

yielding time. Mr. TIMMONS is doing an excellent job managing floor time today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our bill, the Skills-Based Federal Contracting Act. The price of admission should not be a 4-year college degree.

At a hearing I held last Congress in the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, a witness from IBM testified that Federal contractors are rarely able to place an individual without a 4-year degree on a technology services contract, regardless of their qualifications. This problem extends beyond technology and service contracts.

Across the Federal Government, many contract solicitations include unnecessary degree requirements, mandating individuals who perform various tasks hold specific education credentials such as 4-year college degrees.

The Federal Government spends hundreds of billions of dollars outsourcing work to millions of contractors to perform the functions of government. This immense purchasing power shapes the entire labor market.

When we embed unnecessary degree requirements into Federal contracting solicitations, we are not just making a hiring decision; we are sending a signal to the entire economy that a college diploma is a prerequisite for economic opportunity.

With less than 40 percent of Americans holding a 4-year college degree, this creates a paper ceiling where talented Americans are excluded from opportunity, regardless of how qualified they may be, simply because they lack a college degree.

The Skills-Based Federal Contracting Act bill would tear through this paper ceiling by prohibiting the Federal Government from including a minimum educational requirement for proposed contractor personnel in a Federal contract solicitation, unless the contracting officer provides a written justification for why the needs of the agency cannot be met without such requirements.

Think about the immense economic value and economic opportunity created in this country by individuals who didn't finish college. These include Mark Zuckerberg, Larry Ellison, and Steve Jobs. Under onerous degree requirements, it would have been nearly impossible for any of these individuals to have been placed on a government contract.

Across the private sector, we have seen companies move to phase out or even eliminate degree requirements, recognizing a college degree does not serve as an effective proxy for competence or skills. It is far past time the Federal Government follows suit.

This bill in no way tells private companies how to hire or who to hire. Rather, it removes unnecessary Federal restrictions on their ability to hire the best qualified Americans who ac-

quired their skills through alternative pathways.

□ 1640

In some cases, required education credentials are warranted. For example, we expect a doctor to have a medical degree, but only a small fraction of Federal contract work falls into these types of categories.

In the case that it does, this bill would simply require a brief justification in writing from a contracting officer before they exclude over 60 percent of American workers who do not have a 4-year degree from the chance to compete.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the lead Democratic cosponsor of this bill, Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, for joining me in this effort.

Skills-based hiring has been a rare area of widespread bipartisan and non-partisan support in Congress. The Skills-Based Federal Contracting Act passed out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on an enormously bipartisan basis by a vote of 44-0.

Together, we can provide all Americans, regardless of whether they studied classic literature in ivory towers, with economic opportunity and the chance to work on behalf of their fellow citizens serving our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this commonsense, non-partisan bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and the patrons for their work on this bill. I urge colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5235, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, which puts merit back into Federal contracts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5235, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ROTORCRAFT OPERATIONS TRANSPARENCY AND OVERSIGHT REFORM ACT

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2503) to require all aircraft to be equipped with Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast In, to improve aviation safety, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2503

*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 "Rotorcraft Operations Transparency and Oversight Reform Act" or the "ROTOR Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(2) ADS-B IN.—The term "ADS-B In" means onboard avionics equipment that receives and processes Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast transmissions that are broadcast in accordance with sections 91.225 and 91.227 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), and other aviation advisory information from ground stations, that provides the aircraft with awareness to the location of other aircraft and traffic advisories.

(3) ADS-B OUT.—The term "ADS-B Out"—(A) has the meaning given such term in section 91.227 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) broadcasts information from the aircraft in accordance with sections 91.225 and 91.227 of such title 14 (or any successor regulations).

(4) AFFECTED AIRCRAFT.—The term "affected aircraft" means any aircraft that is required to operate in accordance with section 91.225 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(5) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(6) CABINET MEMBER.—The term "Cabinet Member" means an individual who is the head (including an acting head) of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, the Department of State, the Department of Transportation, the Department of the Treasury, or the Department of Veterans Affairs, or any other individual who occupies a position designated by the President as a Cabinet-level position.

(7) FAA.—The term "FAA" means the Federal Aviation Administration.

(8) NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION; NCR.—The terms "National Capital Region" and "NCR" mean the geographic area located within the boundaries of—

(A) the District of Columbia;

(B) Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in the State of Maryland;

(C) Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties and the City of Alexandria in the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

(D) all cities and other units of government within the geographic areas described in subparagraphs (A) through (C).

(9) POWERED-LIFT.—The term "powered-lift"—

(A) has the meaning given such term in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

(B) includes vertical-lift flight mode and wing-borne flight mode, as such terms are defined in section 194.103 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(10) ROTORCRAFT.—The term “rotorcraft” has the meaning given such term in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(11) TRANSPORT AIRPLANE.—The term “transport airplane” has the meaning given such term in section 44741(i) of title 49, United States Code.

(12) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.—The term “unmanned aircraft system” has the meaning given such term in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code.

### SEC. 3. REVISION TO EXCEPTION FOR ADS-B OUT TRANSMISSION.

#### (a) ADS-B OUT REFORMS.—

##### (1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) SENSITIVE GOVERNMENT MISSION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this section, in applying section 91.225(f)(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, the term “sensitive government mission” shall be narrowly construed and shall not include routine flights, non-classified flights, proficiency flights, or flights of Federal officials below the rank of Cabinet Member or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(B) NOTIFICATION.—For the purposes of interpreting section 91.225(f)(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, the operating agency shall—

(i) when operating a sensitive government mission during which the aircraft will not be transmitting ADS-B Out, notify Air Traffic Control; and

(ii) notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on the Armed Services of the House of Representatives on a monthly basis regarding each sensitive government mission within Class B airspace operated during such month.

#### (2) RULEMAKING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall—

(i) issue or revise regulations to update section 91.225(f) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, to comply with the requirements of this section; and

(ii) revise any memorandum of agreement between the FAA and any other Federal, State, local, or Tribal agency to conform with the revised regulations described in clause (i), including any agreement pursuant to section 1046 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note).

(B) REPORT.—If the Administrator fails to issue or revise regulations pursuant to subparagraph (A) or revise any memorandum of agreement between the FAA and any other agency pursuant to such subparagraph, the Administrator shall, within 30 days, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of such regulations, including the reasons that the Administrator has failed to issue or revise such regulations within the period required under such subparagraph.

(b) GAO REVIEW AND REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) review the utilization of exceptions under section 91.225(f) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), as revised under subsection (a), to determine—

(A) whether the Department of Defense and other relevant Federal agencies or other applicable operators have utilized such exceptions in accordance with relevant laws and regulations; and

(B) the extent of such utilization;

(2) compare the utilization of exceptions specified in such section 91.225(f) before and after the issuance of revised regulations under subsection (a); and

(3) submit to the Administrator and the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the findings of the review conducted under paragraph (1) and the comparison conducted under paragraph (2).

(c) FAA REVIEW OF NON-COMPLIANT OPERATORS.—Upon submission of the report under subsection (b)(3), the Administrator shall—

(1) determine whether any Federal agency or other applicable operator that has been found to have not utilized the exceptions under section 91.225(f) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), as revised under subsection (a), in accordance with relevant laws and regulations shall be permitted to continue to utilize such exceptions; and

(2) not later than 30 days after the date on which the Comptroller General submits the report under subsection (b)(3), brief the appropriate committees of Congress on such determination.

#### (d) REPORTS.—

(1) TO THE ADMINISTRATOR.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, and on a quarterly basis thereafter, each Federal, State, local, and Tribal agency that performs sensitive government missions as described in section 91.225(f)(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), as revised under subsection (a), shall submit to the Administrator a report that includes—

(A) an attestation that such operations are regularly transmitting ADS-B Out and are conducted with proper consideration to aviation safety;

(B) a list of operations delineated by flight in which the ADS-B Out equipment is not in transmit mode because the aircraft was performing a sensitive government mission, including the airport, airspace location, date, time, duration, and mission type of each such operation; and

(C) with respect to any classified operation, a classified annex.

#### (2) TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and biannually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the frequency and nature of the ADS-B Out exceptions granted to Federal, State, local, and Tribal agencies under section 91.225(f)(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), as revised under subsection (a). Such report—

(i) shall include—

(I) aggregated data on the operations in which ADS-B Out equipment is not in transmit mode by each agency described in paragraph (1); and

(II) a determination from the Administrator as to whether each operation described in paragraph (1)(B) jeopardizes aviation safety; and

(ii) may include a classified annex.

(B) SPECIAL NOTIFICATION.—If an agency described in paragraph (1) operates a flight using an exception granted under section 91.225(f)(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), as revised under subsection (a), 5 or more times in a calendar month, or fails to provide to the Administrator the attestation required under paragraph (1)(A), the Administrator shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of such use within 14 days of being notified of such use. For the purposes of this subparagraph, a flight shall be interpreted as the period beginning when an aircraft moves under its own power for the purpose of flight and ending when the aircraft lands.

#### (e) ANNUAL INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation (in this section referred to as the “Inspector General”) shall conduct an annual audit of FAA oversight of all operations that utilize an exception under section 91.225(f) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), as revised under subsection (a), including Federal agency operations.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting an audit under paragraph (1), the Inspector General shall assess the efficacy of FAA oversight related to the following:

(A) Ensuring exceptions under such section 91.225(f)(1) (or any successor regulation) are strictly utilized by operators in accordance with relevant laws and regulations.

(B) Ensuring exceptions under such section 91.225(f)(1) (or any successor regulation) are not routinely used by operators.

(C) Identifying and engaging with any operator not in compliance with relevant laws and regulations relating to exceptions under such section 91.225(f)(1) (or any successor regulation).

(D) Any other factor determined appropriate by the Inspector General.

(3) BRIEFINGS TO CONGRESS.—The Inspector General shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress on an annual basis after the completion of each annual audit.

### SEC. 4. ADS-B IN REQUIREMENTS.

#### (a) REQUIREMENT FOR ADS-B IN OPERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall issue a final rule in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to require any person operating an aircraft (other than an unmanned aircraft, as defined in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code) required to be equipped with ADS-B Out in accordance with section 91.225 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), to be equipped with and operating with ADS-B In equipment that provides the aircraft with awareness to the location of other aircraft and traffic advisories, unless otherwise authorized by air traffic control.

(2) COMPLIANCE DEADLINES.—In issuing a final rule under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall—

(A) include an effective date of not later than 60 days after the date on which such final rule is published in the Federal Register; and

(B) require aircraft described in paragraph (1) to be equipped with ADS-B In not later than December 31, 2031.

(3) FINAL REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.—In issuing a final rule under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall, at a minimum, do the following:

(A) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall establish appropriate performance requirements for ADS-B In equipment to provide integrated safety-enhancing capabilities for a pilot or other flight crew, including by increasing situational awareness to the location of other aircraft and providing traffic advisories with alerting sufficient to provide traffic advisory indications while airborne and on the airport surface, such as visual and aural advisories.

(B) ALTERNATIVE EQUIPMENT OR TECHNOLOGY.—With respect to aircraft with a maximum certificated takeoff weight of less than 12,500 pounds when operating under part 91 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, and qualifying military aircraft as specified by the Administrator in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator shall establish performance requirements for

alternative equipment or technology that the Administrator determines acceptable in satisfying the ADS-B In requirement. The performance requirements shall, at a minimum—

(i) provide similar or improved situational awareness to the location of other airborne traffic, as well as traffic advisory information; and

(ii) leverage the use of portable ADS-B In receivers or equipment that allow display on an existing or future electronic flight bag or panel mounted display, provided that the installation or use of such equipment does not adversely affect other required avionics or the airworthiness of the aircraft.

(C) **REQUIRED BRIEFING.**—The Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, on at least a monthly basis, regarding the alternative equipment or technology for qualifying military aircraft prior to determining that such equipment or technology is acceptable to satisfy the ADS-B In requirement.

(D) **GUIDANCE.**—The Administrator shall issue relevant guidance for aircraft operators and other appropriate stakeholders regarding the types of equipment that satisfy the performance requirements described in this paragraph.

(4) **OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—In issuing a final rule under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall include—

(A) requirements for ADS-B In equipment and the use of such equipment;

(B) technical assistance to facilitating ADS-B In equipage across the entire fleet of affected aircraft, including, as appropriate, guidance under part 26 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide support for affected transport airplane operators in complying with the requirements of this section;

(C) any other associated guidance necessary to assist operators and other stakeholders in identifying equipment that satisfies the ADS-B In performance standards described in paragraph (3) prior to the compliance deadline described in paragraph (2)(B);

(D) a determination of alternative equipment or technology described in subsection (e); and

(E) a presumption, absent clear and compelling evidence to the contrary, that ADS-B In equipment is cost beneficial and improves aviation safety.

(5) **CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFINGS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and every 90 days thereafter, the Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress, as well as publish a publicly available report, on the status of—

(A) the ADS-B In rulemaking required under paragraph (1); and

(B) after the compliance deadline described in paragraph (2)(A), the implementation and oversight of such ADS-B In requirement.

(b) **NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator may establish a negotiated rulemaking committee (in this section referred to as the “committee”) pursuant to section 565 of title 5, United States Code, to negotiate proposed regulations to implement the requirements described in subsection (a).

(B) **MEMBERSHIP.**—If the Administrator elects to establish a committee under this subsection, the committee shall be composed of—

- (i) representatives of—
  - (I) the FAA;
  - (II) air carriers;
  - (III) avionics manufacturers;

(IV) aircraft manufacturers; and

(V) general aviation organizations;

(ii) the exclusive bargaining representative of air traffic controllers of the FAA certified under section 7511 of title 5, United States Code;

(iii) organizations representing certified collective bargaining representatives of airline pilots, including the principal organization representing the largest certified collective bargaining representative of airline pilots;

(iv) aviation safety experts outside of the FAA; and

(v) any other representatives determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(C) **REQUIRED CONSULTATION.**—In establishing a committee under this subsection, the Administrator—

(i) shall consult with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(ii) may consult with other Federal agencies as appropriate.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—If the Administrator elects to establish a committee under this subsection, the Administrator shall do the following:

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall direct the committee to make recommendations relating to—

(i) ADS-B In equipment and its use;

(ii) ADS-B In equipment performance standards pursuant to subsection (a)(3);

(iii) the consideration of effective approaches to facilitating ADS-B In equipage across the entire fleet of affected aircraft, including requirements under part 26 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide support for affected transport category airplane operators in complying with the requirements of this section; and

(iv) with respect to aircraft with a maximum certificated takeoff weight of less than 12,500 pounds when operating under part 91 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, a recommendation for low cost alternative equipment or technology in accordance with subsection (e).

(B) **LACK OF COMMITTEE CONSENSUS.**—In the event the committee does not reach a consensus regarding a recommendation for low cost alternative equipment or technology under subparagraph (A)(iv), the Administrator shall, after the submission of the committee under paragraph (3), consider prescribing a low cost alternative that includes the criteria described in subsection (e).

(3) **SUBMISSION TO THE ADMINISTRATOR.**—If the Administrator elects to establish a committee under this subsection, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the committee shall submit to the Administrator—

(A) a consensus proposal of regulations to implement the requirement described in subsection (a)(1); or

(B) in the event the committee does not reach a consensus, a report identifying any points of agreement and disagreement with respect to such proposed regulations.

(4) **PROPOSED RULE.**—If the Administrator elects to establish a committee under this subsection, not later than 180 days after receiving the submission of the committee under paragraph (3), the Administrator shall issue a proposed rule, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, that either—

(A) to the maximum extent possible consistent with the legal obligations of the FAA, uses the consensus proposal of the committee under paragraph (3)(A) as the basis for the proposed rule for notice and comment, including with respect to any standards or requirements described in subsection (a)(3); or

(B) in the event the committee does not reach a consensus, considers the points of agreement and disagreement submitted by the committee under paragraph (3)(B).

(c) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED WITHOUT NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.**—If the Administrator does not establish a committee under subsection (b), prior to issuing a final rule, the Administrator shall consult with appropriate stakeholders in conducting the rulemaking required under subsection (a)(1), including at a minimum the representatives described in subsection (b)(1)(B).

(d) **PHASED-IN RETROFIT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In issuing a final rule under subsection (a)(1), the Administrator shall—

(A) establish a process by which the operator of an affected aircraft, in service as of the date on which the final rule under subsection (a)(1) is published in the Federal Register in accordance with subsection (a)(2)(A), may apply to the Administrator to request additional time, not to exceed a period of 1 year after the deadline described in subsection (a)(2)(B), to finalize equipage of its fleet and make ADS-B In operational, provided that—

(i) an aircraft operator, owner, or their agent submits an application deemed acceptable to the Administrator for additional time for compliance, including a justification for such request and an attestation of actions to date demonstrating progress toward achieving compliance;

(ii) the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, determines additional time is required to mitigate a significant disruption to air transportation; and

(iii) the Administrator determines the aircraft operator or owner does not have any uncorrected violations of subchapters F and G of chapter I of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) notify the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 14 days after making a determination under clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A).

(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR AGENTS.**—With the exception of an agent representing an owner or operator of transport airplanes, for the purposes of this subsection, an agent may represent more than 1 aircraft operator or owner of the same type, model, or manufacturer and may submit 1 or more applications under paragraph (1)(A)(i), each of which may contain multiple aircraft operators or owners.

(e) **LOW COST ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF COMPLIANCE.**—In issuing a final rule under subsection (a)(1), the Administrator shall determine low cost equipment or technologies that provide similar or improved situational awareness to the location of other airborne traffic, as well as traffic advisory information, that satisfy the ADS-B In equipage requirement for aircraft with a maximum certificated takeoff weight of less than 12,500 pounds when operated under part 91 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations. In making such a determination, the Administrator shall consider the use of—

(1) portable ADS-B In receivers; and

(2) equipment that allows display on an existing or future electronic flight bag or panel mounted display, provided the installation or use does not adversely affect other required avionics or the airworthiness of the aircraft.

(f) **PROACTIVE EQUIPAGE.**—With respect to any aircraft for which ADS-B In equipment is available and complies with the requirements of the final rule issued under subsection (a)(1), the operator of any such aircraft shall take all appropriate actions necessary to equip such aircraft with ADS-B In prior to the compliance deadline described in subsection (a)(2).

(g) SEPARATION STANDARDS; RELEVANT CONTROLLER TRAINING.—

(1) RULEMAKING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the final rule described in subsection (a), the Administrator shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to establish separation standards, as appropriate, that leverage ADS-B Out or ADS-B In equipment, and all other available technological capabilities in the air traffic control system, to achieve safety and efficiency benefits throughout the national airspace system, including on an airport surface and within Class E airspace (as defined in section 71.71 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation).

(B) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the rulemaking under this subsection, the Administrator shall consult with appropriate stakeholders, including, at a minimum—

(i) representatives of—

(I) air carriers;

(II) original equipment manufacturers; and

(III) general aviation organizations;

(ii) organizations representing certified collective bargaining representatives of airline pilots, including the principal organization representing the largest certified collective bargaining representative of airline pilots;

(iii) the exclusive bargaining representative of air traffic controllers of the FAA certified under section 7111 of title 5, United States Code;

(iv) aviation safety experts from outside the FAA; and

(v) any other stakeholder deemed appropriate by the Administrator.

(2) REQUIRED UPDATES TO FAA ORDERS.—Not later than 18 months after the issuance of the notice of proposed rulemaking under paragraph (1)(A), the Administrator shall complete revisions, as appropriate, to FAA Order 7110.65 and other relevant FAA Orders, to increase safety and efficiency benefits in the national airspace system.

(3) RELEVANT CONTROLLER TRAINING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the compliance deadline described in subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall revise initial and recurrent air traffic controller training, as appropriate, in accordance with FAA Orders 3000.22 and 3120.4 and revise associated orders and directives, as appropriate, to ensure such controllers are trained to apply any new separation standards and procedures.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In revising training under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall—

(i) consider human factors impacts, appropriate phraseology adjustments, and surface movement applications; and

(ii) consult with the exclusive bargaining representative of air traffic controllers of the FAA certified under section 7111 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) ACAS-X ACTION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an action plan for advancing the deployment of the Airborne Collision Avoidance System-X (in this section referred to as “ACAS-X”), or any variant or successor technology, in the national airspace system. The Administrator shall publish the action plan in a publicly available format not later than 10 days after submitting such action plan to Congress.

(2) CONTENTS.—In developing the action plan under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall include—

(A) a strategic roadmap for the deployment of ACAS-X technology, including steps required for widespread adoption among air-

craft operators (including rotorcraft operators);

(B) actions and funding necessary to complete any applicable research, development, testing, evaluation, and standards development needed to support the certification of such technology;

(C) plans for engagement with appropriate stakeholders, including—

(i) aircraft operators, including those in the Department of Defense;

(ii) aviation safety experts outside the FAA;

(iii) avionics manufacturers;

(iv) aircraft manufacturers;

(v) general aviation organizations;

(vi) the exclusive bargaining representative of air traffic controllers of the FAA certified under section 7511 of title 5, United States Code;

(vii) organizations representing certified collective bargaining representatives of airline pilots, including the principal organization representing the largest certified collective bargaining representative of airline pilots; and

(viii) any other stakeholders determined appropriate by the Administrator;

(D) engagement with foreign civil aviation authorities to harmonize international standards for certification of such technology;

(E) ACAS-X interoperability considerations for aircraft operators (including rotorcraft operators) equipped with ADS-B Out and ADS-B In equipment;

(F) an assessment of safety benefits for aircraft operators equipping with such technology, including civil and military operators; and

(G) any recommendations for administrative or legislative action, as determined appropriate by the Administrator, to advance such technology deployment.

(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator may take actions, as appropriate, to implement the action plan developed under paragraph (1).

(4) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administrator submits the action plan under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress on the contents of such action plan and any prospective actions to implement such plan.

(i) ARAC TASKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall task the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the “ARAC”) with reviewing and assessing the need for aircraft operating in Class D airspace to be equipped with ADS-B Out and ADS-B In equipment.

(2) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after initiating the review and assessment under this section, the ARAC shall submit to the Administrator—

(A) a report on the findings of the review and assessment under paragraph (1); and

(B) any recommendations for legislative or regulatory action the ARAC determines appropriate.

(3) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the ARAC submits the report under paragraph (2), the Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress on—

(A) the findings and recommendations included in such report; and

(B) any plan to implement such recommendations, including a justification for any recommendations the Administrator determines should not be implemented.

**SEC. 5. REPEAL OF MANNED ROTARY WING AIRCRAFT SAFETY PROVISIONS.**

Section 373(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 is repealed, and Chapter 157 of title 10, United

States Code, shall be applied as if the amendments made by such section had not been enacted.

**SEC. 6. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE ARMY AUDIT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Inspector General of the Army shall initiate an audit to evaluate the Army’s coordination with the FAA, pilot training, and qualification standards, and the Army’s use of ADS-B Out and whether it adheres to Army policy, regulation, and law.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—In conducting the audit required by subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Army shall assess practices and recommendations for the Army, including—

(1) whether Army policy and United States law was adhered to, and the Army’s coordination with the FAA, during National Capital Region (“NCR”) operations of pilot training and qualifications standards in the NCR;

(2) the Army’s policy on ADS-B Out equipment, usage, and activation;

(3) maintenance protocols for UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters operated by the 12th Army Aviation Brigade including, but not limited to, the calibration of any system that transmits altitude and position information outside the aircraft and the calibration of systems that send altitude and position information to the pilots inside the aircraft, and the frequency with which such maintenance protocols occur;

(4) compliance with the September 29, 2021, Letter of Agreement executed between the Pentagon Heliport Air Traffic Control Tower and the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Air Traffic Control Tower regarding flight operations in the NCR; and

(5) the Army’s review of loss of separation incidents involving its rotorcraft in the NCR along with possible mitigations to prevent future mishaps.

(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Not later than 14 days after the audit required by subsection (a) is concluded, the Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) transmit a report on the results of the audit, without redactions, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) publicly release the report without redactions, except to the extent required for national security reasons.

(d) INTERIM REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after initiating the audit required by subsection (a), and every 180 days thereafter until such audit is concluded, the Inspector General of the Army shall brief the committees of Congress described in subsection (c)(1) regarding the progress of such audit.

**SEC. 7. SAFETY REVIEWS OF AIRSPACE.**

(a) FAA-DOD COORDINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish or designate an office within the FAA as the “Office of FAA-DOD Coordination” (in this section referred to as the “Office”), which shall—

(1) coordinate airspace usage of military aircraft and rotorcraft with relevant FAA lines of business, including the Air Traffic Organization;

(2) coordinate with the Office of Audit and Evaluation of the FAA to ensure employee complaints and whistleblower protections are considered;

(3) consider opportunities to improve management and consolidation of aviation safety information system databases to enhance

civil and military aviation incident reporting; and

(4) carry out the safety review required by subsection (b).

(b) SAFETY REVIEWS.—

(1) REVIEW OF RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Office is established or designated, the Administrator shall initiate a safety review of all military, law enforcement, and civilian rotary wing, powered lift, fixed wing, and unmanned aircraft system flight operations and flight routes in the Washington D.C. Metropolitan Area Special Flight Rules Area, including but not limited to flight operations conducted by the Department of Defense, emergency response providers, and air medical transport operators, to evaluate any associated safety risk to commercial transport airplane operations at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

(B) CONSULTATION.—In conducting a safety review under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall consult with—

- (i) the Secretary of Defense;
- (ii) Federal, State, and local agencies;
- (iii) law enforcement agencies;
- (iv) emergency response providers, including air medical transport operators;
- (v) air carriers;
- (vi) aviation labor organizations, including, at a minimum—

(I) the exclusive bargaining representative of air traffic controllers of the FAA certified under section 7511 of title 5, United States Code; and

(II) organizations representing certified collective bargaining representatives of airline pilots, including the principal organization representing the largest certified collective bargaining representative of airline pilots; and

(vii) other stakeholders determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(2) OTHER AIRPORT REVIEWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall conduct safety reviews of all military, law enforcement and civilian rotary wing, powered lift, fixed wing, and unmanned aircraft system flight operations and flight routes at other Class B airports (as listed in section 1 of Appendix D to part 91 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) and within the lateral boundary of Class B airspace, at commercial service Class C airports (as listed in FAA Order JO 7400.11J (or any successor order)) and within the lateral boundary of Class C airspace in the national airspace system, and at Class D airports that provide passenger service under part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, determined to meet the risk criteria set forth in subparagraph (C), including flight operations conducted by the Department of Defense, emergency response providers, and air medical transport operators, to evaluate any associated safety risk to commercial transport airplane operations.

(B) CONSULTATION.—In conducting a safety review under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall consult with—

- (i) the Secretary of Defense;
- (ii) Federal, State, local, and Tribal agencies;
- (iii) law enforcement agencies;
- (iv) emergency response providers;
- (v) air carriers;
- (vi) aviation labor organizations, including, at a minimum—

(I) the exclusive bargaining representative of air traffic controllers of the FAA certified under section 7511 of title 5, United States Code; and

(II) organizations representing certified collective bargaining representatives of airline pilots, including the principal organiza-

tion representing the largest certified collective bargaining representative of airline pilots; and

(vii) other stakeholders determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(C) PRIORITIZATION AND RISK CRITERIA.—In prioritizing the safety reviews of Class B, Class C, and Class D airports described in subparagraph (A) and conducting the safety reviews pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall, at a minimum, consider the following risk criteria:

(i) The type of airspace the airport is located in and the type of tower at the airport.

(ii) Whether the airport has radar on the field.

(iii) The total number of air traffic operations at the airport per calendar year, as reported in the Operations Network (OPSNET) data of the FAA, and the rate of growth measured over a 20-year period prior to the initiation of a safety review under this section.

(iv) The Traffic Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) resolution advisory rates at the airport compared to the number of arrivals at the airport.

(v) The presence of parallel runways.

(vi) The presence of visual flights (in this subparagraph referred to as “VFR”) corridors in proximity to the airport.

(vii) The presence of a helicopter corridor in proximity to the airport or nearby helicopter operations.

(viii) The presence of dense VFR operations at the airport.

(ix) The presence of complex VFR procedures at the airport or in the adjacent airspace.

(D) DEADLINE OF INITIATION OF REVIEWS.—The Administrator shall initiate the reviews under this paragraph by the following deadlines:

(i) CLASS B AIRPORTS.—With respect to Class B airports, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section.

(ii) CLASS C AIRPORTS.—With respect to Class C airports, not later than 90 days after the initiation date of the Class B airport reviews.

(iii) CLASS D AIRPORTS.—With respect to Class D airports, not later than 90 days after the initiation date of the Class C airport reviews.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the safety reviews required by paragraphs (1) and (2), the Office shall do the following:

(A) Analyze air traffic and airspace management.

(B) Evaluate the level of coordination the Administrator exercises with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of any other Federal agencies, and emergency response providers as appropriate, to inform the designation and approval of airspace use and flight routes for non-transport airplane operations.

(C) Assess any risks posed to transport airplanes from military aircraft and rotorcraft, civil rotorcraft, powered lift aircraft, and unmanned aircraft systems operating in Class B, Class C, or Class D airspace in proximity to Class B, Class C, or Class D airports.

(D) Review relevant incidents submitted to the Administrator through Air Traffic Mandatory Occurrence reports (as documented via FAA Form 7210-13), Aviation Safety Reporting System reports, and Aviation Safety Action Program reports, and relevant reports submitted to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through the Aviation Safety Reporting System, to identify any safety trends regarding the operation of military aircraft and rotorcraft, civil rotorcraft, powered lift aircraft, and unmanned aircraft systems in Class B, Class C, or Class D airspace near Class B, Class C, or Class D airports.

(4) DEADLINES FOR COMPLETION OF SAFETY REVIEWS.—

(A) RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.—The Administrator shall complete the safety review required by paragraph (1) not later than 120 days after the date on which such review is initiated.

(B) OTHER AIRPORTS.—The Administrator shall complete a safety review required by paragraph (2) not later than 180 days after such review is initiated.

(5) REPORTS.—

(A) REVIEW OF RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completing the safety review required by paragraph (1), the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the analyses and results of such review, together with relevant findings and recommendations, including any corrective action plans to address any risks identified, and recommendations for legislative or administrative action determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(B) OTHER AIRPORT REVIEWS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, and every 6 months thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the analyses and results of the safety reviews completed pursuant to paragraph (2) since the preceding report under this subparagraph (or, in the case of the first such report, since such date of enactment), together with relevant findings and recommendations, including any corrective action plans to address any risks identified, and recommendations for legislative or administrative actions determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(6) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate a person within the Senior Executive Service of the FAA to be directly responsible for the completion of the requirements of this subsection.

(7) STAFFING.—The Administrator shall ensure adequate staffing to conduct the safety reviews within the deadlines specified in this section.

#### SEC. 8. FAA-DOD SAFETY INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) MOU WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Secretary of the Army to permit, as appropriate, the sharing of information from the Army’s Safety Management Information System with the FAA, as well as the sharing of information from the FAA’s Aviation Safety Information Analysis and Sharing System, Operational Analysis Reporting System, Safety Trend Analytics Dashboard, Aviation Risk Identification and Assessment Program, Comprehensive Electronic Data Analysis and Reporting Tool, and Falcon tool with the Army, to facilitate communications and analysis of any applicable impacts to the safety and efficiency of civil aviation operations and to mitigate risk in the national airspace system.

(b) OTHER DOD MOUS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the following military departments to permit, as appropriate, the sharing of information from applicable aviation safety information systems to facilitate communications and analysis of any applicable impacts to the safety and efficiency of civil aviation operations and to mitigate risk in the national airspace system:

- (1) The Department of the Navy.
- (2) The Department of the Air Force.
- (3) The Coast Guard.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the

Administrator enters into any Memorandum of Understanding under subsection (a) or (b), the Administrator shall notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 9. TREATMENT OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b) of section 1046 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), the Memorandum of Agreement Between the Department of Defense and the FAA entered into on May 10, 2024, is deemed to be notice jointly submitted to the appropriate congressional committees for purposes of such subsection and subsection (a) of such section shall cease to be effective as of such date.

**(b) UPDATE AND EFFECT OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—**

(1) UPDATE.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense shall update the memorandum of understanding described in subsection (a) consistent with regulations issued by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration pursuant to section 3(a)(2).

(2) EFFECT OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—The memorandum of agreement described in subsection (a) shall remain in force subject to—

(A) any modifications made jointly by the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense;

(B) termination by either such Secretary; or

(C) modification or termination by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. GRAVES. 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 in the RECORD on S. 2503.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, aviation has been in my blood for my entire life, and it continues to be something that I love very much.

In the middle of my family farm in Tarkio, Missouri, is the Gould Peterson Municipal Airport, which is named after my uncle. Growing up, when my brother and I weren't doing chores on the farm, we would do anything we could at the airport just to mooch a ride. That love of aviation and being a professional pilot has never left me.

When I came to Congress in 2001, I joined the Transportation Committee to work on these issues, and it has been extremely rewarding. Being a pilot has provided me with an invaluable insight into these issues.

Throughout the years, I have worked on several pieces of legislation that addressed safety gaps following unimaginable tragedies. Every aviation accident typically has multiple contributing factors. Too often, I have seen Congress act prematurely and in a way that fails to address multilayered causes of accidents in a comprehensive and consensus-driven manner, in some instances to the detriment of fostering sound safety policy that prevents unintended consequences.

That is why I have long believed that the best way to honor victims of aviation accidents is for Congress to wait until the NTSB completes its investigation so that Congress first has all the facts.

On January 29, 2025, an Army helicopter collided with an American Airlines flight while on final approach to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. The fatal collision claimed the lives of all 67 passengers and crew in both aircraft.

The NTSB, along with their Federal partners and law enforcement agencies, jumped into action that cold January night. Over the last year, the NTSB carried out one of the most impressive and comprehensive investigations that I have seen, and I thank the NTSB for their dedicated work over the past year.

The NTSB officially concluded its investigation and issued its final report last week, including numerous findings, the probable cause, and 50 recommendations to ensure that this doesn't occur again.

It is my deeply rooted respect for the NTSB's investigations and processes that has led me to believe that S. 2503 does not sufficiently or properly address the findings and recommendations of the Board.

That is why, last Friday, I joined together with Transportation Committee Ranking Member RICK LARSEN, Armed Services Committee Chairman ROGERS, and Armed Services Committee Ranking Member SMITH to introduce the ALERT Act.

The ALERT Act is a comprehensive package of improvements that addresses all 50 safety recommendations issued by the NTSB. Unlike the bill before us today, the ALERT Act tackles all the identified root causes that led to this deadly crash.

Unfortunately, the ROTOR Act, or this piece of legislation, touches on only two of the NTSB's 50 recommendations and provides an overly prescriptive approach to mandating a specific technology, which is still largely under development, in a manner that can prove burdensome to some operators and create burdens to its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that we have been down this road before. We have been in this position before. Congress mandated the exact technology prescribed in the ROTOR Act in 2012. Due to the lack of maturity of the technology and scalable ap-

plications that can benefit a broad range of operators, the mandate proved to be so unworkable that the body had to repeal that mandate in 2018.

Sadly, many of the considerations that led Congress to repeal that mandate still exist today. Don't just take my word for it. Listen to the words of an NTSB Board member, who said in their final report: "While we laud ADS-B systems as an emerging technology in commercial fixed-wing and rotorcraft aviation that could have prevented this accident, it is still exactly that, an emerging technology. There are still technological barriers to implementing ADS-B In into the 5,500 commercial aircraft that are in the skies at any given moment."

Mr. Speaker, let me be extremely clear. As a pilot myself, I unequivocally support the adoption of safety enhancement technologies, and I want to get this right. Ultimately, any successful directive or mandate from Congress will be calculated, scalable, and future-proof, not a blanket mandate that limits the aviation community to one technology. We tried this before, and it failed, leading to no tangible safety benefit.

Mr. Speaker, my greatest fear is that passage of this legislation today in its current form will unintentionally lead to an operational crisis in 2031 and force future Congresses to have the same debate on the need to repeal another unworkable government mandate.

It is that concern that informed the approach that we took in the bipartisan ALERT Act. By implementing a performance-based and technology-agnostic approach, aircraft would be able to be equipped with the appropriate collision mitigation system, thereby enhancing awareness for all.

Mr. Speaker, while I rise in opposition to this bill, I know that all Members of this body across the Capitol have a shared priority, and that is commitment to aviation safety. It was that shared priority that brought us together last Congress to pass the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024, which was a landmark piece of legislation that is improving aviation safety and providing benefits to the flying public.

Here in the House, we will continue our legislative effort around the bipartisan ALERT Act to ensure that all NTSB recommendations are addressed, and that is coming.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last month marked the 1-year anniversary of the D.C. midair collision where a U.S. Army Black Hawk helicopter collided with American Airlines Flight 5342 near Washington National Airport, or DCA, tragically claiming all 67 lives aboard both aircraft.

It was the first mass-casualty commercial plane accident in the United

States in nearly 16 years and marked the end of one of the longest streaks without such an accident in U.S. history.

□ 1650

This devastating accident is a stark reminder that we have to remain vigilant in our pursuit of aviation safety. More can always be done to make air travel safer. We owe it to the victims, to their families, and to the flying public to leave no stone unturned and to learn every lesson we can.

I thank the friends and families of the victims. Their presence keeps loved ones' memories alive, and their advocacy reminds us to focus on this unwavering pursuit of improving aviation safety.

After the D.C. accident, the National Transportation Safety Board started its thorough investigation. Like every accident, the House waited for the NTSB's final report and recommendations. Now, we do that deliberately to give the agency's investigators the room to pursue every lead and vet every theory, especially when it comes to complex accidents.

This patience proved to be prudent. For instance, the hypothesis that ADS-B In coupled with the right interface could have given more warning was in fact correct.

However, some of the NTSB's initial theories about ADS-B Out usage were ultimately not included as part of the probable cause.

Allowing NTSB investigators to pull on threads and test their theories is important, and it is why the House did not rush an investigation but instead allowed for the final conclusions from the entire Board.

When it comes to the ROTOR Act, I appreciate the urgency to act on the safety gaps in our aviation system. Although I disagree with the ROTOR Act's approach and have concerns about how it executes, both the ROTOR Act and the ALERT Act—the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Armed Services' response to the D.C. accident—seek to respond to this tragedy in their own ways.

While I know some have attempted to pit the bills against each other, suggesting there could only be one right bill to respond to the tragedy, we all do want the same thing. As the chair of the full committee said, we want to make our skies safer.

The ROTOR Act responded first before the NTSB's investigation was complete. As a result, it only addresses a few of NTSB's final 50 recommendations. All of the NTSB's recommendations are important and deserve to be considered by Congress and implemented by the respective Federal agencies. Bypassing the House's regular order and forcing the ROTOR Act through this typically deliberative process doesn't get us to this goal.

That brings me to the ALERT Act, the comprehensive bipartisan House re-

sponse to the NTSB's recommendations on the D.C. midair collision. Chair GRAVES of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Chair ROGERS of the Committee on Armed Services, Ranking Member SMITH, and I introduced this bill.

The ALERT Act was bipartisan from its inception and emerged from productive and good-faith collaboration between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Armed Services.

It also builds on the ROTOR Act's momentum and tackles many of the issues the ROTOR Act does not address. For instance, the ROTOR Act's ADS-B In mandate doesn't apply to military aircraft since the FAA Administration equipment requirements don't apply to military aircraft. The ALERT Act does.

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure purposely partnered with the House Committee on Armed Services to make sure that both the FAA and the Department of Defense have strong ADS-B requirements. The D.C. midair tragedy involved both the FAA and the DOD. Consequently, the solution needs to involve both of the committees.

Through that partnership, the ALERT Act is truly comprehensive. It works to address all 50 recommendations.

Now, the excellent work of the NTSB investigators provided a thorough report that identified many—not just one—goals which Congress has to now pursue. The ALERT Act is the necessary response and narrowly focuses on the NTSB recommendations. Each provision can be tied to one or more of the NTSB recommendations and corresponding findings.

To the critics of the ALERT Act, I just say that legislating is a collaborative process. A bill is introduced as a draft until it is passed, and until then, all feedback is welcome.

Upon introduction, we immediately requested that the NTSB and FAA provide feedback, and we have solicited stakeholder input from many folks to ensure that we get the ALERT Act's swift implementation. We are still getting feedback. The ALERT Act works to address all of the NTSB recommendations. These recommendations deserve full consideration by Congress.

In the meantime, the ROTOR Act and the vote before us this week address just a small percentage of these recommendations.

Now, the NTSB has nearly 200 outstanding aviation recommendations, dating back to the year 2000. If the ROTOR Act passes as is, all we are doing is adding 45 or more recommendations to this long list that Congress has already not acted on.

If the Speaker can, in fact, promise the Senate that the Senate gets a vote on their bill—that only partially addresses the tragedy—then I certainly hope the Office of the Speaker can

promise a floor vote on the one bipartisan joint committee House bill that comprehensively addresses all of the issues.

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

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

The bill before us today is a flawed response to last year's tragic midair collision at Reagan National. First and foremost, this bill will undermine our national security.

The Department of War just released the following statement regarding the bill: "As currently drafted, enactment [of this bill] would create significant unresolved budgetary burdens and operational security risks affecting national defense activities."

Let's talk about those operational security risks. The ROTOR Act requires ADS-B, which is a beacon signal, In and Out to be transmitted on all aircraft in the national airspace, including Department of War aircraft performing sensitive missions.

ADS-B systems transmit information on the location, speed, and direction of aircraft over unencrypted, open channels. Websites like FlightAware then post that information for all the world to see.

Since 2018, certain military aircraft have been exempt from broadcasting that information pursuant to a memorandum of agreement between the FAA and the Pentagon. The ROTOR Act overrides that MOA with the FAA rule-making. The FAA, not the Pentagon or our military commanders, will have the final say on which military aircraft must be equipped with ADS-B and when it must be turned on. That is unacceptable.

Requiring our fighters, bombers, and highly classified assets to regularly broadcast their location puts our men and women in uniform at risk by exposing operational planning, aircraft details, and patterns of life to our adversaries.

Now, we can all agree that certain military aircraft should be equipped with and transmit the ADS-B signal, especially in congested civilian airspace. Fortunately, the current MOU already provides for that. At this time, nearly all Army helicopters flying in congested airspace are equipped with ADS-B Out and have been instructed to transmit.

The problem is the ROTOR Act goes much further than these aircraft, undermining the operational security of our fighters, bombers, and aircraft on classified missions. For obvious reasons, we do not want our enemies to know where our bombers or fighters are or where they are headed.

Beyond the serious national security impacts of the ROTOR Act, the bill fails to address nearly 90 percent of the recommendations made by the NTSB.

Over 40 critical air safety recommendations are left out of this bill. This includes important recommendations for the Department of War, such as increased coordination between the military and the FAA on aircraft safety matters, better safety management systems and reporting for military aircraft, and enhanced training for military pilots operating in congested airspace.

All of these flaws can be easily fixed if the committees of jurisdiction in the House are afforded the opportunity to follow regular order and consider an alternative bill.

I have joined Chairman GRAVES and Ranking Members LARSEN and SMITH to introduce the bipartisan ALERT Act that will fix the flaws of the ROTOR Act, but our legislation goes much farther than the ROTOR Act to improve aviation safety by addressing all 50 of the NTSB recommendations. It will also ensure our military can continue to carry out sensitive operations that are crucial to our defense and to our Nation.

The Department of War is requesting these changes be made before the ROTOR Act is signed into law. If we defeat this bill, we can have the ALERT Act on the floor the very next day. We can reconcile the differences with the Senate and get the bill to the President the next week.

The House of Representatives should not send a bill to the President that has no input from the House, especially a bill this impactful to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose the bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2503, the ROTOR Act.

Last year's January 29 midair collision at Reagan National Airport tragically took 67 lives, but it was preventable. It is our duty to do everything we can to keep this tragedy from ever happening again.

This bill would implement a central recommendation from the NTSB's final report on the collision: a requirement to use Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast technology, ADS-B Out and In.

NTSB has recommended an ADS-B In requirement 17 times before.

NTSB's final report said that the ADS-B In would have alerted the flight crew 59 seconds before the collision and the helicopter crew 48 seconds before.

□ 1700

ADS-B In would have given those pilots a fighting chance to avoid the disaster. It is high time that ADS-B Out and In are required in our Nation's busiest airspaces like the national capital region.

Passing the ROTOR Act is the strongest first step we can take for ensuring a safer airspace for the flying public today to improve aviation safety and prevent a future crash at DCA.

I thank Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member LARSEN, Ranking Member SMITH, and Chairman ROGERS for the comprehensive draft legislation they released last week addressing the systemic causes of the January 2025 collision.

Their ALERT Act of 2026 improves important must-pass provisions. We need to reevaluate the arrival rate at National Airport. We need to improve our helicopter route charts. We need to limit military helicopter flights in our region. But Congress must pass the ROTOR Act this week to mandate that pilots have access to ADS-B In and Out as soon as possible.

Then we must immediately work to advance the ALERT Act of 2026 while reconciling any differences in a way that maximizes aviation safety to ensure that all of the recommendations of the NTSB can be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the families of flight 5342 who have been a driving force for the ROTOR Act and for aviation safety reform. These families have been advocates, experts, and champions all in the face of tremendous loss. It has been an honor to work with them.

Passing the ROTOR Act is the first and strongest step that Congress must take to immediately give pilots another key tool to prevent collisions and begin saving lives now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the ROTOR Act and soon the ALERT Act of 2026.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS).

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the legislation before us, the ROTOR Act.

The ROTOR Act seeks to fulfill a longstanding recommendation from the National Transportation Safety Board to require ADS-B In technology on aircraft operating in our national airspace system. That recommendation reflects years of accident investigation and careful analysis.

But we must also recognize that this bill does not alone close the book on aviation safety. The NTSB recently released its final report on the DCA midair collision, which contains 50 safety recommendations. There is much more work to be done to address them comprehensively and thoughtfully.

We must also be cognizant of the feasibility of implementing the ROTOR Act for all national airspace system users. Safety mandates must be achievable in the real world. Small aircraft operators and regional jet operators could face significant challenges integrating new equipment, particularly if the Federal Aviation Administration were to insist on a fully integrated control panel solution. Costs, downtime, and certification hurdles are not abstract concerns. They are real bur-

dens for operators working on tight margins.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, flexibility will be crucial to ensure that all operators can be equipped with available situational awareness tools, including portable technologies and electronic flight bag solutions. I believe this will achieve the broadest implementation and the greatest safety benefits in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

The ROTOR Act isn't perfect. No bill ever is. But I remain committed to working with my colleagues to strengthen aviation safety without placing unnecessary burdens on those we depend on to keep America flying.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. AMO).

Mr. AMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Spencer and Christine Lane of Barrington, Rhode Island, whose lives were tragically taken on January 29, 2025, in the midair collision that claimed 67 lives.

I have spoken with Doug Lane and other families who are mourning their family members who passed away in this tragic incident. They shared the pain that their families carry from this heartbreaking event.

For years, there were warnings. Since 2008, the National Transportation Safety Board has recommended requiring technology to help pilots detect nearby aircraft in real time and avoid collisions.

The ROTOR Act finally acts on that recommendation by requiring technology to help avoid collisions, aligning military and civilian safety standards, strengthening coordination and closing dangerous gaps in our aviation system. We must act now to make our skies safer.

For the Lane family, for the 67 lives lost and their families, for every passenger and crew member in our skies, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ONDER).

Mr. ONDER. Mr. Speaker, the ROTOR Act is an urgent piece of legislation that implements proven technology to help pilots see the real-time location of other aircraft. Had it been law, it would have prevented the needless loss of 67 lives in last January's DCA crash.

In the past 15 years, there have been an average of at least one near miss per month at DCA. Since 2008, the National Transportation Safety Board has recommended 18 times that all aircraft install ADS-B equipment that allows pilots to see and be seen when flying in busy airspace.

NTSB Chair Hormendy testified if the ROTOR Act had been the law last

January, the jet and the helicopter would have had nearly a minute of advanced warning and the crash would have been prevented.

The ROTOR Act's ADS-B requirement is neither expensive nor burdensome. General aviation can meet the requirement with a receiver like this one that costs about \$400, roughly the cost of a routine oil change for most planes.

American Airlines has installed ADS-B for about \$50,000 per plane with only 1 to 2 days of downtime.

ROTOR's ADS-B requirement applies only to our Nation's busiest airspace, not to pilots flying in rural America. The families of flight 5342 are here today to support the ROTOR Act so that what they needlessly suffered will never happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the ROTOR Act.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM).

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the ROTOR Act. I thank the sponsor as well.

On January 29, 2025, a U.S. Army Black Hawk helicopter and American Airlines flight 5342 collided midair outside of DCA, and 67 lives were lost.

Among the victims were families from my community in northern Virginia. We lost children, parents, and members of the ice-skating community. These folks had their whole lives ahead of them. It is a tragedy that has had a profound and lasting impact on our community and our Nation.

This week, the families of the victims are here on Capitol Hill, and I got to speak with them today. They have one message for us: Pass the ROTOR Act.

The ROTOR Act addresses the glaring holes in aviation safety around DCA that allowed this completely preventable accident to happen. It does so by requiring military and civilian aircraft in busy airspace to broadcast and receive real-time traffic information.

Having been more than a year since the collision, it is time for there to be real accountability and change. We must ensure that nothing like this ever happens again, and people don't fear flying.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

□ 1710

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 67 lives that we lost on January 29, 2025. After months of investigative work, the NTSB uncovered systemic failures that culminated in the fateful midair collision between an Army Black Hawk helicopter and a passenger aircraft.

The flight originated from my hometown of Wichita, Kansas. Our commu-

nity was shocked by the tragedy, and I am heartbroken that several Kansans were among the victims. No family should ever have to endure that heartbreak.

It is imperative that we work in Congress to ensure tragedies like this never happen again and that our skies are the safest in the world. We must build back the layers of safety that failed that night.

I am grateful for the work of the NTSB and the Senate, and I realize there is always more that can and should be done to enhance aviation safety. I look forward to continuing this important work that honors their lives and makes our skies safer. Flying in the United States is the safest of anywhere in the world, but we must continue to identify and implement ways to make it safer.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, may I again inquire about how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), who is also the Research and Technology Subcommittee chair.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the ROTOR Act.

This bill is a well-intentioned response to the horrific airline accident last year at DCA. In the months since the accident, it has become clear that the accident would have been prevented had the helicopter that was involved in the collision been broadcasting its position and its speed through the ADS-B Out system.

This bill would indeed fix that. However, this bill imposes a costly mandate that every aircraft within the system implement a technology called ADS-B In.

Mr. Speaker, most of the aircraft that would be affected by this bill, those with a takeoff weight of over 12,500 pounds, already have superior technology for collision avoidance called TCAS II.

Mr. Speaker, this is technology that works at all airports. At most of the general aviation airports in my district, ADS-B Out will not work near the ground, Mr. Speaker, because you have to be receiving air traffic control signals for it to work. TCAS II works at all of those airports.

Moreover, since the ROTOR Act was introduced months ago before the NTSB report was released, it does not implement many of the recommendations in that report.

Chairman GRAVES has a far superior bill called the ALERT Act that addresses all 50 of those recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us to reject the ROTOR Act today and to quickly pass the ALERT Act, conference those changes with the Senate, and get it on the President's desk for signature.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on the ROTOR Act and on the ALERT Act. I really appreciate the bipartisan work and joint committee work done here in the U.S. House to produce the ALERT Act, the comprehensive response to the tragic DCA air crash.

I look forward to continue working with the T&I Committee and the House Armed Services Committee to bring that bill into markup in committees and onto the floor as soon as possible if we are allowed to.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the question: Why are we here?

With something this important, with something that has so much consequence, why hasn't the House been given any opportunity to be a part of this bill?

You have to ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Why are we running this on suspension where it can't be amended or it can't be made better? It makes absolutely no sense that with something this important that the House doesn't have any input whatsoever. I can't stress enough just how wrong that is.

As I noted before, I live and breathe aviation.

I have seen what happens when aviation goes wrong. I have lost several very close friends to accidents over the years, most recently at the Wings Over Dallas midair collision that occurred in 2022.

Throughout my congressional career, I have always believed in fostering sound policy with a carefully deliberative and consensus-driven approach. That approach is critical to getting the safety outcomes that we all desire.

Aviation policy is enormously complex and deserves the full deliberation of Congress to ensure that we get it right. It certainly deserves some House input into the legislation.

I am extremely disappointed that the House has been denied any opportunity to express its will on such a consequential piece of legislation. I am going to say it again: There has been no House input. I fear this will set a terrible precedent that the will of the House and the expertise of our committees will not be allowed an opportunity for meaningful input.

For these reasons and the reasons I stated previously, I will, regretfully, be voting against this legislation. I cannot say this enough: This is not a vote against safety. I continue to pray for the victims and their families, and I understand that they are motivated to prevent anyone else from having to experience what they are going through.

I simply want to get this right, and I believe that we can absolutely do that by allowing the House and Senate to work together to ensure a tragedy like this never happens again.

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

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the terrible midair collision at DCA on January 29, 2025. I continue to mourn the loss of 67 people who died because of this tragedy, including Asra Hussain, from Carmel, Indiana. The House needs to pass a comprehensive, bipartisan solution that will implement all 50 of the NTSB's recommendations, and which provides a holistic framework for meaningful, system-wide safety improvements.

I commend my Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman and Ranking Member, SAM GRAVES and RICK LARSEN. They worked tirelessly to produce a bill that will implement all 50 safely recommendations from the NTSB, which just released their final report on January 29th. As the Ranking Member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I'm proud to join them as an original cosponsor of the ALERT Act, with our colleagues from the Armed Services Committee, Chairman MIKE ROGERS and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, and many other colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the House needs to follow regular order. Today's bill was added to the suspension calendar over the concerns of the Chairs and Ranking Members of the Committees of Jurisdiction. This bill has been mysteriously held and stuck at the desk since December—without being referred to the Transportation Committee or the Armed Services Committees for consideration, markup, and amendments. Yet, as soon as our two committees introduced a comprehensive safety bill, the Speaker green lights the other chamber's bill to fly off the desk and bypass our committees. That's not regular order, and it's not right. Our carefully crafted joint Transportation and Armed Services bill should not be railroaded out of floor consideration because of some backroom deal. Under regular order, our Committee should be able to bring our House bill, the ALERT Act, to the House floor before a Senate bill is pushed ahead of us. Especially when it's an incomplete bill.

Unlike the ALERT Act, which implements every one of NTSB's safety recommendations, the ROTOR Act addresses just seven of the 50 recommendations. While the ROTOR Act is a good first step, it doesn't fix the massive systemic problems that resulted in a crash that was 100 percent preventable. Safety is too important to break the rules and ignore regular order. I urge the Speaker to refer this bill to our Committee for consideration and markup.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2503.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 12,

2026, the following joint resolution was presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.J. Res. 142. Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the D.C. Income and Franchise Tax Conformity and Revision Temporary Amendment Act of 2025.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 24, 2026, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2921. A letter from the Office Manager, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report titled: "D.C. Personnel Operation Need Greater Coordination, Cohesion (published 01.30.2026)", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-2922. A letter from the Chairman of the Board and Chairman, Audit Committee, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's report addressing the requirements of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-2923. A letter from the Commissioners, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2025, through, September 30, 2025 and the Management Report on Final Actions for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-2924. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Management Report to Congress, covering the period April 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-2925. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the fiscal year 2025 Delayed-Notice Search Warrant Report, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3103a(d)(2); Public Law 90-351, Sec. 1401(a) (added by Public Law 109-177, Sec. 114(c)); (120 Stat. 211); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4294. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a pilot program with respect to the sale of blue catfish caught within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, with an amendment (Rept. 119-510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 6365. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue a right-of-way for an emergency exit on certain National Park Service land in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3340. A bill to provide for the standardization, publication, and accessibility of data relating to public outdoor recreational use of Federal waterways, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2130. A bill to require the Bureau of Indian Affairs to process and complete all mortgage packages associated with residential and business mortgages on Indian land by certain deadlines, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3073. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Utah with respect to civil causes of action arising on or within the Indian lands of the Shivwits Band of Paiutes, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 7640. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve public safety through the enforcement of Federal immigration law in the interior of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself and Ms. JACOBS):

H.R. 7641. A bill to provide for a pilot program to require congressional notification of additional information for certain foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KIM:

H.R. 7642. A bill to authorize the recruitment and retention of specialized disaster assistance professionals by the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKINSHAW (for himself and Mr. MCGARVEY):

H.R. 7643. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the manner in which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs calculates the average employment rate of veterans participating in the VET TEC high technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 7644. A bill to amend the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 to modify the authorities of the Millennium Challenge Corporation relating to strategic competitors of the United States and critical minerals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. DELUZZIO, Ms. BALINT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BEYER, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TRAN, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms.