ranking member and all of the members of the committee, for the legislation that was just acted on concerning the police officers. As a former police officer, I want my colleagues to know that I appreciate holding this annual event every year to recognize those who have given their dedication and those who have paid the ultimate price in living their lives in the service to their communities and to this country.

So I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership on both of these efforts, as well as the ranking member.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

The last speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), served as the ranking member on this subcommittee during the last Congress; and although we are pleased to have the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) as our new ranking member, the service that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) provided to the subcommittee was greatly appreciated by those of us on our side of the aisle; and we do miss his guidance and leadership on a number of these important resolutions. It is an honor to serve in the Congress with him.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I understand that we are trying to use some time while we wait for the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and I will say that I have had the privilege a few years ago of attending the soap box derby in Knoxville; and I have seen firsthand the excitement and the interest and, really, the educational value that is given to many young people around the country through this nationwide program.

I have been asked to give this statement on behalf of the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee, and myself. So I will say on behalf of Chairman YOUNG and really speaking, I think, for the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I rise today to offer my full support for House Concurrent Resolution 53, which authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the 62nd Annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to be held on June 21, 2003.

This event, which is open to the public and free of charge, gives young people from around the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area an opportunity to not only showcase their talents of building a vehicle that will perform at high levels, but also the opportunity to realize the rewards of a job well done. Participants will compete in three open divisions based on their experience in building their vehicles. This event is currently one of the oldest of its kind in the country, having taken place for over 60 years. The winners of these events will go on to represent the Washington area at the national competition to be held in Akron, Ohio, later in the summer.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for introducing this resolution and all of my colleagues who have spoken previously and for their continued support for this very worthwhile program. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this worthy legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for the additional time.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has been detained and will not be able to speak on the bill that he is sponsoring.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time to indicate I am glad we received that announcement because I had run out of soap box derby things to talk about.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 53, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS SECURITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 866) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to enhance the security of wastewater treatment works.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 866

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 ''Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS SECURITY.

Title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1281 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 222. WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS SECURITY.

''(a) GRANTS FOR VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS AND SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS.—The Administrator may make grants to a State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency—

''(1) to conduct a vulnerability assessment of a publicly owned treatment works;

''(2) to implement security enhancements listed in subsection (c)(1) to reduce vulnerabilities identified in a vulnerability assessment; and

''(3) to implement additional security enhancements to reduce vulnerabilities identified in a vulnerability assessment.

''(b) VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'vulnerability assessment' means an assessment of the vulnerability of a treatment works to actions intended to—

''(A) substantially disrupt the ability of the treatment works to safely and reliably operate; or

''(B) have a substantial adverse effect on critical infrastructure, public health or safety, or the environment.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF METHODS TO REDUCE VULNERABILITIES.—A vulnerability assessment includes identification of procedures, countermeasures, and equipment that the treatment works can implement or utilize to reduce the identified vulnerabilities.

''(3) REVIEW.—A vulnerability assessment shall include a review of the vulnerability of the treatment works's—

''(A) facilities, systems, and devices used in the storage, treatment, recycling, or reclamation of municipal sewage or industrial wastes;

''(B) intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, sewage collection systems, and other constructed conveyances;

''(C) electronic, computer, and other automated systems;

''(D) pumping, power, and other equipment;

''(E) use, storage, and handling of various chemicals; and

''(F) operation and maintenance procedures.

''(c) GRANTS FOR SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS.—

''(1) PREAPPROVED SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS.—Upon certification by an applicant that a vulnerability assessment has been completed for a treatment works and that the security enhancement for which assistance is sought is to reduce vulnerabilities of the treatment works identified in the assessment, the Administrator may make grants to the applicant under subsection (a)(2) for 1 or more of the following:

''(A) Purchase and installation of equipment for access control, intrusion prevention and delay, and detection of intruders and hazardous or dangerous substances, including—

''(i) barriers, fencing, and gates;

''(ii) security lighting and cameras;

''(iii) metal grates, wire mesh, and outfall entry barriers;

''(iv) securing of manhole covers and fill and vent pipes;

''(v) installation and re-keying of doors and locks; and

''(vi) smoke, chemical, and explosive mixture detection systems.

''(B) Security improvements to electronic, computer, or other automated systems and remote security systems, including controlling access to such systems, intrusion detection and prevention, and system backup.

''(C) Participation in training programs and the purchase of training manuals and guidance materials relating to security.

''(D) Security screening of employees or contractor support services.

''(2) ADDITIONAL SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS.—

''(A) GRANTS.—The Administrator may make grants under subsection (a)(3) to an applicant for additional security enhancements not listed in paragraph (1).

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this paragraph, an applicant shall submit an application to the Administrator containing such information as the Administrator may request.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants under subsections (a)(2) and (a)(3) may not be used for personnel costs or operation or maintenance of facilities, equipment, or systems.

''(B) DISCLOSURE OF VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT.—As a condition of applying for or receiving a grant under this section, the Administrator may not require an applicant to provide the Administrator with a copy of a vulnerability assessment.

''(d) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of activities funded by a grant under subsection (a) may not exceed 75 percent.

''(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount of grants made under subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) for one publicly owned treatment works shall not exceed $150,000.

''(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS.—

''(1) SECURITY ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator, in coordination the States, may provide technical guidance and assistance to small publicly owned treatment works on conducting a vulnerability assessment and implementation of security enhancements to reduce vulnerabilities identified in a vulnerability assessment. Such assistance may include technical assistance programs, training, and preliminary engineering evaluations.

''(2) PARTICIPATION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—The Administrator may make grants to nonprofit organizations to assist in accomplishing the purposes of this subsection.

''(3) SMALL PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'small publicly owned treatment works' means a publicly owned treatment works that services a population of fewer than 20,000 persons.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator—

''(1) $200,000,000 for making grants under subsection (a); and

''(2) $15,000,000 for providing technical assistance under subsection (e).

Such sums shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 3. REFINEMENT OF VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY FOR PUBLICLY OWNED TREATMENT WORKS.

(a) GRANTS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may make grants to a nonprofit organization for the improvement of vulnerability self-assessment methodologies and tools for publicly owned treatment works, including publicly owned treatment works that are part of a combined public wastewater treatment and water supply system.

(b) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Grants provided under this section may be used for developing and distributing vulnerability self-assessment methodology software upgrades, improving and enhancing critical technical and user support functions, expanding libraries of information addressing both threats and countermeasures, and implementing user training initiatives. Such services shall be provided at no cost to recipients.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2007. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 866, The Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act of 2003.

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, made the identification and protection of critical infrastructure a national priority and taught our Nation to take a broader look at our vulnerabilities. A good deal of planning and protection of our Nation's critical infrastructure is now under way as a result of these tragic events. But only limited attention has been given to security issues associated with our Nation's wastewater treatment plants.

Sewer pipes form a vast underground network that could provide a terrorist with access to many public buildings, urban centers, private businesses, residential neighborhoods, military installations, and transportation systems. A wastewater treatment system itself could also be a target of an attack with significant public health and environmental impacts.

H.R. 866 will help communities across the country address these security concerns by authorizing, first, $200 million for grants to wastewater utilities to conduct vulnerability assessments and implement security enhancements at their facilities; secondly, $15 million for technical assistance to small wastewater facilities on security measures; and, thirdly, $5 million for the further development and refinement of vulnerability self-assessment methodologies and tools for use by wastewater facilities.

These authorizations are designed to help wastewater treatment utilities take immediate and very necessary steps to improve security at their facilities and to fill a remaining major security gap within our Nation's critical infrastructure.

These authorizations do not create a new, ongoing infrastructure assistance program or create any new Federal mandates. The Association of Metropolitan sewerage agencies and the National Rural Water Association strongly support this legislation, as do utilities from cities throughout the Nation.

This is the same bill the House passed by voice vote in the last Congress. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act on it.

I urge all Members to support this very important and very bipartisan bill to improve our Nation's security.

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

□ 1115

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 866, the Wastewater Treatment Work Security Act of 2003. This legislation, which is virtually the same as legislation that was approved by the 107th Congress by voice vote, would authorize $200 million in grants from the Environmental Protection Agency to State and local governmental entities to conduct vulnerability assessments of wastewater treatment facilities and to take steps to reduce identified vulnerabilities.

This legislation is similar to the approach taken for the vulnerability assessments of drinking water facilities in the bioterrorism legislation that was signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of September 11 we have learned that the Nation's wastewater treatment plants are potentially vulnerable to terrorist attacks. While most plants have treatment redundancies, many plants have single points of failure, where two or more pipes feed into a common interceptor or have a large common pumping station serving the entire system.

Significant damage to one or more of the Nation's largest wastewater treatment plants or pumping stations would not only cause disruption to the normal community way of life, it would have serious environmental consequences.

While the largest impact might not be the loss of life, the discharge of millions and perhaps billions of gallons of raw sewage into the Nation's rivers and lakes would result in catastrophic environmental damage to the ecosystem and recreational economies, destroy commercial fish and shellfish industries, contaminate drinking water supplies, and lead to long-term public health problems.

In order to alleviate these concerns, under H.R. 866 the EPA would be authorized to provide grants for three purposes: One, to conduct vulnerability assessments at publicly owned treatment works; two, to implement certain preapproved security enhancements that have been identified in vulnerability assessment; and, three, to implement any other security enhancement measures identified in a vulnerability assessment.

This legislation would also authorize $15 million to provide technical assistance to small communities, those serving fewer than 20,000 individuals, and $1 million annually for 5 years for development and dissemination of computer software to aid in vulnerability assessment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the funding provisions for vulnerability assessments and security enhancements contained in this legislation have been drafted as an amendment to the Clean Water Act with the intent of ensuring that the Davis-Bacon Act would apply to any federally funded work that meets the definition of construction.

This approach was confirmed through staff conversations with representative of the Environmental Protection Agency in the 107th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I urge passage of this legislation and commend the chairman of the committee for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for his work on this legislation. The ranking member, as he said, is a very good friend of mine and he is a pleasure to work with on this subcommittee.

This bill, as I mentioned in my first statement, is strongly supported by wastewater utility systems all over the entire Nation. This Nation has 16,000 wastewater utility systems. These grants would probably be most applicable to the 2,000 larger utilities. There is a $150,000 cap per grant in this legislation and that is so a small handful of cities cannot gobble up all of this money and so it will be spread very effectively throughout the Nation to do this very important security work.

This bill provides for 75 percent Federal share of this money and then, of course, there would be a local participation for the remainder of the amount, and the total authorization of the bill, as both I and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) have noted, is $220 million, $15 million of which would go for technical assistance to the smaller utilities.

We have written this legislation so that there is no Davis-Bacon issue or any other controversial issue, and I think this legislation has strong and broad bipartisan support, strong support from both sides of the aisle. It is cosponsored both by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and myself and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO). I think it is a measure that deserves and can justify and merit the support of all Members of this body.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 866, "The Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act of 2003." Our nation's wastewater infrastructure consists of: 16,000 publicly owned wastewater treatment plants, 100,000 major pumping stations, 600,000 miles of sanitary sewers, and 200,000 miles of storm sewers. Taken together, our wastewater infrastructure has a total value of more than $2 trillion.

Significant damage to our nation's wastewater facilities could result in loss of life, catastrophic environmental damage, contamination of drinking water supplies, long term public health impacts, destruction of fish and shellfish production, and disruption to commerce, the economy, and our nation's way of life.

We need to protect our investment in our wastewater infrastructure and be sure it is not used to harm our people, property, or the environment.

H.R. 866 is aimed at filling a remaining major security gap involving our nation's critical infrastructure:

H.R. 866 provides for assistance to wastewater utilities by authorizing critical resources they need to conduct vulnerability assessments and implement security enhancements at their facilities.

H.R. 866 also provides for technical assistance directed to small communities on enhancing security at their wastewater plants.

For these reasons, I urge all members to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 866.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RAIL PASSENGER DISASTER FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2003

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 874) to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 874

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 "Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. ASSISTANCE BY NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD TO FAMILIES OF PASSENGERS INVOLVED IN RAIL PASSENGER ACCIDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 11 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1138. Assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents

"(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after being notified of a rail passenger accident within the United States involving a rail passenger carrier and resulting in a major loss of life, the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board shall—

"(1) designate and publicize the name and phone number of a director of family support services who shall be an employee of the Board and shall be responsible for acting as a point of contact within the Federal Government for the families of passengers involved in the accident and a liaison between the rail passenger carrier and the families; and

"(2) designate an independent nonprofit organization, with experience in disasters and posttrauma communication with families, which shall have primary responsibility for coordinating the emotional care and support of the families of passengers involved in the accident.

"(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD.—The Board shall have primary Federal responsibility for—

"(1) facilitating the recovery and identification of fatally injured passengers involved in an accident described in subsection (a); and

"(2) communicating with the families of passengers involved in the accident as to the roles of—

"(A) the organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2);

"(B) Government agencies; and

"(C) the rail passenger carrier involved,

with respect to the accident and the post-accident activities.

"(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF DESIGNATED ORGANIZATION.—The organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) shall have the following responsibilities with respect to the families of passengers involved in the accident:

"(1) To provide mental health and counseling services, in coordination with the disaster response team of the rail passenger carrier involved.

"(2) To take such actions as may be necessary to provide an environment in which the families may grieve in private.

"(3) To meet with the families who have traveled to the location of the accident, to contact the families unable to travel to such location, and to contact all affected families periodically thereafter until such time as the organization, in consultation with the director of family support services designated for the accident under subsection (a)(1), determines that further assistance is no longer needed.

"(4) To arrange a suitable memorial service, in consultation with the families.

"(d) PASSENGER LISTS.—

"(1) REQUESTS FOR PASSENGER LISTS.—

"(A) REQUESTS BY DIRECTOR OF FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—It shall be the responsibility of the director of family support services designated for an accident under subsection (a)(1) to request, as soon as practicable, from the rail passenger carrier involved in the accident a list, which is based on the best available information at the time of the request, of the names of the passengers that were aboard the rail passenger carrier's train involved in the accident. A rail passenger carrier shall use reasonable efforts, with respect to its unreserved trains, and passengers not holding reservations on its other trains, to ascertain the names of passengers aboard a train involved in an accident.

"(B) REQUESTS BY DESIGNATED ORGANIZATION.—The organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) may request from the rail passenger carrier involved in the accident a list described in subparagraph (A).

"(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—The director of family support services and the organization may not release to any person information on a list obtained under paragraph (1) but may provide information on the list about a passenger to the family of the passenger to the extent that the director of family support services or the organization considers appropriate.

"(e) CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD.—In the course of its investigation of an accident described in subsection (a), the Board shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the families of passengers involved in the accident—

"(1) are briefed, prior to any public briefing, about the accident and any other findings from the investigation; and

"(2) are individually informed of and allowed to attend any public hearings and meetings of the Board about the accident.

"(f) USE OF RAIL PASSENGER CARRIER RESOURCES.—To the extent practicable, the organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) shall coordinate its activities with the rail passenger carrier involved in the accident to facilitate the reasonable use of the resources of the carrier.

"(g) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

"(1) ACTIONS TO IMPEDE THE BOARD.—No person (including a State or political subdivision) may impede the ability of the