Response to No. 6: All of the funds we are requesting can be obligated over the next 5 years.

7. What is the proposed schedule and status of work on the project?

Response to No. 7: The environmental clearance has been completed on this project. However, a reassessment may be necessary. Following completion of the environmental reassessment, right-of-way and design plans will be prepared and this takes approximately 2 years. Right-of-way acquisition will then take about 18 months to complete. Construction contracts should be ready for letting within 4 to 5 years.

8. Is the project included in the metropolitan and/or State Transportation Improvement Program(s), or the State long-range plan and, if so, is it scheduled for funding?

Response to No. 8: The right-of-way acquisition and utility relocations for one section of this project are currently on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and funding is scheduled for these items. The entire project limit, however, is identified as one of the transportation improvement corridors in the Statewide Intermodal Transportation Plan (long range plan). Due to the high cost of this project and the State's limited funds, the remaining construction, right-of-way, and utility phases of this project are not currently scheduled.

9. Is the project considered by State and/or regional transportation officials as critical to their needs? Please provide a letter of support from these officials, and if you cannot, explain why not.

Response to No. 9: This project is considered critical to the economic growth of the eastern region of Oklahoma which generates a large amount of tourism in the Fort Gibson Lake and Tahlequah areas. The highway also serves as a major travel corridor and commuter route extending from the Tulsa Metropolitan area east to Broken Bow, Muskogee and the Arkansas State Line.

10. Does the project have national or regional significance?

Response to No. 10: This project is regionally significant because it provides access to the Tulsa metropolitan area, McClellan Kerr Navigational System, and several recreational areas in eastern Oklahoma. SH 51 is also nationally significant because it connects with I–44, I–244, the Muskogee Turnpike, US 412, and other major routes in the eastern section of Oklahoma.

11. Has the proposed project encountered, or is it likely to encounter, any significant opposition or other obstacles based on environmental or other types of concerns?

Response to No. 11: The environmental clearance has been completed on this project. However, a reassessment is likely. We do not anticipate any major opposition or other obstacles that will delay construction of this project.

12. Describe the economic, energy efficiency, environmental, congestion mitigation and safety benefits associated with completion of the project.

Response to No. 12: Widening SH 51 to a 4 lane highway will increase capacity, promote tourism and economic growth in the region, and improve the safety and congestion along this major highway serving the eastern region of Oklahoma.

13. Has the project received funding through the State's Federal-aid highway apportionment, or in the case of a transit project, through Federal Transit Administration funding? If no, why not?

Response to No. 13: During the past few years the State has expended in excess of $34,000,000.00 to improve this corridor between I–44 in Tulsa and the Arkansas State Line. However, because the overall critical needs of the entire highway system far exceeds the limited funding levels, this project from Coweta to Wagoner has not received funding through the State's Federal-aid highway apportionments.

14. Is the authorization requested for the project an increase to an amount previously authorized or appropriated for it in federal statute (if so, please identify the statute, the amount provided, and the amount obligated to date), or would this be the first authorization for the project in federal statute? If the authorization requested is for a transit project, has it previously received appropriations and/or received a Letter of Intent or entered into a Full Funding Grant Agreement with the FTA?

Response to No. 14: This is the first authorization we have requested for this project.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 10, 1997.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation, Rayburn House Office Building.

Hon. THOMAS PETRI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Rayburn House Office Building.

Hon. JIM OBERSTAR,
Ranking Democratic Member, House Committee on Transportation, Rayburn House Office Building.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Ranking Democratic Member, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBERS: On February 25, 1997, the North Carolina Delegation forwarded to your attention copies of the State of North Carolina's highway transportation project priorities.

Included in this package, there were two funding requests that are of particular concern to our districts, the Ninth and Twelfth Districts of North Carolina. These requests regarded funding for construction of the Eastern and Western Outer Loops in Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. The completion of the Outer Loop is the foremost road priority for our region during consideration of transportation funding this year. The purpose of this letter is to formally inform you of our strong support for this critical transportation need for the City of Charlotte.

We thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. Please do not hesitate to contact either of us if we can provide you with further information regarding the Outer Loop project.

Sincerely,

SUE MYRICK,
Member of Congress.
MELVIN WATT,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, August 20, 1997.

Chairman BUD SHUSTER,
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: We are writing to express our strong support for the I–40 cross bridge project, which was submitted to the Surface Transportation Subcommittee in February. This project is important not only to the State of Oklahoma, but also to the Nation.

The I–40 cross bridge is in a critical state of disrepair. There are serious safety concerns surrounding the continued use of this bridge. Due to these concerns Oklahoma inspects this particular bridge every six months; other bridges are inspected only once every two years.

It is critical to the State and to the Nation that this bridge remains open. Recently, the Oklahoma Department of Transportation determined that approximately 102,000 cars cross this bridge every day. Furthermore, 61% of all the trucks that cross this bridge are out of state trucks. Clearly, this bridge is heavily traveled by more than just Oklahomans.

Both the Governor of Oklahoma and the Secretary of Transportation have endorsed this project and have made it the number one transportation priority for the State of Oklahoma. Unfortunately, due to the magnitude of the project, Oklahoma does not have the funds to tackle it at this time.

We are committed to working with our state officials to ensure that this project receive the attention and funding it needs. We would greatly appreciate your consideration of the merits of this project. The I–40 cross bridge is indeed vital to both Oklahoma and the overall interstate system. Please let us know if we can provide you with additional information.

Sincerely,

REP. J.C. WATTS, JR.
REP. ERNEST ISTOOK, JR.
REP. STEVE LARGENT.
REP. FRANK LUCAS.
REP. WES WATKINS.
REP. TOM COBURN.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

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

There was no objection.

FAIRNESS FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYEES ACT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Fairness for Small Business and Employees Act will be considered by the House today. Title I of this bill makes it clear that an employer does not have to hire someone who is not a bona fide applicant. In other words, a job applicant's primary purpose in seeking the job must be to work for the employer, not for someone else.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3246 was drafted after careful examination of the best way to protect employers, while not upsetting the principles of the National Labor Relations Act. It addresses the worst examples of salting in which people who have no intention of really working for an employer are simply filling jobs and filing charges to disrupt the employer's operation, resulting in lost productivity and thousands of dollars in legal fees to defend weak allegations.

This bill addresses the problems which occur when someone applies for