

to our national security. This is particularly important now when a significant amount of our country's economic and social activity has moved online, and consumers are connecting more devices to these networks. We must build in safeguards to increase the safety of communications networks to protect Americans while also promoting innovation and competition.

H.R. 1345 will help us achieve these goals. This legislation authorizes the existing Office of Policy Analysis and Development at the NTIA and renames it as the Office of Policy Development and Cybersecurity. It also codifies responsibilities of NTIA in administering parts of the Secure and Trusted Communications Network Act and requires the office to coordinate and develop policy initiatives to enhance cybersecurity efforts with respect to our communications networks.

The office will also be tasked with developing and analyzing policies that promote innovation, competition, digital inclusion, and workforce development in the communications, media, and technology markets.

I thank Representatives WILD and CURTIS for their bipartisan work on this bill, which will ensure that there is a firm foundation within the Federal Government to oversee the security of our Nation's communications networks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that unanimously advanced out of the Energy and Commerce Committee early this year, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the NTIA Policy and Cybersecurity Coordination Act. This bill would streamline the development of cybersecurity policy at the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, NTIA, through the establishment of an office of policy development and cybersecurity.

This office would work with industry and stakeholders to recommend the cybersecurity practices and policies of the internet and communications technology sectors. The office of policy development and cybersecurity would also carry out the communications supply chain risk information partnership to facilitate information sharing on cybersecurity risks to small and rural communities.

State and nonstate actors are working overtime to find vulnerabilities in our networks and infrastructure. We must work even harder to ensure Americans are protected from cyberattacks.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative WILD for joining me on this bill in the House and Senator HICKENLOOPER for leading in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important bill, and I urge everyone to support it on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1345, the NTIA Policy and Cybersecurity Coordination Act. This bill would promote collaboration between security research and industry development, preventing and mitigating future software vulnerabilities in communications networks.

It is also important to codify NTIA's administering of information sharing established in the Secure and Trusted Communications Network Act. The NTIA is assigned with coordinating policy related to the cybersecurity of communications networks.

These attacks on communications networks include those we have all heard about: unauthorized access; distributed denial of service; man-in-the-middle attacks, where communications traffic is intercepted; and code attacks, where malicious code can be passed to a server to make it vulnerable. This is a serious problem.

Like the Secure and Trusted Communications Network Act, H.R. 1345 passed with unanimous, bipartisan support out of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

We need to address cyberattacks in a more effective and coordinated fashion to go after the bad actors attacking America's communications networks.

I appreciate the good work of my colleagues, Representatives JOHN CURTIS and SUSAN WILD, and I strongly support this bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman just stated, this bill encourages collaboration between government agencies and stakeholders so that we can work together to address cyber threats and vulnerabilities more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage by the House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1345.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SATELLITE AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS STREAMLINING ACT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1338) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide authority for certain licenses, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1338

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act" or the "SAT Streamlining Act".

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORITY REGARDING CERTAIN LICENSES.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### "SEC. 346. RADIOFREQUENCY LICENSING AUTHORITY REGARDING CERTAIN OPERATIONS.

“(a) RULES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commission shall issue rules to amend part 25 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, to establish—

“(A) for any license granted under subsection (b) or grant of market access granted under subsection (c), specific, measurable, and technology-neutral performance objectives for space safety and orbital debris, in accordance with paragraph (2);

“(B) for any license granted under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b), specific modifications (or classes of modifications) to such a license that warrant expedited treatment under subparagraph (A) or (B) (as the case may be) of subsection (g)(2);

“(C) for any license granted under subsection (b), grant of market access granted under subsection (c), authorization granted under subsection (d), or covered authorization, the manner in which the licensee, grantee, or entity shall notify the Commission of a request to submit a modification under subsection (g)(5);

“(D) for any request to modify a covered authorization, the manner in which the entity with the covered authorization shall indicate in the request whether the entity is seeking a modification described in subsection (h)(2)(B)(i)(I) or a modification described in subsection (h)(2)(B)(i)(II);

“(E) for any license granted under subsection (b), grant of market access granted under subsection (c), or covered authorization, in a spectrum band with service rules that require a licensee of such a license, a grantee of such a grant, or an entity with such a covered authorization to share spectrum with another such licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization that is authorized to use the same frequencies of such spectrum, specific actions taken by such a licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization, or by any other entity that is authorized to use such frequencies, that constitute a failure to coordinate in good faith, including whether withholding from another such licensee, grantee, entity with a covered authorization, or other entity information necessary to coordinate in good faith that it is technically feasible to make available to such licensee, grantee, entity with a covered authorization, or other entity is such an action;

“(F) for any license granted under subsection (b)(1) or grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1), in a spectrum band with service rules that require a licensee of such a license, a grantee of such a grant, or an entity with a covered authorization to share spectrum (except with respect to the use of a gateway station) with another such licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization that is authorized to use the same frequencies of such spectrum, a quantifiable level of protection required under subsection (h)(4);

“(G) rules that—

“(i) clarify, for purposes of subsection (h)(1)(A)(ii), the protection from harmful interference that, during the covered period, an entity with a covered authorization that was approved in a processing round is required to provide to any other entity with a covered authorization that was approved in an earlier processing round; and

“(ii) seek to promote competition, innovation, and efficient use of spectrum by entities with covered authorizations, including by accounting for advancements in technology capable of managing interference concerns to the greatest extent possible consistent with clause (i); and

“(H) for any application or request for modification described in subsection (n), what constitutes reportable foreign ownership for purposes of paragraph (1) of such subsection.

“(2) CONFLICT WITH INTERAGENCY STANDARD PRACTICES.—In the rules issued pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), or any successor rule, the Commission may not establish performance objectives that conflict with any standard practice established in the Orbital Debris Mitigation Standard Practices adopted by the United States Government.

“(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS SERVICES AND INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subsection, including the rules issued pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), shall be construed to grant the Commission authority to carry out the functions provided under section 2274 of title 10, United States Code (relating to the provision of space situational awareness services and information), including any such functions that may be transferred to a civilian agency that are otherwise provided in law.

“(B) SPACE SAFETY AND ORBITAL DEBRIS.—Nothing in this subsection, including the rules issued pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), shall be construed to expand the authority of the Commission to establish requirements for or regulate space safety and orbital debris.

“(C) AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION UNDER THIS ACT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission with respect to space stations licensed under this Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(b) APPLICATION FOR LICENSE.—

“(1) NGSO DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—Except as provided in paragraph (5) and subsection (m), not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application (including any amendment to such application) for a license for covered radiocommunication services using—

“(A) a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations;

“(B) a blanket-licensed earth station or earth stations that will operate with a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations; or

“(C) a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations and the blanket-licensed earth station or earth stations that will operate with the nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations.

“(2) GSO DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—Except as provided in paragraph (5) and subsection (m), not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application (including any amendment to such applica-

tion) for a license for covered radiocommunication services using—

“(A) a geostationary orbit space station or space stations;

“(B) a blanket-licensed earth station or earth stations that will operate with a geostationary orbit space station or space stations; or

“(C) a geostationary orbit space station or space stations and the blanket-licensed earth station or earth stations that will operate with the geostationary orbit space station or space stations.

“(3) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—In addition to the application requirements described in section 308(b), an application submitted under paragraph (1) or (2) shall include the following:

“(A) Performance metrics with respect to the frequencies and transmission power to be used.

“(B) A demonstration of compliance by the applicant with the performance objectives established under subsection (a)(1)(A).

“(C) A description of compliance by the applicant with the actions established under subsection (a)(1)(E), if applicable.

“(D) In the case of an application submitted under paragraph (1), a demonstration of compliance by the applicant with the quantifiable level of protection established under subsection (a)(1)(F), if applicable.

“(4) TERM OF INITIAL LICENSE.—The Commission shall grant a license for a term not to exceed 15 years for any application granted under this subsection.

“(5) EXCEPTIONS.—The deadline for the determination required in paragraphs (1), (2), and (6) may be extended by the Commission for an application subject to review under subsection (n).

“(6) TIMELY GRANT OF CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (5) and subsection (m), not later than 60 days after the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission for a license described in paragraph (1) with respect to which the applicant indicates in the application that the application meets the additional criteria described in subparagraph (B), the Commission shall—

“(i) determine whether such application (including any amendment to such application) meets the additional criteria described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) if the determination under clause (i) is affirmative, grant such application (including any amendment to such application).

“(B) CRITERIA DESCRIBED.—The additional criteria described in this subparagraph are as follows:

“(i) A limit on the number of space stations authorized by the license, as determined by the Commission.

“(ii) A limit on the total in-orbit lifetime for any individual space station, as determined by the Commission.

“(iii) For each space station, the following:

“(I) A limit on the orbital altitude at which the space station may operate, as determined by the Commission.

“(II) A requirement that the space station has a maneuverability capability and the ability to make collision avoidance and deorbit maneuvers, as determined by the Commission.

“(III) A requirement that the space station is identifiable by a unique signal-based telemetry marker that meets requirements issued by the Commission.

“(IV) A requirement that the space station releases no operational debris.

“(V) A requirement that the space station can be commanded by command originating from the ground to immediately cease trans-

missions and the applicant has the capability to eliminate harmful interference when required by the Commission.

“(iv) A requirement that the operator has assessed and limited the probability of an accidental explosion, including an explosion that results from the conversion of energy sources on board any space station into energy that fragments the space station.

“(v) A limit on the probability of a collision between each space station and any other large object, as determined by the Commission.

“(vi) A requirement that each space station is disposed of post-mission and the probability of human casualty from disposal meets requirements issued by the Commission.

“(C) CRITERIA NOT MET.—If the determination under subparagraph (A)(i) with respect to an application is negative, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application (including any amendment to such application) under paragraph (1) by the deadline specified in such paragraph.

“(D) EVASION.—An application does not meet the additional criteria described in subparagraph (B) if the Commission determines that, taken together with any other application or applications submitted by the applicant under subparagraph (A) (including an application that has been approved), such applications are submitted with the purpose of evading a negative determination with respect to such additional criteria.

“(E) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of this section (other than this paragraph), any reference to an application submitted or granted or a license granted under paragraph (1) shall be construed to include an application submitted or granted or a license granted (as the case may be) under subparagraph (A).

“(F) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commission shall—

“(I) issue rules to implement this paragraph; or

“(II) make the finding described in clause (ii).

“(ii) FINDING DESCRIBED.—If the Commission finds that the rules of the Commission, as of the date of the enactment of this section, satisfy the requirements in this paragraph, the Commission shall issue a public notice stating such finding.

“(c) APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF MARKET ACCESS.—

“(1) NGSO DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—After the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application (including any amendment to such application) for market access within the United States for covered radiocommunication services using—

“(A) a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations;

“(B) a blanket-licensed earth station or earth stations that will operate with a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations; or

“(C) a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations and the blanket-licensed earth station or earth stations that will operate with the nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations.

“(2) GSO DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—After the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application

(including any amendment to such application) for market access within the United States for covered radiocommunication services using a geostationary orbit space station or space stations.

“(3) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—In addition to the application requirements described in section 308(b), an application submitted under paragraph (1) or (2) shall include the following:

“(A) Performance metrics with respect to the frequencies and transmission power to be used.

“(B) A demonstration of compliance by the applicant with the performance objectives established under subsection (a)(1)(A).

“(C) A description of compliance by the applicant with the actions established under subsection (a)(1)(E), if applicable.

“(D) In the case of an application submitted under paragraph (1), a demonstration of compliance by the applicant with the quantifiable level of protection established under subsection (a)(1)(F), if applicable.

“(4) TERM OF INITIAL GRANT OF MARKET ACCESS.—The Commission shall grant a grant of market access for a term not to exceed 15 years for any application granted under this subsection.

“(d) EARTH STATION AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) DETERMINATION REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUALLY LICENSED EARTH STATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (4) and subsection (m), not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application (including any amendment to such application) for authorization to use an individually licensed earth station.

“(2) DETERMINATION REQUIRED FOR RECEIVE-ONLY EARTH STATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (4) and subsection (m), not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission issues a public notice of the acceptance for filing of a written application submitted to the Commission, the Commission shall make a determination whether to grant such application (including any amendment to such application) for authorization to use an earth station or earth stations to receive a signal from—

“(A) a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations operated under a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1); or

“(B) a geostationary orbit space station or space stations operated under a license granted under subsection (b)(2) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(2).

“(3) DEEMED GRANTED.—If the Commission fails to grant or deny a written application (including any amendment to such application) submitted under paragraph (1) or (2) by the deadline for the determination required by such paragraph (including any extension of such deadline under paragraph (4) or subsection (m)), the application (including any amendment to such application) shall be deemed granted on the date on which the Commission receives a written notice by the applicant of the failure.

“(4) EXCEPTION.—The deadline for the determination required by paragraph (1) or (2) may be extended by the Commission for an application subject to review under subsection (n).

“(5) INAPPLICABILITY TO BLANKET-LICENSED EARTH STATIONS.—This subsection does not apply with respect to an earth station or earth stations to the extent that the earth station or earth stations will be blanket-licensed with a space station or space stations

as described in subsection (b)(1)(B), (b)(1)(C), (b)(2)(B), (b)(2)(C), (c)(1)(B), or (c)(1)(C).

“(e) DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC INTEREST, CONVENIENCE, AND NECESSITY.—The Commission may not make a determination to grant an application, renewal, or modification under subsection (b), (c), (d), (f), or (g) (as the case may be) unless—

“(1) except in the case of a modification under subsection (g)(2), the Commission determines that the license, grant, or authorization (as the case may be) serves the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

“(2) the Commission determines that—

“(A) in the case of a licensee or grantee to which subsection (h)(4) applies—

“(i) in the case of an application, except in accordance with a coordination agreement, the licensee or grantee will not, during the term of the license or grant, exceed the quantifiable level of protection established in subsection (h)(4) in operating under the license or grant;

“(ii) in the case of a renewal, except in accordance with a coordination agreement, the licensee or grantee has not exceeded, during the preceding term of the license or grant, and will not exceed, during the term of the renewal of the license or grant, the quantifiable level of protection established in subsection (h)(4) in operating under the license or grant; and

“(iii) in the case of a modification, except in accordance with a coordination agreement, the licensee or grantee has not exceeded, during the portion of the term of the license or grant preceding the determination, and will not exceed, during the remainder of such term, the quantifiable level of protection established in subsection (h)(4) in operating under the license or grant; and

“(B) in the case of a licensee or grantee that is required to protect radio astronomy observatories by the International Telecommunication Union, the application, request for renewal, or request for modification demonstrates that the licensee or grantee will provide such protection in operating under the license or grant.

“(f) RENEWAL OF LICENSE, GRANT OF MARKET ACCESS, OR AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 309(k)(2), the Commission shall grant a renewal for a license granted under subsection (b), a grant of market access granted under subsection (c), or an authorization granted under subsection (d), upon request by the licensee, grantee, or entity with such authorization (as the case may be), for a term not to exceed the length of the initial term beginning the day after the date on which the preceding term of the license, grant of market access, or authorization expires, if the Commission determines the requirements under subsection (e) and section 309(k) have been met.

“(2) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—Except as provided in subsection (m), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Commission receives a request for renewal of a license granted under subsection (b), a grant of market access granted under subsection (c), or an authorization granted under subsection (d), the Commission shall—

“(A) grant such request (including any amendment to such request); or

“(B) make the determination described in section 309(k)(3) and deny such request (including any amendment to such request).

“(g) MODIFICATION OF LICENSE; GRANT OF MARKET ACCESS.—

“(1) MAJOR MODIFICATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (6) and subsection (m), and not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission receives a request to modify a license granted under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall grant the request (including any

amendment to such request) if the Commission determines the modification meets the requirements under subsection (e). Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (5), the Commission may grant a request (including any amendment to such request) to modify a license granted under subsection (b)(2) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c) if the Commission determines the modification meets the requirements under subsection (e).

“(2) EXPEDITED TREATMENT FOR MINOR MODIFICATIONS.—

“(A) NGSO LICENSE MODIFICATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3), (5), and (6) and subsection (m), and not later than 90 days after the date on which the Commission receives a request to modify a license granted under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall grant the request (including any amendment to such request) if—

“(i) the Commission determines that the modification or modifications meet the requirements (if applicable) under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (e)(2); and

“(ii) the request is limited only to modifications, or a class of modifications, that—

“(I) increase transmission capacity;

“(II) improve spectral efficiency, such as by improving compression technologies; or

“(III) otherwise do not substantially modify the space station (or space stations, considered collectively, if there is more than one such space station) authorized by the license.

“(B) GSO LICENSE MODIFICATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3), (5), and (6) and subsection (m), and not later than 90 days after the date on which the Commission receives a request to modify a license granted under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall grant the request (including any amendment to such request) if—

“(i) the Commission determines that the modification or modifications meet the requirements (if applicable) under subsection (e)(2)(B); and

“(ii) the request is limited only to modifications, or a class of modifications, that—

“(I) increase transmission capacity;

“(II) improve spectral efficiency, such as by improving compression technologies; or

“(III) otherwise do not substantially modify the space station (or space stations, considered collectively, if there is more than one such space station) authorized by the license.

“(C) DEEMED GRANTED.—If the Commission fails to grant a request (including any amendment to such request) made by a licensee under subparagraph (A) or (B) by the deadline specified in such subparagraph (including any extension of such deadline under paragraph (6) or subsection (m)), the request (including any amendment to such request) shall be deemed granted on the date on which the Commission receives a written notice by the licensee of the failure.

“(3) EMERGENCY GRANT, RENEWAL, OR MODIFICATION.—If the Commission finds that there are extraordinary circumstances requiring temporary operations in the public interest and that delay in the institution of such temporary operations would seriously prejudice the public interest, the Commission—

“(A) may grant a license described in subsection (b), a grant of market access described in subsection (c), or an authorization described in subsection (d), a modification of such a license, grant of market access, or authorization, or renewal of such a license, grant of market access, or authorization for a period not to exceed 180 days in a manner and upon the terms the Commission shall by rule prescribe in the case of an emergency found by the Commission involving—

“(i) danger to life or property; or

“(ii) an action that is necessary for the national defense or security of the United States;

“(B) shall include with a grant made under this paragraph a statement of the reasons of the Commission for making such grant;

“(C) may extend a grant made under this paragraph for periods not to exceed 180 days; and

“(D) shall give expeditious treatment to any timely filed petition to deny such application and to any petition for rehearing of such grant filed under section 405.

“(4) EXCLUSION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to a request to modify a license for—

“(A) the addition of an ancillary terrestrial component; or

“(B) modifying the service offered under the initial license granted under subsection (b) between fixed satellite service and mobile satellite service.

“(5) AUTOMATIC GRANT OF CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS.—Upon notification to the Commission, the Commission may automatically grant a request to modify a license granted under subsection (b), a grant of market access granted under subsection (c), an authorization granted under subsection (d), or a covered authorization, to replace—

“(A) one space station (or component of such space station) with a technically similar space station (or component of such space station) previously approved by the Commission; or

“(B) one earth station (or component of such earth station) with a technically similar earth station (or component of such earth station) previously approved by the Commission.

“(6) EXCEPTIONS.—The deadlines under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be extended by the Commission for a request subject to review under subsection (n).

“(h) SHARED SPECTRUM; PROTECTION FROM HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.—

“(1) GRANDFATHERED TREATMENT AND SUNSET OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the duration of the covered period—

“(i) a covered authorization shall not be treated as being granted under subsection (b)(1) or subsection (c)(1) (as the case may be); and

“(ii) an entity with a covered authorization shall be afforded, and shall afford to any other entity with a covered authorization, protection from harmful interference that is consistent with the terms of such protection afforded before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(B) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—The Commission shall dismiss without prejudice any application for a license or grant of market access to operate a system described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) or subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (c)(1) that is submitted to the Commission after the date of the enactment of this section and before the date on which the rules issued pursuant to subsection (a) take effect.

“(2) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—

“(A) RENEWAL UNDER THIS SECTION.—An entity with a covered authorization may, at any time before the end of the covered period, seek renewal of the covered authorization under subsection (f) as if the covered authorization were a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1) (as the case may be). If the Commission grants the renewal, the renewal shall be treated as a renewal of a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1) (as the case may be).

“(B) MODIFICATION.—

“(i) INDICATION OF TYPE OF MODIFICATION SOUGHT.—If an entity with a covered author-

ization submits to the Commission a request to modify the covered authorization, the entity shall indicate in the request whether the entity is seeking—

“(I) a modification of the covered authorization under the law and regulations applicable to the covered authorization; or

“(II) a modification of the covered authorization under subsection (g) as if the covered authorization were a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1) (as the case may be).

“(ii) TREATMENT.—If the Commission grants a request to modify a covered authorization—

“(I) in the case of a request for a modification described in clause (i)(I), the covered authorization as modified shall continue to be treated as described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) and the entity with the covered authorization shall, with respect to the covered authorization, continue to be afforded, and to afford to any other entity with a covered authorization, the protection described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii); and

“(II) in the case of a request for a modification described in clause (i)(II), the covered authorization as modified shall be treated as a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1) (as the case may be) with respect to which a request to modify has been granted under subsection (g).

“(3) GOOD FAITH COORDINATION OF SHARED SPECTRUM.—Not later than the date on which the rules issued pursuant to subsection (a) take effect—

“(A) a licensee of a license granted under subsection (b), a grantee of a grant of market access granted under subsection (c), or an entity with a covered authorization, in a spectrum band with service rules that require such a licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization to share spectrum with another such licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization that is authorized to use the same frequencies of such spectrum, shall make a good faith effort to coordinate the use of such frequencies (including the use of such frequencies by an individually licensed earth station) with any other such licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization and any other entity that is authorized to use such frequencies; and

“(B) any other entity that is authorized to use such frequencies shall make a good faith effort to coordinate the use of such frequencies with any such licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization.

“(4) PROTECTION FROM HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date on which the rules issued pursuant to subsection (a) take effect, for any spectrum band in which the Commission grants a license under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access under subsection (c)(1) and for which the service rules require such a licensee or grantee or an entity with a covered authorization to share spectrum (except with respect to the use of a gateway station) with another such licensee, grantee, or entity with a covered authorization that is authorized to use the same frequencies of such spectrum, the Commission shall establish a quantifiable level of protection that (except with respect to the use of a gateway station) such a licensee or grantee shall afford to any other entity (including an entity with a covered authorization but not including a licensee of a license granted under subsection (b)(2) or a grantee of a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(2)) that is authorized to use such frequencies.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to—

“(i) the spectrum between the frequencies of 1617.775 megahertz and 1618.725 megahertz, inclusive; or

“(ii) any spectrum band allocated for the earth exploration satellite service.

“(5) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—When establishing the quantifiable level of protection described in paragraph (4), the Commission shall, with respect to the entities to which the quantifiable level of protection is required under such paragraph to be afforded—

“(A) consider protection of such entities based on a degraded throughput methodology, requiring that, except in accordance with a coordination agreement, a licensee of a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grantee of a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1) may cause no more than a certain percentage increase in the link unavailability of such an entity and may reduce the throughput of such an entity by no more than a certain percentage;

“(B) consider protection of such entities from interference beyond a permissible interference-to-noise ratio, or whether interference-to-noise alone provides a sufficient level of protection; and

“(C) consider protection of such entities from harmful interference by awarding a greater share of spectrum during in-line events to earlier-filed systems.

“(6) RELATION TO ITU RADIO REGULATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the Commission to adopt rules regarding the use of spectrum that contravene a requirement of the radio regulations of the International Telecommunication Union.

“(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An entity with a covered authorization shall not be required to submit additional information in order to retain such authorization, nor shall paragraph (1)(A) affect any obligation of such entity under applicable law or regulation until the end of the covered period.

“(i) STATE PREEMPTION OF MARKET ENTRY; RATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no State or local government shall have any authority to regulate the entry of or the rates charged by an applicant or licensee related to a license granted under subsection (b), an applicant or grantee related to a grant of market access granted under subsection (c), or an applicant or entity related to an authorization granted under subsection (d), except that this subsection shall not prohibit a State from regulating the other terms and conditions of such a license, grantee, or entity.

“(j) REGULATORY RESTRAINT.—

“(1) LIMITATION ON INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED.—In performing any act, making any rule or regulation, or issuing any order necessary to carry out this section, the Commission—

“(A) shall limit the information required to be furnished to the Commission;

“(B) shall demonstrate the Commission has taken every reasonable step to limit the information required to be furnished to the Commission;

“(C) may not require, with respect to an application under subsection (b), (c), or (d), a request for renewal under subsection (f), or a request for modification under subsection (g), the filing of any information which previously has been furnished to the Commission or which is not directly material to the considerations that affect the granting or denial of such application or request (but the Commission may require any new or additional facts the Commission deems necessary to make its findings); and

“(D) may not request additional information regarding the performance objectives established under subsection (a)(1)(A) for any case in which an applicant has demonstrated

compliance with such performance objectives.

“(2) DEADLINE FOR PETITION DETERMINATION.—If an applicant for a license or a licensee under subsection (b) files a petition under part 1 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) relating to information required to be furnished to the Commission under this section, the Commission shall grant or deny the petition within 90 days after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(k) RELATION TO EXPERIMENTAL AND AMATEUR USES.—This section shall not apply to any Commission authorization in—

- “(1) the experimental radio service; or
- “(2) the amateur radio service.

“(l) COMPLETENESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 20 business days after receiving a written application submitted under subsection (b), (c), or (d), the Commission shall—

“(A) determine whether—

“(i) such application contains—

“(I) in the case of an application submitted under subsection (b), all of the information required to be submitted with the application under subsection (b)(3) and the first sentence of section 308(b);

“(II) in the case of an application submitted under subsection (c), all of the information required to be submitted with the application under subsection (c)(3) and the first sentence of section 308(b); or

“(III) in the case of an application submitted under subsection (d), all of the information required to be submitted with the application under the first sentence of section 308(b); and

“(ii) the applicant has paid the fee (if any) required under section 8 in connection with the application; and

“(B) either—

“(i) if both determinations under subparagraph (A) are in the affirmative, issue a public notice of the acceptance for filing of such application; or

“(ii) if either determination under subparagraph (A) is in the negative, provide notice to the applicant of the negative determination, including what information that was required to be submitted was not submitted or the amount of the application fee due, or both (as the case may be).

“(2) INACTION BY COMMISSION.—If the Commission does not comply with paragraph (1) with respect to an application by the deadline specified in such paragraph, the Commission shall be deemed for purposes of subsection (b), (c), or (d) (as the case may be) to have issued a public notice of the acceptance for filing of such application on the date that is 21 business days after the date on which such application was received.

“(3) LIMITATION.—In making a determination under paragraph (1)(A)(i), the Commission may only consider whether the application contains the information described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) (as the case may be) of such paragraph and may not consider whether the information is sufficient to allow the Commission to grant or deny the application.

“(m) TOLLING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b)(5), (d)(4), and (g)(6), with respect to an application for a license under subsection (b) or an authorization under subsection (d), or a request for renewal under subsection (f) or modification under subsection (g) of a license granted under subsection (b), a grant of market access granted under subsection (c), or an authorization granted under subsection (d), the Commission may extend the deadline under subsection (b), (d), (f), or (g) (as the case may be) for consideration of the application or request only if the Commission—

“(A) finds that there are extraordinary circumstances requiring additional time for consideration of the application or request such that, if the deadline were not extended, the public interest would be seriously prejudiced; and

“(B) issues a public notice of the finding described in subparagraph (A) that states—

“(i) the reasons of the Commission for the extension; and

“(ii) the length of the period of the extension.

“(2) LENGTH.—The Commission may not grant an extension of a deadline under paragraph (1) for a period that exceeds 90 days but may grant 1 or more additional extensions of such deadline under such paragraph, if the Commission makes the finding and issues the public notice required by such paragraph with respect to any such additional extension.

“(n) REVIEW FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT CONCERNS.—

“(1) REVIEW REQUIRED FOR ENTITIES WITH REPORTABLE FOREIGN OWNERSHIP.—In the case of an application under subsection (b), (c), or (d), a request for modification under subsection (g), or a request for modification of a covered authorization that is submitted by an entity that the Commission determines to have reportable foreign ownership, the Commission shall refer such application or request to the Committee for the Assessment of Foreign Participation in the United States Telecommunications Services Sector established by Executive Order No. 13913 (85 Fed. Reg. 19643) (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Committee’) for review of national security and law enforcement concerns that may be raised by such application or request.

“(2) REVIEW AT DISCRETION OF COMMISSION.—In addition to the applications and requests that the Commission is required to refer to the Committee under paragraph (1), the Commission may, in the discretion of the Commission, refer any other application under subsection (b), (c), or (d), request for modification under subsection (g), or request for modification of a covered authorization to the Committee for review of national security and law enforcement concerns that may be raised by such application or request.

“(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED APPLICATION.—The term ‘covered application’ means an application for a license or grant of market access to operate a system described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) or subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (c)(1) that is pending on the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) COVERED AUTHORIZATION.—The term ‘covered authorization’ means—

“(A) a license or grant of market access granted by the Commission to operate a system described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(1) or subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (c)(1) that is in effect on the date of the enactment of this section; or

“(B) a license or grant of market access granted by Commission approval of a covered application.

“(3) COVERED PERIOD.—The term ‘covered period’ means, with respect to a covered authorization, the period of time that begins on the date of the enactment of this section and ends on the earliest of—

“(A) the date that is 11 years after such date of enactment;

“(B) the date on which the Commission determines that the licensee or grantee (as the case may be) has not either—

“(i) deployed a level of service commensurate with the terms of the license or grant of market access; or

“(ii) otherwise demonstrated progress and investment consistent with the deployment

obligations under the license or grant of market access;

“(C) the date on which the Commission grants a request to renew the covered authorization; or

“(D) the date on which the Commission grants a request for a modification of the covered authorization described in subsection (h)(2)(B)(i)(II).

“(4) COVERED RADIOCOMMUNICATION SERVICE.—The term ‘covered radiocommunication service’ means a radiocommunication service (as defined in the radio regulations of the International Telecommunication Union that are in force as of the date of the enactment of this section (or any successor to such regulations)), except that such term does not include any radionavigation or safety service specifically identified by the Commission as a safety service for aeronautical or maritime transportation.

“(5) GATEWAY STATION.—The term ‘gateway station’ means an earth station or a group of earth stations that—

“(A) supports the routing and switching functions of a system operated under a license granted under subsection (b) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c);

“(B) may also be used for telemetry, tracking, and command transmissions;

“(C) does not originate or terminate communication traffic; and

“(D) is not for the exclusive use of any customer.

“(6) INDIVIDUALLY LICENSED EARTH STATION.—The term ‘individually licensed earth station’ means—

“(A) an earth station (other than a blanket-licensed earth station) that sends a signal to, and receives a signal from—

“(i) a nongeostationary orbit space station or space stations operated under a license granted under subsection (b)(1) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(1); or

“(ii) a geostationary orbit space station or space stations operated under a license granted under subsection (b)(2) or a grant of market access granted under subsection (c)(2); or

“(B) a gateway station.”

(b) RELATION TO OTHER LAW AMENDMENTS.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 309(j)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) for licenses, grants of market access, or authorizations granted under section 346; or”; and

(2) in section 309(k)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “BROADCAST STATION RENEWAL PROCEDURES” and inserting “RENEWAL PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN AUTHORIZATIONS”;;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “, the licensee of a license granted under section 346(b), the grantee of a grant of market access granted under section 346(c), or an entity with authorization granted under section 346(d),” after “broadcast station”;;

(II) by inserting “, grant, or authorization” after “such license”;;

(III) by striking “that station” and inserting “that licensee, grantee, or entity”; and

(IV) by inserting “, grant of market access, or authorization” after “its license”;;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the station” and inserting “in the case of a broadcast station, the station”;;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) in the case of a licensee of a license granted under section 346(b), a grantee of a grant of market access granted under section 346(c), or an entity with authorization granted under section 346(d), the licensee, grantee, or entity has met the requirements of section 346(e);”;

(v) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by inserting “, grantee, or entity” after “licensee”; and

(vi) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by inserting “, grantee, or entity” after “licensee”;

(C) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or the licensee of a license granted under section 346(b), the grantee of a grant of market access granted under section 346(c), or an entity with authorization granted under section 346(d),” after “broadcast station”;

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “of a broadcast station, a licensee of a license granted under section 346(b), a grantee of a grant of market access granted under section 346(c), or an entity with authorization granted under section 346(d)” after “that a licensee”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “, grantee, or entity” after “licensee”; and

(II) by inserting “or 346” after “section 308”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “former licensee” and inserting “former licensee of a broadcast station or such applications for a license, grant of market access, or authorization as may be filed under section 346(b), 346(c), or 346(d) specifying the information of the former licensee, grantee, or entity”; and

(E) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, grant of market access, or authorization” after “licensee”.

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The requirements in the amendments made by this section apply with respect to any application submitted under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of section 346 of the Communications Act of 1934 and any request for renewal or modification submitted under such section, as added by subsection (a), on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself some time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1338, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act, led by the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Over the last several years, the satellite marketplace has changed drastically. Every American now expects

fast, reliable access to the internet no matter where they are, and satellite communications networks play an important role in bridging the digital divide.

Today, new innovations in the satellite marketplace now enable speeds comparable to the other internet service providers. This new and enhanced satellite service is especially important in rural Ohio and other rural areas across America.

For Americans who have never had internet, satellite broadband can enable families to connect with distant relatives, children to complete their homework and receive an education online, and users to access telehealth services.

The new speeds and low latency provided by satellite communications networks are enabled by several advancements in technology.

First, some new satellite communications networks operate in low-Earth orbit, which means their radio signals do not have to travel as far as other satellite communications signals. As a result, communications networks offering low-Earth orbit can provide lower latency services that can deliver a better experience for consumers.

Additionally, some new satellite communications networks have more satellite radio stations in their network than satellite communications networks that were licensed many years ago. In some cases, there are thousands of radios, all of which work together in concert to provide faster, more reliable connectivity service.

Finally, investment and innovation in new satellite communications networks have led to novel proposals to use electromagnetic spectrum in new ways. By their nature, satellite communications networks serve global markets and therefore share the use of electromagnetic spectrum. The complex design and architecture of these satellites, as well as how they utilize spectrum, has led to more advanced satellite service offerings.

However, all of this change has amplified the challenges with the Federal Communications Commission's licensing process. A regulatory process that once contemplated only a handful of applications has seen dozens of applicants seeking new applications, modifications to existing applications, and new uses of spectrum that the old regulatory regime was not designed to address.

To provide needed direction to the FCC and promote competition and innovation, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act is the first legislation in decades to modernize the regulatory framework for licensing commercial satellite communications networks.

H.R. 1338 would bring our licensing framework for satellite communications into the 21st century, especially as we compete against other countries like China that seek to dominate the United States.

The legislation would establish a statutory framework at the FCC that provides a streamlined process for considering new satellite communications licenses, modifying existing ones, and facilitating the deployment of innovative communications technologies.

In addition to bringing next-generation satellite connectivity to Americans and the world, H.R. 1338 would also promote U.S. technological leadership. By creating a regulatory environment that invites investment and rewards innovation, we can turn the United States into the destination of choice for licensing satellite communications systems for providers around the world.

While the use of spectrum must be coordinated internationally, ensuring timely access to predictable, reliable use of shared spectrum in the United States will send a signal that the government wants to be a partner, not a roadblock, to deploying next-generation technologies.

This is key as the United States looks to defend America's technological leadership against China. The Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act will ensure the United States' regulatory process doesn't hold back American innovation. China can act unilaterally to approve changes to their satellite communications system and spectrum usage, which is a far cry from the competitive, market-based spectrum licensing system in the United States.

In order for the government to be a partner and not a roadblock, it must make sure that innovative, new satellite spectrum technologies make it from the lab to orbit in a timely manner. H.R. 1338 will ensure that there is a fair regulatory regime built on an objective, performance-based system that facilitates the investment needed to maintain our technological leadership.

Also, the FCC currently has authority under the Communications Act to attach conditions to licenses for satellite communications systems to ensure licensees are acting in the public interest. This authority has been upheld by the courts.

The Energy and Commerce Committee wants to ensure that the FCC does not become a space traffic cop and try to manage space traffic management functions or provide space situational awareness information. We added rules of construction to clarify that the FCC does not have the authority to be that space traffic cop and to affirm that nothing in H.R. 1338 would expand the existing authority the FCC currently has regarding orbital debris and space safety.

The rules of construction also clarify that nothing in H.R. 1338 grants the FCC the authority to carry out functions provided under 10 U.S.C. 2274 related to the provision of space situational awareness services and information.

The FCC uses its current authority to attach conditions to spectrum licenses relating to orbital debris and



space safety capabilities to prevent harmful interference among satellite systems and avoid granting licenses to potentially unsafe satellite communications systems that would jeopardize space safety and exacerbate orbital debris.

This legislation is good government. It provides statutory direction and boundaries to the FCC rather than allowing it to retrofit old laws for the new marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1338, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1338, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act, or the SAT Streamlining Act.

Within the last decade, satellite capabilities have jumped leaps and bounds. We have seen significant advancements in satellites providing broadband internet and other services to consumers and the public throughout the country and the world. While this is beneficial to all, it is especially helpful to those living in areas where other types of technologies have not been built out yet due to geographic considerations and other factors.

These technological breakthroughs are a positive step forward for our country, but it is evident that other countries, including our foreign adversaries, are also aggressively trying to dominate this industry. It is imperative that Congress act now to retain our country's leadership position in the satellite marketplace.

H.R. 1338 helps to accomplish this goal. This bill will enhance the competitiveness of our Nation's satellite industry by requiring the FCC to set reasonable rules to prevent harmful interference as satellites utilize spectrum to communicate with one another and with base stations on Earth. It does not expand the FCC's jurisdiction over the space industry. Instead, it sets new rules of the road with respect to the licensing of electromagnetic spectrum, which is needed to operate satellite systems.

For instance, it establishes application requirements for the licensing of the spectrum and sets forth the guidelines for how and when the FCC should consider these applications and the timeframes for doing so.

We must implement these solutions to ensure the United States remains competitive with our counterparts across the globe, including China, in producing cutting-edge consumer innovations and fortifying our public safety and national security capabilities.

The Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. Speaker, has traditionally worked in a bipartisan fashion on key telecommunications matters, and I commend Chair RODGERS for continuing this tradition with this legislation. Unfortunately, though, another

bipartisan bill that I led with Chair RODGERS that unanimously passed out of the committee would have directly addressed the threat of adversaries deploying their satellite systems for use by U.S. customers. H.R. 675, the Secure Space Act, would extend the framework Congress adopted in the bipartisan Secure and Trusted Communications Network Act to satellite operators. This framework ensures that foreign adversaries cannot use our communications network for espionage and disruption.

□ 1730

The Energy and Commerce Committee, and then the full Congress passed last year then-Minority Whip SCALISE's bipartisan legislation to extend that framework to the FCC's equipment authorization process.

It surprised and disappointed me that some members of the Republican caucus are objecting to the Secure Space Act—again, a bill passed unanimously out of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Unfortunately, it can't go forward without amendments limiting its scope, and therefore its effect, in keeping unquestionably bad actors from infiltrating our networks.

We should be passing this bill today rather than allowing a small extreme minority in the House Republican caucus to have veto power over a policy that is so important to our national security and that a significant majority of this House favors. It is unfortunate that the Republican majority continues to cave to the extreme elements of their party.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1338, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1338, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act that I am proud to lead with Ranking Member PALLONE.

The SAT Streamlining Act is the first legislation in over two decades to update our laws governing how communications services using satellite technologies are licensed by the FCC.

Satellite communications systems play a pivotal role in closing the digital divide. Yet, the legal framework for licensing new and innovative satellite technologies has not kept pace with the 21st century.

Other adversaries, like China, seek to overtake our lead in developing these next-generation technologies. The SAT Streamlining Act would reform and improve the FCC's process to make the United States the destination of choice for licensing satellite communications systems without expanding the FCC's authority.

Our goal today is to ensure that the FCC does not become a space traffic cop and try to manage space traffic

management functions or provide space situational awareness information. We added rules of construction to clarify the FCC does not have the authority to be the space traffic cop and affirm that nothing in H.R. 1338 would expand the existing authority of the FCC currently regarding orbital debris and space safety.

I will read the Rules of Construction. If you look at the Rules of Construction—this is section 3(A). "Space Situational Awareness Services and Information. Nothing in this subsection, including the rules issued pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), shall be construed to grant the Commission authority to carry out the functions provided under section 2274 of title 10, United States Code . . ."

Then you go to section B: "Space Safety and Orbital Debris. Nothing in this subsection, including the rules issued pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), shall be construed to expand the authority of the Commission to establish requirements for or regulate space safety and orbital debris."

Subsection C. "Authority of Commission Under This Act. Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission with respect to space stations licensed under this Act."

Those are the Rules of Construction.

This legislation today is to provide certainty to satellite operators by setting out clear performance objectives for satellite communications systems.

These changes will ensure that as satellite operators choose a venue for licensing their global systems, the United States' regulatory process is more appealing than other nations.

The SAT Act would establish an expedited review process for approving minor modifications to satellite communications systems, which will get new technologies into space sooner.

Second, the legislation would promote competition among satellite communications providers.

Spectrum access is a necessary component of global satellite communications networks.

Innovation takes place at a rapid speed, and the FCC should have clear guidance from Congress on how to evaluate whether a proposed satellite communications system can share spectrum with other systems to avoid harmful interference.

The SAT Act sets forth a framework that will ensure spectrum is used efficiently and promotes competition and innovation in the satellite communications marketplace.

China is currently working to launch and operate a national constellation similar to the American satellite communications systems.

Unlike our regulatory process, China can move swiftly to approve new technologies in their quest to dominate America and the world.

In order to ensure U.S. licensed systems stay ahead of our competitors, our regulatory environment must keep

pace with industry while continuing to ensure responsible spectrum use.

We began this effort to develop a new licensing framework for the modern era 2 years ago. We have worked with a wide array of stakeholders from the satellite industry. I am pleased we are moving forward today.

We must lead with more innovation, more competition, and better communications services for American homes and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE and all the stakeholders that worked with us over the last few years to create a framework that will promote competition, innovation, and predictability.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of the legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1338, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act. I believe I am joined in this opposition by the chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. LUCAS, and by the chair of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, Mr. BABIN.

Mr. Speaker, with complete respect to the chair and the ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, if this bill were focused solely on regulating electromagnetic spectrum use and improving the spectrum licensing process in the United States, then this would be a very different speech.

Improving the Federal Communications Commission's licensing of spectrum is important. However, H.R. 1338 goes way beyond the FCC's spectrum mission. It would provide unprecedented authority to the FCC to issue rules on "space safety and orbital debris." This is a serious problem and cause for deep concern.

Drafting such rules would only detract and divert attention and resources from the FCC's primary mission of assessing applications for spectrum, actions the bill seeks to strengthen.

The FCC does not have sufficient expertise to issue appropriate rules on space safety or orbital debris.

Further, Federal agencies engage in interagency coordination on orbital debris mitigation based on science and technical research led by NASA.

Rather than follow a cohesive and coordinated approach within the Federal Government, H.R. 1338 would give authority to the FCC to do its own thing and to act unilaterally without participating in the interagency coordination that is necessary to prevent a fragmented government approach toward space activities. On something as important as space safety and orbital debris, this is a troubling thought.

The issue of space safety and orbital debris is a pressing concern. The administration and stakeholders through

two administrations have been coalescing around the Department of Commerce as the lead agency on space safety and related orbital debris activities in coordination with other Federal Government agencies.

Congress has appropriated funding for the Department of Commerce to advance civil space situational awareness and related orbital debris activities. This is a critical time for the U.S. commercial space industry. Clear and predictable roles, responsibilities, and regulatory frameworks from the Federal Government are needed.

Having the FCC regulate space safety and orbital debris mitigation would duplicate efforts and cause confusion, including for our partners, where the U.S. has led internationally. Rather than supporting the continuing growth and leadership of the U.S. in commercial space, and the interagency process within the Department of Commerce, H.R. 1338 risks undermining it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), from Florida's Second District.

Mr. DUNN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the ever-expanding realm of space-based architecture, we have witnessed an unprecedented growth in commercial, academic, and military applications over the past two decades.

As we enter into a new era of space exploration and innovation, it has become imperative for the United States to move at the speed of business, embracing agility and efficiency in our regulatory approach.

The Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act, or SAT Act, represents a transformative step toward ensuring that our regulations keep pace with the dynamic and rapidly evolving satellite communications ecosystem.

This bill directs the FCC to establish new rules for licensing satellite communications systems that describe crucial performance objectives within a defined timeframe of 18 months.

These performance objectives will provide certainty to satellite operators seeking a spectrum license so they understand the requirements they must meet in order to avoid interfering with other space systems.

This bill would also direct the agency to decide on new license applications within 1 year.

The SAT Act provides a streamlined application process for satellite communications providers, and with the goal of promoting U.S. leadership in the satellite communications industry.

During these contentious geopolitical times, the importance of space-based assets for our national security cannot be overstated. Many of these assets are critical to safeguarding our Nation's interests and are extensively utilized for national security applications.

By providing an updated and efficient licensing process, the SAT Act ensures

that these vital space assets remain protected from harmful interference and operation.

With the satellite ecosystem constantly evolving as technologies and innovations come online, it is paramount that regulations governing them are able to keep pace to ensure we remain ahead of our adversaries, especially as the Department of Defense continues to rely on innovations in commercial satellite technology.

We must update Federal regulations so that industry can deliver requirements to the warfighters at the pace that they demand.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my esteemed colleagues to pass the SAT Act, recognizing its potential to drive our Nation's competitiveness in the space domain.

By streamlining regulatory processes, we set the stage for a future where American businesses can contribute to our continued leadership in space.

Let us unite in embracing this transformative legislation, ensuring that the United States remains at the forefront of communications technology and innovation in space.

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened to what Mr. BEYER said, and I know that some of the leadership on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee are opposed to this bill. I will say that despite the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's claims, H.R. 1338, the Satellite And Telecommunications Streamlining Act does not infringe on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's jurisdiction or grant the FCC new authority with respect to space safety and orbital debris.

Instead, this bill streamlines existing FCC licensing procedures so the commercial satellite operators can more easily obtain the necessary spectrum rights to launch their satellite systems into space.

Because the bill deals directly with access to spectrum and the FCC's management of it, this legislation falls squarely within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

To the extent the bill references space safety and orbital debris, it is in the context of ensuring that the FCC acts within the bounds of the rules adopted by the U.S. Government for orbital debris mitigation.

Specifically, the language in the bill simply directs the FCC to align any licensing requirements that it may impose on satellite operators concerning orbital debris and space safety—which it can do today consistent with its existing authority—with the orbital debris and space safety practices established by NASA and others.

Mr. Speaker, mandating such action is good government as it reduces the likelihood of conflicting standards or requirements and ensures that government continues to speak with one voice on these important matters.



□ 1745

Nevertheless, recognizing the Science Committee's concerns, language has now been added to the bill to make it crystal clear that this legislation does not give the FCC any new authority on space safety and orbital debris.

Finally, for those Members suggesting that the Department of Commerce does not support this bill, I want to be clear that this is not true. In reality, the Department of Commerce has not taken a position on this bill.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1338 is a worthwhile bill, I urge all my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1338, the Satellite and Telecommunications Streamlining Act. This bill amends the Communications Act to clarify the Federal Communication Commission's statutory role in licensing satellite communications systems.

While the FCC has long exercised the authority to license satellite systems—and while Congress has recognized this authority—this bill provides further direction on the agency when it comes to balancing and considering novel issues throughout its licensing process.

For example, the FCC can use its current authority to regulate satellite communications systems designed to ensure that related aspects of radio stations in space can continue to serve the public interest. This is on top of using its authority when considering the complex use of electromagnetic spectrum by various satellite systems.

This bill would effectively simplify FCC space station licensing rules, impose FCC licensing decision timelines, and add performance standards to mitigate orbital debris to ensure safe operation in space. It also clarifies FCC radio frequency sharing obligations to encourage innovation and investment.

The bill is very clear. It does not expand the FCC's authority.

In terms of innovation, Mr. Speaker, spectrum is limited. Our adversaries are not hindered by regulations. We need to streamline this.

This bill passed with unanimous bipartisan support out of the Energy and Commerce Committee in March. This is not unprecedented authority for the FCC. In response to my Democrat colleague who claimed this allows the FCC to act unilaterally; that is false.

In fact, this legislation constrains the FCC's authority to issue rules around space safety to be aligned with the orbital debris mitigation plan which is approved by the interagency.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1338 promotes U.S. leadership in the commercial satellite communications industry by creating a regulatory environment that encourages innovation and investment in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something. The Energy and Commerce Committee is all about encouraging innovation and investment in the United States.

This bill helps us to beat China. China is actively working to undermine U.S. leadership in the satellite communications marketplace and provide service to other allies so that they can gather intelligence.

This bill streamlines the process for modifications to existing satellite communications systems. The bill would ensure that modifications to existing satellite communications are not held up unnecessarily by new applications that may be more complex.

The bill also creates a regulatory fast lane for minor modifications that do not change the spectrum interference landscape in a meaningful way.

It incentivizes satellite communications systems to be good stewards of spectrum. By establishing a quantifiable level of protection that defines how each satellite communications system licensed by the FCC may use spectrum, the bill ensures a balance between competition and innovation.

It enhances FCC transparency and efficiency of processing NGSO satellite applications, for example, SpaceX.

The bill would provide direction to the FCC on how their satellite communications licensing rules should be designed.

By creating objective, measurable, and technology-neutral performance objectives, satellite operators will have flexibility to design their systems without government overregulation.

Mr. Speaker, we need H.R. 1338.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill on a bipartisan basis. The committee voted this out, again, on a bipartisan basis. I think it is very important, and I assure my Science Committee colleagues this does not impinge on their jurisdiction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from so many of our speakers this afternoon about how essential H.R. 1338 is to promote effective information sharing, collaboration, and response efforts to establish the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019.

The legislation facilitates the public-private partnerships to develop and im-

plement cybersecurity policies related to the communications networks. By encouraging this collaboration between the government agencies and stakeholders, we can all work together to address the cyber threats and vulnerabilities more effectively.

Again, this piece of legislation passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee. We worked together on this in a bipartisan manner, and with a vote of 44-0, that bill came out of committee. It is a good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1338, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote NO on H.R. 1338, the Satellite and Telecommunications Streamlining Act.

This bill seeks to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of FCC's spectrum licensing, a goal I support. However, the bill, as written, would go well beyond FCC's expertise and mission to regulate spectrum by also seeking to regulate space safety and orbital debris. That is deeply concerning and it is the reason I am in opposition to H.R. 1338.

As Ranking Member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I recognize the importance of maintaining the long-term sustainability of the space environment. U.S. citizens depend on assets in space to support our national security, give us accurate weather forecasts, enable communications services, and so much more. It is essential that we get space safety right.

The space community, including the National Space Council, is coalescing around the Department of Commerce as the lead agency with responsibility for space situational awareness, orbital debris monitoring, and related critical space safety activities.

Setting up a fragmented licensing or certification regime—as I believe this bill, as written, would do—is in no one's interest. It would create confusion and could even harm U.S. economic competitiveness and global leadership in space. For decades, the U.S. has taken a whole-of-government approach to orbital debris, and has actively coordinated on approaches with other nations. This bill would allow the FCC to act on its own in regulating orbital debris mitigation, an approach that would likely confuse and ultimately undermine, rather than strengthen, efforts to reduce and mitigate the risk of orbital debris.

The Chairman of the Science Committee and I are completely aligned in our concerns around this bill. I am committed to continuing the Science Committee's work, on a bipartisan basis, to address the serious threat of orbital debris to the future sustainability of the space environment comprehensively and holistically.

I urge Members to vote NO on H.R. 1338.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCSHON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1338, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### LAUNCH COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 682) to facilitate access to electromagnetic spectrum for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 682

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Launch Communications Act".

#### SEC. 2. ACCESS TO SPECTRUM FOR COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCHES AND REENTRIES.

##### (a) SERVICE RULES; ALLOCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete any proceeding in effect as of such date of enactment related to the adoption of service rules for access to the frequencies described in subsection (c) for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries, including technical specifications, eligibility requirements, coordination procedures to preserve the Nation's defense capabilities, and the allocation on a secondary basis of the frequencies described in subsection (c).

(2) COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION.—The coordination procedures adopted under paragraph (1) shall include requirements for persons conducting commercial space launches and commercial space reentries to coordinate with the Assistant Secretary regarding access to the frequencies described in subsection (c) for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries.

(b) STREAMLINING OF PROCESS FOR GRANTING AUTHORIZATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue new regulations to streamline the process for granting authorizations for access to the frequencies described in subsection (c) for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries so as to provide for—

(1) authorizations that include access to such frequencies for multiple commercial space launches from one or more Federal space launch sites and multiple commercial space reentries to one or more Federal space launch sites;

(2) authorizations that include access to such frequencies for multiple commercial space launches from one or more private space launch sites and multiple commercial space reentries to one or more private space launch sites;

(3) authorizations that include access to multiple uses of such frequencies for commercial space launch or commercial space reentry;

(4) automation of the processes of the Commission to review applications for authorizations for access to such frequencies for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries; and

(5) improved coordination by the Commission with the Assistant Secretary (who shall coordinate with the heads of such other Fed-

eral agencies as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate) to increase the speed of review of applications for authorizations for access to such frequencies for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries.

(c) FREQUENCIES DESCRIBED.—The frequencies described in this subsection are the frequencies between 2025 and 2110 megahertz, between 2200 and 2290 megahertz, between 2360 and 2395 megahertz, and between 5650 and 5925 megahertz.

##### (d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FREQUENCY RANGES.—Each range of frequencies described in this section shall be construed to be inclusive of the upper and lower frequencies in the range.

(2) SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize or require elimination or limitation of, or any amendment to, or otherwise to affect, special temporary authority, as provided for by section 1.931 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

##### (e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term "Assistant Secretary" means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(2) COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH.—The term "commercial space launch" means a launch licensed under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(3) COMMERCIAL SPACE REENTRY.—The term "commercial space reentry" means a reentry licensed under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(4) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 682, the Launch Communications Act led by the gentlemen from Florida's Second and Ninth Districts.

Over the last decade, the American commercial space industry has dramatically reduced the cost to enter space, revolutionizing the industry. Investment has increased, and innovation has flourished. The number of commercial space launches has increased dramatically.

Unfortunately, our Federal processes have not kept pace.

To launch satellites into orbit, launch providers need access to certain radio frequencies, known as spectrum, which requires coordination between several Federal agencies.

H.R. 682 will take important steps to streamline the process for commercial

space launch providers to gain access to the frequencies they need when they need them and ensure that a lack of coordination between Federal agencies does not hamper the thriving commercial space economy.

No space launch should be threatened because approval for their spectrum access is caught up in bureaucratic delay.

This legislation would provide more certainty to commercial satellite operators that when they make the investment in satellite technologies, they will be able to launch them into space.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 682, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 682, the Launch Communications Act.

Over the last decade, we have seen the costs of exploring space drop drastically. As a result, space launches in this country have increased dramatically. In 2013, the FAA authorized eight launches, but by 2022, less than a decade later, the number was 79. The number of space launches from the United States is only expected to increase in the years to come. We must foster and support this growth in order to enhance our national security capabilities and cement our Nation as a global leader in space and other cutting-edge technologies.

Transporting satellites to space cannot happen without launch entities having reliable access to electromagnetic spectrum. Right now the FCC only temporarily allocates spectrum for space launches. Nevertheless, this process is becoming increasingly burdensome given rise in the number of space launches occurring in our country. For the United States to continue its leadership in space, it is imperative that the FCC develop an efficient and effective process to license spectrum for commercial space launches, as well as the space reentries that inevitably must follow.

Now, H.R. 682 addresses these challenges. Specifically, this bill requires the FCC to streamline its process for allocating spectrum usage rights to commercial space launch providers. These efforts will better support these providers as they communicate with their launch vehicles during flight and upon reentry. The bill also directs the FCC to complete a rulemaking proceeding to adopt service rules for the spectrum bands identified in the bill for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Representatives SOTO and DUNN for their bipartisan work on this bill. This important bill helps secure America's leadership in the commercial space industry by strengthening our country's position as a prime destination for launching satellites into space.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in a bipartisan