

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 22.

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

□ 1453

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, with Mr. CONAWAY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-32 was pending.

Pursuant to House Resolution 512, no further amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114-326 and amendments en bloc described in subsection (c) of that resolution.

Each further amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-326 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-326 not earlier disposed of. Such amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

No further amendment to the Senate amendment, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114-326. Each such further amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, except that amendment No. 23 printed in part B of the report may be considered as though immediately following amendment No. 9 in part B of the report. Each such further amendment may be offered only by a Member des-

ignated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1500

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT 114-326 OUT OF SEQUENCE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 22, pursuant to House Resolution 512, amendment No. 1, printed in part A of House Report 114-326, may be considered out of sequence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 512 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 22.

Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) kindly take the chair.

□ 1504

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, with Mr. PALAZZO (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-32 was pending.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, amendment No. 1, printed in part A of House Report 114-326, may be considered out of sequence.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 56, line 8, after "diesel retrofits" insert "or alternative fuel vehicles".

Page 56, line 9, insert "or indirect" after "direct".

Page 56, line 14, insert "or indirectly" after "directly".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is cosponsored by Congresswoman NAPOLITANO and is endorsed by the Natural Gas Vehicles for America, the Electric Drive Transportation Association, and the National Propane Gas Association.

The amendment addresses one specific provision in the bill, section 1109, which modifies how Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, CMAQ, funds can be used in PM2.5 nonattainment and maintenance areas. "PM" stands for "particulate matter."

The purpose of the CMAQ Program is to fund transportation projects or programs that will contribute to the attainment or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. All projects and programs that are eligible for CMAQ funds must come from a conforming Federal or State transportation plan. The program is designed to allow States to identify the right solution for their air quality challenges and utilize CMAQ funds to implement them.

Without the Ryan-Napolitano amendment, the language in section 1109 may restrict States' discretion in identifying the most cost-effective emissions reduction technologies and effectively limit their options to only diesel retrofits. Specifically, the priority consideration and use of funding provisions for the section seemingly restrict local authorities' ability to consider other alternative vehicle technologies that can be adopted to meet the goals of this section.

Other technologies, such as natural gas, propane, or electric vehicles, also reduce PM2.5 and provide other air quality benefits. In my State of Ohio and the chairman's State of Pennsylvania, being two of those States, they

allow for the use of CMAQ funds for a variety of alternative fuel vehicles. However, section 1109, as written, may limit their and other States' solutions in using CMAQ funds to address the nonattainment issue.

We should not be directing States on how to use these funds, and it is important that we keep the utilization of CMAQ funding technology neutral. Giving States the flexibility in utilizing these funds allows them to select the best vehicle technology to address PM2.5 concerns. Modifying the priority language in this section allows us to meet the environmental goals while avoiding picking winners and losers.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER for his help and Ranking Member DEFAZIO and their staffs for working with us on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the amendment's cosponsor.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support as a cosponsor of this amendment. I thank my colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for offering it. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to cosponsor it because this is an important issue for my area.

In section 1109(c), this amendment would clarify language in the bill in order for local transportation agencies to continue to fund not only highway, but transit, bicycle, and pedestrian, projects with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program funds, called CMAQ. This amendment would also allow for alternative fuel vehicles to be eligible for recipient funds along with diesel retrofit projects.

A concern was brought to my attention by the metropolitan planning organizations in California, including the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and the cities they represent, which includes my district in the San Gabriel Valley, that important transportation projects would no longer be prioritized for CMAQ funding.

In 2014, southern California transportation agencies—mind you, they represent over 20 million people—used CMAQ funding to provide \$51 million in traffic flow improvements, \$50 million in transit, and \$22 million in bicycle and pedestrian projects. This amendment would clarify that these projects are still prioritized for CMAQ funding.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for working with us on this amendment. I look forward to working with my colleagues in conference to further clarify that traffic flow, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects continue to be eligible for CMAQ set-aside programs as they are now.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I don't oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, currently under the CMAQ Program, funds may be used to purchase publicly owned alternative fuel vehicles, including passenger vehicles, service trucks, street cleaners, and others.

This is a good amendment that ensures alternative fuel vehicles are still eligible under this bill. I support the amendment.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 24, strike the closed quotation mark and the final period.

Page 73, after line 24, insert the following: “(n) FACILITATING COMMERCIAL WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or rights granted thereunder, and provided that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) are met, a property owner may develop, construct, operate, and maintain pier, wharf, or other such load-out structures on that property and on or above adjacent beds of the navigable waters of the United States to facilitate the commercial waterborne transportation of domestic aggregate that may supply an eligible project under this section, including salt, sand, and gravel, from reserves located within ten miles of the property.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the roads, bridges, and other infrastructure projects we seek to advance in the legislation before us today require a steady supply of aggregate and gravel. Without it, we might as well not even be here debating this legislation.

In fact, a report from the U.S. Geological Survey—2011 USGS Report: Aggregate Resource Availability in the United States—found “a 70 percent increase in annual aggregate production may be required to upgrade our transportation infrastructure.”

The report went on to say, “There is an indisputable need for an uninterrupted, large supply of aggregate for the restoration and rehabilitation of the infrastructure.”

It is also important to note that a substantial portion of the cost of aggregate is its transportation costs, and lowering those costs will reduce the cost of construction projects.

My State of California is just one example of where the need is great. According to a recent report, California goes through 200 million tons of high-grade aggregate every year, which is the equivalent of more than 7 million trips by large diesel trucks.

So here is what my amendment does:

It streamlines access to marine-accessible sand and gravel aggregate supply points throughout the United States, allowing our country to meet the future needs of the national infrastructure projects which are covered in this legislation.

With this amendment, we have the opportunity to strengthen our supply of raw building materials for infrastructure projects, to reduce road congestion and transportation costs, and to strengthen our maritime community.

I urge all Members to support this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Generally, the gentleman from California and I have worked together on a number of things, and this is one time when I reluctantly rise in opposition to his proposal.

I have spent a good deal of time on aggregate issues in my own district that relate to those which are located in the marine environment, and I understand some of the frustrations and concerns that go on there. The language in this, though, is so broad that we are preempting both the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and the Truman-Hobbs Act, which relate to impediments to navigation.

At this point, that sort of amendment would, for instance, overturn an easement that has been entered into between the joint Naval Base Kitsap and the owners of this aggregate. There is a concern that, if a dock were built in that area, it would interfere with the navigation that is a prime route for our strategic submarine forces in the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific region.

□ 1515

So we think it has unintended consequences that go far beyond any idea of streamlining access to maritime aggregate resources.

So I would have to recommend Members oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman from California's amendments.

With this amendment, we need to start the rebirth of our Nation's shipping capabilities and begin to build

U.S.-flagged seagoing vessels to move a domestic supply of sand and gravel across our Nation.

This amendment allows access to aggregate that will be available to restore damaged beaches, enhance fisheries habitats in the estuaries and littoral regions of the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific Ocean by providing clean sand and gravel for broad-scale beach replenishment projects that are so vital across the Nation.

This amendment will also lead to establishment of a reliable U.S. source to meet domestic demand for major construction and public projects. Half of all uses for sand and gravel are used for public projects, building and replacing vital U.S. highways, bridges, and seawall infrastructures.

Utilizing our marine transportation will save taxpayer dollars by reducing costs on public works projects because, simply put, moving containerized cargo on the water is cost-competitive, economical, and efficient.

Passage of this amendment puts our country on the path to having the potential to create at least 20,000 more shipbuilding manufacturing jobs just by building at least 30 to 40 new seagoing bulk freighters and container carrier ships worth at least \$3 billion that will result if we pass this amendment.

This amendment is good for the country. It is good for our infrastructure, and it is good for creating American jobs across this country.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Here is what this amendment does. If you have a quarry that does gravel or aggregate by any waterway, whether it is an inland waterway, an inlet, a sound, or the ocean, you can then develop your gravel pits and put that aggregate on ships—not on trucks, not on rail, but on ships—that have a much lower emission cost than anything else does. You can put them on ships, which means it is going to help the maritime community.

We import sand and gravel right now from China. We get our aggregate right now from Communist China. Instead of doing that, let's strengthen our domestic supply and allow the aggregate producers around the country the ability to export their aggregate to domestic suppliers, to the national defense community, to our road makers, and to our building makers.

This strengthens America. It strengthens our national security. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, this amendment waives all laws for construction of these transpor-

tation-related facilities, i.e., piers, wharfs, and load-out structures.

Now, the problem is that, if you waive all the laws, someone may want to build a pier that interferes with everybody else who navigates that narrow channel, including the United States Navy with their boomer subs. That is not really, I think, a very good way to go forward; and that was recognized by Congress as a problem in 1899, impediments to commercial navigation, in this case, strategic national defense navigation.

So I think there may be another way to get at more easily utilizing these resources. But preempting the Rivers and Harbors Act and the Truman-Hobbs Act, which means structures could be built which would impede others' navigation, is really incredibly problematic. I really think that this should be considered in a more deliberate way as part of future legislation, perhaps the Water Resources Development Act or something along those lines.

Again, I would strongly oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 4 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 110, after line 23, insert the following:

(C)(i) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) PROJECT SELECTION TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Projects included in the adopted transportation plan shall be selected through a publicly available transparent process that includes use of criteria that directly support factors in subsection (h), the national transportation goals under section 150(b), and applicable State and regional goals. The criteria shall be used to publicly evaluate and identify the highest performing projects.”

Page 111, after line 3, insert the following:

(7) in subsection (j)(3)(A), by inserting at the end the following: “Projects included in the priority list shall come from the highest performing projects identified in the transportation plan under subsection (i)(7). If a lower-performing project is included in the priority project list, an explanation shall be included to explain why the lower-performing project was selected, including the goals of achieving geographic balance or providing benefit to economically distressed areas.” after the period.

Page 114, after line 22, add the following:

(C) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) PROJECT SELECTION TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Projects included in the

adopted long-range statewide transportation plan shall be selected through a publicly available transparent process that includes use of criteria that directly support factors in subsection (d), the national transportation goals under section 150(b), and applicable State and regional goals. The criteria shall be used to publicly evaluate and identify the highest performing projects.”; and

(4) in subsection (g), in paragraph (5)(A), by inserting at the end the following: “Projects included in the transportation improvement program shall come from the highest performing projects identified in the transportation plan under subsection (f)(9). If a lower-performing project is included in the priority project list, an explanation shall be included to explain why the lower-performing project was selected, including the goals of achieving geographic balance or providing benefit to economically distressed areas.”

Page 244, after line 9, insert the following:

(C)(i) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9);

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) PROJECT SELECTION TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Projects included in the adopted transportation plan shall be selected through a publicly available transparent process that includes use of criteria that directly support factors in subsection (h), the national transportation goals under section 150(b), and applicable State and regional goals. The criteria shall be used to publicly evaluate and identify the highest performing projects.”

(7) in subsection (j)(3)(A), by inserting at the end the following: “Projects included in the priority list shall come from the highest performing projects identified in the transportation plan under subsection (i)(7). If a lower-performing project is included in the priority project list, an explanation shall be included to explain why the lower-performing project was selected, including the goals of achieving geographic balance or providing benefit to economically distressed areas.” after the period

Page 247, after line 17, insert the following:

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) PROJECT SELECTION TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Projects included in the adopted long-range statewide transportation plan shall be selected through a publicly available transparent process that includes use of criteria that directly support factors in subsection (d), the national transportation goals under section 150(b), and applicable State and regional goals. The criteria shall be used to publicly evaluate and identify the highest performing projects.”

(5) in subsection (g)(5)(A), by inserting at the end the following: “Projects included in the statewide transportation improvement program shall come from the highest performing projects identified in the transportation plan under subsection (f)(9). If a lower-performing project is included in the priority project list, an explanation shall be included to explain why the lower-performing project was selected, including the goals of achieving geographic balance or providing benefit to economically distressed areas.” after the period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is based on the bipartisan Metropolitan Planning Enhancement Act that rebuilds public trust by promoting evidence-based decision-making in the transportation investment process. This commonsense amendment helps States and metropolitan planning organizations offer the highest return for taxpayers and commuters through increased transparency and improved accountability.

Americans of all types are suspicious of government right now. In the context of transportation funding, many Americans believe that highway and bridge project decisions are based on politics and insider connections rather than statewide and regional transportation goals.

In many areas of the country, local commuters have little idea how State Departments of Transportation and MPOs make their project decisions or why they choose one project over another; yet, every year, lawmakers ask taxpayers to spend more and more of their hard-earned dollars on infrastructure projects with minimal transparency and accountability.

This amendment requires State and regional transportation plans to include project descriptions and to score projects based on criteria developed by the State or the region, not the Federal Government.

Requiring that projects be assessed with objective criteria ensures that limited transportation resources are invested in projects that provide the highest return on investment to commuters. Furthermore, requiring transportation decisionmakers to communicate how projects are chosen enhances the public's understanding of and confidence in the project selection process.

Many States and MPOs are incorporating project priority criteria today: Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Louisiana, Texas, Washington State, Minnesota, Massachusetts, amongst others. There is plenty of early evidence that this has increased confidence within the commuting public.

Effective and efficient transportation systems are critical to our growing and prosperous U.S. economy. We cannot allow diminishing resources to be directed toward bad investments. This amendment ensures that the public has more complete information to judge the merits of projects for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, much of the debate about America's crumbling infrastructure is about how we are going to find the necessary money to match the need. As responsible legislators, we should ask ourselves how we can most efficiently invest the resources we already have.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, good governance amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment would impose burdensome new requirements on States and metropolitan planning organizations, significantly delaying project selection and construction.

States and MPOs already, under current law, are subject to extensive planning requirements and take multiple factors into account in developing their short- and long-range plans. It is critical that they have the flexibility to weigh tradeoffs in different priorities without being hamstrung by a strict ranking process.

Transparency and the opportunity for participation by stakeholders and the public is a hallmark of the planning process. States and MPOs are required to have a participation plan to ensure that any interested party can be heard.

The National Governors Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials all oppose this amendment, and they are the very people that deal with this.

I oppose the amendment, and I would urge all my colleagues to oppose it, also.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chair, with all due respect to the chairman, I want to thank him for his consideration.

I do believe, having seen this in the San Francisco Bay Area, that the incentive and the requirement to do more will actually help with the transparency, as I have stated earlier.

I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise as designee of Representative GRIJALVA, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1301 through 1313.
Page 168, line 12, strike "this Act,".
Strike sections 1315 through 1317.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this bill uses "streamlining" the regulatory process, which is a euphemism for "steamrolling" over bedrock environmental laws. In fact, it dedicates 50 pages of this bill to paving over the National Environmental Policy Act, also known as NEPA, as well as the National Historic Preservation Act, NHPA.

I know it is popular in Republican circles to blame environmental regulations for all of our Nation's ills, but that doesn't make it true. In fact, the evidence tells us an entirely different story.

The Federal Highway Administration reported several years ago, before all of this steamrolling started, that more than 90 percent of NEPA reviews for highway projects were accomplished through a categorical exclusion process that takes only a few days. For the few—and we are talking about only 4 percent—highway projects which do require an environmental impact statement, the end result is often savings for the taxpayers and better projects that cause less harm to the environment and to our communities.

Earlier this year, a plan to improve U.S. Route 23 in Michigan was modified to avoid the largest loss of wetlands in the State's history and to preserve that habitat for migratory waterfowl prized by hunters.

In New Jersey, in 2012, construction on the Route 53 causeway to Ocean City was completed after NEPA review helped them minimize private property takings as well as damage to tidal marshes.

In my own home State of Pennsylvania, construction of the Pennsylvania Turnpike/I-95 Interchange Project is underway after a thorough and public NEPA review, which was conducted with the input and support of local residents and local government officials. This process led to the selection of a design with the fewest impacts to homes, businesses, and the local environment.

NEPA does not lead to unnecessary delays; it leads to better outcomes. The real culprit in delaying highway projects is a lack of funding. To address that problem, the House majority will need to first look in the mirror. It is their draconian budget slashing that has left our transportation infrastructure in the disrepair that is in existence today.

My amendment is simple, Mr. Chair. It would require us to evaluate the impacts of the last two rounds of regulatory steamrolling passed in the

SAFETEA—LU bill and the MAP-21 bill before we take any further steps to gut environmental protection and historic preservation.

This approach is perfectly reasonable because, while there is ample evidence that regulatory reform was not needed in the first place, there is exactly zero evidence that it has had any positive impact at all because no information has been collected on the matter.

So the very least we can do, in the interest of responsible government, is evaluate the effects of the laws we pass before we declare the need for more of the same. Shirking our responsibility to appropriate highway dollars and instead just scapegoating laws that protect the American people from harm is simply dishonest.

□ 1530

I do believe the sections of this bill that this amendment strikes are seriously flawed, and I do look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the administration, and our friends in the Senate on achieving a more reasonable outcome.

Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), I withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 225, strike lines 4 through 20 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to permit the acknowledgment of roadside maintenance with the use of live plant materials.

(b) TERM.—The Secretary shall carry out the program for a 10-year period. Upon the request of a State, the Secretary may continue to carry out the program for that State for an additional 10-year period.

(c) PARTICIPATING STATES.—The Secretary shall select 10 States to participate in the program.

(d) GUIDELINES FOR SELECTION OF STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish guidelines for selecting States to participate in the program.

(2) DISCRETION OF STATES.—The guidelines shall not limit the discretion under subsection (e) of any State participating in the program. Any other guidelines relating to the participation of a State in the program shall be established by that State, subject to subsection (e).

(3) PRIORITY.—In selecting States to participate in the program, the Secretary shall give priority to any State that can provide documentation demonstrating that the State, or its agents, prior to November 2015, actively reviewed, or stated an interest in, innovative approaches using live plant materials for acknowledging a substantial contribution to roadside maintenance.

(e) INCONSISTENT LAWS, REGULATIONS, OR MANUALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, States participating in the pro-

gram may permit acknowledgment of roadside maintenance through the use of live plant materials without being limited by any Federal, State, or other law, regulation, or manual that limits or regulates procurement actions, acknowledgment signs, advertising, landscaping, or other uses of, or actions relating to, highway rights-of-way or areas adjacent to highway rights-of-way.

(f) FUNDS EXCLUSIVELY FOR ROADSIDE MAINTENANCE.—Any funds paid to a State under the program shall be considered to be State funds (as defined in section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code), and shall be made available for expenditure under the direct control of the State transportation department (as defined in that section) exclusively for roadside maintenance.

(g) REPORT.—Before the expiration of the first 10-year period referred to in subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is only a technical change to a pilot program that is already included in the underlying bill. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for including the base language in the bill.

This legislative language in our proposed amendment is a means for State Departments of Transportation to increase their revenues without additional burden on the taxpayer. Everybody knows that every State is hurting for transportation dollars. This helps them.

By acknowledging contributions of third parties to a State DOT's roadside maintenance through a corporate logo made of live plant materials rather than conventional metallic material, State Departments of Transportation will have innovative new means for funding highway maintenance needs. This will free up funds for other highway projects.

I support this program because Caltrans, my State DOT, and six other State DOTs asked for the authority to operate this kind of innovative program. The pilot program does not cost the State or Federal Government a penny to operate. Estimates are that my State of California could conservatively save millions of dollars annually in roadside maintenance costs from this program. Other States would enjoy other similar tangible benefits.

The legislative language for the pilot program, as it appears in the underlying bill, does not specifically permit acknowledgment through live plant materials and places no limitations on what guidelines the U.S. Department of Transportation would develop for innovative approaches under the pilot program.

The legislative language in our proposed amendment paves the way for

State DOTs to implement an acknowledgment program with live plant materials by specifying this particular approach in the legislative language and by providing some specificity on the guidelines that the U.S. Department of Transportation should develop and what matters are best left to the States to assure the success of this innovative new approach.

I urge all Members to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow commercialization within the Federal right-of-way, and that causes concern as to the potential for proliferation.

We have had many debates over the years that I have been on the committee over advertising proximate to interstates. We have come to a pretty good stasis on that issue. This amendment is not new. It is not widely supported.

We did not hear from California that they were in support. We were in touch with them numerous times. Perhaps they are, but we didn't hear that. The Outdoor Advertising Association of America does not support the amendment.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the amendment.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for taking the initiative on offering this amendment, which simply modifies the pilot program already created in the manager's amendment.

My endorsement of this amendment stems from the fact that Florida's DOT currently has a cosponsorship program, and a multitude of other State DOTs have also offered their support. This program permits States to partner with private sector organizations, which will fund further roadside maintenance. The private sector, not the government, will be responsible for the fabrication, installation, and maintenance of the signs, resulting in zero expense to taxpayers.

This amendment enables State DOTs to implement an acknowledgment program with live plant materials. Furthermore, it provides specifics on the guidelines USDOT should develop and lets States decide which matters are of significance to them.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those things that I kind of thought everybody would enjoy. It is environmentally friendly, it uses plants and flowers, and it doesn't cost anybody anything. I mean, this is one of those deals that I am surprised is opposed by any Member.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my State of Florida could receive \$35 million in revenue and \$8.7 million in maintenance savings annually for the program.

At this time, revenue is flat-funded. This is a "may." The States don't have to participate in it. It is a pilot program. It is flowers, and it is friendly. I support it, and I would urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill itself establishes this. The gentleman has proposed an up-to-20-year pilot program. That seems pretty permanent in terms of most people's life spans.

Mr. HUNTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. It takes a long time for these flowers to grow.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I guess we are putting in perennials, not annuals. Okay.

In any case, the bill itself does establish a pilot program that would establish that five States would be allowed not just to do logo flowers, but to do other innovative projects that could generate revenues for use in the maintenance of the rights-of-way, and this would be five States. There would be guidelines published by the Secretary. They would terminate after 6 years, and then we would see if there was wisdom in expanding it.

One problem that is raised is we have gone through, as I said, many controversies over billboards, particularly when they went to billboards that would change as you were driving.

There was heavy regulation of that because of the period of the change so as not to distract drivers and cause potential traffic accidents. I can imagine you are driving along and you are really wanting to read that logo as you are going by, and this could contribute to distracted driving. So we must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am looking at some of the designs that have been already done. One is a Nike

swoosh. You don't have to read a swoosh. You just know it is a swoosh because we all know what Nike swooshes look like.

You have the Pepsi logo. You don't have to read that. By going with the gentleman's argument, you couldn't have any billboards up anywhere. There are tons of billboards that you have to read.

These are just logos, and the corporations want to pay the State DOT to put these logos on the side of the road. This is free money for the States, free money for States' transportation.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of Division A, insert the following:

SEC. . . FEDERAL AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14501(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended —

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "paragraphs (2) and (3)" and inserting "paragraphs (3) and (4)";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6) respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.—

"(A) A State, political subdivision of a State, or political authority of 2 or more States may not enact or enforce a law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law prohibiting employees whose hours of service are subject to regulation by the Secretary under section 31502 from working to the full extent permitted or at such times as permitted under such section, or imposing any additional obligations on motor carriers if such employees work to the full extent or at such times as permitted under such section, including any related activities regulated under part 395 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

"(B) A State, political subdivision of a State, or political authority of 2 or more States may not enact or enforce a law, regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law that requires a motor carrier that compensates employees on a piece-rate basis to pay those employees separate or additional compensation, provided that the motor carrier pays the employee a total

sum that when divided by the total number of hours worked during the corresponding work period is equal to or greater than the applicable hourly minimum wage of the State, political subdivision of the State, or political authority of 2 or more States.

"(C) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the provisions of paragraph (1)."

(4) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated) by striking "Paragraph (1)—" and inserting "Paragraphs (1) and (2)—"; and

(5) in paragraph (4)(A) (as redesignated) by striking "Paragraph (1)" and inserting "Paragraphs (1) and (2)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall have the force and effect as if enacted on the date of enactment of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-305).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, in 1994, Congress enacted the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act, or F4A, to prevent States from undermining Federal deregulation of interstate commerce through a patchwork of State regulations. Since 1994, motor carriers have been operating under the Federal meal and rest break standards until a ruling by the California Ninth Circuit Court. This amendment would remedy that issue.

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

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

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

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

Unfortunately, the language of this amendment is so broad that it would basically preempt meal, rest break, and other laws that relate to truck drivers in 21 States. So I think this is an issue of states' rights.

It is an issue of an overly broad attempt to address what is a real contradiction that was created by the ninth circuit, that if you have a truck driver who is operating long haul through a number of States having to comply with new rest or meal break requirements on the Federal clock, which I can barely understand with the new requirements on rest, every time the driver crosses a State line, it is confusing and I think is a potential impediment to interstate commerce.

We offered an amendment that would have specifically addressed that concern. Unfortunately, we weren't able to reach agreement on that. Mr. LARSEN of Washington State submitted that amendment to the Committee on Rules. It was not allowed. Unfortunately, we only have this overly broad amendment.

This would not just affect interstate trucking; it would preempt California's wage, hour, and rest break rules for intrastate trucking in the State of

California and 20 other States. In fact, the case that was before the ninth circuit was intrastate truck drivers who were delivering appliances.

It also would go further. We spent a lot of time when I chaired the subcommittee on the issue of these, basically, pressed labor, who were theoretically purchasing their drayage trucks to haul cargo out of Long Beach and out of Los Angeles, who were really basically being enslaved. They were never going to pay them off. They were never going to own them. In fact, they were hot-seated. Other people were also buying the same truck at different hours of the day. Nobody ever got the trucks.

This would basically preempt any laws in California so that drivers could be paid on a piece rate no matter what the congestion conditions: Sorry. Gee, we paid you for that load. So it took you 8 hours. That is the way it is. So you only earned 49 cents an hour. Sorry. Because wage and hour laws don't apply to you.

□ 1545

It is just an overly broad attempt to address what has, at its core, a contradiction under the FAAA Act, the ruling about interstate commerce. So I would have to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Oregon. He was here in 1994 when Speaker Foley pushed this issue through. He understands the issue. While his language did not fully address the issue, we are going to continue to work together to resolve this as this amendment moves forward.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chair, let me just say first to Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO that I want to thank them for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor. I am just going with the new Speaker, who said, "the will of the House." And I am sure the will of the House will pass this amendment. Why? Because one thing is that transportation is intermodal.

I was here in 1994, when we said we were not going to have a patchwork and we were not going to have each State with their own rules and regulations. I say let's move forward. In my opinion, we need to reinstate the intentions of the Congress in 1994.

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

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

I would note that 90 percent of the trucking industry is represented—not necessarily in terms of volume, but in terms of value—by OOIDA, and they are opposed to this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank Mr. DEFAZIO for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would overturn a Federal court decision that determined California meal and rest break laws apply to truckers.

On July 9, 2014, the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, as was mentioned before, ruled that trucking operators in California must allow for 30-minute breaks after 5 hours of work and a 10-minute rest break after each 4 hours. This meal and rest break standard is very reasonable when you consider the truck drivers can be subject to 14 hours of on-duty time.

The amendment would not only preempt California's law with regard to trucking operations, but would preempt laws in 21 other States and territories that guarantee a meal break. I won't go into the States' names. The States must be allowed to set meal and rest break standards as they see fit for the health and safety of their workers. One size does not fit all.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is needed to keep interstate commerce moving and to correct a misguided rule issued by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Here, we are faced with an overactive judiciary legislating from the bench with very real and very adverse economic consequences as a result of this misinformed decision.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has taken deliberate action in the past to preempt States from getting in the way of a nationally uniform set of rules for motor carriers. This amendment makes clear the intent of Congress that States can't impose their own requirements on drivers whose working hours and breaks are governed under nationally uniform Federal regulations.

Mr. Chairman, under current Federal safety regulations, drivers who need a break are always entitled to take one. This amendment does not change that. Likewise, current Federal whistleblower laws protect drivers from carriers who stand in the way of that, and this amendment does not change that.

But as a result of the Ninth Circuit Court decision, motor carriers will now be forced to plan their routes and services around the obligations of individual State break requirements. This will deprive businesses and drivers of the flexibility currently afforded under Federal law for interstate commerce. It will reduce shipping capacity. It will increase shipping costs, and it causes confusion and cost.

If not corrected, who will pay the price for the decision of the unelected judges of the ninth circuit? In my district, it will be the small businesses and consumers who face higher prices, and it will prove more costly to transportation professionals whose livelihoods are directly dependent on an efficient and streamlined shipping and trucking industry.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. May I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment.

My friends across the aisle regularly reject legislation because it encroaches on states' rights, yet their commitment to State sovereignty disappears when it comes to protecting workers.

This amendment does more than just clarify the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994. It changes and expands its application to preempt the will of States such as mine.

California's meal and rest break laws ensure a safe working environment for truck drivers traveling within the State, and the U.S. Court of Appeals specifically ruled these laws are not preempted by the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act.

This amendment overrules the court and State legislatures to weaken labor protections at the industry's request.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and as a Californian, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD).

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am proud today to stand with Representative DENHAM as a cosponsor of this amendment.

This amendment reinforces—make no mistake—a current law that has been on the books for over two decades. It promotes interstate commerce, ensures economic growth, and fortifies safety requirements.

This amendment will allow a vital industry in my district and a vital industry to our Nation, the trucking industry, to operate without a patchwork of State regulations.

In my home State of Nebraska, we have several of the Nation's largest motor carriers. These employers haul freight throughout the country and provide good-paying jobs. Unfortunately, these employers may now face litigation that could cost tens of millions of dollars and create regulatory uncertainty across this country.

Far-flung litigation shouldn't threaten the livelihood of hardworking Nebraskans. It is likely that companies like those in my district will simply refuse to do business in certain States. This result will destroy jobs, hinder competition, and hurt taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, Congress has been clear that the patchwork of laws and rules dictating when drivers eat, sleep, and pull over is impractical. Fifty standards create an unreasonable burden on truck drivers and companies.

Furthermore, dismantling the Federal standards jeopardizes safety, increases costs, causes significant inefficiencies, reduces competition, inhibits innovation and technology, and curtails the expansion of markets.

I support the Denham amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

In my district, I have some of the largest trucking companies in the country. I recognize these are hardworking, dedicated people who play a vital role in the success of our economy. The growth of regulations under this administration has made their jobs much, much more difficult.

This amendment seeks to relieve truck drivers of a patchwork of regulations that make their jobs very difficult, with little positive effect.

Let me correct a common misunderstanding. This amendment does not prevent drivers from taking breaks when they think it is appropriate. In fact, it does the exact opposite. It allows the drivers to be flexible to take breaks when they think it is most appropriate and most safe and not to worry if they are violating the law.

Arbitrarily predetermined break times set by 50 different States simply will not work, and that is why I am such a strong supporter of this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PROGRAM TO ASSIST VETERANS TO ACQUIRE COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in co-

ordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall fully implement the recommendations contained in the report submitted under section 32308 of MAP-21 (49 U.S.C. 31301 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I think we can all agree that our veterans deserve the very best we can offer when they return home. While we can never repay them for their heroism and bravery, we can reaffirm our appreciation by doing everything in our power to help them transition back to civilian life. My amendment would help us do just that.

This amendment requires the Department of Transportation and the Department of Defense to work together to help veterans transition into civilian jobs driving commercial trucks. It would help them obtain commercial driver's licenses, as outlined in a report commissioned by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration 2 years ago. This report was done at the direction of the last surface transportation bill, MAP-21, and my amendment requires DOT and DOD to work together to implement the report's recommendations.

Along with improving access to quality health care, one of the most important ways we need to help veterans is connecting them with job opportunities. Encouraging local businesses to hire more veterans is one step, but helping our veterans translate those skills they used in the military is a crucial part of putting our veterans back to work.

Many veterans who drove specialized vehicles in the military struggle to put these skills to work when they return home because of unnecessary and burdensome regulations. My amendment makes it easier for veterans to put their skills to work by requiring the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's report recommendations be put into effect.

Please allow me to explain.

My amendment writes into law the recommendations that States can waive driving skills tests if a veteran certifies that he or she was employed in the military in a position operating a commercial motor vehicle, or CMV, during the last year. This was included in the underlying bill, for which I applaud the majority and minority for their efforts; however, my amendment goes a bit further.

Among other things, my amendment helps create an abbreviated commercial driver's license skills test for States to give military drivers who do not have the experience operating vehicles with air brakes or manual transmissions.

This amendment also, based on the recommendations of the report, directs the military services to work with the

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration and the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators to clarify options available to servicemembers and veterans to obtain existing information on military licenses, military CMV driver history, and military CMV experience.

Mr. Chairman, we need to do better by our men and women in uniform who have risked and sacrificed so much to keep us safe and free. As we focus on growing our economy, we need to keep our veterans in mind as we seek to expand job opportunities. This amendment will help us do just that.

The study commissioned by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration was 2 years ago. It is time to put that into action and to get our veterans back to work. This is about getting our veterans what they have earned and deserve, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to see this through.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman from California bringing this amendment forward.

The STRR Act requires the Secretary to issue regulations by the end of this year to implement recommendations of a report to Congress on assisting veterans in acquiring a commercial driver's license. However, the bill does not address the nonregulatory recommendations. This amendment does that. It requires the Secretary to implement those recommendations within a year.

This is a good amendment that will assist our veterans in making the transition to civilian life. I urge all Members to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AGUILAR. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY ON BURYING POWER LINES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a study and report the findings of such study to the appropriate committees of Congress regarding the feasibility, costs, and

economic impact of burying power lines underground. Such study shall include the potential costs and benefits of burying power lines underground when building new roads.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the Hahn-Cicilline amendment to the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015. Our committee has been putting in many months, some would say even years, in writing this bill. So it is actually a great day to see this bill finally come on the floor.

In addition, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and the entire Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for our hard work in crafting this legislation.

If I might just take a moment at this point to give a farewell and a rest in peace to Howard Coble, who was a good member of our Transportation Committee, who served in the Coast Guard. In fact, we named our Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014. We will miss him. He was a good member of our committee.

Our amendment today looks to make our Nation's roadways safer and, also, more scenic by directing the Secretary of Transportation to study the benefits and costs of undergrounding power lines.

Forty percent of all power outages are due to fallen trees or weather events, and an additional 8 percent are caused by traffic accidents.

By placing power lines underground, roadways are safer from downed lines during storms, service to customers is more reliable, and our roadways will simply be more beautiful to drive on.

Every year over 1,000 fatalities occur as a result of collisions with utility poles. In fact, according to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, about 20 percent of all highway deaths are due to power line poles and traffic barriers.

This is a preventable tragedy, and this amendment asks the Secretary to evaluate if this is feasible and to share with Congress its findings.

We should take this highway authorization as an opportunity to make our highways safer and more scenic.

My home State of California has been a leader in undergrounding power lines. In 1967, California began encouraging and directing utility providers to allocate a portion of their budgets to replace overhead cables with underground cables. This has been a good start, but I think we could do more in this country.

It was President Johnson, urged on by Lady Bird, who signed the Highway Beautification Act in 1965 to limit unsightly roadside mess.

Upon the bill's passage, President Johnson said, "Beauty belongs to all the people. And so long as I am President, what has been divinely given to nature will not be taken recklessly away by man."

By conducting a nationwide study through the DOT, we can begin to see where these conversions make sense across this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I, as always, appreciate the gentlewoman from California and her hard work. She is a valued member of the committee.

I don't believe this amendment has to do with transportation policy. I think it is a good thing when you bury power lines for a lot of reasons—appearance, weather, all those things—but I really don't believe this is a Federal issue, nor do I believe the U.S. Department of Transportation is the appropriate agency to determine the costs and benefits of burying power lines.

I really believe that should be up to the companies and their cost-benefit analysis to determine that and not to underwrite or subsidize their operation by doing this.

So, again, with great respect to the gentlewoman from California, I oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) to speak in support of this important amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership on this effort.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. This amendment would require the Secretary to conduct a study of the feasibility, costs, and economic impact of burying power lines underground.

According to Federal data, the U.S. electric grid loses power 285 percent more often than it did in 1984, when data collection efforts on blackouts began.

According to the Department of Energy, that costs American businesses as much as \$150 billion per year, with weather-related disruptions costing the most per event.

Underground power lines make up just 18 percent of U.S. transmission lines, yet nearly all new residential and commercial developments opt for underground electric service.

During Hurricane Irene in 2011, more than 6.5 million people in the United States lost power, including more than 30 percent of the residents living in my home State of Rhode Island, as well as Connecticut and Maryland.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple, straightforward amendment so

that we can begin to create a more reliable and resilient electric grid.

I want to acknowledge the work being advanced by Scenic America to help restore and modernize the Highway Beautification Act that Congresswoman HAHN just made reference to.

A group of us, including this extraordinary gentlewoman from California, have been in a working group trying to work on legislation to really restore and modernize the Highway Beautification Act, and Scenic America has really taken the lead in this work.

I think the words of Lady Bird Johnson that the gentlewoman just recited are incredibly important. This is an important first step to just get information to understand the economic impact of burying power lines, what a difference it will make not only in terms of the scenic beauty of our highways, but also to businesses, and to prevent the economic loss that happens both to individuals and businesses.

It is an excellent amendment. I thank the gentlewoman for her great leadership. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Ms. HAHN. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE). This was our joint amendment.

Mr. Chair, as you said, Scenic America is working on different ways in this country to beautify our landscape. I believe that this transportation bill was the appropriate place to do this, as this is about highways and our roads in this country.

But, having the disapproval and opposition of my chairman—it wasn't that strong, but it was a disapproval—I will agree to withdraw this amendment, and we will work with Scenic America to find another way to bring the undergrounding of our utilities forward.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, although I oppose his amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. I would just ask the gentleman if he would commit to working with Congresswoman HAHN and I and a group of others that are really interested in restoring and modernizing the Highway Beautification Act so that we might work collaboratively on restoring some of those important provisions.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman pushing this issue. Again, as I said, burying power lines I think is a positive thing. It does add to the beauty of the landscape. But I just don't believe that it is the Federal Government's role to underwrite, the taxpayers to underwrite, these utility companies.

So, again, I appreciate the withdrawal. I appreciate your pushing this issue. I continue to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 114–326.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 1431. STORMWATER REDUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 300. Stormwater reduction assistance program

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ‘green stormwater infrastructure’ refers to stormwater management techniques that address the quality or quantity of stormwater related to highway construction or due to highway runoff.

“(b) FEDERAL HIGHWAY RUNOFF MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall develop and publish best practices and guidance for the installation, use and maintenance of green stormwater infrastructure, including the adoption of permeable, pervious, or porous paving materials or other practices and systems that are designed to minimize environmental impacts of stormwater runoff and flooding.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The guidance shall include best practices, guidelines, and technical assistance for the installation and use of green stormwater technologies, including—

“(A) identification of existing and emerging green stormwater infrastructure technologies;

“(B) cost-benefit information relating to green stormwater infrastructure approaches;

“(C) performance analyses of green stormwater infrastructure technologies in typical use scenarios; and

“(D) guidance and best practices on the design, implementation, use, and maintenance of green stormwater infrastructure features.

“(3) UPDATES.—Not later than 5 years after the date of publication of the guidance under this paragraph, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall update the guidance, as applicable.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, small towns and cities alike have reasons to manage their storm water runoff. Our streams, rivers, lakes, and estuaries are all at risk of dangerous pollution following a downpour.

Trust me, those of us from western Washington know this full well, and places like Puyallup, Washington, are

actually finding ways to adjust their neighborhoods to protect surrounding waterways from pollution.

Since 2009, Puyallup has helped residents install rain gardens to absorb the rainfall. These rain gardens are linked by pipes that collect the excess water from the roofs and direct it to the gardens rather than to the streets and then into the sewer.

This is just one innovation of several great ideas that are innovated throughout this country in places like Puyallup.

My amendment today builds on the success on the ground by simply asking the Department of Transportation to develop best practices for storm water management, to collect the information, and a guide on how to implement, install, and maintain green storm water infrastructure, and help any State that requests help with the development of such a plan—a voluntary program, not a requirement, no new money.

Many of these innovative infrastructure practices—permeable pavement, natural drainage swales, green roofs—are economical and increase property values and invest in the people that make their careers designing and building these inventions.

These new tools are both flexible and yield a strong return on investment. The people of Puyallup, Washington, get that.

They know and I know and you know that we can’t let water carry oil from our cars, pesticide from our lawns, and other pollutants into Clarks Creek or the Puyallup River or the Puget Sound.

We can’t do that and keep a strong economy or a desirable location for business and living. We can’t let runoff kill, as an example, our cherished Coho salmon.

So I ask you to support the promise of these innovative economical ideas to manage our storm water and to get DOT involved.

This is the best of federalism. No new money, no mandatory program, just a way to get the information out, which the Federal U.S. DOT is in the perfect position to collect and make available.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth Congressional District of Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentleman from Washington’s Tenth District.

In my neck of the woods, we take pride in the Puget Sound and we understand that it is in danger. That is why I join my colleague today to talk about the treasures the Sound holds: the water, the salmon, the oysters, the orcas, an entire ecosystem that is currently under attack. This is a threat that happens every time a thunderstorm or a rain strikes cities like Tacoma.

When heavy rains hit, that water will wash toxic mixtures of oil and heavy metals off of our city streets and highways and into waterways like Puget Sound.

The Seattle Times recently wrote about a new study that found some runoff was so toxic that it killed Coho salmon in 2½ hours.

It is something we don’t often think about, but this storm water mix creates a pollution that lingers. Folks in the region I represent are doing groundbreaking work putting in green storm water infrastructure to capture this runoff before it hits our waters.

These are projects like rain gardens, green roofs, and natural drainage swales. Instead of letting storm water slide along and collect more dirt and grime and end up in our bodies of water, it captures it.

Our amendment would encourage the growth of these projects. It would give our local governments and places like Tacoma and Puyallup and elsewhere a clear playbook on the most effective ways to implement green storm water infrastructure.

It demonstrates that the Federal Government and local stakeholders can be partners in cleaning up our waters. This matters. It matters to Tacoma and other cities. It matters to bodies of water like the Puget Sound.

Storm water runoff may be hard to spot, but it is taking a toll on Puget Sound and other bodies of water. That is why this amendment is important. That is why I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand what the gentleman from Washington is trying to accomplish here.

The reason I oppose it is not because of what he is attempting to do, but the Federal Highway Administration currently has strongly supported and encouraged the use and implementation of green infrastructure in the Federal aid transportation projects to mitigate highway runoff impacts.

FHWA recently published a new storm water runoff model, and it is engaged in various storm water research, including storm water performance measures.

The Department of Transportation also is part of a Federal agency green infrastructure collaborative. This initiative includes working with States to implement integrated ecosystems, including landscape-scale mitigation. So I don’t believe we need to legislate further on this.

I also would make note that just last night, we agreed to the amendment of Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland on storm water mitigation to put the States in the metropolitan planning process.

□ 1615

Again, I understand what the gentleman is trying to accomplish. I think it is already in the legislation. I think it is already in current law, so I would oppose the amendment

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HECK of Washington. With all due respect to the chair of the committee, that isn't included in the current legislation and is clearly not the intent of the amendment. The intent of the amendment is to ask them to accumulate best practices. Yes, they have programs where they promote and they advocate. This is to ask them to go out and find these programs like we talked about in Puyallup which are unusual and innovative and which aren't yet in the manual so that they can share. This is information sharing on a scale that they don't currently do.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, it would help with a serious problem; but given the Chair's opposition to this, I will only ask that he consider taking a deeper dive into what we are trying to accomplish here because it solves a problem.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I will continue to work with the gentleman. The gentleman is correct. It is not in current law, but the Federal Highway Administration is working on these things collaboratively with the States, and I think that we ought to let them continue at that pace.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE REQUIREMENTS.

None of the funds made available by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing rate of wage requirements in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I have offered in the past, and it will be known as the amendment that eliminates the effect of the Davis-Bacon Act. The substance of it is this:

None of the funds made available by this act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing rate of wage, which is the effect of this

amendment, and it is effectively the Davis-Bacon Act. It seems to get the attention of some of my colleagues.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I have worked with this issue as long as anyone in the United States Congress. I have worked back for years, as I began about 5 years in the construction site as an employee. Multiple times I received Davis-Bacon wage scales; sometimes I did not.

As I became a contractor in 1975, we began hiring employees. Sometimes we paid Davis-Bacon wage scales, and sometimes we did not; but I was always aggravated by the Federal Government's deciding that they knew what we had to pay our help and what they were worth.

I recall many debates on the floor of the House of Representatives when people from the other side of the aisle would say that anytime there is a relationship between two or more people that are consenting adults, the Federal Government has no business sticking themselves in the middle of that relationship. Yet the Davis-Bacon Act tells me what my son, who is now sitting in the gallery, has to pay me if I am going to climb in the seat of one of his machines, say an excavator, a scraper, a bulldozer, or a motor grader.

So we are 40 years in the construction business. I have watched the inefficiencies that are created by the Davis-Bacon Act. You might need somebody on a shovel, and he decides it pays more to get on a motor grade; or you might need somebody on a scraper, and he decides it pays more to get on a bulldozer. This wrecks the efficiency as well as puts an extra high price on the cost of the products that are being produced under the contracting business in the United States.

So I would say this, Mr. Chairman, that over our years in the construction business, the extra costs for Davis-Bacon ranges somewhere between 8 and 38 percent additional, depending on the type of project and the location where you are. The average is someplace between 20 and 22 percent.

So to boil this all down, if we want to be responsible to the taxpayer, then we want to get the best dollar out of that.

Somebody is going to say that it is second-rate work. That would be a direct insult to me. It would be a direct insult to my son, who owns King Construction today and who is listening to this debate. Our quality work stands with anyone's, and it is superior to many; and sometimes it is Davis-Bacon wage scale, and sometimes it is not. But we know what they are worth. The government doesn't know what they are worth. We want to hire the best help, keep the best help, and keep the best help on. That is just here in this microcosm of King Construction, but it is extrapolated across the Nation.

So do we want to build 4 miles of road under government-mandated wages or do we want to build 5? I want to build the 5 miles. I want to build five bridges, not four. I want the best

dollar for the taxpayers, and I want the highest efficiency that we can get. That is the substance of this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time in America in 1931 when people were desperate, and unscrupulous contractors would move people from place to place, put them in work camps, and undercut the wages in communities. The wisdom of the Congress back then was this is not proper. Communities have different wage rates.

This is not a diktat from Washington, D.C., about the wages. It says you will pay the wages that prevail in your community. For instance, in the gentleman's community, the median wage is \$49,427. But under Davis-Bacon, an electrician—a pretty darned skilled person in my opinion—would only get \$36,500 if they get the minimum Davis-Bacon wage. So I don't see that that is outrageous.

What we are trying to prevent here is the abuse of construction workers and people, moving them from place to place, bringing them from a very low-cost State and saying: Hey, when you go home, you are going to be doing good. We will put you in a little work camp and a tent. You come here to this State; you undercut all the local workers; you do the job; and you go home. We don't want to go back to those days. Those were not halcyon days in America.

So this is really a way to provide people with a living wage, certainly not an extravagant wage. I don't think \$36,500 for an electrician in Iowa is an extravagant wage, and I don't see why we should pull that floor out from underneath them and say: Oh, hey, well, that is a little too high. We want to be able to pay our electricians less than that.

This is about trying to create a race to the bottom like we have in too many other things in this country, our trade agreements and a whole host of other things that are going on that are creating income inequality. This will exacerbate income inequality. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

This amendment would prohibit the application and payment of prevailing wages provided under the Davis-Bacon Act for funds expended on construction projects in this bill.

Davis-Bacon sets wage and benefit standards for federally assisted construction projects to ensure that contractors compete on the quality of their work, not by undercutting wage levels in local communities. Negating the application of wage laws, as the King amendment proposes to do, often leads to shoddy construction and substantial cost overruns.

This is not said to insult the sponsor of the amendment. The fact is that the census construction data shows that the value added per worker in States with prevailing wage laws is 13 to 15 percent higher than in States without prevailing wage laws.

Additionally, studies conducted by the University of Utah have found that repealing the prevailing wage has led to the reduction or elimination of apprenticeship programs. Mr. Chairman, this is National Apprenticeship Week. We should be promoting the participation in apprenticeship programs, not taking up measures that would negatively impact this critical job training tool.

Under prevailing wage laws, contractors are forced to compete on the basis of who can best train, equip, and manage construction crews, not on the basis of who can assemble the cheapest, most exploitable workforce either locally or by importing labor from somewhere else.

Historically, Mr. Chairman, there has been bipartisan opposition to repealing or suspending the Davis-Bacon Act in infrastructure programs. Let's continue that bipartisan tradition on prevailing wages by voting "no" on this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I thought I had actually made the statement, I thought my good friend from Virginia would pick this up, that it isn't about shoddy construction work that can be laid at the feet of merit shop operations. I am standing here on my feet in my boots having done all kinds of work for lots of years, and so has my family, going back about five generations. Our work has been competing with and superior to that of many, and there is nothing in the record of our company that anyone could point to other than quality and efficiency.

In fact, the reason that he needs an apprentice program is because you can't afford to hire somebody and train them unless the government is willing to let you pay them less than the prevailing wage. That is what the apprentice program is. I have been one, and I have been bounced out of there because of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, when I listen to the gentleman about how we are going to prevent people from moving people in from a low-wage area to a high-wage area to take a higher wage

or perhaps undercut the existing wage that is there, that is what started the Davis-Bacon Act. It wasn't to keep the low wages out. It was to keep African Americans out of New York City during the Depression when there was a large Federal building contract, and a contractor successfully bid that job. He was from out of town and he brought his crews in from Alabama, African Americans from Alabama, to do the work cheaper than the union scale would do in New York. That is what brought about this Davis-Bacon Act.

When the Federal Government decides they are going to tell people what they have to pay their employees, they are the last people that actually know what that is worth. When you have to compete in this real world where equipment is expensive and time is priceless and we have strict specifications, strong engineers, bonds—bid bonds and performance bonds—and insurance contracts, we have to be efficient, and we have to be professional. We have to be able to not only do this as well as anyone, but more efficiently than anyone. That is what the merit shop does.

Mr. Chairman, nobody is dragging their feet in our operation. They want the company to be successful. When I send people out on a Davis-Bacon job, they are out there sometimes rolling clods because they know that it pays them to roll clods rather than get the job done. That is our expression, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if I have 1 minute remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, this is actually a pretty simple question, and I know my friend from Iowa tends to see this question through the lens of his own personal experience and his own company, but, frankly, this is a bigger question than that.

I think it is right that the Federal Government has a stake in how it spends its money and that the Federal Government ought to be able to say that when we fund construction projects, we don't want contractors to simply pick the cheapest labor they can. Sure, we may want to build more roads, but we want to make sure those roads last. It is not just a matter of how many miles you build, but whether or not they are going to be done in a way that makes sure that the quality of the work matches the investment that this country is making.

So, Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's point. I can just tell you about my own experience having done development and construction in one of

the toughest markets in America, big construction and small jobs. I always knew when we paid a prevailing wage that the work was going to be done on time and it was going to be done with quality.

When it comes to the Federal dollar, doesn't it seem to me and all of us here that cheap is not always better, and that we owe it to the American people to deliver to them a product that is consistent with the quality that they would like to see in their own home? When you go to buy material or when you go to hire a contractor yourself for your own home, you don't say to yourself, "Who is the lowest cost provider I can get?" You want to make sure the job is done right.

Secondly, the American people need a raise. We don't need the Federal Government to participate in this race to the bottom in undercutting local economies by paying people less than they are worth. We have lost enough in this country. It is time to end this.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

For over 75 years, the Davis-Bacon Act has been protecting middle class families and taxpayers.

As a son of a union worker in Snohomish County, Washington, I know how important prevailing wages can be for middle class families.

A prevailing wage is not necessarily a union wage—it's set by the Department of Labor after surveying local labor.

But it's a living wage, one that has helped build middle class economies in my district in places like Everett and Lynnwood.

Davis-Bacon standards also ensure that taxpayers are getting their money's worth when it comes to construction projects.

By paying a decent wage, Davis-Bacon projects are built by more experienced and more productive construction workers.

The result is better built, longer lasting projects that save money over their lifetime which is especially important because poor and crumbling infrastructure hurts everyone.

We shouldn't cut corners when it comes to our transportation infrastructure, and we shouldn't cut corners when it comes to hiring construction workers.

The amendment before us would do just that.

Workers deserve to be paid fair wages.

I ask my colleagues to support middle class families by voting against this amendment.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II the following:

SEC. ____ . STREAMLINED APPLICATION PROCESS. Section 603 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) STREAMLINED APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015, the Secretary shall make available an expedited application process or processes available at the request of entities seeking secured loans under this chapter that use a set or sets of conventional terms established pursuant to this section.

“(2) TERMS.—In establishing the streamlined application process required by this subsection, the Secretary shall include terms commonly included in prior credit agreements that are desirable to borrowers and allow for an expedited application period, including—

“(A) the secured loan is in an amount of not greater than \$100,000,000;

“(B) the secured loan is secured and payable from pledged revenues not affected by project performance, such as a tax-backed revenue pledge, tax increment financing, or a system-backed pledge of project revenues; and

“(C) repayment of the loan commence not later than 2 years after disbursement.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 114-326 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

In lieu of amendment #13 printed in Part A of House Report 114-326.

Add at the end of title II the following:

SEC. ____ . STREAMLINED APPLICATION PROCESS. Section 603 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) STREAMLINED APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015, the Secretary shall make available an expedited application process or processes available at the request of entities seeking secured loans under this chapter that use a set or sets of conventional terms established pursuant to this section.

“(2) TERMS.—In establishing the streamlined application process required by this

subsection, the Secretary may include terms commonly included in prior credit agreements and allow for an expedited application period, including—

“(A) the secured loan is in an amount of not greater than \$100,000,000;

“(B) the secured loan is secured and payable from pledged revenues not affected by project performance, such as a tax-backed revenue pledge, tax increment financing, or a system-backed pledge of project revenues; and

“(C) repayment of the loan commence not later than 5 years after disbursement.”.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the modification.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have heard from many midsize cities in my district that they often struggle to compete with larger cities for Federal transportation funding.

While the needs of midsize cities are just as significant as those of larger cities, the administrative burden of accessing TIGER grants or TIFIA loans is often too great. My amendment addresses that difficulty by improving access to TIFIA loans.

While TIFIA is a great funding source for bigger projects, sponsors of smaller projects can be discouraged from using it because the application process is complicated and requires more resources than these cities can muster.

My amendment would require the Secretary to provide an expedited process for TIFIA applications that are less than \$100 million and backed by real revenue. These are smaller, lower risk projects that aren't happening because States and localities might be scared off by the long and involved TIFIA loan application process.

By creating an expedited process for these smaller, lower risk projects, we can open access to Federal resources for smaller cities and counties that we represent.

This is a streamlined amendment that puts more power in the hands of State and local governments, something I know that my colleagues can support.

I appreciate that Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO have made other improvements to the TIFIA process in the underlying bill, and my amendment complements these improvements in a straightforward way. I would appreciate the support of the leadership on the committee for this amendment.

I ask support of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's commonsense amendment. As usual, he brings common sense to the table.

This amendment does and will accelerate the approval of TIFIA credit assistance for certain projects.

I encourage all Members to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 249, after line 14, insert the following:

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii) by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end of subparagraph (B) the following:

“(iv) the applicant shall have a current operating ratio, as such ratio is set forth by the Federal Transit Administration using the ratio of current assets to current liabilities, of 1:1.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, one of our principal responsibilities here is to be good stewards of our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars. It is a responsibility that I know each one of us takes very seriously.

My amendment today will ensure that we apply the same commonsense standards to the investment of our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars that we do in the investment of our own dollars.

You in your own life would not loan money or invest money in a business that was so poorly managed that it took on more debt than they could manage. You wouldn't put your money in a company that had taken on so much debt that their debt exceeded their liabilities. And, certainly, if you were applying for a bank loan, a bank would not loan your business money if your business had more debt than it had assets.

That is all this amendment says is that the Federal Government will not

invest our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars in a transit agency that has more debt than they do liabilities.

My amendment ensures that the minimum asset-to-debt ratio that a transit entity can have is 1:1. It is common sense. This is sort of a working guideline that I know the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I work, and the Federal Transit Administration has for years wanted to be sure that the agencies out there—transit entities across America—have no more debt than they do assets.

So the amendment says the Federal Government will not issue a Federal transit grant to an agency that has a ratio of current assets to debt that exceeds 1:1, very straightforward, very simple.

Let's protect our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars in the same way we would protect our own. In fact, it is actually a much higher obligation that we have to be good stewards of the Treasury, as responsible representatives.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

This is an unusual amendment, to say the least. There is no measure of assets done regularly for our transit systems in America. In fact, the only measurement that is done is that we have an \$84 billion—B, billion—backlog to bring our existing transit systems up to a state of good repair. That means, basically, I am sure everybody would fail this test.

So if you want to do away with transit in America and get them out of the trust fund—something that Ronald Reagan made a high priority, and he put transit into the trust fund. He was the first Republican to support that, and they have been in ever since.

He said: We cannot ignore our urban centers. They are the engines of economic growth in this country, and we can't ignore them. We need to be able to move people efficiently in those urban areas.

So, since then, we have had a modest proportion of the trust fund—about 20 percent, generally—going into transit.

That is not adequate, as it is not adequate for bridges; 140,000 need replacement or repair. It is not adequate for highways; 40 percent of the system is failing and it needs total rebuilding.

But an \$84 billion backlog in transit—they are killing people right here in the Nation's Capital because of the state of disrepair. It is an embarrassment.

There is no transit district in the United States of America who makes money. So what is this about? I don't get it. We are not lending money for them to make a profit and pay off loans. They all receive Federal support, and they need more Federal support.

In fact, in my travels, I have only been one place where they claim the transit district made money, which is Hong Kong. I urge you to go ride there at rush hour and see if you enjoy that experience. It is not very good here either.

But, in any case, no one else claims to make money. And I don't know if they really do. That is a Communist-dominated state. So it is probably not true.

I don't understand the amendment, to tell the truth. I would urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Oregon is confusing the issue here. The amendment is very straightforward.

Let me read from the amendment itself. The applicant transit agency has to have a current operating ratio of current assets to current liabilities of 1:1. They have to have the same current level of debt as they do assets in order to be eligible to apply for a Federal transit grant.

This isn't about making money. This is about making sure the taxpayers are not going to give another brick to a transit agency that has already got too much debt and is overloaded and is in a position where they may not be able to take full advantage of the grant. Taxpayers, our constituents, should not have to put their hard-earned tax dollars into a transit agency that is carrying more debt than they have assets. This is very straightforward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas for him to name a transit agency that has gone bankrupt recently.

Mr. CULBERSON. In fact, I just spoke to the chairman of the Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority yesterday, and he tells me that their asset-to-debt ratio—they have got assets.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I don't know what and who is running that thing.

Mr. CULBERSON: They are going to go bankrupt.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Sir, it is my time. They have not gone bankrupt. They are still operating.

The Federal Government has not had, that I am aware of, any major TIFIA loans or anything go into default.

This is a bizarre amendment in search of a problem that doesn't exist. We have no transit agencies that are making money. I don't anticipate we ever will have a transit agency that makes money. No one in the world operates transit agencies that make money.

It is a public service to mitigate congestion and provide for our major urban areas to move people more efficiently with a partnership between the Federal Government and local authorities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, this is not about making money. The

Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority chairman yesterday told me that their asset-to-debt ratio is about 2.3:1. So they have got 2 to 3 times more assets than they do debt.

That is what this amendment says, that we will, as good stewards of our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, only send Federal transportation grants to transit agencies like Houston Metro that have done a good job managing their responsibilities and their assets are at least on par with their debt. That is all it says.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Oregon is confusing the issue. This isn't about making money. This isn't about repaying the money.

This is about making sure that our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars are going to be wisely and carefully and prudently sent only to those transit agencies that have proven they can do a good job, that they don't have more debt currently than they have current assets.

My amendment, quoting from the amendment, is very simple:

Applicant shall have a current operating ratio of current assets to current liabilities of 1:1.

That is at a minimum. Houston Metro would qualify for this. There are transit agencies all over America that would qualify for this.

Let's make sure that the transit entity, before they ask for our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, have demonstrated that they are competent and capable of managing the money that they already have on hand and they don't have more debt than they can carry.

I urge passage of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Actually, the amendment is to take money from New York City, Washington, D.C., probably Baltimore, Boston—I don't know—anyone who has a legacy transportation system that actually, until Ronald Reagan was President, pretty much was built without Federal dollars and run without Federal support and they have huge backlogs in terms of bringing them up to a state of good repair, 120-, 130-year-old tunnels.

This would just basically say: Let's put the money in the places which have the most modern transportation systems, built most recently, and probably built since Federal support was put in place by Ronald Reagan and stick it to the ones who did it on their own 130, 140 years ago and have been struggling to keep up and only had a partnership with the Federal Government since Ronald Reagan was President of the United States.

This does not go to the efficiency of an operation anytime anybody applies for a TIFIA loan or anything else. They

are evaluated in terms of how they are going to be able to repay those loans at the fare box, out of the fare box, out of operating costs, not what their assets to liabilities are.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1645

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 15 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title I (page 233, after line 8), insert the following:

SEC. 1431. IMPROVEMENT OF DATA COLLECTION ON CHILD OCCUPANTS IN VEHICLE CRASHES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall revise the crash investigation data collection system of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to include the collection of the following data in connection with vehicle crashes whenever a child restraint system was in use in a vehicle involved in a crash:

(1) The type or types of child restraint systems in use during the crash in any vehicle involved in the crash, including whether a five-point harness or belt-positioning booster.

(2) If a five-point harness child restraint system was in use during the crash, whether the child restraint system was forward-facing or rear-facing in the vehicle concerned.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In implementing subsection (a), the Secretary shall work with law enforcement officials, safety advocates, the medical community, and research organizations to improve the recordation of data described in subsection (a) in police and other applicable incident reports.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on child occupant crash data collection in the crash investigation data collection system of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration pursuant to the revision required by subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, this bipartisan amendment is simple. It is identical to language that appeared in the Senate version of the transportation bill that required improved data collection on the types of child restraint systems in use whenever a child is present during a car crash.

I am honored to have Representative LOVE as a cosponsor of this amendment, and I thank her for her support.

Mr. Chair, I know that we have 81 amendments to work through today and a long evening ahead of us; so, in the interest of time, I will keep my remarks brief.

The amendment I am offering merely requires revisions to the crash investigation data collection system of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in an effort to save children's lives. The more we know about the type of child restraint system used, how it was used, and the outcome of that use, the more we will be able to avert future tragedies.

After 3 years of collection of the data required by this amendment, the Secretary will be required to submit a report to Congress on the performance of various child restraint systems. It is my hope that we will join together at that time to craft new legislation that addresses what we learn.

Again, this is a bipartisan amendment, Mr. Chair. I believe it is a good amendment, and I think we have an opportunity to save children's lives.

I urge support for this amendment. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in our jurisdiction. It is in the Energy and Commerce Committee's jurisdiction. I understand the Energy and Commerce Committee supports the amendment, so we support the amendment also.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the chairman does not oppose and that the committee of jurisdiction does not oppose.

It is very timely. We just had a study about child safety seats which raises questions about rear-facing seats, and I think this comprehensive data would be very, very important as we move forward, potentially changing the guidelines on how we restrain children in vehicles to better protect them.

I congratulate the gentlewoman on bringing this amendment forward, and I hope that it is accepted.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. STREETCAR FUNDING PROHIBITION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal financial assistance may not be provided for any project or activity to establish, maintain, operate, or otherwise support a streetcar service. This section does not apply to a contract entered into before the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, streetcars, also known as trollies, are mass transit vehicles that operate on rail lines embedded in normal roadways, often drawing electrical power from overhead structures.

From 2009 to 2014, the Department of Transportation awarded \$432 million for streetcar projects in 14 cities throughout the country.

Streetcars are highly impractical from a public transit standpoint. Like a bus, but unlike a train, a streetcar's speed is constrained by the speed of traffic around them. Unlike a bus, however, they are bound by their tracks. If anything blocks the tracks, such as an accident or a construction project, the entire line shuts down, making it an inefficient form of transportation.

Streetcars are costly to build and operate. They require extensive infrastructure, including tracks and overhead power, that is not required for buses. Per passenger, per mile, they are also significantly and consistently more costly to operate than buses. According to a 2013 Journal of Public Transportation study, they fail or are at the bottom of all efficient forms of transportation.

The Congressional Research Service can find no clear evidence that streetcars increase transit ridership. Streetcar corridors that saw economic growth often benefited from other substantial subsidies. It is unclear if streetcars contributed to this growth.

The main argument for this amendment, which would prohibit future funding, is that it would establish Federal prohibitions on any financial assistance to establish, maintain, operate, or otherwise support a streetcar service unless there is a current contract in place that would be entered

into before the date of the enactment of the act.

The main argument for streetcars is often their psychological appeal. While this is appreciated, it is also very subjective, and it depends on the sentiments of tourists or local communities. They are more comparable to water taxis or Ferris wheels than to buses and light rail. The Department of Transportation is not in a good position to judge how tourists and locals will feel about a streetcar project. The agency, therefore, lacks the insight to predict the success of a project.

Most streetcar funding has come from the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery grant program, or TIGER program. TIGER is an extremely competitive program with 20 times more applicants than there is money available. Recent rule changes are expected to make it easier for streetcars to receive funding from the Capital Investment Grant Program, also known as the New Starts and Small Starts program.

The President's administration has requested \$3.2 billion for this program for FY 2016, including \$75 million for streetcar projects, and at least six more are under development.

Any further grant awards for streetcar projects will divert scarce Federal funding from other high-priority transportation projects. While we appreciate all forms of transportation, our infrastructure, our national defense, and the vitality of our commerce on our roads beg for more efficient means of transportation for our dollars, which are limited.

Bus Rapid Transit projects, or BRT projects, for example, attract riders with higher quality stations and buses, traffic lanes that are fully or partially dedicated to buses, and more reliable, frequent service. Unlike for streetcars, there is objective evidence that the BRT tends to increase transit ridership and decrease trip time, according to the Government Accountability Office.

Streetcar projects are expensive, uncertain gambles that depend on subjective local and tourist sentiments more than on objective facts. It is for that reason—as we face a \$19 trillion deficit and as we face foreign policy challenges abroad that require contingency dollars and as we look at husbanding the strength for our transportation—that my amendment would make sure that these resources are used in their proper place.

Local communities should, therefore, risk their own funds, like in my home State of Oklahoma. Oklahoma City recently passed a \$129 million downtown streetcar project, which its own citizens approved, without using Federal funds. While municipalities may desire streetcars, they should not do it with other Americans' money.

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

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

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

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

This amendment would dictate to communities across America what form of transit they could put into their urban areas to solve problems of congestion and the efficient movement of people from place to place.

The gentleman mentioned tourist destinations. Yes, some may relate to tourist destinations; others may relate to medical facilities, as in Portland, Oregon, where the streetcar terminates at the Oregon Health & Science University. It also then utilizes a tram, which is at both the bottom and the top of the hill. It is used by many patients and others who have to get there. So these are not just toy things or things that are used for tourists. They are used to solve congestion problems in major urban areas. They are also incredible tools for economic development.

As for the fixed streetcar line in Portland, they revitalized a whole section of the city, which generated \$3.5 billion in private economic development because the line was there. They didn't get any Federal money, but they built their projects adjacent to that line, which also provided a built-in ridership. Many people who reside in those pretty high-end apartments actually don't own cars, and they utilize the streetcar.

Salt Lake has already attracted \$400 million in investment. Atlanta, Georgia, has a very successful program. Tucson, Arizona, has seen an incredible initial ridership, far exceeding projections. Cities across America are finding great success with streetcars; so to deny them this tool on some sort of arbitrary basis, I think, is unwarranted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, no research supports clear economic growth, according to the Congressional Research Service. While there may be other factors—usually with heavy government subsidies—that also contribute to this growth, it does not have any delineation toward streetcars.

This amendment does not dictate but protects scarce resources. In a nation that has an incredible deficit problem, we have to get to the point at which we can have priorities. This focuses on priorities.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I could not disagree more with my friend from Oklahoma City.

First of all, the streetcar is a highly developed mechanism that 30 commu-

nities across the country are involved with right now, and they all invest their own money, including Oklahoma City. I find it ironic that somehow there is this notion that people are picking this out of the air as a toy or arts and crafts. That is not the case.

Look, I have been working on this for over 30 years, since I initiated a project for Portland's streetcar. I would be happy to introduce the gentleman to businesspeople, to local government. Actually, my friend from Oregon understated it. It is \$4.5 billion. It is happening in Seattle, in Tacoma. I was in New York—in Brooklyn—this Friday, where they are looking at a streetcar. It is an extraordinarily efficient way to concentrate development. It encourages private investment. It extends the pedestrian experience. It is part of the toolkit.

I notice the gentleman has left the Chamber. I was going to ask him if he knew that, in his Oklahoma City, there is a TIGER grant that is going to build three blocks of rail line starting in 2016. It was a choice of Oklahoma City. They thought the TIGER grant was so important that they are using Federal money in a project that is supplementing local money.

My friend from Oregon is correct, the ranking member, in that we shouldn't take this tool away from communities, large and small, across the country. From Kenosha, Wisconsin, to Los Angeles, people are understanding that the streetcar has a vital role in revitalizing communities, in giving people more choices, in focusing economic development; and it is why the tram—the streetcar—is ubiquitous across the world. It is why we now have 30 cities that are doing it.

I would argue, if you look at the billions of dollars we have invested in transportation projects, less than a half a billion dollars that people competed for very aggressively, for these TIGER grants, is money well spent. It is well spent in my community. Some people might warrant Bus Rapid Transit, like my colleague from Oregon has in Eugene.

□ 1700

This is a tool that has proven its worth. Communities around the country, from Cincinnati to Dallas, Texas, are doing it because it works. It would be a tragic mistake to approve an amendment that would take this tool away from communities that decide to do it and would like to supplement their local resources with Federal money, like is happening in Oklahoma City next year.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ . APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTORS OF THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
(1) the term “Compact” means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact (Public Law 89-774; 80 Stat. 1324);

(2) the term “Federal Director” means—
(A) a voting member of the Board of Directors of the Transit Authority who represents the Federal Government; and

(B) a nonvoting member of the Board of Directors of the Transit Authority who serves as an alternate for a member described in subparagraph (A); and

(3) the term “Transit Authority” means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority established under Article III of the Compact.

(b) APPOINTMENT BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any appointment made on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall have sole authority to appoint Federal Directors to the Board of Directors of the Transit Authority.

(2) AMENDMENT TO COMPACT.—The signatory parties to the Compact shall amend the Compact as necessary in accordance with paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Representative COMSTOCK of Virginia and I have an amendment that is at the desk, and I don't have to tell my colleagues who ride Metro every day to and from work of the issues that WMATA Metro has had with safety, performance, and management.

Our bipartisan amendment gives the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation the authority to appoint the four Federal members to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Board. Currently, the General Services Administration has this sole authority and shares oversight responsibilities of the Federal board members with the U.S. Department of Transportation. The WMATA board determines the agency's policy and provides oversight for the funding, operation, and expansion of transit facilities.

We have worked closely with Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland on this issue, and she has introduced a bill in the Senate that is cosponsored by all three other local Senators: Senators CARDIN, WARNER, and KAINE of Virginia.

From various conversations we have had, the Secretary of Transportation is also aware of this issue and is supportive of the Department of Transpor-

tation taking over. The General Services Administration has stated that “this was never in our wheelhouse.” And WMATA does not oppose this change.

I want to thank Chairs CHAFFETZ and MEADOWS and Ranking Members CUMMINGS and CONNOLLY for working with us since the amendment also falls under the jurisdiction of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. They have cleared this amendment.

Before I close, I want to remember our late colleague—and former colleague on the Transportation Committee—Howard Coble, who died last night. He represented the Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina, including the town I was born in, Yanceyville, North Carolina. He will be sorely missed by all of us and his long-time constituents and his service with us. May he rest in peace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

I don't have to tell my colleagues, some of who ride Metro each day to and from work, of the issues the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) has had with safety, performance, and management.

The Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA, Public Law 110-432), included the National Capital Transportation Amendments Act, a bill authorizing \$1.5 billion in federal funding for WMATA capital improvements. It was because of this federal investment and WMATA's large federal employee ridership that the National Capital Region Congressional Delegation created the federal board members.

The Delegation expanded the WMATA Board from twelve members from Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia to include sixteen members, establishing the four new federal member positions. The Delegation also believed that these federal board members would not be wrapped up in jurisdictional politics. Often board members from the jurisdictions do not recommend what is needed because their jurisdiction does not have the money.

The National Capital Region Congressional Delegation gave the appointment authority to the General Services Administration (GSA) because at the time, it seemed the best federal agency to represent the overall federal workforce. Approximately forty percent of WMATA's ridership is federal employees.

Our amendment gives the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) the authority to appoint the four federal members to the WMATA Board. Currently, the GSA has this sole authority and shares oversight responsibilities of the federal board members with USDOT. The WMATA Board determines the agency's policy and provides oversight for the funding, operation, and expansion of transit facilities.

I have worked with Senator MIKULSKI on this issue and she has introduced a bill in the Senate that this amendment is based on. S. 2093 is cosponsored by all 3 other local Senators, Senators CARDIN, WARNER, and KAINE.

From various conversations we have had, Secretary Foxx is aware of this issue and is supportive of USDOT taking over. GSA has stated that “this never was in our wheelhouse.” And WMATA does not oppose.

I want to thank Chairs CHAFFETZ & MEADOWS and Ranking Members CUMMINGS & CONNOLLY for working with us since the amendment falls under the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee's jurisdiction. It is my understanding they have cleared this amendment.

Since the creation of the federal board positions in 2008, GSA has not played an active role in oversight of the federal board members. GSA does not have any expertise about what it takes to operate a transit system, nor does it have any experience.

Only USDOT has been committed to the oversight of the federal board members and trying to correct WMATA's myriad problems. WMATA's serious safety, operational, and financial issues have all been documented by USDOT. The Secretary of USDOT and the Federal Transit Administration have been working directly with the federal board members and the transit agency to get things fixed. The federal board members and USDOT are in regular communication.

In addition, the local delegation led by Senator MIKULSKI has been providing the federal finding authorized in PRIIA in the annual Transportation & HUD (THUD) Appropriations Bill. For the last seven years, bill and report language has been included requiring strict oversight by the USDOT Secretary on how these taxpayer dollars are spent.

Before I close, I would like to remember our late colleague, Howard Coble, who died last night. He represented the 6th Congressional District of North Carolina, including the town that I was born in, Yanceyville. Howard will be sorely missed by all of us and his long-time constituents. May he rest in peace.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, although I don't oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment really is in the jurisdiction of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. They are in favor of the amendment, so we are going to urge our colleagues to support it. We are not going to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say it has been a real pleasure to be able to work with Mrs. COMSTOCK on this amendment. It is very rare that we have opportunities to work across the aisle and also across the Capitol to make sure that we are doing the right thing for our transit system here in the metropolitan Washington area that serves so many millions of both Federal workers and tourists from all of our different States and jurisdictions.

It is really clear that the General Services Administration in this day and age is probably not the most appropriate place for the appointment of these members of the board. It is dutifully to be placed with the Department of Transportation to which they have

agreed. I thank our colleagues for all agreeing to this as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 424, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 426, line 24.

Page 428, line 20, strike "and" at the end. Page 428, line 23, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 428, after line 23, insert the following: (4) is not a high-risk carrier, as identified by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Beginning on page 449, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 451, line 22.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair, ranking member, and all the colleagues who worked so hard on bringing this legislation to the floor.

My amendment is really about improving this bill. It is going to make it a better bill, and it is about making our Nation's roads safer and the delivery of goods more efficient.

There are 15.5 million trucks on the road each year driving more than 93 billion miles annually, carrying over a billion dollars' worth of goods. There is no question that our Nation's trucking industry is a huge economic driver, earning \$650 billion annually, 5 percent of the United States GDP.

With all that sunshine comes a little bit of rain. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration said that in 2013 almost 4,000 people were killed and 95,000 people were injured by large trucks, costing the public a whopping \$100 billion annually. So my amendment does three things to increase safety and to reduce those costs.

First, the amendment brings the requirement for commercial truck insurance into the 21st century. It is shocking, Mr. Chair, that the minimum insurance required for commercial trucks has remained the same since the 1980s at \$750,000 per incident regardless of the number of victims or their injuries. The FMCSA, which is the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, is currently engaged in rulemaking to examine the appropriateness of this standard. The base bill requires studies that I respectfully submit will slow down this process.

Imagine a large truck hitting a bus full of schoolchildren and the insurance only being \$750,000 to cover all the losses. Do you want to be the person that tells the parents that Congress needs to do more studies before their medical bills can be paid? My amendment strikes these unnecessary studies so that the FMCSA can finish their important work without delay.

Second, the base bill creates a national hiring standard that brokers and shippers must use to hire carriers. One of these standards is based on outdated information. It is not updated annually. So my amendment at the desk would strengthen the hiring standard by prohibiting the hiring of motor carriers defined as "high-risk carriers" by the FMCSA.

Finally, just this year, the FMCSA did a study that found that compliance, safety, and accountability scores accurately predict safety performance by drivers. These scores are currently used by brokers and shippers to identify unsafe carriers. Studies show that, since this system has been used, there has been a 14 percent reduction in serious violations of the law. I want to repeat that. There has been a 14 percent reduction in serious violations of the law.

This base bill requires another study that is going to take 18 months. Not only that, the base bill now hides important safety statistics during this time. What my amendment does is very simple. The provision makes these safety scores transparent for the public to see.

Together, these measures are going to improve the movement of goods across the country by increasing safety and efficiency. It is a real good amendment. I think it is going to make this bill much better, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment literally just guts some very crucial reforms to this bill. What this amendment does is strikes a section in the bill that requires the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to remove from its Web site those compliance and safety accountability program scores.

What we found is that the CSA is a flawed system. It treats safe carriers unfairly, and it has done very little to improve motor carrier safety records.

The Government Accountability Office and the motor carrier stakeholders, they have been very critical of the CSA program. They have called for the reform. So what this does is make sure that those reforms are going to happen quickly. It doesn't hide anything. Once the reforms are in place, the scores are going to go back up on the Web site.

In the meantime, that raw data concerning accidents, violations, out-of-

service rates, it will remain publicly available; and it is also going to be available to law enforcement if they need to investigate or prosecute an unsafe carrier. So nothing is being hidden, but what this does is require that these reforms are going to take place and they are going to take place very, very quickly.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would just be repeating myself.

I do want to repeat one thing which I think is important. Since the system has been used by FMCSA, there has been a 14 percent reduction in serious violations of the law, and I think that speaks for itself.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chair, again, this guts some very important parts of this bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF
TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 428, line 23, before the period, insert "or be unrated".

Page 428, after line 23, insert the following:

(4) has not been issued an out-of-service order to prohibit a motor carrier from conducting operations at the motor carrier level—

(A) for failing to pay fines under part 385.14 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations;

(B) for a proposed "unsatisfactory" safety rating under part 385.13(d) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations;

(C) for failing to respond to a new entrant audit under part 385.325 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(D) and currently is being considered as an imminent hazard at the carrier level (not the individual driver or equipment level).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED
BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 20, printed in part A of House Report 114-326, be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

on line 12 of amendment No. 20, add the word "not" after is.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend Chairman GRAVES. Nobody could have done a better job on this bill than he has done. I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO because they have placed just about everything that I have requested into this bill, including accepting an amendment yesterday.

I will repeat something that I said during general debate yesterday: I am so pleased that after we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars over the last 15 years in a vain attempt to rebuild the Middle East, now we are finally going to pass a major bill to rebuild this country and provide hundreds of thousands of jobs all across this Nation.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, with Mr. PAULSEN of Minnesota to offer an amendment that is basically very technical in nature, but it is one that is very, very important to many thousands of the smallest companies in the trucking industry.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for including in the base bill some of the language from a bill that I introduced that deals with this situation. This amendment expands that by clarifying the requirements that a freight broker must meet before hiring a motor carrier for the delivery of goods.

□ 1715

Currently, the bill requires a broker to check to ensure that the motor carrier is first registered with and authorized by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to operate as a licensed motor carrier; secondly, has the minimum insurance required by Federal law; and, third, has the satisfactory safety fitness determination by the FMCSA. All of these things make for a safer trucking industry in this country.

Our amendment inserts "or be unrated" in the third requirement. Currently, there are thousands of small trucking operations which have yet to be audited or rated by the FMCSA. By adding the words "or be unrated," we ensure that these small companies are not precluded from being in the pool of eligible motor carriers that can be used for shipping goods.

According to the Owner-Operators Independent Drivers Association, OOIDA, without this amendment, we will be creating an incentive not to use small carriers, putting hundreds of thousands of truck drivers out of business due to no fault of their own.

Without this change, we will hurt small mom-and-pop trucking businesses and drive up the cost of shipping goods for everyone.

The second part of our amendment adds a fourth requirement that must be checked by the brokers. This fourth condition requires a broker to check to make sure that a motor carrier has not been issued an out-of-service order to prohibit a carrier from conducting operations. Once again, this makes for a safer trucking industry in this country.

If we do not make this amendment part of the bill, thousands of small companies and mom-and-pop operators who have never had a wreck or had a violation would lose business just because FMCSA does not have the sufficient time or staff to officially rate them.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I will just say this amendment ensures that we have only safe trucks on the road and that thousands of small businesses are not hurt in the process. However, I have received assurances from both Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO that they want to do something about this.

I think everybody on both sides of the aisle in this Congress really wants to try to help the smallest businesses in almost any industry, and they have told me that they will really try to do something about this in conference.

With that assurance and at their request, I am withdrawing this amendment and hope that we can improve the bill as it goes on through conference.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment at this point.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 441, beginning line 3, strike section 5404 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 5404. STUDY ON COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate the safety effects of the laws and regulations of States that allow licensed drivers between the ages of 18 years and 21 years to obtain a commercial driver's license to operate a commercial motor vehicle within the State.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of the requirements for licensed drivers between the ages of 18 years and 21 years to obtain commercial driver's licenses described in such subsection.

(2) A review of collision rates and fatal collision rates for such drivers while operating a commercial motor vehicle.

(3) A review of any other safety factors and metrics determined appropriate by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (c).

(c) INPUT.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), including with respect to the safety factors and metrics reviewed under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall solicit input from representatives of State motor vehicle administrators, motor carriers, labor organizations, independent truck drivers,

safety advocates, medical associations and medical professionals, and other persons determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a report containing the results of the study under subsection (a), including any recommendations for statutory changes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would strike a pilot program that allows teenagers to drive trucks across State lines. Right now this bill mandates that we allow teenagers to become truck drivers. But, Mr. Chairman, it does not ask whether we should give them the keys.

The American public has a strong opinion on this issue. After 92 percent of the comments strongly opposed to this idea, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration denied a request for a similar program in 2003. The vast majority thought it was a bad and dangerous proposal.

My amendment simply asks the Department of Transportation to take another look, a second look, before starting a national program. We need to examine the safety of places where young drivers are already allowed to drive trucks within their own States.

Interstate highways are already dangerous enough. Given the higher and higher accident and fatality rates of younger drivers, it makes no sense to make this change without looking at all of the data.

Mr. Chairman, young drivers may not have the experience needed to handle heavy, dangerous vehicles. Some follow too closely. Others go too fast and don't check their mirrors. Young drivers can use their brakes too much, and that is a real danger when handling an 80,000-pound truck.

Ask any parent. They know. Young drivers do not always listen, even when an experienced driver is in the front seat. My amendment does not say no. It says just let us do the research first. We should study the safety of teen truck drivers before any experiment that might have dangerous results.

I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike a limited pilot program that is authorizing drivers over the age of 19½ to enter into a graduated program to obtain a commercial driver's license. The program is very limited to a number of States and a number of carriers that

can participate. It also includes a number of safety requirements and a GAO report to Congress examining its safety impacts.

Mr. Chairman, what is interesting about the way present law is is that a driver of the age that is being addressed here could drive all the way across the State of Missouri, for instance, but they can't drive 10 miles in the city of Kansas City, across town, because it is over a State line.

It doesn't make a whole lot of sense, and it actually hampers a whole lot of businesses out there that operate in communities like Kansas City, St. Louis, and St. Joseph that are actually split by a State line.

The trucking industry is facing a severe shortage in the number of drivers. With freight expected to increase 30 percent over the next 10 years, the driver shortage is only going to worsen. We need to get more young people interested in careers in the transportation industry. It is as simple as that.

This is a limited pilot program. It represents a delicate compromise that would accomplish a very important goal.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that there is a driver shortage, but it is important, very important, to follow the data. We should not put inexperienced drivers on the road before we have all of the facts.

In my congressional district, in Metro Atlanta, we have three major interstate highways running through our city: I-75, I-85, and I-20. Even with experienced drivers, there is always some major accident. We need to follow the data. I urge all of my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, again, what we are trying to do with this program is just allow those drivers to be able to cross the State line. Again, they are already allowed to go an entire State's length within the State.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 449, beginning line 5, strike section 5501 relating minimum financial responsibility rulemaking.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of my amendment to H.R. 22.

Minimum insurance requirements for trucks have remained the same since the 1980s. Currently, it is \$750,000. Healthcare costs have skyrocketed. For example, hospital care for traumatically brain-injured people can average \$8,000 per day. Minimum insurance does not realistically account for multivehicle accidents where \$750,000 must be divided among all of the injured parties.

FMCSA is currently undergoing rulemaking to evaluate current insurance requirements. Congress should not delay or derail this effort. Section 5501 conditions the agency's rulemaking upon its completion of detailed studies that must be completed in consultation with industry stakeholders.

This amendment strikes language that is designed to delay and ultimately derail this long-overdue rulemaking. When a person suffers life-threatening injuries due to the negligence of a motor carrier, the cost of long-term care and the loss of his or her livelihood often is pushed to the background. For families that undergo this ordeal, it often comes as a surprise that, despite a congressional mandate in the 1980s, minimum insurance requirements for interstate truckers and bus carriers have remained unchanged.

The Motor Carrier Act of 1980 specifically set out to ensure public safety by requiring insurance premiums to be updated regularly. A similar bill, the Bus Regulatory Reform Act of 1982, was passed for the segment of the industry transporting passengers interstate.

While the minimum insurance levels in 1985 for general freight carriers and small-bus operators was \$750,000 and \$1.5 million respectively, with higher liability limits for carriers of hazardous materials and large bus carriers, the intent of Congress was to increase the minimums regularly to keep pace with inflation.

In April of this year, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration released a report to Congress that examined the adequacy of the current financial responsibility requirements for motor carriers. The conclusion was clear: Today the cost of injuries and fatalities arising from crashes far exceed the minimum insurance levels interstate operators are required to carry.

As a result, victims are often not appropriately compensated for their injuries.

Language in section 5501 is an attempt to stop or at the very least delay this long-overdue FMCSA rulemaking in its tracks by taking away the resources necessary for the agency to evaluate appropriate levels of financial responsibility for the motor carrier industry. FMCSA rulemaking is necessary because current insurance limits do not adequately cover crashes primarily because of increased medical costs.

To be on par with medical consumer price index inflation, the liability limit for general freight carriers today would be \$4.4 million, calculated from the 1980 passage date of the Motor Carrier Act, and around \$6.5 million for small-bus operators.

Moreover, the April FMCSA report found that, in real terms, insurance premiums have actually decreased for the same level of coverage since the 1980s. The result is that thousands of crash victims are left without the financial resources to pay medical bills or restore the quality of life that he or she enjoyed before the trucking or bus accident, that despite the fact that insurance premiums have gone down.

In many cases, the burden of healthcare costs are passed on to taxpayers, as Medicare and Medicaid shoulder millions of dollars of medical care each year due to inadequately insured carriers. We must keep the trucking industry accountable for safety by supporting this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

□ 1730

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is it strikes some very commonsense regulatory reforms in the bill.

The underlying bill requires the Department of Transportation to study whether an increase in minimum insurance levels for intercity buses is needed before pursuing a rulemaking to change the levels. I don't understand why we would strike language that simply tells the Department to determine whether a problem exists before it regulates.

The amendment also strikes language in the bill that requires the Secretary to consider the impact of an ongoing rulemaking on small trucking companies and safety.

These considerations, Mr. Chairman, are not going to delay the rulemaking, but it is going to add transparency and accountability to the process.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. RIBBLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ . TRANSPORTATION OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 229(e)(4) of the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (49 U.S.C. 31136 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “50 air mile radius” and inserting “75 air mile radius”; and

(2) by striking “the driver.” and inserting “the driver, except that a State, upon notice to the Secretary, may establish a different air mile radius limitation for purposes of this paragraph if such limitation is between 50 and 75 air miles and applies only to movements that take place entirely within the State.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the air-mile radius from 50 air-miles to 75 air-miles for the transportation of construction materials and equipment to satisfy the 24-hour reset period under the hours of service rule. It would also give States the ability to opt out of this increase if the movement would take place entirely within one State's borders.

This is a bipartisan amendment co-sponsored by Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. CRAMER.

Commercial motor vehicle drivers in the construction industry face some unique circumstances. They often haul perishable materials like asphalt and concrete from a construction company's central shop or dispatch center to a specific project site within that company's area of operation.

These drivers spend long periods of time waiting to pick up materials and loading or unloading equipment, instead of driving, but they are considered on duty for the entire duration of the trip. Current law allows construction industry drivers to reset their weekly on-duty time after a 24-hour consecutive off-duty period; however, this exemption is only allowed if those drivers work within a 50 air-mile radius.

Because construction companies operate today in larger areas than they did when the exemption was first put in place two decades ago, I am offering this amendment to increase this air-mile radius to 75 air-miles. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, though I am not in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment extends an existing exemption established in 1995 by Congress, and I think it is a reasonable and very small adjustment to that. I think it will improve efficiency and lower costs. I have no objection.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I want to thank Mr. RIBBLE for his work on this amendment and other important transportation issues. I think Mr. RIBBLE and Ranking Member DEFAZIO have explained this very well.

In recognition of the unique nature of the construction industry, Congress did provide this exemption to certain hours of service rules for commercial motor vehicle drivers in the industry.

Increasing this from 50 to 75 miles is a small change, but I think it will be very helpful because the current exemption we have seen has come up short. It needs to be modernized for most efficient goods movement and keep perishable materials from spoiling, as well as account for the fact that many materials suppliers operate in areas outside of the current air-mile radius. This amendment helps improve the exemption by increasing it by 25 miles.

It is also important to note that this amendment provides an opt-out provision for those States that do not wish to participate in this increase.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 6027. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REDUCTION OF DEPARTMENT-OWNED VEHICLES AND INCREASE IN USE OF RIDE-SHARING SERVICES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of each covered department shall

establish a pilot program within the department for the following purposes:

(1) To reduce the inventory of light vehicles owned by the department by 10 percent for each of the fiscal years described in subsection (b), through the sale or other appropriate disposal of such vehicles.

(2) At the discretion of the Secretary of the department, to increase the use by the department of commercial ride-sharing companies.

(b) FISCAL YEARS DESCRIBED.—The fiscal years described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The first fiscal year beginning after the expiration of the 1-year period starting on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Each of the four fiscal years following the fiscal year described in paragraph (1).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year described in subsection (b)(1), and annually thereafter for the duration of the pilot program, the Secretary of each covered department shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program in the department. The report shall include information about the transportation budget of the department and such findings and recommendations as the Secretary of the department considers appropriate.

(d) COVERED DEPARTMENT.—In this Act, the term “covered department” means each of the following:

- (1) The Department of Agriculture.
- (2) The Department of the Interior.
- (3) The Department of Energy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, these amendment marathons can often be a bit exhausting around here with all sorts of ideas coming from different directions, but now for something completely different.

Our government is heading to having about a half a million light-duty vehicles, so think of this: As of today, I think we have about 460,000 light-duty vehicles in the fleet of government.

Our amendment is something very, very simple. We all walk around with these supercomputers in our pocket—our smartphones—and we see the technology revolution, the information revolution, that is happening around us, whether it be ride sharing, on-call services, or just the management of data. We have people living next to each other going to the same workplace.

Let's use this information in this new world around us and ask three agencies to reduce their vehicle fleets by engaging in the new world of information, whether it be ride sharing, an Uber model, a Zipcar model, or taxicab model. Maybe it is a hybrid that we have never thought of that gets brought forward.

So the amendment is very, very simple. All we are asking is that three agencies reduce their vehicle fleets by using modern technology, modern means of transportation, modern social transportation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Chair, first, I would ask the gentleman very quickly the question: Why these particular agencies?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, to my friend on the other side, there was a GAO report—I think it might now have been a couple of years ago—and these three agencies actually were tagged as having the highest number of vehicles as a percentage of, I believe, employment population that sat idle. Agriculture was close to 30,000 vehicles; Interior, 18,000. There was an actual reason.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Although the gentleman does reside in Arizona, I know he certainly is aware that both the BLM and the Forest Service must cover huge amounts of territory with their employees, including many forested and remote areas.

In my district, just doing my rounds on paved roads, I can be out of cell service 20 to 25 percent of the time. There is no Uber, Lyft, or any alternative available to me, let alone my Forest Service and BLM employees who are up in the forest. I don't think Uber is lurking around the forest waiting to pick them up. Plus, they don't have cell service. I guess they could use a sat phone, but I don't think they will come.

The agency choices are peculiar. They may have a large fleet, and they have a large fleet for a particular reason. Obviously, you can have one Forest Service employee and one vehicle going to a very remote work location for one work duty. They don't have an opportunity to ride share or do anything else. I find that to be particularly problematic.

I think the intent of having the government reduce the number of light vehicles, particularly for agencies that are based in urban areas or more urban environments, is very intriguing and interesting. I would be happy to support his next amendment, which would have us study this issue. The GAO, working with GSA, I think could point to appropriate ways to reduce the fleet and to more efficiently reduce costs and yet still have employees be able to use their time very efficiently.

I would oppose this amendment, but in order to save time, I will say now that I will support the next amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from Oregon, one more time, the reference points in the GAO study actually said vehicles that lay idle, and that is why we chose these. There was actually a reason for choosing these three agencies.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of data points: Agriculture, 29,818 light-duty

vehicles; Interior, 18,752 light-duty vehicles; the Department of Energy, 7,315 light-duty vehicles.

We are asking them to do the 10 percent reduction of those vehicle fleets over the 4 years. If technology efficiencies, the new gig economy, however you see it, can't accomplish that through the simplest reforms brought to us by the modern era, we are in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I think the gentleman misstated. It is 10 percent per year for 5 years. It is a 50 percent reduction in fleet. So that seems, without much more granular data, pretty radical. And I wouldn't want to see that the next time I have got a major fire, the Forest Service doesn't have adequate vehicles in the Willamette Forest or in any other forest in my State to dispatch all the people they need to command and control and to deal with that fire.

So I think the idea of the study has merit. I think it is an arbitrary cut of 50 percent, particularly with two land management agencies that manage millions of acres of land. I know of Forest Service and BLM employees that, on a given day, their duty may require them to drive 4 hours to a remote spot to do a particular function, spend an hour there, and drive back; and there is no way around it because they had to do something at that particular point. So saying, "Gee, you are going to have to ride share or thumb or call Uber and see if they will take you out there for a couple hundred miles in the mountains," it just doesn't work for me.

I think a study is a good idea, and we may find, indeed, there are efficiencies. But to arbitrarily reduce the fleets of the two largest land management agencies in the Federal Government, the Forest Service and the BLM, by 50 percent, I think could cause very unanticipated and potentially disastrous problems.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 6027. STUDY AND REPORT ON REDUCING THE AMOUNT OF VEHICLES OWNED BY CERTAIN FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND INCREASING THE USE OF COMMERCIAL RIDE-SHARING BY THOSE DEPARTMENTS.

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

(1) reducing the amount of vehicles owned by a covered department; and

(2) increasing the use of commercial ride-sharing companies by a covered department.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results and conclusions of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) COVERED DEPARTMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term "covered department" means each of the following:

(1) The Department of Agriculture.

(2) The Department of the Interior.

(3) The Department of Energy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, not to belabor this one, because actually, in many ways, our friend from Oregon has spoken to this one. I actually believe we may have some misreading of what the previous one says, but we will adjudicate that again maybe over coffee.

This is basically a similar concept as we were just discussing but is actually trying to produce some data sets for future policy.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is the gentleman from Oregon is going to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 580, in the matter following line 20, add to the analysis for chapter 702 of title 49, United States Code, after the item relating to section 70203, the following:

"70204. GAO study on economic impact of labor contract negotiations at ports on west coast.

Page 584, line 20, strike the closing quotation marks and the period at the end.

Page 584, after line 20, insert the following:

"§ 70204. GAO study on economic impact of labor contract negotiations at ports on west coast

"(a) STUDY.—With respect to the slowdown that occurred during labor contract negotiations at ports on the west coast of the United States during the period from May 2014 to

February 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to—

“(1) determine the economic impact of such slowdown on the United States and on each port in the United States, including changes in the amount of cargo arriving at and leaving from ports on the west coast and other changes in cargo patterns, including congestion;

“(2) calculate the cost, including the cost to importers, exporters, farmers, manufacturers, and retailers, of contingency plans put in place to avoid disruptions from such slowdown;

“(3) review steps taken by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to resolve the dispute that caused such slowdown;

“(4) identify tools such Service or the President could have used to facilitate a resolution to such dispute;

“(5) evaluate what other mechanisms are available to the President to avoid disruptions during future labor negotiations at ports in the United States;

“(6) suggest how such mechanisms could be changed to improve the ability to avoid such disruptions in order to prevent serious economic harm to importers, exporters, farmers, manufacturers, and retailers; and

“(7) suggest any legislation that might ensure better regulation of the operations of ports in the United States with respect to such labor negotiations.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment that will allow us to collect the facts and evaluate the impact of the 2014-2015 West Coast ports slowdown and dispute.

The efficient movement of goods is critical to the economic success of this country. Our farmers and manufacturers must be able to export their high-quality products to the customers around the world that they rely upon.

Beginning in the summer of 2014, these customer relationships and our economy were threatened. This was the result of a prolonged contract negotiation between the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshore and Warehouse Union that ended February 2015.

Just how serious was the impact of these prolonged negotiations? One example from my home State provides a clear illustration.

Our apple growers in Washington State were faced with an estimated \$100 million worth of apples that they could not sell. Other stories can be told about multiple types of produce and products, including the hay and the potato industry, in Washington State.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I was in Malaysia and Singapore during part of the slowdown, and the complaint in those two countries was they couldn't get their potatoes. And especially they were upset they weren't getting their Washington State french fries.

So this did have an impact across the globe. This wasn't just a United States economy impact. This was a global impact.

In fact, the ships coming from those countries to the West Coast were slowed down to 8 knots, hoping that this would be resolved by the time the ships reached the West Coast.

This amendment simply requires the Government Accountability Office to study the economic impact of this dispute, review the steps taken to reach an agreement, and suggest what other tools might be used to prevent future slowdowns.

Like many of you, I have committed to my constituents that I will work to ensure that this is not repeated for the sake of our workers, farmers, and manufacturers. This amendment moves us in that direction.

I thank my colleagues, Representatives SCHRADER, NEWHOUSE, RADEWAGEN, and COFFMAN for working with me on this important issue. I urge support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we would all like to prevent future disruptive shutdowns like this. I think a full survey of all the causes would be interesting. It would be an interesting thing to have the GAO conduct.

Unfortunately, this is directed only at one factor, which is the union itself. In fact, in here, finding 7 says: Suggest any legislation that might ensure better regulation of the operations of the ports in the United States with respect to such labor negotiations.

I think that that is very focused just on the labor side and not a balanced look at what might have gone on on the management side of this issue.

Secondly, there are many other ongoing, enduring, and very costly port congestion factors out there that should be comprehensively looked at in order to more efficiently move freight in and out of our ports, absent any sort of labor dispute or shutdown or lockout or any of those certain things that relate to labor that also merit a comprehensive look and, I think, merit a potential action by Congress. But this report would not enlighten us in those areas either.

I would like to see the GAO conduct an analysis of the myriad of factors that point to port congestion, provide Congress with a wide range of policy recommendations, including options for financing intermodal efficiency to enhance the trade of goods in and out of the United States. So I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of clarification, this legislation addresses both the Pacific Maritime Association and union issues.

How can you be against something that would be an investigation that would clearly reveal what the problems are on both sides?

So this legislation is not designed to point the finger at any one entity. Two entities are involved in this issue. We need to find out what we can do to prevent this from happening in the future because it costs the United States economy money, it costs jobs, and it affects the entire global economy.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN).

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank Representatives REICHERT, SCHRADER, NEWHOUSE, and COFFMAN for their work in offering the amendment that will simply direct GAO to conduct a study on the impact of the recent West Coast ports slowdown so that we can avoid these costly slowdowns in the future.

As we all know, the Nation's economic stability and prosperity are directly linked to our ability to import and export goods. In fact, 30 percent of the Nation's GDP stems from imports and exports, 30 percent. That is a large portion of the country's production.

During the slowdown, many of our businesses struggled to maintain the flow of capital due to their inability to ship goods. Additionally, many of our retailers found it difficult to keep their shelves stocked due to the lack of incoming goods, causing revenue loss and even the shutting of some businesses.

Now, just imagine if, instead of 30 percent, that number was 90 percent. Could you possibly imagine the devastation to the economy of even a brief slowdown?

It would have been the biggest story of the year. Our constituents would have been camped out on our front steps demanding action from Congress.

Well, let me tell you that, in American Samoa, that number is 90 percent. We rely almost solely on imported goods for our food and energy needs.

The main revenue generator on our beautiful islands is the tuna canning industry, which comprises more than 85 percent of the island's GDP. This industry relies heavily upon their ability to ship their products quickly to the mainland and other nations.

We must ensure that this does not happen again. This amendment being offered by my colleagues and me will take the first step in finding solutions to future slowdowns in the operations at our Nation's ports.

I ask that my colleagues in the House support this bipartisan measure to ensure the continued flow of goods to and from our ports and the growth of our economy.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I am actually pleased here to join my colleague, Representative REICHERT from

Washington, in offering this important amendment today.

I want to assure Members here on the floor that this in no way is picking sides. You want to talk about labor disputes? These are labor management disputes.

The problem we have on the West Coast is that this particular dispute last year actually crippled severely the United States economy not just on the West Coast, but into the Midwest and beyond.

We can't have this happen again. We cannot have this happen again. We have to remain competitive in this global economy. We have to figure out a different way to resolve these disputes so that what is a legitimate labor management negotiation does not affect businesses, farmers, workers, and thousands of jobs across this country.

In my State, Terminal 6, the port of Portland's container terminal, is no longer operational. Why? Because the carriers don't want to call on this port because it is too unreliable. They don't know if they are going to have ships to anchor up for weeks on end waiting to upload.

Instead, they will just call on other ports north or south of us. This is directly an impact for the businesses and farmers.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHRADER. The Reichert amendment simply allows us to have a GAO study to talk about what possible outcomes could be different than what we endured last year. The goal here is just simply to get some facts, get some information, protect American jobs, protect American workers.

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

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

I would suggest that, in reading the language, I think it could be more balanced and I think it also should include those other factors which are day-to-day congestion, which do cost our economy hundreds of millions or billions of dollars a year.

So I am opposed to this, as worded. I urge people to oppose it, and I would hope that we can work through the conference committee on something that will give us a more comprehensive analysis of what we need to do to increase the viability of all American ports.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII of Division A of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . FINDINGS ON PORT PERFORMANCE.

Congress finds the following:

(1) America's ports play a critical role in the Nation's transportation supply chain network.

(2) Reliable and efficient movement of goods through the Nation's ports ensures that American goods are available to customers throughout the world.

(3) Breakdowns in the transportation supply chain network, particularly at the Nation's ports, can result in tremendous economic losses for agriculture, businesses, and retailers that rely on timely shipments.

(4) A clear understanding of terminal and port productivity and throughput should help—

(A) to identify freight bottlenecks;

(B) to indicate performance and trends over time; and

(C) to inform investment decisions.

SEC. ____ . PORT PERFORMANCE FREIGHT STATISTICS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 6314. Port performance freight statistics program

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish, on behalf of the Secretary, a port performance statistics program to provide nationally consistent measures of performance of, at a minimum—

“(1) the Nation's top 25 ports by tonnage;

“(2) the Nation's top 25 ports by 20-foot equivalent unit; and

“(3) the Nation's top 25 ports by dry bulk.

“(b) REPORTS.—

“(1) PORT CAPACITY AND THROUGHPUT.—Not later than January 15 of each year, the Director shall submit an annual report to Congress that includes statistics on capacity and throughput at the ports described in subsection (a).

“(2) PORT PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The Director shall collect monthly port performance measures for each of the United States ports referred to in subsection (a) that receives Federal assistance or is subject to Federal regulation to submit a quarterly report to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics that includes monthly statistics on capacity and throughput as applicable to the specific configuration of the port.

“(A) MONTHLY MEASURES.—The Director shall collect monthly measures, including—

“(i) the average number of lifts per hour of containers by crane;

“(ii) the average vessel turn time by vessel type;

“(iii) the average cargo or container dwell time;

“(iv) the average truck time at ports;

“(v) the average rail time at ports; and

“(vi) any additional metrics, as determined by the Director after receiving recommendations from the working group established under subsection (c).

“(B) MODIFICATIONS.—The Director may consider a modification to a metric under

subparagraph (A) if the modification meets the intent of the section.

“(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall obtain recommendations for—

“(A) specifications and data measurements for the port performance measures listed in subsection (b)(2);

“(B) additionally needed data elements for measuring port performance; and

“(C) a process for the Department of Transportation to collect timely and consistent data, including identifying safeguards to protect proprietary information described in subsection (b)(2).

“(2) WORKING GROUP.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Director shall commission a working group composed of—

“(A) operating administrations of the Department of Transportation;

“(B) the Coast Guard;

“(C) the Federal Maritime Commission;

“(D) U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

“(E) the Marine Transportation System National Advisory Council;

“(F) the Army Corps of Engineers;

“(G) the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;

“(H) the Advisory Committee on Supply Chain Competitiveness;

“(I) 1 representative from the rail industry;

“(J) 1 representative from the trucking industry;

“(K) 1 representative from the maritime shipping industry;

“(L) 1 representative from a labor organization for each industry described in subparagraphs (I) through (K);

“(M) 1 representative from a port authority;

“(N) 1 representative from a terminal operator;

“(O) representatives of the National Freight Advisory Committee of the Department; and

“(P) representatives of the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the working group commissioned under this subsection shall submit its recommendations to the Director.

“(d) ACCESS TO DATA.—The Director shall ensure that the statistics compiled under this section are readily accessible to the public, consistent with applicable security constraints and confidentiality interests.”.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN DISCLOSURES.—Section 6307(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or section 6314(b)” after “section 6302(b)(3)(B)” each place it appears.

(c) COPIES OF REPORTS.—Section 6307(b)(2)(A) of such title is amended by inserting “or section 6314(b)” after “section 6302(b)(3)(B)”.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 63 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

“6314. Port performance freight statistics program.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHUSTER, as well as Ranking Member DEFAZIO and all the

members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their hard work on this large bill, this legislation.

The amendment I offer today for myself and Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon is vitally important to the American economy. Nearly a year ago, a dispute began at 29 of our Nation's West Coast ports that drastically slowed imports and exports to a near standstill.

Agricultural products rotted on the docks. Retailers couldn't get products to stores. American manufacturers could not get their products to foreign customers. By one estimate, there was nearly \$7 billion in damages to our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I have no interest in pointing fingers over who is responsible for the dispute. However, I do believe that Congress has a great interest in preventing future disruptions from harming our businesses and consumers as well as our economy.

One thing that became abundantly clear during the disruption was that there was very little data available to gauge how our ports are functioning on a day-to-day basis. If something is impeding port performance, be it a dispute, major congestion, or even a natural disaster, we need to know if and how our ports are suffering before it harms our economy and standing with foreign trading partners.

This amendment is simple. It requires the Bureau of Transportation Statistics to collect and make available data on how our Nation's ports are operating. Currently, the Bureau collects this information for our railroads, for our highways, and our airports. We also need this information for our ports as well.

The amendment that we are introducing is already in the Senate highway bill. It has been approved by the Senate Commerce Committee by voice vote. This is not and should not be controversial.

□ 1800

I also want to note that there are over 150 organizations supporting this measure, organizations like the National Retail Federation, the American Farm Bureau, the Association of American Railroads, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Trucking Association. The list goes on and on. It has very broad multi-industry and bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about transparency and certainty for our Nation's economy. If something is harming our ports, our decisionmakers need information to address and mitigate that harm.

Now, I would have urged my colleagues to adopt this amendment, just as a broad, bipartisan group did so in the Senate, but I have been in close conversation with staff of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, as well as the chairman and the ranking member. I would ask for continued commitment on the part of the chairman to keep working on this

issue. It is very important and vital to the economy of the United States.

With that commitment, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 28 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 1431. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INSOLVENCY OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND RETURNING POWER TO STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Highway Trust Fund is nearing insolvency.

(2) It is critical for Congress to phase down the Federal gas and diesel taxes and empower the States to tax and regulate their highway and infrastructure projects.

(3) The Federal role and funding of surface transportation should be refocused solely on Federal activities and empower States with control and responsibility over their transportation funding and spending decisions.

(4) The objective of the Federal highway program has been to facilitate the construction of a modern freeway system that promotes efficient interstate commerce by connecting all States.

(5) The Interstate System connecting all States is near completion.

(6) Each State has the responsibility of providing an efficient transportation network for the residents of the State.

(7) Each State has means to build and operate a network of transportation systems, including highways, that best serves the needs of the State.

(8) Each State is best capable of determining the needs of the State and acting on those needs.

(9) The Federal role in highway transportation has, over time, usurped the role of the States by taxing motor fuels used in the States and then distributing the proceeds to the States based on the perceptions of the Federal Government on what is best for the States.

(10) The Federal Government has used the Federal motor fuel tax revenues to force all States to take actions that are not necessarily appropriate for individual States.

(11) The Federal distribution, review, and enforcement process wastes billions of dollars on unproductive activities.

(12) The Federal mandates that apply uniformly to all 50 States, regardless of the different circumstances of the States, cause the States to waste billions of hard-earned tax dollars of projects, programs, and activities that the States would not otherwise undertake.

(13) Congress has expressed a strong interest in reducing the role of the Federal Government by allowing each State to manage its own affairs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary should provide a new policy blueprint to govern the Federal role in transportation once existing and prior financial obligations are met;

(2) this policy should return to the individual States maximum discretionary au-

thority and fiscal responsibility for all elements of the national surface transportation systems that are not within the direct purview of the Federal Government;

(3) this policy will preserve the Federal responsibility for the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and will preserve responsibility of the Department of Transportation for design construction and preservation of transportation facilities on Federal public land, preserving responsibility of the Department of Transportation for national programs of transportation research and development and transportation safety; and

(4) this policy will preserve responsibility of the Department of Transportation to eliminate, to the maximum extent practicable, Federal obstacles to the ability of each State to apply innovative solutions to the financing, design, construction, operation, and preservation of Federal and State transportation facilities with respect to transportation activities carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, we are here today discussing how to meet the country's important infrastructure needs, and I think what my amendment does is offer a vision for a different approach in the future. I think it is an approach that is more accountable to taxpayers, and I think it rests on governments closer to the people making more of our transportation decisions.

I don't think anyone is going to sit here and claim that the transit and highway system as it is done up here in Washington is being done well. It is chronically underfunded. We are using all kinds of budget gimmicks in this bill. We are doing the Strategic Petroleum Reserve again to, quote, unquote, pay for this. Somehow you are taking oil at \$50 a barrel and you are projecting it to be sold for \$85 a barrel. So we know we have been through this a lot here.

I think part of the problem is, if you look at our infrastructure needs, most of them are intrastate, not necessarily interstate. And while the interstate system is very important and it needs to be maintained, expanded where appropriate, most of the needs that we have in a State like Florida can be done at the county level or at the State level.

I would note, Mr. Chairman, that since we have had the highway trust fund since 1956, Florida has paid a lot in taxes, and we received about 88 cents on the dollar back. So I am trying to figure out why we would want to perpetuate a system that is not fiscally sustainable and that puts more power in Washington.

Think about it. Most of your needs are done countywide, citywide, and statewide, and yet people in a State like Florida will pay their gas taxes. That will be shipped up to Washington;

people will fight over it, politicians, lobbyists, and interest groups; and then the money that comes back is 88 cents on the dollar.

I would like to send the gas tax to Washington that is going to fund the actual interstate system, but then leave a portion of the gas tax for State legislatures to spend or for people in local governments to spend. I think you would be able to do it cheaper. I think it would be more accountable to the taxpayers, and I think it would be better for motorists and people who are using our transportation system.

So all this does, Mr. Chairman, it is not binding. I wish we could have done something binding, but there are different budget rules. What it does is lay out a vision that we can do this in a way that rests on decisions being made closer to the American people rather than putting everything in Washington, D.C.

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

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we want to go back to the good old days; that is, before Dwight David Eisenhower was President. Here we have what we had before when we didn't have a national highway program. This is the brand-new Kansas turnpike. Oklahoma said: We will build ours. Uh-oh. We have got financial problems.

They didn't.

So for a few years, this brand-new ribbon of concrete ended right here. Kind of odd. This is Amos Schweitzer's farm field. They put up a big wooden barrier. People crashed through it, and Amos towed them out of the field. He was a nice guy.

Until we had a national program where the Federal Government would partner with the States for something that was of national import, it didn't happen. Let's go back to those good old days.

This is a new idea, came from Grover Norquist: We are going to devolve the duty to the 50 States assembled and the territories, and somehow they will magically coordinate this. Oh, by the way, if you happen to be a coastal State with major ports—I think Florida has a few of those—gee, you are going to have to pay for all of the costs of transshipping the goods that flow into your State out to the other States. That is your responsibility. You are Florida, raise the money to do it.

Oh, how are you going to do that?

I don't know. You can't raise taxes on the imports because that would be a Federal responsibility, a different category.

Mr. Chairman, this is an idea whose time has not yet come, an idea whose time passed a very long time ago. We

need more investment in the national system. Mr. Chairman, 140,000 bridges need repair or replacement; 40 percent of the highway surface, the roadbeds need replacement; \$84 billion backlog in bringing our transit systems up to a state of good repair, and that is not even dealing with a growing population, growing mobility, and the need for a national freight program. And we are just going to send it back to the States, and they will magically somehow take care of it—poppycock.

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, we would love for these interstate issues to be done at the Federal level. That is what the Federal Government is here for, and that is the way it should be. But when you are talking about purely local issues, there is not a reason to send the money up to Washington and then beg back for pennies on the dollar. That is not an efficient way to do it.

Yes, I think that we do have a responsibility to have an efficient interstate system, but we also need to understand that Washington shouldn't be dictating what local communities do.

And, yes, in a State like Florida where we have a lot of this is intrastate, let's empower the States and let's empower the local communities. Just imagine if they were able to have a portion of that gas tax go directly to them. I think you would see great decisions made.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I share many of the same conservative beliefs that my colleague from Florida has. This town is littered with agencies that don't belong here according to the Founding Fathers. Over time they have grown up, and the Federal Government has taken that power.

But I do disagree with the gentleman from Florida on this issue. When it comes to transportation, the Constitution we have today, the breaking point of the Articles of Confederation, one of the breaking points, the biggest breaking point, was the transportation system. Maryland and Virginia couldn't come together on a treaty to navigate the Potomac River, so they realized that if they couldn't connect this Nation, then we would never be a nation. We would be 13 separate entities, 50 entities today. But the Founding Fathers came and wrote the Constitution we know today.

Article I, section 8 talks about the role of the Federal Government, providing for the common defense, regulating interstate commerce, and establishing post roads. Those post roads today are the highways and the byways of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. Washington shouldn't be dictating. This bill does more to send back power to the States, to let the States drive the issues. But there is a Federal role, not to do it all, but to partner—to partner—with the States in building the infrastructure system that we have today. What physically connects us is our highway system; it is our transportation system.

I would argue also, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman pointed out that Florida—I agree, I know what the return on Florida is, but Florida has benefited tremendously by two roads in particular: I-95 and I-75. If you go to the east coast or the west coast of Florida, millions of people are traveling from the Northeast and the Midwest down to Florida to spend their dollars, and many are relocating. If you go to the east coast, there are many Pennsylvanians. So Florida has benefited tremendously by this system that we have today.

Again, I believe with this bill we are turning back to the States a lot of responsibility. I think this is a conservative bill based on that, to let States—and also, to remind the gentleman and my colleagues, I like to turn back things to the States that they actually ask for. My phone is not ringing off the hook having Governors say, "Give us this back."

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. SHUSTER. Finally, Mr. Chairman, Adam Smith said in "The Wealth of Nations" that government should do three things for their people: provide them with security, preserve justice, and erect and maintain infrastructure to promote commerce.

If you don't believe BILL SHUSTER, get out a copy of "The Wealth of Nations" and read what Adam Smith said, the father of our economic system.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to oppose this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that under the current formulas, actually, and current spending levels, Florida is getting back \$1.15 on the dollar. So, actually, under the gentleman's proposal, devolving back to the States, doing away with the Federal revenues, both gas tax and general fund revenues, would actually be a net loss to Florida; but then I guess they would just have to raise their gas taxes by the 18.3 cents that is going to the Federal Government and a bit more in order to make that up.

Again, we would lose the coordination among the States. The priorities of States bordering Florida may not match the priorities of Florida in terms of access and egress to the State of Florida. So I think we are well-served as a nation by having a coordinated Federal program and streamlined and efficient reforms.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 512, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 printed in part A of House Report No. 114-326, offered by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania:

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 17, after line 14, insert the following:
(8) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMPT PAYMENT OF DBE SUBCONTRACTORS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the Secretary should take additional steps to ensure that recipients comply with section 26.29 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (the disadvantaged business enterprises prompt payment rule), or any corresponding regulation, in awarding federally funded transportation contracts under laws and regulations administered by the Secretary; and

(B) such additional steps should include increasing the Department's ability to track and keep records of complaints and to make that information publicly available.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Page 65, strike lines 16 and 17, and insert the following:

“(5) enhance the resiliency of critical highway infrastructure, including highway infrastructure that supports national energy security.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Page 198, line 3, strike the closing quotation marks and the final period and insert the following:

“(86) Interstate Route 70 from Denver, Colorado, to Salt Lake City, Utah.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 198, line 3, strike the closing quotation marks and final period.

Page 198, after line 3, insert the following:
“(86) The Oregon 99W Newberg-Dundee Bypass Route between Newberg, Oregon, and Dayton, Oregon.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER OF OREGON

Page 198, line 3, striking the closing quotation mark and the second period.

Page 198, insert after line 3 the following:
“(86) Interstate Route 205 in Oregon from its intersection with Interstate Route 5 to the Columbia River.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY OF WISCONSIN

Page 229, line 23, strike the closing quotation marks and final period.

Page 229, after line 23, insert the following:
“(n) CERTAIN LOGGING VEHICLES IN WISCONSIN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall waive, with respect to a covered logging vehicle, the application of any vehicle weight limit established under this section.

“(2) COVERED LOGGING VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered logging vehicle’ means a vehicle that—

“(A) is transporting raw or unfinished forest products, including logs, pulpwood, biomass, or wood chips;

“(B) has a gross vehicle weight of not more than 98,000 pounds;

“(C) has not less than 6 axles; and

“(D) is operating on a segment of Interstate Route 39 in Wisconsin from mile marker 175.8 to mile marker 189.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD OF ARKANSAS

Add at the end of the title I of the bill the following:

SEC. ____ OPERATION OF CERTAIN SPECIALIZED VEHICLES ON CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.

If any segment of United States Route 63 between the exits for highways 14 and 75 in the State of Arkansas is designated as part of the Interstate System, the single axle weight, tandem axle weight, gross vehicle weight, and bridge formula limits under section 127(a) of title 23, United States Code, and the width limitation under section 3113(a) of title 49, United States Code, shall not apply to that segment with respect to the operation of any vehicle that may have legally operated on that segment before the date of the designation.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle D of title I of Division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PROJECTS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY RELATING TO IDLING TRAINS.

Section 130(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings” and inserting “the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, and projects to eliminate hazards posed by blocked grade crossings due to idling trains”.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ EXEMPTIONS FROM REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN WELDING TRUCKS USED IN PIPELINE INDUSTRY.

(a) COVERED MOTOR VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered motor vehicle” means a motor vehicle that—

(1) is traveling in the State in which the vehicle is registered or another State;

(2) is owned by a welder;

(3) is a pick-up style truck;

(4) is equipped with a welding rig that is used in the construction or maintenance of pipelines; and

(5) has a gross vehicle weight and combination weight rating and weight of 15,000 pounds or less.

(b) FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.—A covered motor vehicle, including the individual operating such vehicle and the employer of such individual, shall be exempt from the following:

(1) Any requirement relating to registration as a motor carrier, including the requirement to obtain and display a Department of Transportation number, established under chapters 139 and 311 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Any requirement relating to driver qualifications established under chapter 311 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) Any requirement relating to driving of commercial motor vehicles established under chapter 311 of title 49, United States Code.

(4) Any requirement relating to parts and accessories and inspection, repair, and maintenance of commercial motor vehicles established under chapter 311 of title 49, United States Code.

(5) Any requirement relating to hours of service of drivers, including maximum driving and on duty time, established under chapter 315 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

At the end of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall waive, for a covered logging vehicle, the application of any vehicle weight limit established under section 127 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) COVERED LOGGING VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered logging vehicle” means a vehicle that—

(1) is transporting raw or unfinished forest products, including logs, pulpwood, biomass, or wood chips;

(2) has a gross vehicle weight of not more than 99,000 pounds;

(3) has not less than 6 axles; and

(4) is operating on a segment of Interstate Route 35 in Minnesota from mile marker 235.4 to mile marker 259.552.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF TENNESSEE

Page 241, line 10, strike “and”.

Page 241, after line 10, insert the following:
(2) by amending paragraph (3)(I) to read as follows:

“(I) the provision of nonfixed route paratransit transportation services in accordance with section 223 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12143), but only for grant recipients that are in compliance with applicable requirements of that Act, including both fixed route and demand responsive service, and only for amounts—

“(i) not to exceed 10 percent of such recipient's annual formula apportionment under sections 5307 and 5311; or

“(ii) not to exceed 20 percent of such recipient's annual formula apportionment under sections 5307 and 5311, if consistent with guidance issued by the Secretary, the recipient demonstrates that the recipient meets at least one of the following requirements:

“(I) Provides an active fixed route travel training program that is available for riders with disabilities.

“(II) Provides that all fixed route and paratransit operators participate in a passenger safety, disability awareness, and sensitivity training class on at least a biennial basis.

“(III) Has memoranda of understanding in place with employers and American Job Centers to increase access to employment opportunities for people with disabilities.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY OF TEXAS

Page 248, beginning on line 6, strike “or general public demand response service” and insert “or demand response service, excluding ADA complementary paratransit service.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

Page 252, strike lines 14 through 19 and insert the following: “exceed 80 percent of the net capital project cost. A full funding grant agreement for a new fixed guideway project shall not include a share of more than 50 percent from the funds made available under this section. Funds made available under

section 133 of title 23, United States Code, may not be used for a grant agreement under subsection (d). A grant for a core capacity project shall not exceed 80 percent of the net capital project cost of the incremental cost to increase the capacity in the corridor. A grant for a small start project shall not exceed 80 percent of the net capital project costs.”; and

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 263, line 18, strike “minority, and female” and insert the following: “female, individual with a disability, minority (including American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and Hispanic)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 268, line 14, strike “and”.

Page 268, line 17, strike the period and insert a semicolon and after such line insert the following:

“(iv) the percentage of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from any such program;

“(v) the percentage of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after exit from any such program;

“(vi) the median earnings of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from any such program;

“(vii) the percentage of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in or within 1 year after exit from any such program; and

“(viii) the percentage of program participants who, during a program year, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable skill gains toward such a credential or employment.”.

Page 267, line 25, strike “and”.

Page 268, line 4, strike the period and insert a semicolon and after such line insert the following:

“(x) address in-demand industry sector or occupation, as such term is defined in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE OF MICHIGAN

Page 314, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

(d) REPORT.—The Council shall, concurrently with submission to the President of a report containing final recommendations of the Council, transmit such report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. ____ . EFFECTIVENESS OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CHANGES AND FUNDING.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall examine and evaluate the impact of the changes that Map-21 had on public transportation, including—

(1) the ability and effectiveness of public transportation agencies to provide public transportation to low-income workers in accessing jobs and being able to use reverse commute services;

(2) whether services to low-income riders declined after Map-21 was implemented; and

(3) if guidance provided by the Federal Transit Administration encouraged public transportation agencies to maintain and support services to low-income riders to allow them to access jobs, medical services, and other life necessities.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Page 466, after line 21, insert the following: (a) **AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORTER DEFINED.**—Section 3111(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “specifically”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “An automobile transporter shall not be prohibited from the transport of cargo or general freight on a backhaul, so long as it complies with weight limitations for a truck tractor and semitrailer combination.”.

(b) **TRUCK TRACTOR DEFINED.**—Section 3111(a)(3)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “only”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or any other commodity, including cargo or general freight on a backhaul”.

(c) **BACKHAUL DEFINED.**—Section 3111(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **BACKHAUL.**—The term ‘backhaul’ means the return trip of a vehicle transporting cargo or general freight, especially when carrying goods back over all or part of the same route.”.

Page 466, line 22, insert “(d) **STINGER-STEERED AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORTERS.**—” before “Section”.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 322, strike line 8 and insert the following:

“(vii) support for school-based driver’s education classes to improve teen knowledge about—

“(I) safe driving practices; and

“(II) State’s graduated driving license requirements, including behind-the-wheel training required to meet those requirements; and”.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD OF ARKANSAS

At the end of subtitle E of title V of Division A of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMERCIAL DELIVERY OF LIGHT- AND MEDIUM-DUTY TRAILERS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 3111(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **TRAILER TRANSPORTER TOWING UNIT.**—The term ‘trailer transporter towing unit’ means a power unit that is not used to carry property when operating in a towaway trailer transporter combination.

“(6) **TOWAWAY TRAILER TRANSPORTER COMBINATION.**—The term ‘towaway trailer transporter combination’ means a combination of vehicles consisting of a trailer transporter towing unit and two trailers or semitrailers—

“(A) with a total weight that does not exceed 26,000 pounds; and

“(B) in which the trailers or semitrailers carry no property and constitute inventory property of a manufacturer, distributor or dealer of such trailers or semitrailers.”.

(b) **GENERAL LIMITATIONS.**—Section 3111(b)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E) by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) has the effect of imposing an overall length limitation of less than 82 feet on a towaway trailer transporter combination.”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **PROPERTY-CARRYING UNIT LIMITATION.**—Section 3112(a)(1) of such title is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, but not including a trailer or a semitrailer transported as part of a towaway trailer transporter combination, as defined in section 3111(a)”.

(2) **ACCESS TO INTERSTATE SYSTEM.**—Section 3114(a)(2) of such title is amended by inserting “any towaway trailer transporter combination, as defined in section 3111(a),” after “passengers,”.

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

At the end of subtitle E of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5515. GAO REVIEW OF SCHOOL BUS SAFETY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a review of the following:

(1) Existing Federal and State rules and guidance, as of the date of the review, concerning school bus transportation of elementary school and secondary school students engaging in home-to-school transport or other transport determined by the Comptroller General to be a routine part of kindergarten through grade 12 education, including regulations and guidance regarding driver training programs, capacity requirements, programs for special needs students, inspection standards, vehicle age requirements, best practices, and public access to inspection results and crash records.

(2) Any correlation between public or private school bus fleet operators whose vehicles are involved in an accident as defined by section 390.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, and each of the following:

(A) A failure by those same operators of State or local safety inspections.

(B) The average age or odometer readings of the school buses in the fleets of such operators.

(C) Violations of Federal laws administered by the Department of Transportation, or of State law equivalents of such laws.

(D) Violations of State or local law relating to illegal passing of a school bus.

(3) A regulatory framework comparison of public and private school bus operations.

(4) Expert recommendations on best practices for safe and reliable school bus transportation, including driver training programs, inspection standards, school bus age and odometer reading maximums for retirement, the percentage of buses in a local bus fleet needed as spare buses, and capacity levels per school bus for different age groups.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 524, line 12, after “challenges” insert “, including consumer privacy protections”.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO OF CALIFORNIA

Page 541, line 15, add at the end the following: “In developing such regulations, the Secretary shall consult with States to determine whether there are safety hazards or concerns specific to a State that should be taken into account in developing the requirements for a comprehensive oil spill response plan.”

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 571, line 3, redesignate section 7015 as section 7016.

Page 571, after line 2, insert after section 7014 the following new section:

SEC. 7015. STUDY ON THE EFFICACY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN TRAIN CONTROL SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, in consultation with other heads of Federal agencies as appropriate, conduct a study on the European Train Control System.

(b) ISSUES.—In conducting the study described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall examine, at a minimum, the following issues:

(1) The process by which the European Train Control System came to replace the more than 20 separate national train control systems throughout the European continent.

(2) The costs associated with implementing the European Train Control System across all affected railroads in Europe.

(3) The impact of the European Train Control System on operating capacity and rail passenger safety.

(4) The efficacy of the European Train Control System and the feasibility of implementing such a system throughout the national rail network of the United States.

(5) A comparison of the costs associated with adopting European Train Control System technology with the costs associated with developing and implementing Positive Train Control in the United States.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study described in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER OF TEXAS

At the end of title VII, add the following:
SEC. ____ . HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ENDORSEMENT EXEMPTION.

The Secretary shall allow a State, at the discretion of the State, to waive the requirement for a holder of a Class A commercial driver's license to obtain a hazardous materials endorsement under part 383 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, if the license holder—

(1) is acting within the scope of the license holder's employment as an employee of a custom harvester operation, agrichemical business, farm retail outlet and supplier, or livestock feeder; and

(2) is operating a service vehicle that is—
(A) transporting diesel in a quantity of 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) or less; and

(B) clearly marked with a "flammable" or "combustible" placard, as appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS OF MARYLAND

Page 573, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. ____ . TRACK SAFETY: VERTICAL TRACK DEFLECTION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2016, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate detailing research conducted or procured by the Federal Railroad Administration on developing a system that measures Vertical Track Deflection (in this section referred to as "VTD") from a moving railroad car, including the ability of such a system to identify poor track support from fouled ballast, deteriorated cross ties, or other conditions.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—This report shall include—
(1) the findings and results of testing of VTD instrumentation during field trials on revenue service track;

(2) the findings and results of subsequent testing of VTD instrumentation on a Federal

Railroad Administration Automated Track Inspection Program geometry car;

(3) if considered appropriate by the Secretary based on the report and related research, a plan for developing quantitative inspection criteria for poor track support using existing VTD instrumentation on Federal Railroad Administration Automated Track Inspection Program geometry cars; and

(4) if considered appropriate by the Secretary based on the report and related research, a plan for installing VTD instrumentation on all remaining Federal Railroad Administration Automated Track Inspection Program geometry cars within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

At the end of title VII, add the following:
SEC. ____ . HAZARDOUS MATERIALS BY RAIL LIABILITY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate a study on the levels and structure of insurance for a railroad carrier transporting hazardous materials.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall evaluate—

(1) the level and structure of insurance, including self-insurance, available in the private market against the full liability potential for damages arising from an accident or incident involving a train transporting hazardous materials; and

(2) the level and structure of insurance that would be necessary and appropriate—

(A) to efficiently allocate risk and financial responsibility for claims; and

(B) to ensure that a railroad carrier transporting hazardous materials can continue to operate despite the risk of an accident or incident.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date the study under subsection (a) is initiated, the Secretary shall submit a report containing the results of the study and recommendations for addressing liability issues with rail transportation of hazardous materials to—

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

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HAZARDOUS MATERIAL.—The term "hazardous material" means a substance or material the Secretary designates under section 5103(a) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) RAILROAD CARRIER.—The term "railroad carrier" has the meaning given the term in section 20102 of title 49, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, let me start off by first saying we lost a valuable former member of this committee just recently. Howard Coble passed away. I just want to say that Howard was on this committee his entire time in Congress.

He was a very valued member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He was a champion of the Coast Guard, which he served, his beloved Coast Guard, and he was always there fighting for them. He was an ex-

cellent Representative of the people of his district in North Carolina, and he was a great friend of mine and, I know, many, many Members of this Congress.

Howard Coble will be missed greatly. I am just proud to say that on the last Coast Guard reauthorization bill we were able to name it after Howard Coble, someone who deserved that honor.

So, again, it is with a heavy heart I say that I salute Howard Coble and say farewell, as I said, to a great friend and great Member of this institution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise now to offer these amendments en bloc. They reflect priorities from both sides of the aisle. I thank all Members for their cooperation in putting together this en bloc, and I urge all Members to support it.

I would like, also, to take a moment at this time to thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle that participated in this debate. I want to thank the Speaker for putting us first on the floor for this new open and transparent—I know some of my colleagues on the other side don't think it was open enough, but I think many of us on the committee, I don't want to speak for Mr. DEFAZIO, but it was an open process to me, and I think that is important.

□ 1815

As Mr. POLIS talked about earlier today, he had ideas. We were able to incorporate some of those, some of the Members on the other side, and some we certainly opposed. But it was the hard work and willingness to come together on this important piece of legislation. I think this makes it stronger when we go to the Senate.

The STRR Act continues the Federal role in providing a strong national transportation system, enables our country to remain economically competitive, and helps ensure our quality of life. As we just talked about in the last amendment, this is a Federal responsibility. The Founders would have wanted it this way. They certainly probably had differences of opinion. But this role is something the Federal Government needs to be part of.

The STRR Act is a multiyear bill that provides that certainty for States and local governments. This bill helps to improve our Nation's infrastructure and maintains a strong commitment to safety, but it also provides important reforms that will help us to continue to do the job more effectively. Some of those reforms I mentioned earlier were pushing back to the States, giving them the ability to have the flexibility, to make sure that they can drive this in their States to get these projects done more effectively and more efficiently, which will save us all money.

I urge all Members to support this bill and the amendments en bloc.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank both the ranking member for yielding and for his support, and the chairman for his support, for two amendments that I have in this bloc.

One is a commonsense amendment exempting a narrow class of welders from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety regulations that I offered with Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and a number of other Members. The other amendment is a bipartisan compromise that I offered with Mr. DOLD and Mr. NADLER. It is an effort to clarify that transit agencies can utilize CMAQ and TIFIA funds to match the 50 percent funding in a New Start grant.

I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with me on this issue and restore the Core Capacity and Small Starts projects Federal match limit back to 80 percent and allow local agencies to flex other Federal funds to these projects.

Without these funds, without these changes, local flexibility would be greatly diminished and many projects would be delayed or canceled, including Chicago's red and purple line modernization.

This bill still restricts the use of the STP funds for the remainder of the match and codifies the New Starts grant amount at 50 percent. I strongly disagree with these new restrictions and hope we can also work on this in conference.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment and the body of the amendments in this bloc are really all about public safety. Mine, in particular, is a bipartisan, commonsense solution to a very limited but seriously dangerous problem. In short, it will help make winter travel safer for truckers, travelers, and pedestrians who live, work, and do business in and around the great seaport of Duluth, Minnesota.

I would like to thank Chairman BILL SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO for working with me on this, and the endless hours that you have put forth in committee and here on the floor yesterday, today, late into the night, and tomorrow for opening up and democratizing this process, making amendments like mine and others possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) to describe her amendments which are included.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for accepting my

amendments on the DBE prompt payment issue, and to allow teen driving safety grants to be used to help fund school-based driver's education to help our young people meet the Graduated Driver Licensing requirements.

I want to talk about the last of my amendments, requiring a GAO report on the impact of MAP-21 changes on the ability of those who previously benefited from transportation services under the Job Access and Reverse Commute program to get to work.

The report would examine whether services to low-income riders declined after MAP-21 was implemented, as well as efforts by the FTA, after passage of MAP-21, to encourage public transportation agencies to maintain and support these services so that low-income riders would allow them access to jobs, medical services, and other life necessities.

MAP-21 ended the stand-alone JARC grant program. Instead, those activities were added as eligible uses of funds under larger formula grant programs. There was no requirement that transit agencies use any of their annual transit funding to provide services to meet the needs of low-income individuals trying to get to work—none.

My amendment would allow us to know what the real-world impact of these changes are. Congress did not intend these changes to make it harder for low-income and TANF populations to use transportation to get to work. That just doesn't make sense. These hardships should not occur.

I hope that adoption of this amendment sends a message to transit agencies that they must continue to provide innovative services to ensure that low-income people and the marginally employed are able to reach places of employment, educational opportunities, job training, child care, medical appointments, and other life necessities.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) to discuss her amendment.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of this package of amendments that includes my amendment, which clarifies minority groups to be targeted in human resources outreach efforts by the Department of Transportation. My amendment would expand the bill's use of the term "minority" and specify the inclusion of underrepresented minority groups.

Oftentimes, when policies are put in place to create diversity, they are not implemented with special attention to communities that are historically underrepresented. This is a special burden for underrepresented minorities who have higher than average unemployment rates.

Furthermore, we all know investments in infrastructure means jobs for

our constituents and opportunities for our businesses back home. As we work to pass this legislation, I believe we must make a concerted effort to diversify the people who are able to take advantage of these opportunities.

I should note that particular areas of the transportation industry, such as public transportation service providers see better levels of diversity, but it is time to expand these opportunities to include engineering, contracting, project development, and other components of the process. Our transportation industry should reflect the diversity of our country at every level.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make note of an important provision that is included in the en bloc amendment package.

As you know, the transportation bill includes a new program that addresses significant roadways. It addresses some of the more expensive projects, and it establishes a competitive grant program in excess of about \$740 million a year.

One of the important things we have to do is we have to provide guidance to the Department of the Transportation in regard to the criteria they use, the metrics they use, in this competitive process.

An amendment in this bill includes the importance of strategic energy assets to ensure that roadways like LA 1 in south Louisiana are included.

After Hurricane Katrina, gasoline prices nationwide spiked about 75 cents a gallon. Following Hurricanes Gustav and Ike in 2008, gasoline prices spiked about \$1.40 a gallon, which was the largest price spike since the Arab oil embargo. So it is important that, as they go through and allocate these grants, that they are looking at factors that are very important and have national consequences.

I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman and all the big four for helping us on this.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, we are not quite at the end of this epic, but I would like to take a moment.

First, I want to reflect on the chairman's brief eulogy for Howard Coble, who was a wonderful member of the committee; and Howard's embarked on his last great voyage. We all remember him warmly.

I would like to thank the chairman and the chair of the subcommittee for the way in which we moved forward. This bill was a product of many, many months of negotiation between Members and staff. I think we have a good policy-based product here, so I want to thank the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee. I want to thank my ranking member of the subcommittee, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

I want to thank my committee staff on my side: Helena Zyblikewycz, Auke Mahar-Piersma—we are blessed with interesting names on our side—Andrew

Okuyiga, Ben Lockshin, Jennifer Homendy, Ryan Seiger, Alexa Old Crow. Of course, my chief of staff Kathy Dedrick. We have had much mention of the last time we did one of these bills. Kathy staffed me when we did the last time long-term bill, which was quite a few years ago. Jen Gilbreath, Jaime Harrell, and Luke Strimer.

On the Republican side, I particularly want to thank Chris Bertram and Murphie Barrett and all the other Republican staff for their fabulous work.

I won't say all the meetings were warm and fuzzy, but we worked stuff out in the end. I think we got a good product. I think going through this legislative process was a demonstration that House Members can individually be relevant, offer their ideas. They might be rejected, they might be accepted, but I think this was a very good process.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this has been 3 years in the making. When I first became chairman just about 3 years ago to almost the date today, one of my top priorities was to pass a multiyear surface transportation bill. I have had some people who lament and say: Oh, you have been on the floor long; oh, you have had to go through these different fights. But I can tell you, it has all been pleasurable. It is exciting that we finally are getting this thing to send here on the floor and get it into conference.

I couldn't do it without the help and advice of a great staff on the Republican side. I also want to thank the Democratic staff. I know both staffs have spent some long nights and some long weekends trying to get this thing all worked out, and they have done a great job of it. I thank each and every one of them on both sides of the aisle for their hard work.

I want to thank all the members on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on both sides for their valuable input and, again, their hard work in putting this thing together to bring it to the floor. I want to thank Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Ranking Member NORTON, and the chair of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, Mr. GRAVES, for their work.

PETER DEFAZIO has been a good friend and able opponent at times. He has been here a long time. He is bright; he is tough; he is passionate; but at the end of the day, we are able to come together on a lot of these issues and work it out, so I appreciate Mr. DEFAZIO's efforts.

And finally, let me say, for the first time in my 15 years of Congress that I have participated in a Transportation and Infrastructure debate on the floor, that my father's name has not been

mentioned one time. So let me be the first to mention my father, Bud Shuster. I am not sure if he is watching at home. If he is, he is taking notes and will tell me things I said right and things I could have probably said better. But I just want to thank him for the guidance he has given me throughout my life, for the valuable advice he has offered to me at times when I have asked and many times when I have not asked. And, again, if he is watching tonight, I am sure he is writing down some things that he is going to give me some pointers on. But I want to thank my father, Bud Shuster, again, for his great support over the years.

I am looking forward to getting to conference and getting this thing done because I think it is important to the American people that we have a long-term highway bill. This has been an issue that people say it is great, there is a lot of bipartisan support—and there is—but these are issues that Republicans, Democrats, and Americans care about, our infrastructure, and want to get to work without delays and want to get products to market and want to get the raw materials to the factories that keep us competitive in the world. We are in a world market that we have to remain competitive, and transportation is one of those vital links that will keep us there.

With that, again, I thank everybody for their hard work. Staff, again, thank you.

With that, I urge all Members to support the final bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to add the Newberg Dundee Bypass Route as a High Priority Corridor and I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for working with me to bring it forward. Let me be clear—there is no cost to this amendment—it merely raises the prominence and importance of the bypass. The construction of the bypass is underway and has great potential to ease congestion, promote freight mobility, and provide important multi-modal connections for residents and visitors in the broader Yamhill County region. The success of Oregon's wine and agricultural industries has increased freight traffic in the region. The bypass seeks to address the difficulties associated with transportation of goods and services and enhance the recovery of Yamhill County's economically distressed communities. The development of this corridor has wide support in the region, including from the state, local and tribal governments, and surrounding communities. I include a letter from Oregon's Department of Transportation in support of this amendment for the RECORD.

Further, this project is of significant importance because of its location in the Cascadia Subduction Zone. We know that the question is not if, but when, an earthquake and tsunami will hit. Preparing our region is a priority for Oregonians and will save countless lives and federal funds. This road serves as an evacuation route for the central coast and is being built to withstand a 9.0 earthquake. I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their support of my amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Salem, OR, October 30, 2015.

Re: Support for amendment to designate the OR 99W Newberg-Dundee bypass route between Newberg, OR, and Dayton, OR as a new High Priority Corridor on the National Highway System.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, *Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Washington, DC.*

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, *Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER AND RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: I write today in support of an amendment to H.R. 22 offered by Representative Suzanne Bonamici of Oregon.

Representative Bonamici has filed an amendment with the Rules Committee seeking to amend Section 1405 of the bill by adding the OR 99W Newberg-Dundee Bypass route between Newberg, OR, and Dayton, OR as a new High Priority Corridor on the National Highway System.

The Newberg-Dundee Bypass project is one of many key regional transportation corridors in Oregon. The Bypass project is important to both regional freight movement and congestion relief. In addition, the Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) Safety Priority Index System for 2014 identified six sites on OR 99W that are in the top 10 percent of crash sites statewide based on frequency and severity of incidents. In the event of a major natural disaster such as a Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake and tsunami, this corridor would serve as an emergency evacuation and relief route for the central Oregon Coast. The first phase of the project, which is currently under construction, is being built to withstand a 9.0 Cascadia subduction zone earthquake to ensure this critical lifeline will remain operational in such an event. For these reasons, ODOT supports the inclusion of the Newberg-Dundee Bypass on the list of High Priority Corridors on the National Highway System. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW L. GARRETT,
Director.

□ 1830

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA BEUTLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 289, strike lines 11 through 14 and insert the following:

- “(i) \$352,950,000 for fiscal year 2016;
- “(ii) \$462,950,000 for fiscal year 2017;
- “(iii) \$468,288,000 for fiscal year 2018;
- “(iv) \$473,653,500 for fiscal year 2019;
- “(v) \$479,231,500 for fiscal year 2020; and
- “(vi) \$484,816,000 for fiscal year 2021;”.

Beginning on page 289, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 290, line 8, and insert the following:

- “(i) \$262,950,000 for fiscal year 2016;
- “(ii) \$262,950,000 for fiscal year 2017;
- “(iii) \$268,288,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(iv) \$273,653,500 for fiscal year 2019;
“(v) \$279,231,500 for fiscal year 2020; and
“(vi) \$284,816,000 for fiscal year 2021.”.

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. —. INCREASE SUPPORT FOR GROWING STATES.

Section 5340 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) APPORTIONMENT.—Of the amounts made available for each fiscal year under section 5338(b)(2)(M), the Secretary shall apportion 100 percent to States and urbanized areas in accordance with subsection (c).”;

and

(2) by striking subsection (d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, over 50 percent of all transit riders in the U.S. travel on buses, but only 10 percent of our transit funding actually goes to buses. I will say that again. Over half of the people in this country who use public transportation take buses to get to work, to the grocery store, to visit family; yet the Federal Government dedicates less than 10 percent of its transit funds specifically to buses and to bus facilities.

We are selling communities short, communities like my home in southwest Washington, but we have an opportunity to rectify the situation, Mr. Chairman.

While overall transit funding has been steadily increasing, this bill funds buses in 2016 at, roughly, half of the 2012 levels—that is, Mr. Chairman, unless you happen to represent one of seven States for which this bill sets aside, roughly, an additional \$272 million a year.

While all 50 States can compete for funds through the nationwide Competitive Bus Grant program, which is funded at \$90 million in 2016 and \$200 million each year after, a select few of the northeastern States get an additional \$272 million pot to draw from. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

These high-density States—Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Delaware—have a special pot of money set aside for them that averages \$90 million more a year than the nationwide pot that all 50 States compete for. Oh, and those seven States still get to compete for the nationwide pot.

It is an issue of fairness, Mr. Chairman. The idea that seven States have available to them more money than all 50 States combined isn't fair to the communities in my State or in yours or in the other 43 States.

My amendment would simply move the funding from the seven-State set-aside program into the Competitive Bus Grant program and allow all States to compete for these much-needed resources.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington, a former member of the committee.

Let me be clear. I agree we should be further increasing the funds available for bus procurement. MAP-21 cut bus funding in half—a devastating cut to many smaller and mid-sized transit agencies, including in my district.

We tried to reverse these cuts as much as we could in this bill, but with the severely limited funding that was mentioned earlier today, there was only so much we could do. In total, we increased the bus formula and competitive grant program by 40 percent.

I would also like to mention the bus procurement reforms in the bill that are designed to lower the cost of bus purchases. We provided several different mechanisms that provide bulk buying power for transit agencies. Buses are expensive, and larger purchases will help them to get lower costs.

This amendment will further increase the bus procurement programs and shift money from the high-density-States formula that benefits seven northeastern States. The high-density-States formula is actually an old Senate provision, carefully drafted by the esteemed members of the Senate's Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee sometime ago and is of great benefit to those seven States.

I am very sympathetic to the amendment, but I am obligated, reluctantly and tepidly, to oppose it.

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this earmark, as I am a cosponsor and am in support of this amendment, No. 57, offered by Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

This has been interesting in the debate because it has been absolutely clarified on both sides that we see this as an earmark. Basically, seven States take from this bill a disproportionate amount based on a formula that declares them high-density States: New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Delaware.

If you do not live in one of these States and if you are a Member of Congress, you should vote for this amendment because declaring them high-density States is a meaningless designation. For example, Chicago, Los Angeles, and many, many urban areas throughout our country are high density and deserve to be able to participate in this fund, but they cannot be-

cause they are not located in one of these States that has largely been, as the ranking member has indicated, a Senate formula set-aside.

Our Founding Fathers, when they came together to create the system of the House and the Senate, did so so that we would have equality, a balance between each of the States and their populations. This is not a balance when you have a set-aside for seven States.

Once again, I would call on all of my fellow colleagues who do not live in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Delaware to vote for this amendment by Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. She has identified that this is an earmark for these States and that it robs money from other States that need assistance with public transportation.

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. TURNER. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment because it does correct an injustice.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, as was well said, 371 Members of the House represent people in States that will benefit from this amendment. By voting “yes” for this amendment, 371 Members will have an opportunity to increase access to important transit funds in their districts without raising spending levels in the bill.

Even those Members in these high-density States are not losing access to the funds. The amendment allows all 50 States to compete fairly for grant funding based on the needs of the area and the merits of the project.

How can anybody be against this? What is wrong with this?

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would say that a great former Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, said that “all politics is local.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in part A of House Report 114-326.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I of division A, add the following new section:

SECTION 1431. INCREASING CERTAIN PENALTIES RELATING TO COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY.

(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—Section 521(b)(2)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$2,500” and inserting “\$5,000”.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Section 521(b)(6)(A) of title 49, United States Code, is

amended by striking “\$2,500” and inserting “\$5,000”.

(c) DISQUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) FIRST VIOLATION OR COMMITTING FELONY.—Section 31310(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

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

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) determined by the Secretary to have operated a commercial motor vehicle that the individual knew or reasonably should have known had a defect that resulted in a fatality.”.

(2) SECOND AND MULTIPLE VIOLATIONS.—Section 31310(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

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

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G);

(C) in subparagraph (G) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking “(E)” and inserting “(F)”; and

(ii) by inserting “, operations,” after “violations”; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) determined by the Secretary to have more than once operated a commercial motor vehicle that the individual knew or reasonably should have known had a defect that resulted in a fatality; or”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 512, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief.

All of us here have the honor to serve in the people’s House, and we are here to serve our constituents—the people who send us here from all over the country—and also to serve in the best interests of our great Nation.

I had a constituent who approached me. I happened to be touring the business at which he works, and he told me something that affected me greatly.

His son was just days before his 23rd birthday. He was a student at the University of Cincinnati. He was coming down Interstate 75 in a minivan and was minding his own business. I don’t know what he was thinking about, but he had his whole future ahead of him.

But a completely avoidable accident occurred. A wheel that was so rusted broke free from a big rig, and it crossed the median. It struck the vehicle he was in, and it killed him immediately, a couple of days before his 23rd birthday.

It had been a couple of years, but his father was still very emotional about this, understandably so.

We looked into this situation. We talked with a number of our colleagues and did a lot of research on it and worked with the American Trucking Association and with America’s Independent Truckers’ Association as well. We came up with an amendment to this particular bill that we are discussing here this evening, the transportation bill.

What the amendment would do, essentially, is stiffen the penalties for a driver who knowingly operates a commercial vehicle that has a serious defect that results in a fatal crash.

Clearly, what we are trying to do is to make the public more safe and to deal with a family that has been tragically changed forever. They lost one of the most important members of that particular family. We are trying to do this in a responsible way.

The trucking industry in this country, for the most part, is very safety conscious, and their rate of fatalities has come down. I commend them greatly for what they are trying to do, but there is a hole in the system right now.

In this particular situation, there was a rusted thing that shouldn’t have been on the road. This type of thing doesn’t happen all that often, but it happened this time, and it killed my constituent’s son.

We have discussed this with the chairman and with staff. It is my understanding that the chairman is willing to work with us on addressing this issue of trying to make the American public safer and is willing to work with our distinguished folks on the minority side as well.

With that understanding, I am willing to withdraw my amendment here this evening and continue to work with them through the process to hopefully address this issue in a way that will receive support on both sides of the aisle so that we can pass this into law and make the public safer. It will allow this particular family, who was affected so tragically in this instance, to know that they have done something to honor their son.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to work with the gentleman on the issue. I oppose the amendment, but I want to continue talking with the gentleman and working with him.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to work with the gentleman. I mean, this is a story that tugs at you. The gentleman brings before us an important issue. I think there is a way to get at this; so, I would love to work with the gentleman as we go to conference and see what we can do.

With the indulgence of the House, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. DEFAZIO as well for working with me and for working with the entire committee. The Transportation

and Infrastructure Committee does work together in a bipartisan fashion, and the House does work.

On the other hand and in the same vein, I had the pleasure of knowing Howard Coble for my entire time I have been in Congress. I was his ranking member on Judiciary, and he was my ranking member on Judiciary.

We had a great relationship. He was one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. He was a scholar. He was a gentleman. He loved North Carolina. He loved this House. He will be missed. He was an example of the way people can work together to make progress in the United States Congress. I was honored to know him.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to share in the gentleman’s comments about our colleague, Howard Coble of North Carolina.

He was truly a wonderful part of this distinguished institution. I served on the Judiciary Committee for the better part of 20 years with Howard Coble, and we all looked up to him. He was kind of one of a kind, and I say that in the most honorable way.

He was one we looked to. He had a sense of humor that went to your heart. He was just a great guy. He will be truly missed not only by his constituents, but by this House that he loved for so many years.

On my amendment, I have heard both the chairman and our friends on the minority side indicate they are willing to work with us on this amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. With that understanding, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114-326 will not be offered.

□ 1845

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-326 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. DESAULNIER of California.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. HUNTER of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. DENHAM of California.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. CULBERSON of Texas.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Amendment No. 26 by Mr. REICHERT of Washington.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic