

it needs under law to make sure that the dollars that we take from the taxpayers are sufficiently and adequately managed and not wasted.

The Acquisition Review Board would be chaired by the Under Secretary for Management and would require at least two component heads or their designees to be permanent members. This would ensure participation from all DHS components.

The Board would be required to meet regularly and would be responsible to determine if a proposed acquisition has met planning requirements needed to proceed to production and deployment, oversee major acquisitions as a business strategy, and review programs in a cost benefit analysis format to determine performance objectives and ensure that our dollars are well spent.

Mr. Speaker, a recent news story pointed out that nine individuals on the planet Earth control as much wealth as 50 percent of the population of the planet Earth. That means that these nine people control as much wealth as 3.5 billion people. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if you were to take the amalgamated wealth of those nine individuals and add it to those 3.5 billion and apply it to the United States' national debt, we could pay off a mere 9.4 percent.

Given that our national debt is almost \$20 trillion dollars and rising, it is imperative that we take this bipartisan step to ensure that our homeland is secured but that the dollars spent doing so are spent effectively, efficiently, and with good stewardship. This legislation helps to ensure that tax dollars are safeguarded, but it also helps to ensure that DHS personnel receive the tools they need to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, I implore and urge my colleagues on each side of the aisle to join in this bipartisan legislation to ensure that our tax dollars are well shepherded but that our Nation is as secure as can be possible.

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1282, the DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2017, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the Department of Homeland Security has strengthened the management of its major acquisition programs, which historically has been weak.

H.R. 1282 authorizes the key mechanisms from the previous administration to ensure acquisitions valued at more than \$300 million, which account for over \$7 billion of DHS' annual budget, receive ongoing scrutiny—let me repeat, receive ongoing scrutiny.

Since 2008, the Acquisition Review Board has brought leaders together from across the Department to validate foundational acquisition documents such as cost and schedule estimates and performance requirements. The Department has had to learn the hard

way about the importance of adhering to its acquisition best practices, including the establishment of realistic requirements in cost estimates that take into account the life cycle of costs.

An example is the SBInet program, started in 2006, that was supposed to bring together integration of systems of infrastructure and technology to secure the border. This program was terminated in 2011 only after \$1 billion had been spent. Let me repeat that. This program was terminated in 2011, but only after \$1 billion had been spent.

The acquisition went wrong because CBP bypassed required processes and awarded a multimillion-dollar contract without having laid the foundation to oversee contractor performance, cost controls, and scheduling.

Just last week, the Department was forced to cancel its \$1.5 billion Agile Services contract, or the FLASH contract, due to significant errors and missteps in the procurement process.

Many of us are concerned that, in the Department's haste to deliver the President's campaign promise to build a wall, critical steps in the acquisition process will be short-circuited, leaving Americans with a bill for a bad investment.

□ 1500

At this time, a centralized oversight body for DHS major acquisitions is more important than ever.

This bill provides for the board to convene when a major acquisition program requires authorization to proceed from one decision event to another, or is in breach of its approved requirements, or requires additional review.

Efficiency and effectiveness in the acquisition process is imperative for the DHS mission of procuring goods, services, and supplies in support of its national security efforts. The Committee on Homeland Security unanimously approved this measure earlier this Congress, and similar language was approved by the House in October 2015.

By establishing this board into law and laying out its responsibilities, Congress can ensure that this vital oversight will continue and that DHS will continue to show progress in its management of acquisitions.

I urge passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt thanks to my distinguished colleague from California. While we might not agree on all that is appropriate within the purview of the Department, we do agree on being effective stewards of tax dollars, and I am grateful for his comments.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my colleague from Virginia for bringing forth this most important accountability measure.

This bill enhances the Department's accountability and provides greater acquisition oversight to intercede before programs fail to meet important cost and schedule milestones.

Given DHS's limited budgetary resources and the importance of its mission, it is critical that DHS improves its management of major acquisition programs. Although the Department has made some progress in its major acquisition programs, DHS cannot afford to neglect the day-to-day management of the agency and how it procures essential goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, wish to extend my thanks to my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to support this commonsense, bipartisan measure, H.R. 1282, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1282, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICITY RELIABILITY AND FOREST PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 392 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1873.

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

□ 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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and

reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Today marks the Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans' first step in advancing an infrastructure agenda that aims to improve our Nation's infrastructure and expedite the development of new infrastructure.

As vice chairman of the subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), I have already seen a number of bills advance through the committee that, like the bill in front of us today, employ simple, pragmatic solutions to improve our Nation's infrastructure and advance an all-of-the-above energy and water strategy.

The Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, a bipartisan bill offered by my colleagues, Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. SCHRADER, is about avoiding electricity blackouts, preventing forest fires, and promoting healthy habitat for wildlife on Federal lands.

This bill represents a simple, pragmatic solution to an issue that is born out of a lack of communication and consistency within a Federal agency.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for agreeing to help expedite consideration of this bill today.

I commend my colleagues, Mr. LAMALFA from California and Mr. SCHRADER from Oregon, for bringing up this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation.

I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2017.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act. It is my understanding that, on April 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered the bill reported with amendments.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to

any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2017.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported as amended H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, by a bipartisan roll call vote of 24 to 14. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Agriculture to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and for the extraordinary cooperation shown by you and your staff over matters of shared jurisdiction. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Wildfires are a huge problem in our country. They are becoming more frequent and more intense, and they pose a growing threat to public safety and local economies.

But, instead of taking steps to reduce wildfire threats, this bill tries to scare us into weakening environmental safeguards and giving away public land management to States and localities.

I agree with the bill's sponsor that overgrown vegetation and falling trees can spark forest fires. However, government data shows that this accounts for less than one-third of 1 percent of fires in the past 5 years.

Why are we focusing on this minor problem when it is clear that real wildfire solutions require treating these fires like the disasters that they are under the law, and allowing the Forest Service to use its base budget for preventing wildfires, not just fighting them?

Given what we have seen from Republicans in the Natural Resources Committee, the answer is simple: to chip away at the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA; shut expert

Federal agencies and concerned citizens out of the land management process; and allow Big Business to profit at the expense of taxpayers and our public lands.

The bill lets State and local electricity reliability standards trump public land management rules. There is not even any requirement that the standards are based on sound science or principles of risk assessment.

If a county says it needs to clear-cut a half mile into a national forest to protect power lines, this bill would allow it, and the Forest Service could only watch. Further, there is no prohibition on selling timber harvested during these operations.

The bill also mandates the Forest Service and BLM use its NEPA categorical exclusion authority, even when vegetation management projects could cause environmental damage. This means that people who value public lands would be completely shut out from the management process. So much for transparency and public input.

Adding insult to injury, the bill waives liability for companies that start forest fires or cause other damage. This is nonsense and shifts an incredible burden and risk onto American taxpayers.

The bill also fails to deal with the root causes of our fire crisis, including the fact that the Forest Service cannot afford mitigation work to prevent wildfires because it spends half of its budget fighting them.

I support legislation making wildfire disasters eligible for disaster assistance under the Stafford Act, and I know many of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, do as well. I am disappointed that we are not passing a bill to do that today, and, instead, are here just pretending to do something about a very serious problem.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

In California, we know all too well the disastrous effects of wildfires. Reducing the threat of wildfires requires numerous proactive efforts, including the timely removal of fire hazards.

My colleague, Mr. LAMALFA, has identified a solution to help improve fire hazard removal on Federal lands and prevent electrical blackouts.

There are more than 18,000 miles of power lines on Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management land, and these transmission lines, running along electricity rights-of-way, are critical to the power distribution in the West.

The costs of operating and maintaining these transmission rights-of-way are borne by utility companies, but approval for companies to remove the fire

hazards comes from the Forest Service. Currently, it takes the Forest Service months to grant approval to remove a dead tree.

H.R. 1873 addresses this issue by allowing utility companies to remove fire risks in a timely manner and ensuring we are being responsible stewards of our Federal lands.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Additionally, the bill allows utility companies to engage in responsible vegetation management along these rights-of-way, including language that I have added, which encourages the management practices for our pollinators, enhancing the habitat and forage for these pollinators, such as commercial and native bees that are so important to our trees and our community.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me repeat: We are talking about caution and what is causing fires; and 0.03 percent of fires caused by transmission lines is the data that is available to us. I know facts sometimes don't matter, but they should matter in something as important as this; and 0.03 percent is the cause by transmission lines of fires in the forest on public lands.

We are generalizing the huge wildfires that we have seen to make a case for this bill when the case is about transmission lines, rights-of-away; and it is 0.03 percent as the root cause of those fires over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend my colleagues for this commonsense legislation. As a result of drought and the bark beetle, there are an estimated over 107 million dead trees in over 33 million acres of forests in California, and it is also throughout the West. Part of this is due to climate change, which is one of the most vexing challenges of our time.

This unprecedented tree mortality has created serious fire risk of wildfires throughout the West. Today, in California, in the Central Valley, we have record temperatures of 109 degrees and 112 degrees. Obviously, that adds to the concern.

One thing that can be done, though, to prevent wildfires is to manage and control the amount of vegetation, particularly in areas where we have increased fire risk. We just, bottom line, have to manage our forests a lot better than we are. We are putting way too much of our budget for managing our forests to putting out fires, and that must change.

But an example of a location with higher fire risk is a utility corridor

with exposed electrical lines that we have throughout the West in forested areas.

In 2015, the Butte fire in northern California, which was the seventh most destructive in California's history, was sparked by a tree that came into contact with a power line. This is easily prevented by removing those trees that could damage lines, reducing fire risk and the cost of repairs to the utility ratepayers, plus the people in the surrounding area, which these fires are devastating, and sometimes lives are lost as well as property.

□ 1515

H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, if enacted, would create a process to expedite routine maintenance of vegetation along electric utilities in and near utility corridors and would help prevent future tragedies like the 2015 Butte fire in northern California that was devastating, once again.

The bottom line is that we must do more, and we can. I concur that we should utilize the Stafford Act for forest fires, and that would free up more money to manage the forests. But that is a separate piece of legislation that, hopefully, we will get a chance to act on.

This is a separate piece, and I urge support of this commonsense legislation, for my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1873, legislation sponsored by my colleagues from the Western Caucus, which improves the reliability of our electrical grid while, at the same time, protecting our Federal lands and forests from the ravages of wildfires.

This bipartisan legislation is commonsense, plain and simple. This bill allows electric co-ops to prune or remove a tree that would fall on a power line in an electricity corridor if left unmanaged.

Maintaining healthy and well-managed rights-of-way is important for many reasons, not the least of which are the safety of our communities and reliable electricity delivery.

Now, if you knew that a tree was going to fall on a power line and potentially cause a massive blackout or spark a fire, you would probably want to cut it back or get rid of it, right? Of course you would. It is commonsense.

Unfortunately, inconsistent and unpredictable viewpoints between Federal land managers at the Departments of Interior and Agriculture have prevented co-ops from ensuring safety along the corridors, putting many at risk.

Timely decisionmaking is crucial for these co-ops to protect the land, but for far too long, bureaucratic red tape has delayed the removal of hazardous

trees for weeks and, in some cases, months. Too many times, co-ops have notified the proper Department of a dangerous situation only to have the request to remove a hazardous tree either denied or bogged down by unnecessary and duplicative reviews. Not only that, but when the very tree they reported inevitably falls on a power line and sparks a fire, the co-op is left holding the bill for the damages.

Mr. Chairman, this is absurd, and I am pleased that this legislation shifts liability for a fire started under those circumstances back to the party responsible for inaction.

Rolling the dice on forest health is not just unwise, it is flat out irresponsible. I thank the gentlemen from California and Oregon for sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1873, the bipartisan Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for working with me on this important legislation that will bring much-needed consistency and accountability throughout the Federal land management agencies.

This bill is just common sense. Putting it quite simply, we are just helping our utilities better enhance safety and reliability of the grid and protecting against wildfires and blackouts.

Contrary to what some folks have asserted, this is actually a bipartisan bill supported by quite a few Democrats. This bill is especially vital for most of those in the West, where much of our land is federally owned.

Many of your utilities' and co-ops' service territory can be more than 50 percent federally managed. We have witnessed extreme variations and approaches not only between the Forest Service and the BLM, but within the management agency districts themselves.

Jim Pena, out in Oregon: "There is little consistency from agency to agency, district to district, or even within the same offices." This is the Forest Service talking.

We read and listened to the specter of big companies coming in and clear-cutting our Federal lands. I respectfully suggest that that is why we need these vegetative management plans. They are short, concise, deal with only the utility's right-of-way and the land adjacent to it that could cause problems.

I wonder sometimes what the heck folks are talking about. We have heard complaints about absolving companies from liability. That is not true. What we are saying is, if the Secretary fails to allow the utility to manage the vegetation on Federal lands or adjacent right-of-way in a way that is consistent with their approved vegetative

management plan that they have worked out with them or if the hazard tree or tree is in imminent danger of contacting an electricity line, the utility will not be held liable for wildfire damage or loss. It does not absolve a utility from liability if they are negligent or act in a way that is inconsistent with their vegetative management plan.

I give you a great example our colleague from Arizona talked about. In Oregon, a rural co-op requested trimming some dangerous trees along the rights-of-way by the Forest Service. The Forest Service denied the request. A tree fell on the power line, sparked a fire. The utility was held responsible for paying for that fire when they had actually brought the issue to them in the first place. That is ridiculous.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1873.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I also thank Mr. WEBSTER for managing this legislation for us here on the floor today. I appreciate it.

I rise today as a sponsor in strong support, of course, of H.R. 1873. It is indeed a commonsense vegetation management bill that reduces forest fire danger possibilities and electricity blackouts, while cutting through the bureaucratic red tape in the process.

I also want to thank my colleague Mr. SCHRADER from Oregon for his strong support in making this a true bipartisan effort for something that really should have no partisan roots at all.

As we have heard several of my colleagues speak earlier in testimony on the floor here today, there are gross inconsistencies and impediments in the way the Forest Service and BLM manage transmission lines, particularly in the West, where many of these lines run through difficult terrain and dense forest.

One electric utility in my district, the City of Redding Electric Utility, uses helicopters to engage in vegetation management along the rights-of-way on Federal lands. Such remote and forested areas make it especially difficult to effectively manage an area so large and dense.

Rapid agency response is needed to help electric utility requests to conduct routine and emergency vegetation maintenance along Federal rights-of-way. It is absolutely essential to avoid wildfires and blackouts.

Another benefit this bill brings to utility companies is much-needed safeguards in instances where the Secretary fails to allow them to trim or remove a hazardous tree. There was an unfortunate incident in La Pine, Oregon, in which a rural electric utility company was unjustly billed for a \$300,000 fire suppression bill when its request to remove a tree in imminent danger of falling on a transmission line was denied by the Forest Service.

This bill would provide the electric utility companies the confidence and means to manage and maintain their own transmission lines from overgrown and unmanaged trees along rights-of-way, something the Federal Government should already be doing in the first place.

You see from the example here that electricity frequently is generated in rural parts of our country, and long, long transmission lines are needed to get to the urban parts of the country. So we are all in this: blackouts for the urban areas and, indeed, black skies in our rural areas where the forests are from unneeded wildfires.

The Forest Service's own document shows that, between 2012 and 2013, approximately 350 forest fires were caused by this interface of damaged trees, dying trees, falling trees falling into the different types of lines you would find in rural areas in order to move the power.

These changes to status quo are long overdue. This bill is an answer to many of the problems electricity companies are having with the management of electricity rights-of-way on Federal lands. Too many dying and dead trees have fallen unnecessarily on power lines, sparking devastating forest fires that could have been prevented had they had that ability to remove the tree in question.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMALFA. By providing the utilities with the tools they need to ensure the reliability and the longevity of our national forests, we can bolster investment in energy infrastructure and enhance the lives of all Americans and do much better to preserve the habitat of these areas that we treasure.

I urge swift passage of the bill today and favor in the Senate when it gets over there. Indeed, I thank my colleagues for helping this process along today.

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

An example that supporters of this legislation use is from Oregon. It is from 1984. In the 33 years since then, I am aware of no example of a Federal agency refusing to allow a company to do vegetation management work and then holding the company liable for the damages.

In fact, as the committee report for this bill states, the issue of land managers allowing access to rights-of-way was largely resolved by language in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, stating:

Federal agencies responsible for approving access to electric transmission and distribution facilities located on lands within the United States shall, in accordance with applicable law, expedite any Federal agency approvals that are necessary to allow owners and operators of such facilities to comply with any reliability standard approved by the Commission under section 215 of the Federal Power Act that pertains to vegetation management, service restorations, or any

situation that imminently endangers the reliability or safety of the facilities.

If the utility companies feel that BLM and the Forest Service are not complying with the law, they should seek resolution in the court. Instead, they are coming after a backdoor opportunity to affect our public lands.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, it really is amazing that the bureaucratic tangle that has been caused by our so-called environmental laws has now reached the point that even dead trees on public lands that threaten to fall on power lines and cause major forest fires cannot be removed without permission from Federal bureaucrats. And then to add insult to insanity, when the bureaucracy denies or delays permission and a fire results, the cost of the fire is paid by the utility's customers through higher household electricity bills.

Mr. LAMALFA mentioned a situation in La Pine, Oregon, where the Midstate Electric Cooperative begged the Forest Service for permission to trim trees that were threatening their power lines, and they were refused. Well, sure enough, when one of those trees fell on a power line and started a fire, the utility's customers were forced to pay the firefighting costs that resulted, a third of a million dollars.

Carbon Power & Light warned the Forest Service of trees threatening their lines. The Forest Service required them first to conduct \$1.6 million of environmental studies paid by the utility's customers. If there had been a fire in the meantime, they would have had to pay those costs as well.

Mr. LAMALFA's bill basically does two things:

First, it exempts such projects from time-consuming and costly environmental reviews. After all, there is nothing more devastating to the forest environment than a forest fire. Our environmental laws are now causing these fires.

Second, when a Federal agency delays or denies permission for a utility to remove or trim hazard trees and they end up causing a fire, the liability is placed where it belongs: on the agency and its bureaucrats, not on the utility and its customers; and it gives utilities permission to remove imminent threats to power lines before they can cause a fire.

Mr. Chair, you may have noticed, common sense is not exactly common to government. Let's change that today by adopting this bill.

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

At a hearing on similar legislation in the Natural Resources Committee last Congress, both the Forest Service and BLM testified in opposition and explained how they work with utility companies to address vegetation management issues.

In addition to entering into voluntary vegetation management plans, the Forest Service testified that the agency's 2013 vegetation management guide specifies for field staffs the procedures and practices that should be included in operation and maintenance plans for power lines. This guide states that, where vegetation conditions inside or outside the authorized right-of-way pose an imminent threat to power line facilities, utility companies may remove those threats immediately, without prior approval from the Forest Service.

For its part, BLM testified that, under the terms and conditions typically included in a right-of-way grant, a utility company may conduct minor trimming, pruning, and weed management to maintain the right-of-way of a facility after simply notifying BLM. The utility company can often obtain BLM approval for removal of hazardous trees through a streamlined process. For an emergency situation causing an imminent hazard, no BLM preapproval would be necessary.

□ 1530

I understand that some of the companies believe they should be able to do whatever they want whenever they want, but the land does not belong to them. It belongs to the American people, and Federal agencies have a responsibility to all Americans to ensure that those lands are not abused.

Again, facts do matter, and 0.03 percent of fires in public lands were caused by trees falling on transmission lines in the last 5 years—0.03 percent. So we continue to exaggerate the common sense behind the facts that I just laid out.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, and I thank Mr. LAMALFA for his leadership on this issue.

I would also like to commend the nonpartisan support for this bill, and associate my remarks with the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

This bill is a commonsense piece of legislation that will reduce the risk of wildfires and improve the safety and reliability of our electrical grid.

How will this bill accomplish these objectives?

It is really quite simple. When we remove overgrown vegetation near our electric grid on Federal lands, we remove the fuel component of wildfires. By reducing the risk of wildfire, we reduce the risk of an interruption of our electrical grid.

Mr. Chairman, this is so much just plain common sense that it baffles me that we are having to debate it on the

floor of the House of Representatives, but I think it is an example of how misguided some of our land management agencies have become, and the need for broader reforms.

This bill would streamline the Federal review process for removal of trees and vegetation that pose a risk to our power grid and promotes consistency among Federal agencies tasked with the decisions on removal.

If we want to move toward better protection of our forests on Federal lands and the electrical grid that moves through these locations, it is obvious that we should pass H.R. 1873.

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

My colleague from California (Mr. COSTA) brought up one of the real causes of wildfire, and that was climate change, the lack of mitigation, and the situation within the Forest Service budget in which half of the revenue dedicated to that department is used to suppress wildfires.

This administration has denied the existence of climate change, scrubbed it from its vocabulary, from its science, from its study. If we are going to look at the causes of wildfires, if we are going to look at strategies and how we protect the urban and forest interface, if we are going to look at really addressing the subject, then the very salient point that Mr. COSTA brought up regarding climate change has to be part and parcel of the discussion.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, management of the forests and forest fires is an important and significant topic, but it is not the issue that we are having here today. Climate change is an important significant topic, but it is not the issue that we are talking about today.

We are talking about how you transfer power from point A, where it is produced, to point B, where people live, and make sure that you can continue to have that power flowing there because it impacts the quality of life. This is about how we improve our lives. That is the key issue.

The examples have been given out here before of examples of where that has been interrupted simply because we failed to maintain transmission lines. A good example is down in New Mexico, where, once again, an ash tree—pun intended—actually fell on a forest, on the line, creating a 150,000-acre fire; and then the company that actually owned the line and wanted to maintain it but was not allowed to by the Forest Service was given a \$35 million bill. Unfortunately, the liability of that company was only \$20 million, so you can understand the difficulty that company is in right now.

That is the reality in which we are dealing, and we have to realize that this is a solution to that issue. It is about how we provide power to people.

The only chance I had of meeting President Obama was when he came to Utah and visited Hill Air Force Base, and he was there to talk about solar power that is being used on Hill Air Force Base.

Hill Air Force Base also has a great power source that comes from a neighboring trash dump, which provides steam and methane power that goes to the base itself. And I told the President, when he asked us questions about this, that it is very easy for Hill Air Force Base to have this power source because it is next door. But for most people, they live miles and miles away, and you have to have transmission lines that get the power from where it is produced to where they live, and often across Federal lands.

To his credit, President Obama lit up and said: Yes, not only is that an important issue, but it is also an issue dealing with our entire grid structure that needs to be worked on; another issue that is not today's discussion matter.

And to his credit, his office did contact our office, our committee, and started helping us work on some issues. Even though they did not stay with us to the final conclusion of the bill, the bill we have before us today is the result of those discussions, the result of that effort.

I try to emphasize how bipartisan this bill is; an effort to try and solve a real problem that helps real people with real circumstances that have caused problems in the past that need to be changed. That is what we are attempting to do here.

So I applaud the committee that came up with this bill. I applaud the chief sponsor of that bill. I urge my colleagues to please support this. This is the right thing to do if you really care about helping people.

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

You know, this legislation, with a few modifications, could help prevent the 0.03 percent of wildfires that are caused by electricity infrastructure, but the majority refused to work with us on those modifications.

Most importantly, the failure to make vegetation management plans for utility rights-of-way mandatory negates any positive impact this bill might have had. As we have heard from Forest Service and industry at a hearing on similar legislation last Congress, voluntary vegetation management is already allowed and is quite common. This includes the ability for rights-of-way holders to access these areas and conduct vegetation management without notifying Federal land managers until after the fact. This is current law.

The majority claims we need this bill to address delays caused by the approval of unplanned work and delays

associated with removing dead trees on public lands outside of rights-of-way.

Without an up-front planning requirement, I can see authorizing limited activity for utility companies to do targeted vegetation management adjacent to rights-of-way. But instead of offering the commonsense trade off, the bill before us today simply cuts Federal agencies out of the process of managing the American people's land by requiring the Forest Service and BLM to approve plans with no option to modify or reject them if the plans are inadequate.

So whatever the company turns in—the utility company turns in, that is the plan that will become the management plan for that vegetation, regardless of any opinion by Forest Service or BLM.

Further, the bill does not define “adjacent,” meaning that companies could cut trees that are well outside the rights-of-way on public lands. This makes public lands vulnerable to a level of abuse that no one who values them would be willing to support.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers and I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say that this legislation is a solution without a problem. And as I mentioned earlier several times, facts do matter.

When we are doing a whole-scale change of how we manage rights-of-way on public lands because of 0.03 percent of the causation by utility lines of fires on public lands, that is a heavy-handed way to approach doing legislation. There have been opportunities and modifications, opportunities of expediting the process, but those were not allowed as part of this legislation.

If we, indeed, are going to look at both the wildfire situation, the budget stress on Forest Service to suppress those fires, and this rights-of-way issue, which is miniscule compared to the bigger issues, then I think this legislation has to be rejected, and work on a piece of legislation that has consensus, that is bipartisan, and that addresses the real problems with wildfires in this country, not this utility giveaway that we are doing here today.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, again, I commend the bill's sponsors for bringing up this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation. I urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 1873—the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

North Carolina is home to four national forests that offer visitors and residents access to incredible scenery, wildlife, and a wide variety of recreational activities.

In my district in Western North Carolina, American Forestry management has its roots in the Pisgah National Forest: The Cradle of Forestry, the very first forestry school in the country, is located there.

Proper forestry management is a part of North Carolina's history that we hope to pass on to for our future generations to come.

I commend my colleagues, Reps. DOUG LAMALFA and KURT SCHRADER, for identifying a problem and for providing a common-sense solution to make vegetation management in national forests easier.

Managing vegetation around power lines is important for ensuring electric grid reliability, and for keeping overgrown and falling trees from interfering with nearby power lines which can cause blackouts, wildfires, and other safety hazards.

This bill would ensure utility companies, who are responsible for vegetation management near power lines on federal lands, are no longer delayed by bureaucratic red tape and inconsistent federal standards between agencies.

With the passage of this bill, we will be a step closer to providing expedited forestry management plan approval, while also giving utility companies the authority to remove hazardous debris in emergency situations.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased we are advancing a bipartisan proposal today—I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R.1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act. This important legislation is meant to proactively prevent major utility reliability problems before they happen.

Currently, electric cooperatives in my district own transmission lines which cross lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to provide essential services to rural areas. I've heard from my electric coops that before addressing problems with these transmission lines, such as clearing downed trees or excess debris near utility poles, they must first be granted approval to do the work from these federal agencies. Any delay in receiving approval costs time, money, and amplifies the impacts of major power outages to my constituents.

Currently, electric coops can be held responsible for damages if a tree falls on a power line and causes a fire, even if the coop is still awaiting approval to work on clearing the hazardous debris.

H.R. 1873 will save utilities unnecessary costs and improve electricity reliability for consumers by streamlining outdated federal land management policies. The language minimizes the need for case-by-case approvals and instead provides expedited review and approvals for routine vegetation management and maintenance activities. Cutting red tape will make it easier for electric utility companies to initiate preventative measures to manage vegetation and woody debris on right-of-way transmission lines. This proactive work will mitigate the effects of fires and storms by clearing hazardous material before the natural disaster hits.

Just two weeks ago, a major storm with winds up to seventy miles-per-hour blew through my district and left thousands of my constituents without power. The strong winds downed trees and took out power lines, severely damaged homes and businesses, and

ripped the roofs off of barns. Lengthy power outages delay the repairs needed to get storm victims' lives back on track. So I am eager to support legislation which helps my communities recover from these painful storms as fast as possible.

Storms like these are commonplace in Minnesota. Our electric coops are ready to complete the work necessary to mitigate the effects of these disasters as much as possible so consumers can have better access to electricity, especially during natural disasters. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to be here today in strong support of H.R. 1873, the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

As we enter wildfire season, it is of the utmost importance that the federal government act to prevent these devastating disasters.

The Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act strengthens electric grid reliability while reducing the risk of fires and fire hazards caused by poor vegetation management in power line rights-of-way on federally managed public lands.

Currently, bureaucratic permitting delays impede electric utility companies from effectively managing overgrowth near electric infrastructure, which puts these areas at greater risk for a fire event. This common-sense, widely-supported, legislation would require an expedited federal review process for trees that are dangerously close to power lines.

The effective management of this unruly vegetation is especially important in my home state of California, where in 2016, an overwhelming 6,986 fires destroyed over 565,000 acres of land throughout the state.

I thank my Colleague from California, Mr. LAMALFA, for his leadership on this legislation and I look forward to supporting the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act later today.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1873

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ON FEDERAL LANDS CONTAINING ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 512. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE RELATING TO ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

“(a) GENERAL DIRECTION.—In order to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution rights-of-way and related facilities and adjacent property, the Secretary, with respect to public lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System lands, shall provide direction to ensure that all existing and future rights-of-way, however established (including by grant, special use authorization, and easement), for electrical transmission and distribution facilities on such lands include provisions for utility vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance activities that, while consistent with applicable law—

“(1) are developed in consultation with the holder of the right-of-way;

“(2) enable the owner or operator of a facility to operate and maintain the facility in good working order and to comply with Federal, State and local electric system reliability and fire safety requirements, including reliability standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a) and plans to meet such reliability standards;

“(3) minimize the need for case-by-case or annual approvals for—

“(A) routine vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance activities within existing electrical transmission and distribution rights-of-way; and

“(B) utility vegetation management activities that are necessary to control hazard trees within or adjacent to electrical transmission and distribution rights-of-way; and

“(4) when review is required, provide for expedited review and approval of utility vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance activities, especially activities requiring prompt action to avoid an adverse impact on human safety or electric reliability to avoid fire hazards.

“(b) VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLANS.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION.—Consistent with subsection (a), the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide owners and operators of electric transmission and distribution facilities located on lands described in such subsection with the option to develop and submit a vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan, that at each transmission or distribution owner or operator’s discretion may cover some or all of the owner or operator’s transmission and distribution rights-of-way on Federal lands, for approval to the Secretary with jurisdiction over the lands. A plan under this paragraph shall enable the owner or operator of a facility, at a minimum, to comply with applicable Federal, State, and local electric system reliability and fire safety requirements, as provided in subsection (a)(2). The Secretaries shall not have the authority to modify those requirements.

“(2) REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly develop a consolidated and coordinated process for review and approval of—

“(A) vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plans submitted under paragraph (1) that—

“(i) assures prompt review and approval not to exceed 90 days;

“(ii) includes timelines and benchmarks for agency comments to submitted plans and final approval of such plans;

“(iii) is consistent with applicable law; and

“(iv) minimizes the costs of the process to the reviewing agency and the entity submitting the plans; and

“(B) amendments to the plans in a prompt manner if changed conditions necessitate a modification to a plan.

“(3) NOTIFICATION.—The review and approval process under paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) include notification by the agency of any changed conditions that warrant a modification to a plan;

“(B) provide an opportunity for the owner or operator to submit a proposed plan amendment to address directly the changed condition; and

“(C) allow the owner or operator to continue to implement those elements of the approved plan that do not directly and adversely affect the condition precipitating the need for modification.

“(4) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION PROCESS.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall apply his or her categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to plans developed under this subsection on existing transmission and distribution rights-of-way under this subsection.

“(5) IMPLEMENTATION.—A plan approved under this subsection shall become part of the authorization governing the covered right-of-way and hazard trees adjacent to the right-of-way. If a vegetation management plan is proposed for an existing transmission or distribution facility concurrent with the siting of a new transmission or distribution facility, necessary reviews shall be completed as part of the siting process or sooner. Once the plan is approved, the owner or operator shall provide the agency with only a notification of activities anticipated to be undertaken in the coming year, a description of those activities, and certification that the activities are in accordance with the plan.

“(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN.—The term ‘vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan’ means a plan that—

“(i) is prepared by the owner or operator of one or more electrical transmission or distribution facilities to cover one or more electric transmission and distribution rights-of-way; and

“(ii) provides for the long-term, cost-effective, efficient and timely management of facilities and vegetation within the width of the right-of-way and adjacent Federal lands to enhance electricity reliability, promote public safety, and avoid fire hazards.

“(B) OWNER OR OPERATOR.—The terms ‘owner’ and ‘operator’ include contractors or other agents engaged by the owner or operator of a facility.

“(C) HAZARD TREE.—The term ‘hazard tree’ means any tree inside the right-of-way or located outside the right-of-way that has been designated, prior to tree failure, by either the owner or operator of a transmission or distribution facility, or the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, to be likely to fail and cause a high risk of injury, damage, or disruption within 10 feet or less of an electric power line or related structure if it fell.

“(c) RESPONSE TO EMERGENCY CONDITIONS.—If vegetation on Federal lands within, or hazard trees on Federal lands adjacent to, an electrical transmission or distribution right-of-way granted by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture has contacted or is in imminent danger of contacting one or more electric transmission or distribution lines, the owner or operator of the transmission or distribution lines—

“(1) may prune or remove the vegetation or hazard tree to avoid the disruption of electric service and risk of fire; and

“(2) shall notify the appropriate local agent of the relevant Secretary not later than 24 hours after such removal.

“(d) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE RELIABILITY AND SAFETY STANDARDS.—If vegetation on Federal lands within or adjacent to an electrical transmission or distribution right-of-way

under the jurisdiction of each Secretary does not meet clearance requirements under standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a), or by State and local authorities, and the Secretary having jurisdiction over the lands has failed to act to allow a transmission or distribution facility owner or operator to conduct vegetation management activities within 3 business days after receiving a request to allow such activities, the owner or operator may, after notifying the Secretary, conduct such vegetation management activities to meet those clearance requirements.

“(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary or Secretary of Agriculture shall report requests and actions made under subsections (c) and (d) annually on each Secretary’s website.

“(f) LIABILITY.—An owner or operator of a transmission or distribution facility shall not be held liable for wildfire damage, loss or injury, including the cost of fire suppression, if—

“(1) the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture fails to allow the owner or operator to operate consistently with an approved vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan on Federal lands under the relevant Secretary’s jurisdiction within or adjacent to a right-of-way to comply with Federal, State or local electric system reliability and fire safety standards, including standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a); or

“(2) the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture fails to allow the owner or operator of the transmission or distribution facility to perform appropriate vegetation management activities in response to a hazard tree as defined under subsection (b)(6), or a tree in imminent danger of contacting the owner’s or operator’s transmission or distribution facility.

“(g) TRAINING AND GUIDANCE.—In consultation with the electric utility industry, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture are encouraged to develop a program to train personnel of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service involved in vegetation management decisions on rights-of-way relating to transmission and distribution facilities to ensure that such personnel—

“(1) understand electric system reliability and fire safety requirements, including reliability standards established by the Electric Reliability Organization as defined under 16 U.S.C. 824o(a);

“(2) assist owners and operators of transmission and distribution facilities to comply with applicable electric reliability and fire safety requirements; and

“(3) encourage and assist willing owners and operators of transmission and distribution facilities to incorporate on a voluntary basis vegetation management practices to enhance habitats and forage for pollinators and for other wildlife so long as the practices are compatible with the integrated vegetation management practices necessary for reliability and safety.

“(h) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

“(1) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, prescribe regulations, or amend existing regulations, to implement this section; and

“(2) not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this section, finalize regulations, or amend existing regulations, to implement this section.

“(i) EXISTING VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLANS.—Nothing in this section requires an owner or operator to develop and submit a vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan if one has already been approved by the Secretary or Secretary of Agriculture before the date of the enactment of this section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.), is

amended by inserting after the item relating to section 511 the following new item:

“Sec. 512. *Vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance relating to electric transmission and distribution facility rights-of-way.*”

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115-186. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated 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, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115-186.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 10, strike “the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide”.

Page 5, beginning on line 13, strike “with the option to” and insert “shall”.

Page 5, beginning on line 16, strike “plan, that at each transmission or distribution owner or operator’s discretion may cover some or all” and insert “plan covering all”.

Page 6, beginning on line 1, strike “The Secretaries shall not have the authority to modify those requirements.”.

Page 6, beginning on line 10, strike “and approval” and insert “, approval, denial, or modification”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 1873 ensures that we make up-front vegetation management planning a requirement for utilities that hold transmission rights-of-way on public lands.

I agree with Mr. LAMALFA’s intent to address the threats of wildfires. Coming from local government, as the former county supervisor for Santa Barbara, I have experienced firsthand the obstacles and challenges of balancing red tape and coordination among stakeholders.

Now, as the Representative for the Central Coast in California, I can tell you, we are no strangers to wildfires. Just last year, my district witnessed the devastating impacts of the Rey and Sherpa fires.

Unfortunately, the impacts of these wildfires are widespread. The Sherpa fire burned 7,474 acres in Santa Barbara County and the Los Padres National Forest for nearly a month last June. Then in January of this year, the heavy rains in the area triggered mudslides and flooding.

If we can take action to prevent wildfires, we should. We know it pays to be prepared. Congress needs to act to improve better coordination and clarity between Federal and land managers and utility companies that hold rights-of-way on public lands. In improving coordination, we can help utilities prevent fires due to overgrown vegetation or trees contacting power lines.

In turn, it would help the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management respond more quickly and consistently for requests to access and maintain rights-of-way on public lands. At the same time, the agencies can function as good stewards of our natural resources while enhancing their effectiveness in addressing fire hazard vegetation.

While well-intentioned, H.R. 1873 does not solve the problem of poor coordination.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill does not address the threats of wildfires because the rights-of-way maintenance plans described in the legislation are voluntary. Currently, owners of transmission lines can work with the Federal land managers to develop these plans. This is no different than the status quo.

That is why I introduced my amendment to ensure that we make up-front planning a requirement for utilities.

□ 1545

I urge passage of my amendment to make sure that we are prepared and minimize the threats of wildfires.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, the goal of H.R. 1873 is to provide certainty to utilities, their line workers, and their consumers, not forcing unnecessary, one-size-fits-all regulations.

Each plan can be tailored by an individual utility based on the service territory, region, and other characteristics. Some utilities may not choose to submit plans because they are satisfied with their local Forest Service office. Others, especially those who have rights-of-ways that predate the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, may not want to trigger Federal paperwork costs that are ultimately passed on to their consumers.

This amendment, if adopted, would significantly burden Federal Land Management agencies by inundating them with all kinds of submittals. Additionally, if you want to increase the cost of this bill, then this amendment will do just that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I would inject additional bureaucracy into the bill that is unintended to do exactly the opposite of what this bill intended to do.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill is in search of a problem. Voluntary is the status quo. That is the case today, and we see the wildfires happen day in and day out. So, again, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-186.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 9, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 12, line 16, strike the period and inserting “; and”.

Page 12, after line 16, insert the following: “(4) understand how existing and emerging unmanned technologies can help electric utilities, Federal, State, and local governments, and private landowners to more efficiently identify vegetation management needs, lower ratepayer energy costs, and reduce the risk of wildfires.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their leadership. I also thank Congressman LAMALFA, Congressman SCHRADER, and all of the other Members for their hard work on this issue. In particular, I thank Congressman GOSAR, who is here today, Congressman TIPTON, and Congressman O’HALLERAN for cosponsoring our bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Sinema amendment ensures the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior are educated on how unmanned technologies are transforming the energy industry to improve maintenance, lower costs, and reduce the risk of wildfires. Unmanned technology is changing the way Arizonans do business.

Currently, energy companies use manned helicopters to check transmission lines and direct repair and maintenance crews. This work ensures Arizona’s electric grid remains resilient, reliable, efficient, and that it

works when Arizona families and businesses need it. But utilities and cooperatives believe that unmanned technology can improve the way we manage our energy infrastructure. Unmanned technologies can monitor transmission lines quickly and safely in multiple locations, enabling more efficient operations and maintenance.

They provide better situational awareness to crews and managers, reducing accidents and workplace injuries. It also improves vegetation management, disaster prevention, and disaster response. These are critical issues in my home State of Arizona. In rural areas, our transmission and distribution lines run through Federal land that are prone to wildfires.

I am a cosponsor of the underlying bill because I recognize the importance of keeping these rights-of-way clear of dry brush and fallen trees. Streamlining the process that allows us to perform routine maintenance and prevent wildfires that too often endanger our communities is just commonsense. Our bipartisan amendment improves the underlying bill by ensuring that unmanned technologies integrate appropriately, quickly, and effectively into broader vegetation management, disaster prevention, and disaster response strategies.

Unmanned technologies have the potential to improve efficiency, lower energy costs for Arizona families and businesses, and reduce the risk of dangerous wildfires by ensuring that rights-of-way are reliable and properly maintained. Federal agencies should be prepared to embrace these smart technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Sinema amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to H.R. 1873. This bipartisan amendment would ensure that personnel involved in vegetation management decisions understand the benefit that unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, or drones, can add to the maintenance and management of transmission lines.

In 2017, not only does this policy make sense, it is essential. Our electric grid and forests should be protected with this effective and cost-efficient technology, which has proven its worth in so many other areas, including national defense and private industry.

In my home State of Arizona, UAVs have proven to be highly valuable tools in forest management. Utilizing UAV expertise from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Prescott, Arizona, as well as Northern Arizona Uni-

versity in Flagstaff, land managers have greatly improved their ability to monitor forest conditions both at scale and down to the detail of individual trees and branches.

Proper vegetation management around transmission lines is essential to preventing power outages and dangerous forest fires. UAV technology makes transmission line monitoring safer, cheaper, and more effective.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to our constituents to pursue smarter, safer, and cheaper approaches to public policy and resource management. This amendment and this bill allow us to do so in a bipartisan way. I am proud to partner with the gentlewoman from Arizona on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to extend my thanks to my friend and colleague, Mr. GOSAR from Arizona. I encourage my fellow Members to support the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-186.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 3. NO LOSS OF FUNDS FOR WILD-FIRE SUPPRESSION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall detract from the availability of funds or other resources for wild-fire suppression.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill before us today is a well-intentioned attempt to create a process which would minimize the risk of fire along electrical utilities' rights-of-way. Yes, there are some problems with the bill, but my most significant objection is that this bill, our Natural Resources Committee, and this Congress refuse to act on the urgent need to address how our U.S. Forest Service deals with wildfires.

The Forest Service burned through more than half of its budget last year fighting wildfires. Yet our leadership won't bring to the floor for a vote a bipartisan legislation that deals with the problem of "fire borrowing."

In the 114th Congress, just such a bill, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act

had 151 cosponsors—67 Republicans, 84 Democrats—but it never even got a committee hearing. So that is disappointing, and even irresponsible.

So, once again, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are going to go into this fire season knowing that they don't have the resources to do the work necessary to mitigate wildfire damage on U.S. public lands.

In a recent report on fire suppression costs, the Forest Service reported that funding available for recreation, heritage, and wilderness had fallen 15 percent; funding for roads is down 46 percent; facility spending, off 68 percent; deferred maintenance outlays have been slashed by a disastrous 95 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in my two terms on the Natural Resources Committee, we often debate and fret about how little money is available for maintenance of our public lands, the deferred maintenance. The diversion of these funds for wildfire suppression is among the many causes.

Non-fire-related staff has been cut by 39 percent since 1998, and over the last two decades, the cost of fire preparedness and suppression activities has grown from 62 percent of the Forest Service's total budget, to more than half—52 percent.

That shift has come at the expense of programs and staff that every American wants: staff on recreation, permits, timber sales, hunting, and fishing. Everything else is suffering because of our inability to deal in a constructive way with wildfire mitigation.

So now is the time that we address wildfires to be treated as the major disasters they are and for the efforts to put them out, to be eligible for disaster assistance, and not subtract it from funds that land managers need to do their daily jobs.

So my very simple one-sentence amendment simply says that no money in this bill—this bill will not divert legitimate wildfire mitigation money more to wildfires than is already there.

I urge you to vote "yes" on my amendment so, at the very least, we can prevent this bill from detracting from further Federal wildfire suppression efforts.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment, but I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment prohibits any loss of funds for wildfire suppression activities. The bill also provides electric utilities with the certainty that they need to ensure that downed trees do not fall on power lines, which would prevent many of these wildfires from starting in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my friend from Florida for his support for this sensible amendment, and I hope that we can proceed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 243, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—171

Adams	Gallego	O'Rourke
Aguilar	Garamendi	Pallone
Barragan	Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta
Bass	Green, Al	Pascrell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Payne
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pocan
Bonamici	Heck	Polis
Brown (MD)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Bustos	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rosen
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Khanna	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Serrano
Clyburn	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Connolly	Lawrence	Sherman
Conyers	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Cooper	Lee	Sires
Correa	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Crist	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Crowley	Liptinski	Speier
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Suozzi
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	M.	Titus
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Demings	Maloney,	Torres
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dingell	Matsui	Vegaw
Doggett	McCollum	Vela
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Velázquez
F.	McGovern	Visclosky
Ellison	McNerney	Walz
Engel	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Espallat	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Esty (CT)	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Evans	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Neal	
Fudge	Nolan	

NOES—243

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

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Higgins (NY)	Noem
Blum	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (OH)
Comstock	Larsen (WA)	Scalise
Cramer	Long	Weber (TX)
Cummings	Lynch	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	

□ 1622

Messrs. CHAFFETZ, FERGUSON, ROE of Tennessee, GARRETT, KNIGHT, ROSS, MOONEY of West Virginia, PETERS, BRENDAN F. BOYLE

of Pennsylvania, O'HALLERAN, KIND, and SCHNEIDER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, 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. 1873) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, and, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you with your congressional women's softball team, who are tanned, rested, and ready to beat the press tonight.

Our bipartisan team has been practicing for the last 3 months at 7 in the morning, two to three mornings a week, with batting practice at night at the cages at the Nationals training academy.

We have been singularly focused on two things—I know it doesn't make sense, because that would mean it wasn't singularly—making sure that we can continue to raise awareness about the risk that young women face of breast cancer and to make sure that we can shine a spotlight on the fact that young women can and do get breast cancer.

This is our ninth annual game. It is the eighth time that we are playing the common "enemy"—we say that affectionately—the female Capitol press corps. They have been incredible partners in helping this year cross the incredible milestone of raising more than \$1 million for the Young Survival Coalition. We are so proud of that.

We want to thank our coaches who have been remarkable through all these years. Of course, we have our head coach, Torie Barnes, Jo Ann Emerson's daughter, who was the co-founder of this game 9 years ago; our own House favorite, Natalie Buchanan, who is an amazing new mom who has

been out there with us, in spite of just having a baby a few short months ago; Coach Jim, who has been amazing as well; and, of course, our very own colleague, Coach ED PERLMUTTER from the great State of Colorado.

Come on out tonight at 7 p.m. at Watkins Recreation Center, 420 12th Street, SE. Turn right at the CVS.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), my cocaptain, friend, and fellow appropriator.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone would agree with me when I say that, in the midst of the tragedy and horror last week, there are also special moments that brought us together and reminded us of what is really important. One was right here in this Chamber, where we heard touching speeches from PAUL RYAN and Leader PELOSI; another was at the baseball game when the entire Capitol Hill community gathered in an amazing show of support for our friend, STEVE SCALISE, our Capitol Police officers and their heroic acts; as well as Matt, Zack, David, and Crystal; and all of those who were involved.

That spirit of unity and togetherness is a big part of why we play this softball game. Our relationships as Members of Congress are stronger because of this game. I don't think we can have too many reminders about the importance of unity and friendship.

I encourage all Members and staff to come join us tonight and go to bat for this great cause. Unlike the baseball game, Republicans and Democrats don't compete against each other. We team up against one opponent we can all agree on: the press.

So, beat cancer, beat the press.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 300, noes 118, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—300

Abraham	Frelinghuysen	McSally
Aguilar	Gaetz	Meadows
Allen	Gallagher	Meehan
Amash	Garamendi	Messer
Amodei	Garrett	Mitchell
Arrington	Gianforte	Moolenaar
Babin	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Bacon	Gohmert	Moulton
Banks (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	Mullin
Barletta	Goodlatte	Murphy (FL)
Barr	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Barton	Gotthaimer	Newhouse
Bera	Gotwly	Noem
Bergman	Granger	Nolan
Biggs	Graves (GA)	Norcross
Billirakis	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Bishop (GA)	Graves (MO)	O'Halleran
Bishop (MI)	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bishop (UT)	Green, Gene	Olson
Black	Griffith	Palazzo
Blackburn	Grothman	Palmer
Bonamici	Guthrie	Panetta
Bost	Harper	Paulsen
Boyle, Brendan F.	Harris	Pearce
Brady (PA)	Hartzler	Perry
Brady (TX)	Heck	Peters
Brat	Hensarling	Peterson
Bridenstine	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Poliquin
Brown (MD)	Hill	Poliquin
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Posey
Buchanan	Holding	Ratcliffe
Buck	Hollingsworth	Reed
Bucshon	Hudson	Reichert
Budd	Huizenga	Renacci
Burgess	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Bustos	Hunter	Roby
Butterfield	Hurd	Roe (TN)
Byrne	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Cárdenas	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Rokita
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Chabot	Jones	Rooney, Thomas J.
Chaffetz	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Rosen
Coffman	Katko	Roskam
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Ross
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Kihuen	Rouzer
Comer	Kilmer	Royce (CA)
Conaway	King (IA)	Ruiz
Connolly	King (NY)	Russell
Cook	Kinzinger	Rutherford
Cooper	Knight	Sanford
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Costello (PA)	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Courtney	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cramer	LaHood	Scott, David
Crawford	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Crist	Lamborn	Sessions
Cuellar	Lance	Shea-Porter
Culberson	Larson (CT)	Shimkus
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Shuster
Davidson	Lawson (FL)	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Lewis (MN)	Sinema
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sires
Delaney	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Denham	Loeb sack	Smith (NE)
Dent	Lofgren	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Loudermillk	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Love	Smucker
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Soto
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Doyle, Michael F.	Lujan Grisham, M.	Stewart
Duffy	Luján, Ben Ray	Stivers
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Swalwell (CA)
Duncan (TN)	Maloney, Sean	Taylor
Dunn	Marchant	Tenney
Emmer	Marino	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Estes (KS)	Massie	Thornberry
Esty (CT)	Mast	Tiberi
Farenthold	Matsui	Tipton
Faso	McCarthy	Torres
Ferguson	McCaul	Trott
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Turner
Fleischmann	McHenry	Upton
Flores	McKinley	Valadao
Fortenberry	McMorris	Vargas
Fox	Rodgers	Vela
Franks (AZ)	McNerney	Walberg
		Walden

Walker	Westerman	Yoder
Walorski	Williams	Yoho
Walters, Mimi	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Walz	Witman	Young (IA)
Webster (FL)	Womack	Zeldin
Wenstrup	Woodall	

NOES—118

Adams	Gallego	Pelosi
Barragán	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pocan
Beyer	Hastings	Polis
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Blunt Rochester	Huffman	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Carbajal	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Rush
Chu, Judy	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Lawrence	Serrano
Cohen	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Speier
DeGette	Lowe	Suozi
DeLauro	Lynch	Takano
DelBene	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Carolyn B.	Titus
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Tonko
Deutch	McEachin	Tsongas
Dingell	McGovern	Veasey
Doggett	Meeks	Velázquez
Ellison	Meng	Vislosky
Engel	Moore	Wasserman
Espallat	Nadler	Schultz
Evans	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Pascrell	Welch
Fudge	Payne	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Higgins (NY)	Scalise
Blum	Johnson, Sam	Weber (TX)
Comstock	Larsen (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Cummings	Long	
Gabbard	Napolitano	

□ 1639

Messrs. KEATING and PALLONE changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 314 and 315 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Carbajal Amendment. I would also have voted "nay" on H.R. 1873—Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was not present today, June 21, for rollcall votes. I was attending a memorial service in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 311, "yea" on rollcall No. 312, "yea" on rollcall No. 313, "nay" on rollcall No. 314, and "yea" on rollcall No. 315.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.