence Lawrence
 Lawson (FL) Lawson (FL)
 Lee Lee
 Levin Levin
 Lewis (MN) Lewis (MN)
 Lieu, Ted Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski Lipinski
 LoBiondo LoBiondo
 Loeb sack Loeb sack
 Long Long
 Lowenthal Lowenthal
 Lowey Lowey
 Lujan Grisham, M. Lujan Grisham,
 M. M.
 Lujan, Ben Ray Lujan, Ben Ray
 Lynch Lynch
 MacArthur MacArthur
 Maloney, Maloney,
 Carolyn B. Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean Maloney, Sean
 Marino Marino
 Mast Mast
 Matsui Matsui
 McCollum McCollum
 McEachin McEachin
 McGovern McGovern
 McKinley McKinley
 McNeerney McNeerney
 Meehan Meehan
 Meeks Meeks
 Meng Meng
 Moore Moore
 Moulton Moulton
 Murphy (FL) Murphy (FL)
 Nadler Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Neal Neal

NOT VOTING—13

Black Kustoff (TN)
 Blackburn Labrador
 Carson (IN) Lewis (GA)
 Gowdy Lofgren
 Kuster (NH) Noem

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1727

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 92, noes 323, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—92

Aguilar	Gutiérrez	Peters
Barragán	Harris	Peterson
Bass	Herrera Beutler	Pingree
Beatty	Huffman	Pocan
Beyer	Hultgren	Polis
Bonamici	Hunter	Posey
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Capuano	Jayapal	Rohrabacher
Carbajal	Jones	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Schiff
Cleaver	Kihuen	Schneider
Connolly	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Soto
Deutch	Lynch	Speier
Doggett	Matsui	Takano
Ellison	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McGovern	Tonko
Fortenberry	Moore	Tsongas
Gabbard	Nadler	Vela
Gohmert	Napolitano	Walz
Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Green, Al	Nolan	Wilson (SC)
Green, Gene	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Perlmutter	

NOES—323

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Cole
Adams	Brat	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Amash	Brown (MD)	Comstock
Amodei	Brownley (CA)	Conaway
Arrington	Buchanan	Cook
Babin	Buck	Correa
Bacon	Bucshon	Costa
Banks (IN)	Budd	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Burgess	Courtney
Barr	Butterfield	Cramer
Barton	Byrne	Crawford
Bera	Calvert	Crowley
Bergman	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Biggs	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Castor (FL)	Curtis
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Davidson
Blum	Cheney	Davis, Rodney
Blumenauer	Cicilline	DeFazio
Blunt Rochester	Cielline	DeGette
Bost	Clarke (NY)	Clay
Boyle, Brendan	Clay	Delaney
F.	Clyburn	DeBene
Brady (PA)	Coffman	Demings
	Cohen	Denham

Dent	King (NY)	Richmond
DeSantis	Knight	Roby
DesJarlais	Krishnamoorthi	Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Diaz	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Donovan	Lamb	Rokita
Doyle, Michael	Lamborn	Rooney, Francis
F.	Lance	Rooney, Thomas
Duffy	Langevin	J.
Duncan (SC)	Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Rosen
Dunn	Larson (CT)	Roskam
Emmer	Latta	Ross
Engel	Lawrence	Rothfus
Españat	Lawson (FL)	Rouzer
Estes (KS)	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Esty (CT)	Levin	Royce (CA)
Evans	Lewis (MN)	Ruppersberger
Faso	LoBiondo	Russell
Ferguson	Long	Rutherford
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Ryan (OH)
Fleischmann	Love	Sánchez
Flores	Lowe	Sanford
Foster	Lucas	Sarbanes
Foxx	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham,	Schrader
Frelinghuysen	M.	Schweikert
Fudge	MacArthur	Scott, David
Gaetz	Maloney,	Sensenbrenner
Gallagher	Carolyn B.	Serrano
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Sessions
Garamendi	Marchant	Shimkus
Garrett	Marino	Shuster
Gianforte	Marshall	Simpson
Gibbs	Massie	Sinema
Gomez	Mast	Smith (MO)
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Smith (NE)
Gosar	McCaul	Smith (TX)
Gottheimer	McClintock	Smucker
Granger	McEachin	Stefanik
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Stewart
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Stivers
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Suozzi
Griffith	Rodgers	Swalwell (CA)
Grothman	McNerney	Taylor
Guthrie	McSally	Tenney
Hanabusa	Meadows	Thompson (MS)
Handel	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Harper	Meeks	Thornberry
Hartzler	Meng	Tipton
Hastings	Messer	Titus
Heck	Mitchell	Torres
Hensarling	Mooleenaar	Trott
Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)	Turner
Higgins (LA)	Moulton	Upton
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Valadao
Hill	Newhouse	Vargas
Himes	Norcross	Veasey
Holding	Norman	Velázquez
Hollingsworth	Nunes	Visclosky
Hoyer	O'Halleran	Wagner
Hudson	Olson	Walberg
Huizenga	Palazzo	Walden
Hurd	Pallone	Walker
Issa	Palmer	Walorski
Jeffries	Panetta	Walters, Mimi
Jenkins (KS)	Pascrell	Wasserman
Jenkins (WV)	Paulsen	Schultz
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Watson Coleman
Johnson (LA)	Pearce	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Pelosi	Webster (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Perry	Welch
Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Jordan	Poe (TX)	Westerman
Joyce (OH)	Poliquin	Williams
Katko	Price (NC)	Witman
Keating	Quigley	Womack
Kelly (IL)	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Kelly (MS)	Reed	Yoder
Kelly (PA)	Reichert	Yoho
Kildee	Renacci	Young (AK)
Kilmer	Rice (NY)	Young (IA)
King (IA)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Black	Kustoff (TN)	Sewell (AL)
Blackburn	Labrador	Sires
Carson (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (FL)
Gowdy	Lofgren	
Kuster (NH)	Noem	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1732

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—222

Abraham	Emmer	Loudermilk
Aderholt	Estes (KS)	Love
Allen	Faso	Lucas
Amash	Ferguson	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fleischmann	Marchant
Arrington	Flores	Marino
Babin	Fortenberry	Marshall
Bacon	Foxx	Massie
Banks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Mast
Barletta	Gaetz	McCarthy
Barr	Gallagher	McCaul
Barton	Garrett	McClintock
Bergman	Gianforte	McHenry
Biggs	Gibbs	McMorris
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Rodgers
Bishop (MI)	Goodlatte	McSally
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	Meadows
Blum	Granger	Meehan
Bost	Graves (GA)	Messer
Brady (TX)	Graves (LA)	Mitchell
Brat	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Mooney (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Mullin
Buchanan	Handel	Newhouse
Buck	Harper	Norman
Bucshon	Harris	Nunes
Budd	Hartzler	O'Halleran
Burgess	Hensarling	Olson
Byrne	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Pallone
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Paulsen
Carter (TX)	Hill	Pearce
Chabot	Holding	Perry
Cheney	Hollingsworth	Pittenger
Coffman	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Cole	Huizenga	Poliquin
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Posey
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Comer	Hurd	Reed
Comstock	Issa	Reichert
Conaway	Jenkins (KS)	Renacci
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Cooper	Johnson (LA)	Roby
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cramer	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Rokita
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Francis
Curbelo (FL)	Kind	Rooney, Thomas
Curtis	King (IA)	J.
Davidson	Kinzinger	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Roskam
Denham	LaHood	Ross
Dent	LaMalfa	Rothfus
DeSantis	Lamborn	Rouzer
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Royce (CA)
Duffy	Latta	Rutherford
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (MN)	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Scalise
Dunn	Long	Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor

Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) 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 amend-

Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

NOES—193
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth
Zeldin

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 227, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]
AYES—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Lance
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Dingell
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Larsen (WA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Soto
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14
Black
Blackburn
Carson (IN)
Gowdy
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Noem
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—13
Black
Blackburn
Carson (IN)
Gowdy
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Noem

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1735
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NOES—227
Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1739

Mr. EVANS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes

155 to 160. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

Rollcall 155, on H.R. 4, DeFazio Amendment, vote “yea.”

Rollcall 156, on H.R. 4, Rohrabacher/Bass Amendment, vote “nay.”

Rollcall 157, on H.R. 4, S. King Amendment, vote “nay.”

Rollcall 158, on H.R. 4, Lipinski Amendment, vote “yea.”

Rollcall 159, on H.R. 4, Denha/Costa Amendment, vote “nay.”

Rollcall 160, on H.R. 4, Lynch/Meng Amendment, vote “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, I was not present for the following votes because I chose to remain in my congressional district in Miami for an important district event.

Had I been present, I would have voted: “yes” on rollcall Vote No. 155; “no” on rollcall Vote No. 156; “no” on rollcall Vote No. 157; “no” on rollcall Vote No. 158; “no” on rollcall Vote No. 159; and “yes” on rollcall Vote No. 160.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 4) to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

IRAN HUMAN RIGHTS AND HOSTAGE-TAKING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4744) to impose additional sanctions with respect to serious human rights abuses of the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—410

Abraham	Bass	Bonamico
Adams	Beatty	Bost
Aderholt	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bergman	F.
Allen	Beyer	Brady (PA)
Amodei	Biggs	Brady (TX)
Arrington	Bilirakis	Brat
Bacon	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (AL)
Banks (IN)	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (IN)
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Brown (MD)
Barr	Blum	Brownley (CA)
Barragán	Blumenauer	Buchanan
Barton	Blunt Rochester	Buck

Bucshon	Gohmert	Lynch
Budd	Gomez	MacArthur
Burgess	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney
Bustos	Goodlatte	Carolyn B.
Butterfield	Gosar	Maloney, Sean
Byrne	Gottheimer	Marchant
Calvert	Granger	Marino
Capuano	Graves (GA)	Marshall
Carbajal	Graves (LA)	Mast
Cárdenas	Graves (MO)	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Green, Gene	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Griffith	McClintock
Cartwright	Grijalva	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Grothman	McEachin
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McGovern
Chabot	Gutiérrez	McHenry
Cheney	Hanabusa	McKinley
Chu, Judy	Handel	McMorris
Cicilline	Harper	Rodgers
Clark (MA)	Harris	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Hartzler	McSally
Clay	Hastings	Meadows
Cleaver	Heck	Meehan
Clyburn	Hensarling	Meeks
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Cohen	Hice, Jody B.	Messer
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Mitchell
Collins (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar
Collins (NY)	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Comer	Himes	Moore
Conaway	Holdering	Moulton
Connolly	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Cook	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Hudson	Nadler
Correa	Huffman	Napolitano
Costa	Huizenga	Neal
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Newhouse
Courtney	Hunter	Nolan
Cramer	Hurd	Norcross
Crawford	Issa	Norman
Crist	Jackson Lee	Nunes
Crowley	Jayapal	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Culberson	Jenkins (KS)	Olson
Cummings	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Curtis	Johnson (LA)	Palmer
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell
Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Jones	Payne
DeFazio	Jordan	Pearce
DeGette	Joyce (OH)	Pelosi
Delaney	Kaptur	Perlmutter
DeLauro	Katko	Perry
DelBene	Keating	Peters
Demings	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Pingree
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Pittenger
DeSantis	Kennedy	Pocan
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Kihuen	Poliquin
Deutch	Kildee	Polis
Diaz-Balart	Kilmer	Posey
Dingell	Kind	Price (NC)
Doggett	King (IA)	Quigley
Donovan	King (NY)	Raskin
Doyle, Michael	Kinzinger	Ratcliffe
F.	Knight	Reed
Duffy	Krishnamoorthi	Reichert
Duncan (SC)	LaHood	Renacci
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)
Dunn	Lamb	Rice (SC)
Ellison	Lamborn	Richmond
Emmer	Lance	Roby
Engel	Langevin	Roe (TN)
Eshoo	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)
Españillat	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Estes (KS)	Latta	Rohrabacher
Esty (CT)	Lawrence	Rokita
Evans	Lawson (FL)	Rooney, Francis
Faso	Lee	Rooney, Thomas
Ferguson	Levin	J.
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fleischmann	Lieu, Ted	Rosen
Flores	Lipinski	Roskam
Foster	LoBiondo	Ross
Fox	Loeb sack	Rothfus
Frankel (FL)	Long	Rouzer
Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk	Roybal-Allard
Fudge	Love	Royce (CA)
Gaetz	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Gallagher	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Gallego	Lucas	Rush
Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Russell
Garrett	Lujan Grisham,	Rutherford
Gianforte	M.	Ryan (OH)
Gibbs	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez

Sanford	Speier	Wagner
Sarbanes	Stefanik	Walberg
Scalise	Stewart	Walden
Schakowsky	Stivers	Walker
Schiff	Suozzi	Walorski
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Walters, Mimi
Schrader	Takano	Walz
Schweikert	Taylor	Wasserman
Scott (VA)	Tenney	Schultz
Scott, Austin	Thompson (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Serrano	Thornberry	Webster (FL)
Sessions	Tipton	Welch
Shea-Porter	Titus	Wenstrup
Sherman	Tonko	Westerman
Shimkus	Torres	Williams
Shuster	Trott	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Tsongas	Wittman
Sinema	Turner	Womack
Smith (MO)	Upton	Woodall
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Yarmuth
Smith (NJ)	Vargas	Yoder
Smith (TX)	Veasey	Yoho
Smith (WA)	Vela	Young (AK)
Smucker	Velázquez	Young (IA)
Soto	Visclosky	Zeldin

NAYS—2

Amash

Massie

NOT VOTING—16

Babin	Gowdy	Noem
Black	Kuster (NH)	Sewell (AL)
Blackburn	Kustoff (TN)	Sires
Comstock	Labrador	Wilson (FL)
Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)	
Gabbard	Lofgren	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1747

Mr. COOK changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF “UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS: LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FREDERICK LAW OLMSTEAD’S DESIGN FOR DEMOCRACY” AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 118, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 118

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS: LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FREDERICK LAW OLMSTEAD’S DESIGN FOR DEMOCRACY.

(a) PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT.—The book entitled “United States Capitol