LAYING ON THE TABLE H.R. 309 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 403

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 309, dealing with the rule on fast track, and House Resolution 403, dealing with the rule on the bank reform bill, be waived.

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

There was no objection.

BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 404 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2400.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) 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 Federal Credit Union Act to clarify existing law with regard to the field of membership of Federal credit unions, to preserve the integrity and purpose of federal credit unions, to enhance supervisory oversight of insured credit unions, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidable detained for roll call vote 92. The Credit Union Membership Access Act. Had I been present, I would have voted aye. I would ask the House to accept this record in the appropriate section.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1151, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

In fact, that is the way it was, until in the mid-1960’s President Johnson got the idea that by not spending the money, he could help fund the Vietnam War.

Indeed, it was Eisenhower and the Congress which made a Contract with America. And that contract was: you pay your gas tax, and that money is spent to improve highways. Unfortunately, in the past several years, we have had a fraud perpetrated on the American people. It has not happened. We have had a bait and switch. You pay your gas tax, but the money in the trust fund does not get spent. To the tune, there is $23 billion in that Highway Trust Fund today.

Let me share with Members something that I have known American said when he was Governor of a State just a few years ago. He said this on television: “The Congress took that money from us under a solemn contract to turn right around and give it back to the States to be spent on roads and highways. Instead, they are hoarding that money up there, and the only reason is to make the Federal deficit look smaller than it is. It is just wrong. It is wrong as it can be, and we ought to stop it. It is in violation of the [omitted], contract the national government has to the people who pay the tax.” Governor Bill Clinton.

So I say now to the Clinton Administration, join us. Keep your word. Help us unlock the trust fund so that money can go where it is supposed to go, to improve America’s transportation infrastructure.

We swallowed hard in the committee to get where we are today on a couple of very, very important compromises. We agreed that from this point forward, we would not count the interest in the trust fund.

Over the life of this bill, that means $15 billion in debt reduction for our country. And we swallowed hard and said that approximately $10 billion of the $23 billion in the balance will be returned.

Put those two figures together and you get about $25 billion in reduced debt for the Federal Government, an amount which increases the increase in spending that this bill proposes. We only spend the revenue coming into this Trust Fund from this point forward. We only spend the money paid for by the American people in the gas tax and the related transportation taxes. Indeed, the projection is we come in over the 6-year period and spend $15 billion under the revenue coming in.

I would be quick to say, if there is no need to spend this money, we certainly should not spend it, nor should we let it accumulate. We should reduce the taxes.

So that brings me to, really, the second fundamental principle: That is, what are the needs for investment in infrastructure for America? I suggest
that the needs are very clear; indeed, they are overwhelming. Twenty-seven percent of the highways in America are in poor condition. The average American is stuck 26 hours out of every year in traffic. That does not really tell the whole story. The average American living in one of our big cities is stuck in traffic, bumper-to-bumper traffic, over 50 hours in a year, more than a workweek in a year.

Indeed, on our highways, 42,000 Americans die every year. Of those 42,000, 9,000 are kids killed on our highways. The experts tell us that 30 percent of highway fatalities are caused by bad roads. That is 12,000 Americans of the 42,000 being killed on our highways. Indeed, it is about 2,700 kids being killed on our highways as a result of bad roads. That is more than a commercial airplane crashing every day. What outrage we would have in this country if we had an airplane going down every day.

In the United States, 3,5 million Americans are injured on our highways every year. Get this. For every baby born in America today, six out of every ten babies born will be injured in an automobile accident during his life—some of them more than once, if we do not change these accident rates.

We can change them. In fact, something I do not talk about very much, but it is appropriate today, I think. Seventeen years ago, I had a loved one who was broken in an automobile accident. I was a passenger in a head-on collision. I had my seatbelt on. They tell me I would have been a dead duck if I did not. But I am one of the lucky ones. They put three pins in my neck and a bone out of my hip, and I am okay. I am here. I am alive. I am lucky. But 42,000 Americans every year are not so lucky. Nine thousand kids every year are not so lucky.

I want States to know that there is hardly anybody here in the Chamber today, or in our viewing audience, who has not had a loved one or a friend who has been killed or seriously injured in an automobile accident. What is the cost of a life? We cannot really put a price on it, but what we do know is that with the investment made in this bill over the life of this bill, the experts tell us we can cut fatalities by 4,000 people a year. It sounds like a lot. Actually, it is less than 10 percent of the fatalities. It is doable. But do we want to cut the number in half, 2,000 lives a year? What is the value we put on a life?

This bill will save lives. This bill will give our country a productivity boost, an economic boom. This bill will create jobs. For every $1 billion invested in highways, 42,500 jobs are created.

Where is the support for this bill? It is not just here in the Congress, although the Members were thrilled I was to see the overwhelmingly positive vote we got just a few minutes ago on the rule for this bill. If Members would listen to the naysayers, we would have thought we would have squeaked through, at best. Instead, when the vote came, it was six to one overwhelmingly in support of the rule for this bill. Who are the supporters of this bill? It is not the industry. The industry has endorsed this bill. The League of Cities, the mayors have endorsed this bill. The counties have endorsed this bill. The State legislatures have endorsed this bill. Environmentalists have endorsed this bill. Safety groups have endorsed this bill. The National Safety Council, the Chamber of Commerce, what a pair, have both endorsed this legislation. And, yes, the AAA, representing millions of the motoring public.

Why have they supported this bill? Why do we have this extraordinary, broad, bipartisan support across America? Here is what the bill does: It unlocks the Transportation Trust Fund and says, from this point forward the revenue coming into the Trust Fund can be spent on transportation improvements.

Do not believe this baloney that we somehow break the budget, that we somehow create a deficit. Not a penny can be spent if, indeed, the money is not there in the Fund to be spent. Not a penny can be spent if we do not come back to this House with offsets from conference with the Senate. So it cannot bust the budget. Indeed, it can only spend the revenues that it gets out of the transportation Trust Fund paid for by the motoring public.

That is not all this does. This revises the formulas for the States by which they get their money in a much fairer way. We throw out the old formula, which by the way is based in part on some 1919 statistics, if Members can believe that. We throw that aside, and we create a much fairer formula based on transportation need as well as population.

We raise the minimum allocation for each State to 95 percent, including all formula funds; and, for the first time, we include the projects in the minimum calculation. We also say that the donor States, since they are the ones which by the way is based in part on the minimum calculation, those who throw out the old formula, those who get their money in a much fairer way, they get their money in a much fairer way. We throw out the old formula, the donor States, since they are the ones who get their money in a much fairer way, they get their money in a much fairer way.

Beyond that, we recognize the need for more flexibility. There are those who argue we should give the program back to the States. By the way, if you think this goes too far, but we acknowledge the States and the cities should have much more flexibility, and we put it in this bill. In this bill we provide that, in every category going back, the States and cities can shift up to 50 percent of the money in that category into any other category, based on the State or city need.

There are two modifications to that. We want to protect the environment, and so we provide that in CMAQ are the enhancements the States must spend at least as much as they have been previously spending, but in the increased money, 50 percent of that can be flexed to other categories, should the States and the localities so choose.

Beyond that, we recognize the national interest. Those who talk about just give it all back to the States I think must be living in 1920 instead of 1998. Interestingly, there is a greater Federal interest today to tie our country together than there has ever been. Why? Because we have more interstate travel than we have ever had.

I love to refer to Oklahoma City as an example. Twice a year, two percent of the license plates on those vehicles are out-of-State license plates. It is not an Oklahoma problem. It is a national problem.

Up in Seattle, coming out of the great port of Seattle-Tacoma, over 50 percent of the product of the port coming from Asia is shipped to Chicago and east. With tongue in cheek, I said they should change the name from the Port of Seattle to the Port of Chicago, the point being it is not a Washington problem, it is a national problem.

Across America today, 64 percent of truck traffic is interstate. There is a greater need to tie our country together to make sure that the national interest is protected as well as the State and local interest. That is why we bring this balanced bill to the floor.

We also move some general fund transportation spending into the Trust Fund. We acknowledge that it is the Transportation Trust Fund that should be spending the money, so we do that.

We also toughen up safety standards. We provide incentives to toughen the drunk driving laws. We say that .08 is important, and we provide incentives to the States to put .08 in their State drunk driving laws. But we do not want to have an unfunded mandate. We hope the States will do it. We give them an incentive to do it.

On the subject of projects, which it seems the media and the opponents, few though they are, have focused so much on projects, only 5 percent of the funds in this bill go to congressional high-priority projects. Stop and think about it. Eight percent of all the money in this bill goes back to the States. Seven percent goes downtown to the Secretary of Transportation.

The last time I checked, angels in heaven did not make the decisions and are not making the decisions as to what to build highways and transit systems. It is a political process. There is nothing wrong with the States, the Governors, the legislators having 88 percent of the money to decide how it is going to be spent, or the Secretary having 12 percent. We think it is not unreasonable, in fact, it is very reasonable, to say that the Members of Congress who have to cast the tough votes on this legislation...
should be able to recommend to our committee what projects are most important in their district, and we limit it to only 5 percent of the pot.

In addition to that, when we hear those saying, well, it is the same old way used to be done, that simply is not true. We have a 14-point vetting process where these projects must meet the standard, including support from the Secretary of Transportation in their home States, or their mayors, if it is in an MPO area.

Let me emphasize that this tough 14-point vetting program was something that was actually proposed and put into effect by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Nick Joe Rahall), a Democrat. So this is bipartisan. It is something that makes a lot of sense; and, indeed, it is something that should be done.

Further, let me emphasize, when we hear people saying, well, if you eliminate the projects you save money, Mr. Speaker, we do not save a penny. The money, if there are no projects, simply goes back to the States or downtown. It will be spent, but it will either be the faceless, nameless bureaucrats downtown or in State government or the Congress or the State legislators who will be spending the money.

I do not know how many Members I have had come to me and say, for example, my State government is all Republican, and I am a Democrat. I do not get anything in my district. Well, if they do not have a high-priority project, or, conversely, my State is all Democrat; and, as a Republican, I do not get anything unless I have a high-priority project.

Who knows better what is most important in their district than the Members of Congress from that district? In fact, I would respectfully suggest there is a bit of arrogance in those who say that somehow they know better what is important in their congressional districts than Members know. Indeed, I would imagine if Members do not know what is really important to people in their congressional district, they are not going to be here very long.

Let me emphasize that, while we have some disagreement in this bill, I have the greatest respect particularly for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. John Kasich), who is not a hypocrite and who said he does not want to see tax revenue spent on transportation.
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I disagree with him. I disagree with him fundamentally. But he is straight. This is his position. He has a right to take that position. And he also, in the process, has not sent us letters requesting projects for his district while at the same time saying he opposes projects. He is not a hypocrite. He is an honorable person.

Mr. Chairman, I had to take the well last week and put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from several Members of Congress who are castigating the projects but who have asked for multimillion dollar projects in their own congressional districts. Now, as hard as that is for Members to believe, it is in the RECORD. It is there for Members to see.

Last week I challenged any Member to come forward and say that I had ever done anything to influence his vote, or, conversely, had threatened to take a project away if he did not vote with us. Nobody has responded to that challenge. Why? Because nobody can, because that is not the way we do business. Not only in this bill, but never in my lifetime have I ever made such a threat to a Member of Congress.

So it is very regrettable that the people who on the one hand seem so self-righteous also are dealing very loosely with the truth. Maybe there is a little inconsistency there that I hope one might recognize. In fact, there is a great line in the book, “The Hawaiians” which I will clean up and paraphrase, which is, “How I envy the hypocrites and never even know it.”

Well, the good news is we have dealt fairly with every Member in this body. I must say I was surprised to see the gentleman from Delaware, my good friend, last week holding a press conference because he does not like our bill, calling it highway robbery. He is my good friend. We serve together on the Select Committee on Intelligence. Indeed, we are members of other organizations here on the Hill.

But what short memories we seem to have. It was just last year that the Delaware delegation pushed through $2.3 billion for Amtrak. In fact it was described by some as one of the most bizarre, backhanded ways of funding a program that has ever been witnessed around here.

But I did not take the floor and call it the “great train robbery.” No, I supported what they were trying to do because we perform a service for Amtrak because Amtrak is important, not just to some Members but to the gentleman from Delaware and the Members from the Northeast Corridor. Amtrak is important to them, so we supported that and we supported the reform of Amtrak.

I must tell my colleagues that the reform bill spells out that those reforms must be accomplished by June 1, or all money for Amtrak stops, ceases, zero. I must also tell my colleagues that there are industries that say those reforms may not be met by June 1, which means they will have to be back here on the floor again asking for forgiveness for Amtrak legislation or there will not be any money for Amtrak.

Well, it seems to me that it might be a little more difficult next time around to get that kind of forgiveness for Amtrak. So I hope that those who sometimes seem to feel that nobody’s cause but their own is worthwhile might take a little bit more seriously the transportation needs all across America.

The Woodrow Wilson Bridge is another case in point. A billion dollars.

We read so much in the local papers about the importance of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Let me tell my colleagues there are over 30 interstate reconstruction projects, all of which cost more than a billion dollars. So while the Woodrow Wilson Bridge may well be important to the District where there are other projects all across America which cost just as much on the interstate system, the highest priority system, and which are just as important to other Americans across this country.

So I hope that, again, those who seem to see nothing of virtue in anything but their own particular interest might broaden their horizons just a bit.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues who know me best know I am not exactly a raving left-wing liberal spender. In fact the American Conservative Union gave me a 100 percent rating last year. I slipped in my NFIB rating. I only got a 97. I am not a big spender; I am a fiscal conservative.

But there is a fundamental difference between spending tax dollars to build assets and pouring money down a rat hole.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I would say to my conservative Republican colleagues, you look at the legacy of our party. It was Abraham Lincoln who in the midst of the Civil War signed the papers to create the first transcontinental railroad and who strongly supported Henry Clay’s American system for capital improvements, for internal improvements.

It was Teddy Roosevelt, the Panama Canal. George Will, the wonderful columnist, wrote a column a few months ago in which he observed that some conservatives today, had those same conservatives been back there with Teddy Roosevelt, probably would have voted against the Panama Canal. Well, I would like to think not, but it does not end with Teddy Roosevelt.

The Eisenhower, the wonderful column look at the legacy of our party. It was Abraham Lincoln who in the United States Senate to pass the interstate system? Prescott Bush, the father of President George Bush.

To my conservative colleagues I say we have a legacy here of building America and today is the day we have the opportunity to do it. Today is the day we have the opportunity to put history back in budgeting. I spend only the trust fund money that is coming in. To save lives. To remove congestion and to increase productivity. The revenue exists.

Let me close by sharing with my colleagues something that Stephen Ambrose, the historian, wrote in a book that just came out recently. It is a wonderful book entitled “Citizen Soldiers.” It is a book about the soldiers of America who in World War II slogged their way through Europe to victory for our country and for the allies.

He wrote in the conclusion of his wonderful book about those World War
Il veterans when they came home, and here is what he said about them:

These were the men who built modern America. They wanted to construct. They built the interstate highway system, the St. Lawrence Seaway, all the exciting new projects of the century, so that our children's children 50 years from now might be able to look back and say: See, this they did for us.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago in this Chamber a Democratic Congress, united with a Republican President, launched a new experiment in transportation, one that would prove to be enormously successful in improving America's mobility and expanding its economy and moving transportation from border to border and coast to coast in a way that never had been accomplished before.

Today we stand at the beginning of a new century and a new millennium. The legislation we bring to the floor today takes us beyond the vision of the interstate system and beyond the vision that was created in ISTEA in 1991 and the new century, a new millennium, a new investment with renewed vigor in a future America.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) on the extraordinary job he has accomplished of leading us through the thicket of conflicting issues, values, ideas, demands, interests and pressures to do the right thing for America. He traced the evolution of the transportation system, of this legislation, in a very heartfelt, deeply sensitive and deeply compelling way just a moment ago. His words are a measure for all time.

What we do in this legislation is not just to continue but to extend beyond where we have been in our transportation mix of the last 42 years. Mr. Chairman, we continue the investment in America that is the fundamental driving force for this transportation sector, which is 10 percent of our gross domestic product. We continue the programmatic responsibilities of De-
Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is today in strong support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficiency Surface Transportation and Equity Act, commonly referred to as BESTEA. First, I want to thank our chairman and ranking members for all of their hard work; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL). They have worked together to create a strong bipartisan bill that provides the necessary funds to maintain and improve our Nation's infrastructure.

I am sure that during the debate today, a few of our colleagues will try to say that this important bill busts the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. This is simply not true. This bill is paid for out of the Highway Trust Fund. The Highway Trust Fund is supported by fuel taxes paid by motorists. Therefore, this bill is paid for each time motorists go to pay for their gasoline. BESTEA does not bust the balanced budget. BESTEA simply spends down the large unspent surplus in the Highway Trust Fund. Under this bill, dedicated gas taxes are used for their dedicated purpose, to address the transportation needs of cities and States throughout this Nation.

This is absolutely necessary because America's transportation needs are staggering. Our Nation's transportation infrastructure in many areas is crumbling and it is in urgent need of repair, mainly because we as a Nation have not invested enough to maintain and improve our transportation system. In fact, in the last 30 years transportation spending as a percentage of the Federal budget has been cut in half. Yet investing in transportation means investing in America's future.

Economic studies show that every dollar invested in the highway system yields $2.60 in economic benefit. Other countries are investing hundreds in their core infrastructure. Fortunately, BESTEA does the same for America.

Mr. Chairman, as I said this morning, BESTEA is a good bipartisan bill. It will provide new and improved public transportation systems. It will improve air quality by reducing traffic congestion and by promoting public transit. It will provide good jobs for middle-class America. It will ensure America's future as a world leader by maintaining and improving our world class surface transportation system. I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote to invest in America's future and vote in favor of H.R. 2400.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I almost find myself uncontrollable here in recognizing and giving 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), a former member of Congress and a former ranking member of our committee, the man who would be chairman if he were still here, so I want to acknowledge he is in the Gallery. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to join in the acknowledgment of our colleague, one of the architects of ISTEA that brings us to the floor today, and an extraordinarily distinguished Member of this House and of our committee for so very, very many years. We owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding the time and join in welcoming our friend, Mr. Hammerschmidt, back to this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, the highway bill before us today opens doors for the Nation and the people of Kentucky. First, it unlocks the Highway Trust Fund, providing the money needed to invest in our national highway system and to keep our children safe. States like Kentucky. BESTEA gives Kentucky 90 cents back on every dollar that we send in to the trust fund as opposed to 77 cents they received under ISTEA.

Overall, Kentucky will receive on average approximately $479 million per year in highway funding. That is 70 percent more than our share over the last 5 years.

Second, it launches the I-66 project in Kentucky, making the first major federal contribution toward the much-needed construction of I-66 will open up southern and eastern Kentucky to the rest of the Nation, creating thousands of jobs.

Third, monies included in the House and Senate version of this bill virtually guarantee that we will make substantial progress on the unfinished sections of the Appalachian development road system, which is vital to our region.

Of special importance is that this bill will save lives. BESTEA gives States boost spending in donor States like Kentucky. BESTEA gives Kentucky 90 cents back on every dollar that we send in to the trust fund as opposed to 77 cents they received under ISTEA.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, who has contributed so vigorously and so many dedicated, devoted hours to the shaping of this legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I commend the gentleman as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), for their excellent work on this legislation. As we begin debate on this legislation, we are indeed at a crossroads in this country. We can decide whether we want to retreat from the transportation needs of the new century and fail to make the necessary investments in our highway and transit infrastructure, or we can rise to the challenge and dedicate the necessary resources to these endeavors.

Those of us who bring this legislation forth today are seeking to rise to that challenge, to keep faith with the American public, to restore integrity and restructure our transportation system, which is vital to our region. Our very standard of living, our very ability to enjoy, and it entails the type of legacy we wish to leave to future generations, our children. Poor road pavement, outdated design standards, and the lack of safety enhancement present a very real threat to the motorist public. In parts of my district, school buses have collided with trucks for these very reasons, prematurely extinguishing the innocent lives of our younger generation. I know tragedies like this have happened elsewhere around the country.

This bill makes an investment into improving those roads and providing more safety features so that we can better ensure the well-being of our children.

Our environment, let us look at what this bill does. Congestion plagues our cities, both large and small. Air quality deteriorates as vehicles stack up behind each other with motors idling. And tempers flare erupting into road rage affecting so many parts of this country.

This bill makes an investment into improving our environment by advancing alternative means of transportation such as transit, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and innovative new intelligent transportation systems. Our very standard of living, let us look at what this bill does. In order to compete globally, companies are demanding production efficiency. It is essential that one half of U.S. manufacturers are using just-in-time inventory systems. This approach requires an efficient transportation system.
This legislation makes a fundamental investment into improving our transportation systems, not just highways, but transportation links that are intermodal in nature, to better ensure the smooth flow of goods, both domestic and international.

It has been said that ISTEA represented a revolution in how we viewed our surface transportation needs. Over the course of the last 6 years ISTEA, as implemented, has produced some fundamental changes in the Federal role in transportation. It empowered our local communities.

If ISTEA was indeed a revolution, then this bill known as BESTEA is a revelation; a revelation because it exposes the Highway Trust Fund for what it truly is, not an account to be used to mask the true size of the Federal deficit, or make our budget look brighter. Not a pot of funds to be held hostage to the whims and the caprices of our budgeteers, but rather as a trust fund, a trust established by the American motorists for the express purpose of receiving a better return in building our road and bridges in this country.

I urge adoption of this entire bill. I think it is what the American public wants. It is what our children and future generations want.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to recognize the tremendous steps the committee is taking to significantly improve donor States rate of return in this bill. BESTEA distributes funds equitably among the States by reforming the highway funding formulas so that they are based upon relevant transportation factors.

Specifically, there are provisions in this bill which will guarantee that no State will fall below a 90 percent return of contributions to the Highway Trust Fund. In addition, the committee repealed the penalty on discretionary grants for States that receive minimum allocation funding. While BESTEA is not perfect, Mr. Chairman, it certainly goes a long way to address the critical need of donor States, and I hope we can continue to work together to that end.

This bill is not only about saving lives, it is about being honest with the American people. Many Members in the Chamber today will claim that this is a budget buster. I am a fiscal conservative, Mr. Chairman. This charge is simply not true.

When Congress set up the Highway Trust Fund, it created a contract with the American people by instituting a gas tax with the promise that these taxes would only be used for transportation improvements. When these taxes are used to mask the size of the deficit or to increase welfare spending or for other less than relevant purposes, the broken promise is broken and American lives are put at risk. Using the gas tax for other social spending is wrong and dishonest.

We must, in fact, spend these taxes on what we promised we would spend them on. It is an honesty question and it is time to be honest with the American people. If we are not going to expend these monies for the purpose that was intended, then let us repeal the tax.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to spend the Highway Trust Fund where it is supposed to be spent: Improving roads and enhancing the safety of the American motorists who use those roads.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

(Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for yielding me this time. I also want to commend and congratulate both he and our distinguished Chairman for bringing this truly bipartisan and truly historic bill to the floor of the House of Representatives. I also want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and, of course, our ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to understand that this is not just a highway bill. By improving funding levels that are fiscally sound, it provides necessary resources to meet America's diverse transportation infrastructure needs.

BESTEA maintains the enhancement and CMAQ provisions set forth in ISTEA. It provides for an equitable distribution of funds among States, it improves safety on our highways, provides flexibility for States and local areas, and it benefits urban and rural America.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to point out that these varied and critical goals can only be met because of a provision in the bill that calls for phasing in the 4.3 cents fuel tax recently returned to the Trust Fund and taking the Trust Fund, itself, off budget beginning in 1999.

The monies that are actually spent on our country's infrastructure have not been substantially less than what is collected. To call this money a dedicated tax and then disregard its intended use is a fraud. Clearly, our country has enormous transportation infrastructure needs. We cannot afford to look the other way while revenue is permitted to address these needs go elsewhere or sit fallow. That money is desperately needed, and it exists in a Trust Fund. We do not need to find the money to pay for our infrastructure. We simply have to stop spending it for unintended purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I must tell my colleagues, as a Representative from an urban community, I am greatly encouraged by the increase in transit funding provided for in BESTEA. Ridership on computer and light rail has grown steadily and significantly. New transit starts are exploding. And as much as 37 percent of the funding in the bill, $6.4 billion is spent on transit, nearly a 50-percent increase above current funding levels.

In the current political climate of decreased Federal spending, setting aside such revenues speaks to the recognition of the pivotal role mass transit must play if we are to best utilize our resources, transportation and otherwise.

Perhaps the best illustration of the innumerable benefits investments in our Nation's infrastructure and, more specifically, in transit can yield is found in the welfare-to-work provisions of ISTEA. This important program helps restore our cities and return our people to productive use by providing them with the ability to physically get to where the jobs are.

People in my city of Philadelphia know all too well that the companies in this country cannot abandon our cities for the suburbs, they take their jobs and opportunities with them, leaving unemployed city dwellers. In fact, two-thirds of all new jobs created in the suburbs. Furthermore, less than 6 percent of families receiving benefits from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family program own cars. This means that 94 percent must rely on transit systems to get them to work.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my wholehearted support for H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1997. Let me first congratulate Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member OBERSTAR, Chairman PETRI and Ranking Member RAHALL for the truly remarkable job that they have done. Reauthorization of any bill of this magnitude is always an arduous and delicate task. But the validity of some of the inherently competing interests associated with this process, the need for both to be both acknowledged and reconciled, created a monumental assignment for those charged with the reauthorization of ISTEA. What they bring to the floor today, surpasses any reasonable expectations held by those of us all too familiar with the scope and complexity of the bill. In BESTEA, the enormous needs of our nation's infrastructure have been addressed, while maintaining the integrity of the program itself. The result is a bipartisan product the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and the whole House, should be proud to endorse. Finally, with this bill, we can do what we have promised every American that we would do when we asked them to pay into the Highway Trust Fund at the gas pump-adequately build and maintain our nation's crumbling infrastructure.

This is not just a highway bill. By establishing funding levels that are fiscally sound it provides the necessary resources to meet America's diverse infrastructure needs. BESTEA maintains the enhancement and CMAQ provisions set forth in ISTEA. It provides for an equitable distribution of funds among States, it improves safety on our highways, provides flexibility for States and local areas, and it benefits urban and rural America. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this entire bill. I truly bipartisan and truly historic bill. In BESTEA, the enormous needs of our nation's infrastructure have been addressed, while maintaining the integrity of the program itself. The result is a bipartisan product the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and the whole House, should be proud to endorse. Finally, with this bill, we can do what we have promised every American that we would do when we asked them to pay into the Highway Trust Fund at the gas pump-adequately build and maintain our nation's crumbling infrastructure.

This is not just a highway bill. By establishing funding levels that are fiscally sound it provides the necessary resources to meet America's diverse infrastructure needs. BESTEA maintains the enhancement and CMAQ provisions set forth in ISTEA. It provides for an equitable distribution of funds among states, it improves safety on our highways, focuses on national priorities, streamlines program delivery,
and reinvents the DOT. The bill provides flexibility for states and local areas, benefits urban and rural America and supports technology development needed as we enter the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to point out that these varied and critical goals can only be met because of a provision in the bill that calls for phasing-in spending the 4.3 cents fuel tax recently returned to the Trust fund and taking the Trust fund, itself, off-budget, beginning in 1999. When Congress established the Highway Trust Fund in 1956, it was a deliberate policy decision to impose a user fee funding mechanism and a trust fund, rather than continuing to support transportation infrastructure programs out of general revenues. The Highway Trust fund ensured that the money was collected from those benefiting from the improvements by taxing gasoline, diesel and special fuels as well as heavy trucks and tires. By creating a trust fund, Congress was pre-sumably guaranteeing a promise to those contributing to the fund that the money would be dedicated to transportation infrastructure improvements. This promise has blatantly been ignored for far too long. The monies that are actually spent on our country’s infrastructure are consistently, and substantially, less than what is collected. As a result, an enormous surplus has accumulated in the Transportation and Infrastructure Trust fund, much to the delight of our Nation’s bookkeepers. This practice of locking up billions of dollars in treasury notes that should rightfully be stimulating our economy has been likened to a shell game, and amounts to nothing more than fraud on the taxpayer. To call it a tax is misleading. We have clearly ignored the intended use is fraudulent. I can tell you as a sixteen year veteran of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee that our nation’s infrastructure can no longer afford to pay the price for dishonest bookkeeping.

The Department of Transportation estimates that simply maintaining current conditions on our highway, bridge, and transit systems will require annual investments of $57 billion, an increase of 41%. These conditions are indisputably unacceptable and unsafe. In my home state of Pennsylvania, for example, more than 70% of our roads were rated fair to poor. Over 40% of our bridges were deemed deficient. These statistics are not inconsequential. Inadequate roads and bridges are a factor in traffic accidents that result annually in over 12,000 highway deaths nationwide. Metropolitan congestion alone costs our nation more than $40 million annually.

Transit needs are at least as critical. One-third of rail maintenance yards, stations, and bridges, and almost one-half of transit buildings and their fair condition. For the bus stock needs immediate replacement as the average fleet age for all classes of bus and paratransit vehicles has exceeded the useful life of the vehicles. Additionally, 51% of rural buses are overage and more than 9,000 urban buses need immediate replacement. According to the DOT, to improve the condition of our nation’s infrastructure to optimal levels, would require annual investments of $80 billion. Clearly, our country has enormous needs. We cannot afford to look the other way while revenue committees continue to address these needs go elsewhere, as if nothing falls. Perhaps, if our roads and bridges weren’t crumbling we could indulge our colleagues as they continued to steal money dedicated to infrastructure so that they could claim, and take credit for, a balanced budget. But we can’t. That money is desperately needed, and it exists in the trust fund. We don’t need to find the money to pay for our infrastructure, we simply have to stop others from spending it for unintended purposes. If the budget is not balanced, I would suggest that my colleagues who serve on the appropriate committee should take a closer look and find offsets that would make up for the money they planned to divert from this user fee.

Mr. Chairman, I must tell you, as a Representative from an urban community, I am greatly encouraged by the increase in transit funding provided for in BESTEA. Rider- ship on commuter and light rail has grown steadily and significantly. New transit starts are exploding. In fact, our committee received over 150 requests for these type of projects just this year, totaling over $25 billion. As such, in each of the last four years of the bill, $6.4 billion is spent on transit, nearly a fifty percent increase above current funding levels. In the current post-polar climate of decreased federal spending, committing such revenue speaks to the recognition of the pivotal role mass transit must play if we are to best utilize our resources-transportation and otherwise.

Perhaps the best illustration of the innumerable benefits integral to our nation’s infrastructure—and more specifically, in transit, can yield, is found in the Welfare-to-Work provision of the bill. This critically important program, helps restore our cities—and return our people—to productive use, by providing them with the ability to provide for their families. People are. People in my city of Philadelphia know all too well that, as companies abandon our cities for the suburbs, they take their jobs and opportunities with them, leaving unemployed city dwellers. In fact, two-thirds of all new jobs created are in the suburbs. Furthermore, research by the U.S. Department of Transportation found that less than 6% of families receiving benefits from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program own cars. This means that 94% must rely on transit systems to get them to work. In the past, those of us who have worked with great frustration, the impact on our community as these companies leave for the suburbs. We have focused a great deal of energy on convincing companies to stay in or come to our city. While this is important, it is not always possible and, perhaps in our zeal, we have not recognized the benefits of any other alternatives. If a company can or will not stay in the city, there is still an enormous economic benefit to be had, should people be able to commute out to the suburbs. This is the impetus behind the program to develop the Fast Corridor Program. And, we have seen it work in cities like Chicago. Suburban Job-Link, working with Chicago’s PACE bus company, began serving the needs of unemployed Chicago residents in 1971. The program has proven to yield economic re- wards. For every 1,000 workers employed at $25 million in pay and benefits annually flow back into inner-city neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, again, I would like to applaud the leadership of our committee for their truly remarkable and Historic accomplishment. A testament to the age of a time to meet the very, real, diverse, and often competing needs of our nation’s infrastructure. But Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR held firm to their principles, arguing tirelessly that integrity be restored to the Trust Fund. It is with admiration that I acknowledge their achievement and without any hesitation that I offer my support for the BESTEA bill. This bipartisan effort and product represents the very best our committee has to offer, and represents both the renewing faith with which I have served on it for the past sixteen years.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Chairman on an outstanding bill and ask if the Chairman will enter into a colloquy?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be pleased to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman has noted, the volume of international trade passing through our nation’s ports has snarled traffic at dozens of at-grade rail-highway crossing in the Puget Sound region. As the Chairman knows, public and private interests have come together to propose a series of grade-separating projects and port-access projects that we refer to as the “fast corridor” program.

Does the Chairman agree that section 115 of the bill, the National Corridor Planning and Development Program, was designed to help projects like the fast corridor? Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would certainly agree with the gentleman. I have seen the problem firsthand there.

As the gentleman from Washington has observed, I have first-hand knowledge of the special mobility problems in the Puget Sound region. The Fast Corridor Program was developed to address that problem.

Section 136 of the bill designates the “Everett-Tacoma Fast Corridor’’ as a “high-priority corridor.” With this designation, the fast corridor would be eligible for funding under section 115, as you have already pointed out.

Section 115 was designed with projects like the fast corridor in mind and I am certain that it would be an ideal candidate.

I commend the gentleman for his initiative on this matter and for the leadership he brings to transportation issues in the region. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard critics saying today that we are stealing money from other programs to rebuild our highways and bridges. Now, come on. Let us be honest with the American people. The money is already there. The American people pay for it with the gas tax money.

In 1956, Congress made a simple contract with the American people that gas taxes would be used for highways and bridges. Seven years ago, Congress broke the promise and diverted gas tax revenues to states and localities, but refused to compensate the federal government for lost revenues. But the American people have paid for this promise of funds to be used for national needs. The gas tax trust fund has not been kept separate and was not dedicated to a single purpose. It was a general fund to support transportation infrastructure. Congress falsely reassured the American people that gas tax revenue would be used for infrastructure programs when in fact the gas tax trust fund was used for many other purposes such as education, health care, and welfare. When the gas tax trust fund was opened to support other purposes, Congress was using the American people’s trust fund to support their own political priorities. Congress has repeatedly broken its promise to use the gas tax for its intended use and has misled the American people.

The American people pay for it with the gas tax money. They have paid for the gas tax system because they trusted Congress. Congress has let down the American people. Congress has broken its promise. Congress has misused the General Fuel Tax System and misused the American people’s trust. Congress has broken its promise to the American people. Congress has broken its promise to the American people. Congress has broken its promise to the American people.
money to foreign aid and other programs.
Southern Californians have paid dearly for that ever since. Southern Californians spend more time stuck in traffic than anyone else in the country. And there is another argument. I am tired of hearing this bill is full of pork. It is not about pork. It is about saving people's lives. Every year 14,000 people are killed in roads that are too narrow, too congested, or simply too dangerous for efficient traffic. None of these people have to die.

In my district, there is a road known as “Blood Alley.” Eight lanes of freeway are crammed into a two-lane country road when it crosses the county line. About 10 people die each year on this three-mile stretch of road because the counties do not want each other's traffic.

Our bill includes $13 million to widen this Blood Alley and save lives. Fixing Blood Alley is our responsibility. It is not pork. Our bill saves lives and restores our promise to the American people. This bill forces Washington to keep its promise and fix highways with the gas and tax money.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Oberstar. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, as well as, vice chairman of our committee and advocate for Buy America.

Mr. Traficant. Mr. Speaker, the $217 billion is being invested in America, not overseas. To put some perspective on it, our trade deficits with China in the next 6 years will exceed $300 billion.

Now let us call it like it is. Everybody is talking about pork. I was called the king of pork on ISTEA because I got the bridges. One of my bridges collapsed last week. One of my constituents almost got killed. Thank God, no one got killed in my district. They do not call that bridge pork today.

Now let us put the hay where the goats can reach it. To all of these political purists in the Congress, here is how they would have it: We would fight for the American people because it protects the air we breathe and the water we drink and the food we eat. Nothing is more important than that in terms of our assignment.

Green tea provides over $40 billion for the transit program, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program, commonly known as CMAQ; the Transportation Enhancement Program; the Recreational Trails Program; and the National Scenic Byways Program.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Star), the chairman, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Oberstar), the ranking member, are to be applauded for their obvious concerns about America's transportation policy and how they have incorporated a sensitivity to the environment in this measure.

In fact, the environmental community strongly endorses BESTEA. Let me repeat this point. The environmental community strongly endorses BESTEA because they, too, know it is green tea. The Environmental Defense Fund, the League of American Bicyclists, the National Trust of Historic Preservation, the National Parks and Conservation Association, the National Resources Defense Council, the Rails to Trails Program, Scenic America and the Sierra Club all strongly support BESTEA because they, too, know it is green tea.

Green tea provides nearly $4 billion for the transportation enhancement program. This program provides needed funding to communities to build bicycle and pedestrian facilities and renovate historic transportation facilities. Green tea provides nearly $10 billion for the Congestion and Mitigation Air Quality Program for the next 4 years.

This is a good bill. It deserves support. It has earned the support of the environmental community.

Mr. Oberstar. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Clement), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation.

Mr. Clement. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, this is a great day for all of us when it comes to transportation and the future of transportation needs. We know what they are doing in Europe, we know what they are doing in Asia, we know what they are doing in other countries around the world. When it comes to infrastructure; and we are falling further and further behind.

As one of the so-called donor States, I do know that we have been underserved, short-changed in the past. And I am pleased to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Shuster) said so well and so eloquently a while ago, that this outdated formula goes back all the way to 1991 and now it is time, because of the shifts in population, that we need to realize that we need to make some major adjustments in the formula in order to be fair to all States involved. This is a great day. I strongly support this transportation bill. It is truly in our best interest.

Mr. Shuster. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to have a colloquy with the Chairman on a matter.

I would like to thank the Chairman for his willingness to extend the Coast Guard's boating safety program in H.R. 2400, which extends the transfer of the gasoline tax attributable to motorboats from the Highway Trust Fund to the Boating Safety Account. This means that the Boating Safety Account will have the same budgetary treatment as the Highway Trust Fund in section 701 since this is a disbursement from the Highway Trust Fund?

Mr. Oberstar. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Tennessee is correct. Since the Boating Safety Account receives its money from the Trust Fund, it would have the same budgetary treatment as the Highway Trust Fund under section 101.

Mr. Clement. Mr. Chairman, let us all get behind this most important transportation bill for the 21st century. We need it, and we need it now.

Mr. Oberstar. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fox).

Mr. Fox. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2400, this outstanding bipartisan measure to reauthorize our Federal surface transportation programs. A great deal of time and money goes to this work. Our Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Shuster); the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Oberstar); and members of staff.

We have far too many roads, bridges, and transit systems which have been neglected and have fallen into disrepair. They are leading to highway fatalities, congestion, in addition to wasted time, energy and money. We must restore the trust of the American people and spend the federal gas taxes today to rebuild and save our Nation's infrastructure.

Take roads such as Route 309 in Pennsylvania, right in my district,
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WHERE THE ACCIDENT RATE IS DOUBLE THAT OF THE STATE-WIDE AVERAGE. WE CAN STOP THESE DEATHS BY MAKING SURE WE PASS BESTEA. SAVE OUR ROADS, IMPROVE MASS TRANSIT, JOB CREATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION. THAT IS WHAT THIS BILL IS ALL ABOUT.

THE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF THE COUNTRY ARE AT STAKE, AND WE NEED TO TAKE CARE OF WHAT IS BEST FOR OUR CONSTITUENTS. I URGED ALL MY COLLEAGUES HERE IN THIS ROOM AND THOSE LISTENING TO PLEASE TAKE CARE OF BESTEA. THIS IS THE BEST INVESTMENT IN AMERICA, THE BEST INVESTMENT IN OUR COMMUNITIES, AND THE BEST INVESTMENT FOR OUR PEOPLE.

MR. OBERSTAR. MR. CHAIRMAN, I YIELD 2 MINUTES TO THE GENTLEWOMAN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (MS. NORTON), THE VOICE OF OUR NATION’S CAPITAL IN THIS BODY.

§ 1445

MS. NORTON. MR. CHAIRMAN, I THANK THE GENTLEMAN FOR HIS GENEROSITY IN YIELDING.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE COME TO THE FLOOR WITH A HEART-FELT REQUEST TO REMIND THIS BODY OF THE CRISPY SITUATION THAT THE PEOPLE IN NEW NORTHWESTERN VERMONT, WHICH LOCAL OFFICIALS DESCRIBED AS AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN. IF THAT IS SO, HOW COULD IT BE PORK?

MR. OBERSTAR. MR. CHAIRMAN, I YIELD 2 MINUTES TO THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW JERSEY (MR. MENENDEZ).

MR. MENENDEZ. MR. CHAIRMAN, I THANK THE GENTLEMAN FOR YIELDING.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WHEN THE PRESIDENT TALKS ABOUT BUILDING A BRIDGE TO THE 21ST CENTURY, THIS IS THE BILL THAT LAYS THE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT MAKES THAT BRIDGE A REALITY. THIS BILL SAVES AND CREATES WELL-PAVING AMERICAN JOBS BY MAKING SURE WE HAVE THE MEANS TO EFFICIENTLY MOVE THE GOODS AND PRODUCTS WE PRODUCE.

BUT TRANSPORTATION IS NOT JUST ABOUT MOVING GOODS AND PEOPLE FROM ONE PLACE TO ANOTHER. IT IS ABOUT ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, NEW BUSINESS, EXPANDING COMMERCE, A CLEANER ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY FOR OUR CHILDREN, AND A HIGHER QUALITY OF LIFE.

BETTER INFRASTRUCTURE MEANS MORE TIME WITH OUR FAMILIES. HOW MANY HOURS DO WE WASTE SITTING IN TRAFFIC BECAUSE OUR ROADS ARE INADEQUATE. TOO MANY, MR. CHAIRMAN. TOO MANY. THIS IS THE BILL THAT DOES SOMETHING ABOUT THAT.

MASS TRANSIT AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS MAY NOT BE GLAMOROUS WORK, BUT IT IS IMPORTANT WORK. THE SUCCESS OF ALMOST EVERYTHING DEPENDS ON OUR TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE. AT A TIME WHEN MOST OF OUR MAJOR TRADING COMPETITORS ARE MAKING LARGE INVESTMENTS IN NEW INFRASTRUCTURE, WE CANNOT AFFORD TO LAG BEHIND.

THE SOLUTION WE NEED IS NATIONAL. OUR COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS ARE NO LONGER CONFINED OR CONSTRANDED TO NATIONAL, MUCH LESS STATE BOUNDARIES. OUR SYSTEM IS ONLY AS STRONG AS ITS WEAKEST LINK.

IF ONE STATE HAS A GREAT SYSTEM, AND THE NEXT STATE HAS AN OUTDATED ONE, BOTH STATES SUFFER. IN THE NEXT CENTURY, WE WILL loose CRUCIAL ECONOMIC GROUND IF WE ALLOW THESE GAPS TO REMAIN.

CLOSE TO MY HOME, TRAFFIC ON THE BRIDGES AND ROADS THAT CONNECT NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY IS REACHING THE BREAKING POINT. IRONICALLY, THE REASON IS A GOOD ONE. OUR PORTS ARE BRINGING IN CONSUMERS AND EXPORTING MANUFACTURES THAT WILL BE HARDLY BE HELD BACK BY OUR INABILITY TO HANDLE THE FLOW OF PEOPLE AND GOODS.

SO WE ARE USING FERRIES TO GET PEOPLE BACK AND FORTH, 6 MILLION PEOPLE ANNUALLY. AND BY 2005, WE WILL NEED FERRY SERVICE FOR 8 MILLION OR MORE. BY MAKING THAT INVESTMENT TODAY, WE ARE ABLE TO HANDLE THE GROWTH OF TOMORROW.

THIS IS A COST REDUCTION MEASURE. IT SAVES MONEY. FERRIES DO NOT REQUIRE THE CONSTRUCTION OF COSTLY INFRASTRUCTURE. THEY REDUCE THE DEPENDENCY ON VEHICLE USE. THEY ARE MORE ENERGY-EFFICIENT.

THIS BILL WAS PUT TOGETHER WITH CREATIVE SOLUTIONS LIKE THIS ONE IN MIND. YES, IT IS A BILL OF MANY INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS, BUT IT IS A NATIONAL PLAN. THE PROJECTS IN THE BILL MAKE UP THAT NATIONAL PLAN, AND WE DESERVE TO BE SUPPORTIVE OF IT.

I WANT TO COMMEND THE CHAIRMAN AND THE RANKING MEMBER FOR THEIR VISION IN PUTTING THIS IN BEFORE THE HOUSE.

MR. MENENDEZ. MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM PLEASED TO YIELD 1 MINUTE TO THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK (MR. QUINN), AN IMPORTANT MEMBER OF OUR COMMITTEE.

MR. QUINN. MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS TRULY A HISTORIC DAY FOR THE UNITED STATES. H.R. 2400 IS A MAGNIFICENT WORK WHICH ADDRESSES MANY TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CONCERNS OF OUR COUNTRY.

FOR EXAMPLE, SECTION 205 CONTAINS THE MASS TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND DRIVING MEASURES EVER PUT INTO LEGISLATION. THE BILL ALSO REAUTHORIZED THE DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE PROGRAM THAT GIVES OUR STATE THE TOOLS TO REPAIR AND REPLACE CRUMBLING BRIDGES.

I YIELD TO THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK (MR. Q UINN), AN IMPORTANT MEMBER OF OUR COMMITTEE.

MR. Q UINN. MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS BILL IS IMPORTANT FOR OTHER REASONS AS WELL. THERE ARE AREAS OF THIS COUNTRY WHICH HAVE UNIQUE NEEDS, AND THIS BILL ADDRESSES THOSE NEEDS. THERE ARE AREAS FOR WHICH, FOR WHATEVER REASON, HISTORY HAS BEEN SHORTCHANGED IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUND REVENUE. H.R. 2400 BRINGS FAIRNESS TO THIS PROCESS, AND I STRONGLY SUPPORT IT.
Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of rhetoric and histrionics about demonstration projects. A great many headlines of today highlight this frenzy. But I take a different view. I came to Washington to represent the people of South Dakota. I was eager to request funding for projects my district needs. But I resent the implication from anyone who thinks otherwise. My requests represent the views of the local officials of the towns and communities I represent.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to address the provision of this bill which provides for opportunity for owners of small businesses to participate in the American dream. The DBE program is not a set-aside program, nor is it a quota. It sets reasonable goals for full participation in a highly competitive process, and I believe this bill, with all its compromises, will serve the balance of my time.

Mr. Shuster. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Thune), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. Thune. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today in support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation Equity Act. There has been a lot of talk about the budget issues surrounding the highway program, but there are some things that I think that people are forgetting to mention.

First of all, the fact that the American people have already paid for this bill. I paid for it this morning. We filled our cars; came to work. We will pay for it this evening on the way home when we stop at the gas station to top off the tank.

It makes no sense to impose a national highway tax, collect the money from this tax, then use that money to fund wasteful Washington spending. That is exactly what has been happening here for years.

Finally, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Shuster) and others, we are doing the right thing, and we are returning honesty to the budgeting process by using the motor fuels tax for the purpose for which it was created, intended, and that is the Highway Trust Fund.

I want to credit the chairman again for the work that he has done in seeing that we spend more fuel taxes on roads, bridges, and highways in keeping our promise to the American people. It turns out, honestly to the budgeting process, and it forces Washington to keep its word on transportation funding. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2400.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer).

Mr. Archer. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I bring to the attention of the House the provisions of title XI, the revenue title H.R. 2400. The revenue title provides the necessary financing for our Nation's surface transportation needs by extending for 6 years current law excise taxes on gasoline, diesel, and other transportation taxes which flow into the Highway Trust Fund.

By continuing the dedication of these monies to the Highway Trust Fund, we fulfill the expectations of the American people as the highway user charges they pay are reinvested in our country's infrastructure.

Furthermore, I am pleased to inform my colleague that the Ways and Means revenue title would transfer 69 cents per gallon tax on motorboat gasoline from the general fund to the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund. This is very, very important to Texans who use boats and the fishermen, because the money spent out of that fund enhances boater safety and protects the environment for millions of Americans who fish in the great outdoors.

In addition, title XI would repeal the 43 cents per gallon tax on railroad diesel fuel, which now goes to the general fund. I believe that the Nation's railroads have been unfairly penalized with a tax which has no relationship to railroads or transportation. This will tend to level the playing field between the way that we tax various forms of transportation.

Finally, the Committee on Ways and Means revenue title would repeal after the year 2000 the excise tax on truck tires and tread rubber, which is generally perceived as a nuisance by truckers and the IRS.

I believe that this is a good package that addresses our Nation's critical transportation needs while providing the appropriate tax relief. I urge support for the Committee on Ways and Means revenue title.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to praise the work that the committee has done on H.R. 2400 and to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer), chairman, for the work that the Committee on Ways and Means did, be it ever such a small part of an otherwise Herculean undertaking.

The 6-year extension of the Highway Trust Fund will provide much-needed infrastructure, maintenance, and expansion for this country's economic future. It does an important job. It will create jobs, ease bottlenecks, and will help the traffic flow in the Bay area of California, which is of particular local interest to me, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer) has explained.

It is paid for in a variety of ways. But I have one small reservation with the bill. That redounds not to the leader-ship of the committee of jurisdiction, but I am afraid to the leadership, budget leadership on the other side of the aisle, and that is that the bill is not paid for.

I would be a much happier and more enthusiastic supporter if I knew that other items were on the table. I am led to understand that the $24 or $25 billion shortfall in this bill is not going to be taken out of veterans programs. Well, great for old veterans like me.

But I would like some assurance that that will not leave children at risk, and that will not mean that the $24 or 5 billion is going to come out of education, or that is not going to come out of programs to improve public safety or housing for the homeless. There are many programs in this country that will be competing for that $24 billion, and I would be much more comfortable and feel that we are doing the more responsible job if the leadership of this House had told us just exactly how they intend to come up with that shortfall.

I do not like legislating in the dark, and it is very nice to tell my constituents that I am bringing home all kinds of worthy projects to the San Francisco Bay area and to the East Bay. I am afraid that perhaps later this summer I am going to have to deliver the bad news, which is how we are going to pay for this wonderful Easter present.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Oberstar).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. Archer. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Thune) for a colloquy.

Mr. Thune. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding to me for a question.

I have worked closely with the chairman for several months to amend H.R. 2400, and would like to thank him for his willingness to work with me and our colleagues from other States who are not served by Amtrak. Those States include Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, Oklahoma and Wyoming. What I would like to have offered in amendment, the gentleman from Texas expressed, in conversations we have had, his concerns about doing so.

As my colleague knows, I attempted to attach the same amendment to H.R. 2477, the Amtrak Privatization and Reform Act, but ran into jurisdictional and revenue questions at that time. The provision would amend the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 relating to tax...
refunds for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak. Therefore, a revenue estimate of the amendment was necessary prior to enactment. At my request, the Joint Committee on Taxation conducted a revenue estimate of the amendment and determined it would have no revenue impact.

The 1997 tax provisions specifically would provide Amtrak with access to $2.3 billion. Of that $2.3 billion, the law also sets aside a portion of the fund for non-Amtrak States. However, the allowable uses are limited. In fact, the law would allow those funds to be used only for intercity passenger rail service and for intercity bus services.

While my State, the State of South Dakota, does not have intercity passenger rail service, the State has been clear in stating that it would put available funds to use for intercity bus service. In fact, the State already is putting some of those funds to use. All the same, the State would like to have more flexibility in how it uses those funds.

For that reason I drafted an amendment that would allow non-Amtrak States to use the funds for other transportation purposes, such as Amtrak-owned rail operations, rural transit and transit services for the elderly and disabled, rural air service, and highway-rail grade crossing projects. These are common sense and necessary uses. In fact, the other way to value this amendment, and during consideration of Senate Bill 1173 adopted a similar amendment.

I nonetheless appreciate the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Texas regarding authorizing jurisdiction of the amendment. At the same time I understand the gentleman from Texas would not object to this provision in conference. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THUNE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from South Dakota that it is not normal procedure for us to announce a negotiating position on the floor of the House where there is a difference between a Senate provision and a House provision. Let me simply say that we will try to work this out in the conference. I also said that I have talked with the gentleman from South Dakota a number of times about this and personally do not have any objection to his request, and I think it is appropriate and we will do the best that we can in the conference.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), and would say that for States that do not have rail passenger service, each of these transportation needs are appropriate and important alternatives to rail passenger service. The amendment in my view represents sound, common sense policy that simply allows non-Amtrak States to make the best, most worthwhile use of the funds that are provided for transportation needs.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his hard work and commitment to work with me to address the needs of South Dakota and the other States that are not served by Amtrak. He, our colleagues in the House, the taxpayers of this Nation should have every assurance that the funds provided to non-Amtrak States will address important transportation needs in each of these States.

And I also add that I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for his assistance. He expressed his support of this measure in the past, and as a result, both he and his staff on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have been extremely helpful in this effort to see that these funds are put to the best possible use. As well as, I would like to say to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. BERCROMBIE) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) for her support and assistance, as well as support from the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. McCREE) and from the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ARCHER). I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McCREE), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a colloquy.

Mr. McCREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as I review the tax portion of the bill that we are voting on today, I note that we are considering the elimination of the 4.3 cent per gallon deficit reduction tax on railroad fuel. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this tax was imposed on the railroad industry in 1987 because of the gas tax. It was put as well on other modes of transportation, including the inland barge industry.

As we head toward the conference on this bill, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would work with me and others to explore the extension of this repeal to the barge industry, to make sure that we maintain a level playing field between competing modes of transportation. It is my understanding that the tax on inland barge traffic generates a rather modest contribution to the Treasury, and paying for it is not going to be extremely costly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for a comment from another member of our committee and the former chairman of the Transportation Task Force of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my views in support of the gentleman from Louisiana. Last year members of the Transportation Task Force studied the waterway tax and trust fund structure with regard to equity. In light of the fact the current tax that applies to waterway uses has generated a surplus to the trust fund, and since the legislation before us today will eliminate the deficit reduction tax as it applies to the rail industry, I join in the request that we work toward an equitable extension of the deficit reduction tax as it applies to the barge industry.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the important role that the barge industry plays in the economies both of Louisiana and Texas and other States in this country, and I appreciate the comments from the chairman of the Transportation Task Force, our colleague from Georgia. Accordingly, I will be pleased to work with my colleagues, subject to budgetary constraints. Of course, we are going to maintain tax equity among the various modes of transportation, and I thank my colleague for bringing this up and asserting this point.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McCREE), chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. McCREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. OBERSTAR), a very vigorous advocate for transportation and a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. McCREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a few Members come to the floor and see some press accounts that there is too much in this bill. Now the question will be, too much? Is it that we are meeting and overfilling the transportation and infrastructure needs in the United States? No, not at all. In fact, this bill will still leave us with a $30 billion per year deficit in transportation, $16 billion for highways and $14 billion for transit, 254,000 miles of pavement in poor condition, one out of three highway bridges structurally deficient, and of course every two transit yard stations and bridges for mass transit in poor condition.

In my own State we need an additional $244 million a year to meet our needs for preservation and maintenance and $351 million for capital improvements. It is not too much in the terms of the needs of the country.

Now is it too much in terms of what we have to pay for transportation? No. In fact this bill will not spend all the money which the American people are paying in taxes dedicated to transportation. Every time an American drives to the pump they pay 18.4 cents a gallon gas tax, and this bill, as good as it
is, as robust as it is, will only spend about 14 to 15 cents of that tax, and the rest will go elsewhere in the Federal budget. It will go to deficit reduction, or it will go to pay for secret programs at the CIA, or over to the Pentagon or somewhere else, maybe for tax cuts for the wealthy.

That is not why Americans pay a gas tax, and there should be no diversion of the gas tax money until every infrastructure need of this country is met and up to date. So it is not too much to ask that we fulfill the needs, and it is not too much to ask that we spend every penny of that dedicated regressive tax on the transportation needs of this country.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. POSHARD), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reference some parts of this bill that perhaps other Members have not spoken about. In addition to the core programs of ISTEA, BESTEA offers two other important programs that I think are extremely important. The high risk road safety construction program will give States incentives to address their worst safety problems, and the high cost interstate rehabilitation program will provide additional funds for major projects that are extremely important in current needs. Moreover, BESTEA permits continued flexibility to allow for a productive relationship between all levels of government when it comes to transportation spending.

Another important provision in this bill is language that would benefit rural areas by guaranteeing relief for Illinois farmers from Department of Transportation regulations concerning the local transport of agricultural materials, including seeds, fertilizers and fuel. States have traditionally been allowed to set their own exceptions to Federal regulations for these farming necessities when involved in farm-to-field, field-to-farm and retail-to-farm activities.

However, Federal standards proposed in 1996 would force farmers to comply with costly and burdensome documents meant for over-the-road trucks that regularly haul hazardous materials on a regular basis.

The language in BESTEA allows States to retain the ability to regulate these materials on a regular basis. This will save farmers and retailers hundreds of thousands of dollars in compliance costs and save valuable time for our farm community. I greatly appreciate the efforts of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARTCA), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), who join me for fighting for inclusion of this language.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking member (Mr. OBERSTAR), for their tireless efforts on behalf of this legislation. I think the passage of BESTEA will benefit the entire Nation and ensure that the transportation needs of America are met, and I am proud to have been a part of this historic process.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the chairman for his efforts with regard to this bill. I support the chairman's efforts to take the Highway Trust Fund off budget and share his commitment to infrastructure. Unfortunately, I cannot support this bill and that is because it is not fair to Montana and Western States.

Mr. Chairman, Montanans pay the highest gas taxes in the Nation, 27.5 cents per gallon. In fact, on a per capita basis, they pay the highest State gas taxes, and are fourth in the Nation in how much they pay in Federal gas taxes. They have high portions of Federal lands by the National Forests and Bureau of Land Management.

This bill is unfair to Montana because it reduces the funding formula for Montana by about 26 percent while increasing the formula for the funding in most States by factors of 40 to 50 percent. In addition, it reduces the funding for places like Montana that have high portions of Federal lands by changing that formula, and, even worse, the congestion mitigation air quality changes also hurt Montana.

I urge the chairman to join with the Senate in adopting the Senate version of this bill. This is enough, Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to my good friend from Montana and point out that Montana gets back 1.35 for every dollar it sends into the trust fund from this bill, and, indeed, there are only four States out of the 50 States which get a better return. I do not begrudge that money to Montana.

I understand it is a rural State, has a low population, and the whole Montana, does extremely well, and I think everybody should understand that.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MACSCARA), the gentleman from the Men’s Vote (Mr. BARCIA), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, as well as our leaders from the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, the gentleman from California (Tom PETRI) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Nick RAHALL), for their strong leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Without their firm bipartisan resolve, none of this would have been possible. As a former local official deeply committed to economic development projects, I truly appreciate the significance of this transportation bill. America’s economy depends heavily on the interstate highway system. For example, nearly $6 trillion worth of goods are transported over our Nation’s highways, yet we are allowing our roads to deteriorate. Over the past 25 years, road use has grown more than 15 times the highway capacity.

This has left many of our roads and bridges in need of serious repair. In fact, the Department of Transportation has determined that 12,000 accidents occur each year as a result of poor highway conditions. Thirty percent end up in fatalities.

Furthermore, 59 percent of all roads and 45 percent of all major projects in America are in need of repair, or are structurally deficient. We must begin investing now to improve the quality and safety of our roads. BESTEA will allow us to make these improvements, providing funding for highway projects across America, such as the Mon-Fayette Expressway in my district, but we must begin now. We cannot delay completion of this bill, because many States have already begun their road building projects and if we do not finish our job here, States could lose an entire construction season.

I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill to fix our Nation’s interstate, to improve highway safety, to promote economic development in our communities, and, as all of you have said, to build America.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2400. This bill has been falsely accused of many things, but perhaps the most egregious falsehood is that this bill signals an end to the Republican revolution. Nothing could be further from the truth.

When Republicans took control of Congress, we promised to change the way we do business. We made a Contract with America and followed through on it. BESTEA fulfills another contract by ending the practice of misusing gas tax revenues.

For every gallon of gas we put in our tanks, we pay 18.3 cents to the Federal government. Frankly, it is a pretty high rate of taxation. But we pay the tax because the revenues are supposed to be used so we do not have to sit in traffic, incur the wrath of crumbling roads, damage our cars or lose a friend to an unsafe highway.

The tax is a contract between American motorists and the Federal Government, but for many years now Congress
has simply failed to live up to its part of the contract.

BESTEA fulfills our deal with the American taxpayer. It spends the gas tax revenue on roads and takes the Highway Trust Fund off budget, ending the practice of using the revenues on nonhighway-related needs.

This bill also restores faith to taxpayers in States like Florida who have been forced to fund the infrastructure priorities of other States, receiving only cents on every dollar citizens in Florida pay. Under BESTEA, States will get at least 90 cents of every dollar allocated by formula, a tremendous improvement.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), who has fought for these gains and listened to the concerns of States like Florida. Today we have a chance to vote for honest budgeting, funding equity, economic growth and safer highways. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for their leadership and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for his courage and steadfastness throughout this struggle, which has been an inspiration to all of us on both sides of the aisle.

We thank the gentleman and his staff, and the staff of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). They have had to deal with a lot of issues, and they worked hard for a long period of time. We thank them profusely.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, what I believe this bill is a tremendous step forward, I do want to say I am extremely dismayed that the asphalt tax incentive is not extended in the bill, Mr. Chairman. This incentive is a vital boost to farm income, decreases our dependence on foreign oil, provides consumers with a cleaner burning fuel and creates good jobs.

Ethanol is a proven industry that benefits our local farmers in southeast Missouri and others around the country. It provides real benefits to the broader American public, and the tax incentives should be extended. I strongly urge that during the conference negotiations on H.R. 2400, the House adopt the Senate language which authorizes the ethanol tax incentive through the year 2007.

With that said, I fully support this legislation, and commend the chairman for the terrific job he has done.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the distinguished voice of the great outdoors and of livable cities.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much talk about America's future and fiscal stability in the course of this debate. I rise to support H.R. 2400 because it gives the tools for America's communities to control their own destinies.

You have heard and will hear more from the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), and others about how this bill is good for the safety of the American public, how it provides important resources to improve vital transit programs. It is good for the environment, for rail passengers and freight. It is good for bicyclists. It is good for the motoring public, because it promotes the free flow of a balanced transportation system and, for those people who do drive their cars, makes it safer for them, more convenient, less congested.

But I want to focus, if I could, on what difference this bill makes by making America's citizens and their local governments into their own transportation system, because BESTEA gives the tools for livable communities to stop sprawl and revitalize existing communities.

Every year we spend billions of dollars dealing with the symptoms of dysfunctional communities. The Congress spends money on economic development, on crime, on education that is largely attempting to deal with what has happened after communities go over the brink.

What is critical about BESTEA and the resources that are directed is that it gives communities unprecedented abilities to manage those resources in conjunction with State and local communities to strengthen them before they deteriorate.

I posit, Mr. Chairman, that any careful analysis of the economic benefit that we will derive as a Nation revitalizing these communities, controlling the deterioration of the first ring of suburbs and so on throughout the metropolitan areas, conservatively it is going to return far more money than any modest increase.

When we couple that with the economic benefits of cleaner air, less congestion, and a wide range of important economic infrastructure investments for the next century, I think any short-term increase in funding is going to be dwarfed. BESTEA is good for the fiscal health of America. It is good for the health of American communities.

I would add that the bipartisan leadership of this committee that has given this Congress the most important environmental legislation we are going to see for the remainder of this century and on into the next millennium.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia
(Mr. DAVIS), a valued member of our committee.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would point out some of the provisions in section 140 of the bill entitled “Quality through competition.”

As I understand the provisions, it reflects the following important points:

First, it is going to provide for substantial savings to States by providing for a single, consistent rule for the administration and accounting of costs for engineering and design contracts that are funded with Federal-aid highway funds.

Second, it acknowledges and permits the use of the expedited process in the existing FAR, which is applicable to qualifications-based selection procedures for architect, engineering, and related services of smaller projects which fall below the threshold of $100,000.

Third, by using the term “simplified acquisition procedures,” it does not change or authorize the avoidance of the contract administration and audit requirements specified in the section.

Fourth, this section provides no authority for a contracting authority to waive the requirements of the contract administration or single audit provisions provided in this section.

Mr. Chairman, if we ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is my understanding correct?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct in his observation of the effects of section 140 of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Just to continue, Mr. Chairman, in support of this bill, the Trust Fund dollars are like user fees people pay at the gas pumps to come back and improve our Nation’s transportation system. This bill, instead of spending Highway Trust Fund dollars collected at the gas pumps on offense or health care, deficit reduction, or some other worthy endeavor, simply spends the Trust Fund user fees for their intended use.

In local government, when I was in Fairfax County, I would have raised a trust fund and used it to spend the dollars for water or sewer or another use, we would have gone to jail; but at the Federal level it is perfectly legal to do that. But this starts to straighten that and bring some fiscal accountability to the Trust Fund dollars for our taxpayers.

Secondly, there have been some comments about demonstration projects or earmarking. In my region, Northern Virginia, for 25 years we have been consistently shortchanged from the State government. Money that goes through Richmond does not come back to Northern Virginia in any way, shape or form to our proportion of highway use, population, vehicle miles or anything else. Yet we have the greatest need for transportation dollars. We have historically been shortchanged by the State.

Third, this bill contains over $10 million for the completion of the Fairfax County Parkway through Reston, $25 million for road widening of Route 123, $10 million for the Virginia Railway Express, a transit alternative down the 95 corridor.

These projects are not my projects, they are not political projects, they were requested and coordinated with the local governments in that region, who knew that if they had to wait for Richmond to deliver, they may be waiting a decade. We are putting them out on top.

I applaud the Chairman and the Ranking Member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. J. IM OBERSTAR), for addressing these needs for our region, putting their hands on the red button, and probably the traffic jam capital of the country. This legislation will go a long way to alleviate that.

I strongly support this measure and ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you. I am delighted to stand in favor of BESTEA today. I owe a lot of gratitude to our leaders on this committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the rest.

This bill provides resources to meet America’s infrastructure needs, not frivolous, but needs that have been expressed by persons throughout this Nation, and not just by Members here, but all the people that we represent.

This bill provides an unprecedented commitment to improve safety on America’s highways and to help reduce the 40,000 annual deaths from motor vehicles. It improves the safety for commercial motor vehicles. The Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program has been refined to focus on performance-based goals, and funding for this program has been significantly increased.

That is important. It strengthens and emphasizes our Federal commitment to the national systems of transportation that facilitate interstate travel.

Being from Texas, a border State, it creates a new border infrastructure program that connects to the Mexican highway system. I-69 corridor States are vital to international trade, as they carry 52 percent of the U.S. truck-borne trade with Mexico and 62 percent of U.S. truck-borne trade with Canada.

Another issue I am deeply involved in is the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program, which has been at the center of a lawsuit affecting the Institute for Diversity in Houston Metro. Metro was prohibited from implementing its DBE program by Federal court order, and for some 18 months FTA cut off Federal funds that
it had pledged to Metro as part of a full funding grant agreement. Metro was caught between two branches of the Federal Government. I am very pleased that this committee has recognized this problem and taken care of it.

In the House, the bill has been placed in conference with the Senate, and, in particular, it is vital that the conference report include a guaranteed rate of return that is no less than those included in the Senate bill. Donor States will not stand for another 6 years of funding inequity. I once again congratulate the Chairman and the Ranking Member, and say, just quickly, a job well done.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I would say to the distinguished Majority Whip that I can assure him that we will stand, on a bipartisan basis, in support of the principles that we have crafted jointly, and, as the Chairman pointed out, so astutely in this legislation. We appreciate his support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

It is a pleasure to offer a few remarks in support of this tremendous transportation bill. It is, perhaps, the most comprehensive of all of our distinguished members in the Chamber who worked on drafting what I believe is to be a very equitable and reasonable bill regarding transportation spending at the Federal level for the next 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2400 and urge my colleagues to make a strong showing in support of this landmark legislation. This bill means a lot to the citizens of my Fifth District of Michigan, to our State, and to the country as well.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for their leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to focus on two aspects of the legislation which have drawn unwarranted criticism. First, the budgetary effects of the bill have been completely misrepresented.

Some claim to be outraged at the levels of spending in this bill. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the American people should be outraged that this bill represents, I want now to increase at all. Our government has for far too long ignored the future health of our economy by disinvesting in our infrastructure.

The safe and efficient movement of goods and people makes this country greater and our economy strong. But over the past 2 decades, we have fallen far behind our global competitors in our commitment to our transportation system.

This bill is about tax fairness. To my Democratic colleagues, I say, they are concerned about tax cuts which benefit the wealthy members of our society. This bill is a tax return to our Nation's working families. Those who use our transportation system pay for our transportation. The Highway Trust Fund has been allowed to grow while our citizens' repair bills rise. That is inexusable. This bill will reverse that practice.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman for yielding time to me, and I commend him and the Ranking Member on this legislation and, in particular, for including funds for the widening of U.S. Highway 192.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. Highway 192 is a dangerous two-lane road that connects the south Orlando-Kissimmee-St. Cloud area with the coastal communities of Palm Bay and Melbourne, communities of about 250,000 combined.

I became interested in the widening of this road when a physician colleague of mine lost his wife on this road when a truck crossed the midline and she was killed. Ever since then, my wife will not allow me to drive on this road with her at any time.

Just last week, a truck crossed the midline, the driver was killed, closing the road, a major highway connecting two major areas in Florida, closing the road for a week because of herbicide that was spilled all over the road.

Widening U.S. 192 is not pork. Widening U.S. 192 will save lives. Closing a road for a week because of a midline crossing accident involving a truck hurts our economies. It will save lives. It will be good for our communities. It will be good for the economy.

I challenge those who would call this pork to come to my district and tell to the people who have to travel on this road, a road that should have been widened 10 years ago.

Again, I thank both the Chairman and the Ranking Member.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Los Angeles, California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD), the voice of Southern California (Chairman SHUSTER) for yielding me the time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, over the last 2 years I have heard a lot about building bridges to the 21st century. Let us talk about real bridges, and bridges for America's future, real roads and real bridges that are traveled on by real Americans. BESTEA builds those roads and builds those bridges and provides the infrastructure that will allow our Nation to move into the 21st century.

I come from the most populous State in the Nation, the great State of California, with 32 million people, 25 million registered vehicles, and moves 30 percent of our Nation's freight traffic on our highways. Clearly, we have the most traveled roads and bridges of any State represented in this House and contribute more in gas taxes to the Highway Trust Fund.

As one of the cochairs of the California ISTEA Task Force, I, along its founder, my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. JAY L. HUMMEL), held a number of hearings throughout our great State. In those hearings our State and local elected officials, municipal planning organizations and citizens at large told us one thing: Pass BESTEA. It is a good bill for California, and we all know that what is good for California is good for the Nation.

Transportation provides substantial economic benefit to our country. According to the study by the Department of Transportation, 420,000 jobs are created for every $1 billion we invest in highways, transit, and bridges.

How can we expect to compete in today's global economy without a world class highway and transit system?

I would like to congratulate both my colleagues and my member on doing a yeoman's job on bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor. I will urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to dismiss the empty rhetoric about demonstration projects and focus on our Nation's infrastructure needs to compete in this global economy. Let us move America.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ELHERS).

Mr. ELHERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for asking and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ELHERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak about honesty and integrity, and this bill is a bill of integrity. I have been concerned, unhappy, and upset for almost 30 years now, since transportation funding was placed on budget, surpluses were allowed to accumulate, and the money was used to shield the size of the national deficit from the American taxpayers. That is wrong, and I am pleased that this bill ends that practice.

Mr. Chairman, the money that the public pays for gas taxes, under this bill will be used for the purpose for which it was intended (i.e., that is transportation funding). No longer will it be used to disguise the size of the deficit.

Some people have called this bill a budget bust. If it were a budget bust, he would have shown it.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a good reason it is not a budget bust. Section 1001 makes it very clear that if the
expenditures in this bill exceed the budget guidelines, spending will have to be cut back or offsets will have to be found, and we will take care of that through the budget process.

One other important issue of equity. I come from a different State. This is a polite way of saying that Michigan has contributed more to road funding in this country than it has received back. In fact, under ISTEA, 76 cents of every dollar we sent to Washington came back to Michigan. Under this bill we will likely have better, and this bill achieves equity in funding, equity in taxation, and is an honest bill that serves the people well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Railroads and a strong advocate for transportation.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you very much, and I think the country owes a vote of thanks, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, for all he has done and for the bipartisan efforts, Republicans and Democrats working together. This is going to be the major economic growth package that passes this Congress this year. And, indeed, it is going to be one of the most significant growth packages to pass the Congress in many a year.

It does not do all that it could or should, but it sure does a lot and begins to redress an imbalance that has been there for many years: the fact that we are not investing significantly and not investing enough in our infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, some have called this, yes, a budget buster, and so I look at this $4 billion to $5 billion to maybe $6 billion over what was projected initially to pay for this bill. I commend the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, for all he has done and for the bipartisan effort, Republicans and Democrats working together. This is going to be the major economic growth package that passes this Congress this year. And, indeed, it is going to be one of the most significant growth packages to pass the Congress in many a year.

It does not do all that it could or should, but it sure does a lot and begins to redress an imbalance that has been there for many years: the fact that we are not investing significantly and not investing enough in our infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. SANDLIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, first let me say "thank you" to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, and to the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act. This bill is the single most important piece of legislation that this Congress has considered this year.

For too long the infrastructure has taken a back seat in this country while the hard-earned dollars of our constituents have been used and paid into the trust fund for the highways and we have used it to mask the size of the deficit. With BESTEA we can say no more. No more.

Mr. Chairman, our constituents pay the gas tax with the expectation that the money they pay will be spent to improve and enhance the roads on which they drive. BESTEA meets their expectation. For the first time in 29 years, the Highway Trust Fund will be moved off budget. This important provision ensures that these funds are used for their original purpose, to repair and rebuild our Nation's roads and highways.

Our transportation system is in dire need of improvement and new construction to meet the needs of the traveling public and business in the future. Today more than ever we must begin the modernization of our roads and bridges if we are to be able to handle our increasing traffic.

Today, some will argue that BESTEA busts the budget. This argument is clearly a weak attempt to make political points, and it is an argument that is easily dismantled. All the new spending in BESTEA is more than paid for by gas taxes. In fact, over the next 6 years, Texas receives approximately 77 cents of every dollar for every gas tax dollar it paid into the Highway Trust Fund. Thanks to the efforts of the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this committee, BESTEA includes important language to guarantee that Texas and other donor States receive at least 90 cents on the dollar from this legislation.

Finally, for those who would argue that this bill is "pork," I would say that any bill that creates tens of thousands of new jobs and increases investments in the economy is not pork in my book. Indeed, according to a 1993 CBO report, for every dollar spent building new highways, the economy is estimated to rise by about $2.43. For every $1 billion of new highway construction spending, employment is estimated to rise by 24,300 workers.

Mr. Chairman, we have put the needs of our Nation's infrastructure long enough. This is good for our constituents and good for the economy. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), my good friend.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, a couple of weeks ago Lake Champlain was...
added as a sixth Great Lake over in the Senate, and it was added primarily to take money away from the Sea Grant College Fund. There are many of us here that thought it was highway robbery and are delighted that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BEREUTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SALOMON), as well as Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. LEAHY in the Senate, agreed to language that removed that Great Lake status.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend our two Michigan Members for their work on this highway bill, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BACON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHlers). For many years we have been a donor State, and as one that believes in trust funds, we ought to use the money in the trust funds for the purposes that they were intended for, whether it is this donut such a marvelous job. This bill, this legislation would spend $18 billion less than the Federal Government will collect in highway user taxes, not including the interest, over the next 3 years. Over the next 3 years, the people of the legislation we are about to vote on, it will spend $12 billion less than highway tax receipts.

The facts are clear, Mr. Chairman, that there is within our domain the faculty to pay for what we are voting on here today. New Jersey is a perfect example of a State that will be helped. It ranks fifteenth of all the States in the Union in terms of return on our tax dollar, the very basis of Federalism upon which the Constitution was written. This legislation is going to help correct the major deficiencies in our bridges. Who will we turn to when another bridge is shut down in New Jersey? In just a short 6 years, there have been 2,300,000 new jobs in New Jersey as a result of the original transportation legislation, which my predecessor, Bob Roe, a good friend, was able to bring to this floor.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. PETER), my good friend.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2400. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), as well as the distinguished chairman (Mr. PETERI) and the distinguished ranking member (Mr. RAHALL) of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, for their extraordinary work.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation lives up to its name. It will improve the transportation for all Americans by helping to create a more efficient and safer highway system. I am pleased we are restoring integrity to the trust fund.

Finally, we are returning to the principles that were established by President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Highway Trust Fund. When Americans pay their Federal gasoline tax at the gas pump, they have every right to expect that their money actually will be used for transportation and not diverted to other purposes. Those funds do not belong to OMB or the House Budget Committee. They belong to the American people who pay those gasoline taxes to be used for transportation, primarily highway construction and maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ensures that the taxes paid at the gas pump will go toward constructing and improving our Nation’s highways. Our infrastructure is in desperate need of additional resources. The gentleman from West Virginia a few minutes ago told us of the situation with the country’s obsolete bridges, functionally and structurally deficient. This bill addresses these and other crying needs in our infrastructure. I urge my colleagues to support this outstanding and, I would say, very responsible legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a vigorous advocate for transportation and a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, there is one overriding fact in here that I would like to stress, if I may, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. This is an investment that we can be proud of. Wisconsin is critical legislation. Let us get on and get it passed to help America.

So, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for allowing us the time here today. This is critical legislation. Let us get on with it and get it passed to help America.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. PETERI), my good friend.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
Federal highway funding formula. Like under current law, my home State of Texas receives only 76 cents back for every dollar in Federal fuel taxes that are sent to Washington. This bill will give 90 cents back for every dollar funded by the House. 

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMMSON), a valuable member of this committee.

Mr. LAMMSON. Mr. Chairman, as the only Houston area member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I am pleased to have played a role in moving the BESTEA out of committee and to this floor. 

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for the fine work that the big four produced.

BESTEA sets funding formulas to determine percentages for States to receive Federal Highway Trust Fund monies. Texas, for the past 6 years, has received only 77 cents for every dollar we put in the trust fund. Our needs are too great to give our dollars to other States. This new legislation will make a significant increase in Texas' share of highway funds and bring us closer to equity.

For over two decades, Congress and the White House have used unobligated funds in the four transportation trust funds to make the Federal deficit look smaller. It is a sham that has kept billions of dollars locked up in Treasury notes that should be in our economy, matching local and State transportation dollars continuing the process of building this country. There are plenty of uses for any funds that we can secure.

I also do not need to tell this House how important improving infrastructure is to promoting economic growth. Over the last 6 years, this Nation has dedicated $355 billion to its transportation infrastructure. Compare that to the $2.1 trillion spent by Japan over a decade to develop their respective State programs. This change greatly complicates the development of a simplified, uniform federal program.

American businesses spend $40 billion a year.

Americans waste 1.6 million hours every day sitting in traffic. We cannot allow our Nation's transportation infrastructure to erode any further. Our highways and railroads must be shored up to keep transportation costs as low as possible for the sake of commerce. For the sake of our economy, now is the proper time to act. If we allow the situation to get worse, we will have to make a choice down the road to expand or repair. I do not believe that is a choice we can make. Let us pass H.R. 2400.

As the only Houston-area member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I am pleased to have played a role in moving the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act, or BESTEA, out of Committee and to this floor. I applaud Chairmen SHUSTER, Mr. Chairman, and PETRI and Congressman RAHALL for the fine work the “Big Four” produced.

BESTEA sets funding formulas to determine percentages for States to receive federal highway trust fund monies. Texas, for the past six years, has received only 77 cents for every dollar we put into the fund. Our needs are too great to give our dollars to other States. This new legislation will make a significant increase in Texas' share of highway funds and bring us closer to equity.

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has taken steps to significantly improve donor states' rate-of-return by including the $3.9 billion High Priority Projects category within the Minimum Allocation program. While BESTEA currently includes a 90% rate-of-return, I am of the hope that as the process continues, or for that 90% rate-of-return on 100% of the funds distributed to the States.

For over two decades Congress and the White House have used unobligated funds in the four transportation trust funds to make the Federal deficit look smaller. It is a sham that has kept billions of dollars locked up in Treasury notes that should be in our economy, matching local and State transportation dollars continuing the process of building this country. There are plenty of uses for any funds that we can secure.

Our national transportation economy in 1994 accounted for 10.8 percent of our Gross Domestic Product, employing over 3.2 million Americans. But at the same time, congestion on our highways has risen to such a level that traffic costs to American businesses $40 billion each year. Americans waste 1.6 million hours every day sitting in traffic.

We cannot allow our nation's transportation infrastructure to erode any further. Our highways and railroads must be shored up to keep transportation costs as low as possible for the sake of commerce. Our products compete on a worldwide basis now, and products from countries with strong and efficient infrastructure will cost less on the market and allows time to improve and made more on quality. That's the bottom line. For the sake of our economy, now is the proper time to act. If we allow the situation to get worse, we will have to make a choice down the road to expand or repair the existing infrastructure. That's a choice I don't believe this nation can afford to make.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to engage in a conversation regarding implementation of the unified motor carrier registration system with the chairman and the ranking member.

In 1995, when the Congress enacted the ICC Termination Act, we instructed the Secretary of Transportation to establish a single, on-line Federal system for the registration of all interstate motor carriers. The purpose of the system was to enhance the monitoring of safety and insurance compliance.

We required the DOT to promulgate final rules by January 1, 1998, but little has been done to accomplish that. The State program, it seems to me, needlessly cost the industry about $90 million a year and ought to be replaced by a single national system as this body intended in 1995.

I ask the chairman or the ranking member, is there any optimism to resolve this?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the bill managers in a colloquy regarding implementation of a unified motor carrier registration system.
Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2400 and the manager's amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2400 and the manager's amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, Mr. SHUSTER. As Co-chairman of the Congressional Native American Caucus, I want to speak briefly on the condition of roads in Indian country and on two amendments that Mr. SHUSTER has included in the manager's amendment.

There are more than 85,000 miles of roads that serve hundreds of Indian reservations throughout the United States. Indian reservation roads make up 2.63% of all existing roads eligible for ISTEA funding. However, tribes receive less than 1% of ISTEA funding for these roads.

If Indian country were to receive its full proportionate share of the billions included in this bill, Indian reservations would receive $4.7 billion over six years, or $793 million per year. Mr. Chairman, when you compare this amount of federal funding to annual costs, $40 million to resurface and repair Indian roads, $212 million per year in H.R. 2400 and $250 million per year in S. 1173, the recommended amount hardly seems adequate.

The condition of roads in Indian country endangers the health and safety of those living on reservations as well as future economic development. In inclement weather, over 30,000 miles of roads serving Indian reservations are impassable. Things that most of us take for granted like access to emergency services, or availability of heating fuel and groceries, are not available on many reservations for several months of the year. No business is going to locate on an Indian reservation that cannot offer a basic transportation infrastructure.

The condition of bridges on Indian reservations is even more dire. A recent survey by the Bureau of Indian Affairs counted 4,000 of these bridges and found 190 to be deficient to the point of needing replacing or undergo major repairs. The estimated cost to replace or resurface these bridges is more than $40 million. Under H.R. 2400 and S. 1173, the requested amount for the reservation bridge program is $9 million. While I support funding for the bridge program, this amount still falls short of addressing the need in Indian country.

Two amendments that Mr. SHUSTER includes in the manager's amendments will encourage tribes to be more self-sufficient. These amendments would allow certain tribal governments to receive transportation funds and directly administer them. They would also require that the Secretary allocate funds to tribes according to a negotiated rulemaking process.

While I agree with the idea of the current language in the manager's amendment, I disagree with the recommended process that will be used to accomplish these goals. It is my hope that when this bill goes to Conference, the conferees will agree that tribal governments should manage their funds according to the authority of Public Law 93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975.

Each year, under P.L. 93-638, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service directly transfers hundreds of millions of dollars to tribal governments so they can administer Governmental services and construction projects. P.L. 93-638 provides for streamlined administrative efficiencies while preserving program and financial accountability.
In closing, I strongly urge the House conference to support the recommended amount in S. 1173 that provides $250 million per year for the Indian Reservation Roads program, and to allow tribes to receive funds and directly administer them under P.L. 93-638.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member. I rise today in support of H.R. 2400.

I think about this. In the next 5 years in central Orange County, that is Anaheim, Garden Grove and Santa Ana, we will be spending over $5 billion in new construction and modernization. That is the private sector and that is the public sector; the public sector in our infrastructure needs for all of this new construction and modernization going on.

It is the rising economy of Orange County. It requires local dollars, State dollars and, yes, the dollars that we from Orange County send here to be returned back to help our crumbling infrastructure. That is why I am proud to say that I am a proponent of this responsible bipartisan initiative that was written with the support of diverse transportation communities from business to labor, contractors to environmentalists, from engineers to safety advocates and to cyclists.

These groups see that America is growing and prospering, but our transportation infrastructure is lagging behind. And this bill picks up the pace and our highways. I believe that this bill will improve America, will improve our futures. The projects included are important and very cost-effective, in particular in Orange County.

Our Nation’s networks of road and transit systems are the arteries that keep the economic heart of our country beating. Without our blood supply, our country’s economic body would suffer an irreversible financial heart attack. Please join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair, how much time remains on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER); and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the Ranking Member; and others for the very fine work they have done on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that the infrastructure of the United States of America is rotting. It is falling apart right under us. And our roads, our bridges, our mass transportation, which is our rail system, our rural bus system, our bicycle paths, are in major need of repair; and it is high time that we paid attention to those needs.

In the State of Vermont, we have a major infrastructure problem which has been made worse in recent years by flooding, flooding which is occurring today in the State of Vermont, further damages already there. All over Vermont bridges are in serious need of repair, and this bill begins to address that problem.

Sixteen million from this legislation is going to the Missiquoi Bay Bridge in Franklin County, Vermont. This bridge in the northern part of our State serves as a vital transportation link for New York, Canadian, and other New England traffic and would have paying jobs is doing exactly the right thing. It is improving the economic well-being of this country, and it is long overdue. I congratulate our friends for the work that they have done.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

(Mr. BUYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Chairman for his hard work. It is truly good work, a good piece of legislation. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for their dedication to bringing H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act, to the House Floor. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has taken steps to significantly improve donor states’ rate-of-return.

Indiana is and has been a donor state. For years now, Indiana has received only 77 cents for every $1 generated in federal gas tax revenues in Indiana. Now that the National Highway System has been completed, the time has arrived for Congress to bring fairness and equity back into transportation funding and spending.

BESTEA includes a 90% rate-of-return. The Senate-passed version contains a 91% rate-of-return. As the process continues, donor states continue to seek a 95% rate-of-return. Both versions have made great strides to bring fairness and equity to the funding. It would be only unfair, but also an injustice for the Conference Committee not to support the great strides that both Chambers have made. I encourage Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. OBERSTAR to continue the fine work they have begun with this bill as it moves to conference.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to discuss one of ISTEA’s most vital safety initiatives, the rail-crossing safety program.

Last year, I testified before the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation in support of legislation which I have introduced to change the formula for ISTEA’s rail-crossing safety program which allocates funds to States based on a number of rail-crossing accidents and fatalities.

Although BESTEA does not change the formula by which these funds are distributed, I do want to commend my colleague for increasing by 41 percent funds allocated to the highway rail-crossing safety program in BESTEA.

As this bill moves to conference, I ask my colleague to ensure that that priority funding be maintained.

Sever hundred people are killed, and thousands more injured, every year in the United States as a result of vehicle train collisions at highway-rail grade crossings. Just last week, a resident of Lake Station, Indiana died when a train struck his car at a rail crossing without gates, marked only by stop signs.

Although BESTEA does not change the formula by which these funds are distributed, I do want to commend you for increasing, by 41%, funds allocated to the highway-rail grade crossing safety program in BESTEA. As this bill moves to conference, I ask you to ensure that that priority funding is maintained.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to state that the gentleman has accurately pointed out the importance of this provision, and he certainly has my assurance that we will do everything we can to defend this provision, as we will with every House provision as we go to conference.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman’s concern.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the great strides that both Chambers have made. I encourage Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. OBERSTAR to continue to bring fairness and equity back into transportation funding and spending.

Mr. Chairman, Indiana is known as the crossroad of America. It is nicknamed the crossroad of America not...
only because it connects the people to their communities, but because it is in central America and it connects the east to the west. This bill is an investment in Indiana’s connection to its people, it is an investment to its communities, and it is an investment to the rest of America.

This bill is important because it is about public safety, it is about an investment in our economy, it is about our security. These are very, very important measures that we consider today.

People in La Porte and Michigan City and Rolling Prairie, Indiana, tell me that roads are the single most important issue to many of them; and we must spend money to repair our roads before we spend more and more and more money to repair our cars and our automobiles. This is a prudent investment.

Now, I would say, as complimentary as I am to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETRI), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), they have been fair and judicious, I would encourage them to continue to be fair and judicious in conference; and as we look for offsets in conference, I strongly encourage them not to go into public education.

As shootings go up in our public schools and test scores come down, it is cutting our nose off to spite our face, it is hurting our businesses if we take money out of public education for our children.

Secondly, I want to commend the Chairmen for their addressing the donor State issue for Indiana. Indiana will get close to a billion extra dollars under the 6-year provisions of this bill because of the way the Chairmen have treated donor-state issues. I hope and pray that they continue to hold to those areas and those concerns in conference with respect to Indiana.

Finally, some criticism about the expenditure. China will spend $1 trillion on public investment over a 3-year period. The United States will spend one-third of that over a 6-year period. We need to invest in public safety.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to inform the body that, this being April 1, somebody has sent out a bogus press release from my office saying that I oppose high-priority congressional projects. I just want to make sure that everybody understands this is in the good spirit of April Fool’s Day, and it is not accurate.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that is absolutely astonishing. This is April Fool’s Day, but this is not the time for that sort of thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the most congested and the most dangerous section of Interstate 35 anywhere between Canada and Mexico is in my hometown of Austin, Texas. Correcting the gridlock on Interstate 35 is vital not only for the Central Texas economy but for everyone in this nation that relies on this vital transportation artery. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), and all of the members that have worked so hard to produce this bill.

We have followed their example with a broad regional bipartisan coalition to build demonstrator projects. One of the first projects in this bill is known as State Highway 130. Our work on SH-130 demonstrates the wisdom of the Chairman’s support of demonstration projects. These high-priority projects like SH-130 are a way of assuring that our priorities are addressed by both State and Federal transportation bureaucracies.

These bureaucracies are not the know-all and the be-all on planning transportation. Sometimes the bureaucracy forgets that their actions can crunch people and can crunch neighborhoods as well as numbers.

In the case of SH-130, we have required in this bill a specific route endorsed unanimously by City Council members and commissioners as well as some State legislators. We have also stipulated that that money must be expended solely for the construction of that portion of SH-130 within Travis County and south of U.S. 290.

From the outset, I have supported a bypass for traffic, not a bypass of local community concerns by an unresponsive bureaucratic number-cruncher. Sometimes the bureaucratic number-crunchers forget that their actions can crunch people and can crunch neighborhoods as well as numbers.

I have worked with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on the fine work on H.R. 2400. I believe it is good not only for our Nation but also for the State of Texas that I represent and also for the district that I represent.

BESTEA is the fairest and best bill for donor States such as Texas because it guarantees that each State receives back at least 95 percent of the amount it pays out in gasoline taxes. Transportation funds are imperative for a State as large as Texas, and we need a transportation funding bill that makes sure we will never catch up if we do not keep up.

As a border State, Texas is impacted by large amounts of traffic resulting from trade with Mexico. This high volume of traffic passes through I-69, which runs through the middle of my district. We must make sure that funds are included for trade corridors such as I-69 because NAFTA has so dramatically increased the traffic through Texas. Also, I have worked with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to ensure that inter-modal transportation works.

In addition, I support BESTEA because it recognizes the importance of demonstration projects to solve local transportation problems.

For 5 years now, as a Member of Congress, I have worked with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on a grade separation project; and I am glad to see it in this bill. This project protects the lives of residents and people who work in the Manchester community in East Houston but, again, it is the definitive reason we need demonstration projects on intermodal...
Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for his leadership, and I thank the committee as well. I rise to support H.R. 2400.

Let me point out that, in the 106th congressional an urban district, this legislation will bring our communities together with the funding of hike and bike trails. Many constituents in my district have long asked for such transportation tools.

It is also very important to note that we will be rebuilding our Nation’s infrastructure, the highways, and roads so badly needed. But what is very important to the city of Houston, is the understanding that H.R. 2400 authorizes not only a Houston regional bus plan for final design and construction, and the Houston Advanced Transit program for planning activities, and preliminary engineering.

This allows Houston to look into the options of bus and/or rail. The City of Houston is the fourth largest city in the Nation, with over 1.4 million residents and, as such, must be able to explore all of the transportation options to its residents.

The City experiences frequent traffic congestion. Currently, Houston receives a certain amount for its Better Business Enterprise Program, and has announced a Transportation Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program which, in Chicago, has enabled that city with wise use and efficient transportation systems for Houston.

I am delighted that this bill in its wisdom will allow the City of Houston to consider the options of bus and/or rail. I believe rail is needed in our community. In fact, several transportation options are needed for our city, which is the fourth largest city in the Nation. And or well, it is needed for inner city Houston. This legislation will support such options as rail to be pursued by Houston as the city may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I yield today in support of H.R. 2400 as a modernization of America’s highway and transportation systems for the 21st century. This bill provides for developing the infrastructure that our economy needs to continue its miraculous growth well into the next century.

Transportation is clearly a factor in the development of our economy and will be an element for our continuing economic success in this ever-changing new world order. The modernization and technological advancement of our transportation systems that are contained in this bill are essential to our nation. Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. OBERSTAR as well as all of the members of the committee should be commended for their excellent work.

Our large advanced transportation system unites us and connects even the smallest town with the rest of the world. Transportation and our highways touch every person in this country, it comprises 11 percent of our Gross Domestic Product and makes up one-fifth of the typical American household budget.

However, there are some fundamental problems with how BESTEA will be funded. The ground-breaking balanced budget agreement of last year gave us the guidelines and caps necessary to keep our spending within our revenue. Many of our vital social programs were asked to sacrifice their monies in the name of fiscal restraint. Now we are asked to vote on a bill that exceeds the budget caps by $26 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned as to which programs the Republicans will cut in order to make way for the $26 billion we are asked to spend today. It is imperative that these cuts will not be made by the conference committee at the expense of the disadvantaged, our children and those who do not have the resources to have a lobbying group pressuring that committee.

Another troubling aspect of this bill is the possible amendment to end the Department of Transportation’s disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program. This is a program that for over two decades has been providing equal opportunities for women and minorities competing for highway and transit contracts.

Since its inception, small businesses as well as women and minority-owned construction firms are now participating in building our nation’s highways. Their participation has increased from 1.9 percent in 1978 to 14.8 percent in 1996. By reaching out to and fostering new business relationships, this program has countered the effects of discrimination and good old boy networks which had been roadblocks for many years.

These facts were recognized by the Senate as it voted to preserve this 15-year-old program as we should also. We all wish that we lived in a world that was free from discrimination, but we don’t. But, this program is not about quotas or set-asides as some members want to characterize it. The statute only relies on flexible goals.

The program also complies completely within the “strict scrutiny” standard of the Supreme Court decision in Adarand. The Department of Transportation has recently published proposed rule changes in response to that standard. There is clearly a compelling government interest in preventing past employment discrimination in DOT-assisted contracting. Minority-owned construction firms represent about 9 percent of all such firms and receive only about 5 percent of construction receipts. The 10 percent national goal is constitutional, good policy and still necessary. BESTEA with it is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I am a part of a state delegation that will be getting back less than they will be paying in our taxes. Texas will be getting more than $1.7 billion in formula distributions and over $216 million in demonstration projects with this bill. However, Texans will be getting back only about 90 cents on the dollar, but I understand the needs of the other states. For my part, Houston will benefit from a rail system and Bus Program and has received such funds for a rail system.

Chairman, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for his leadership, and I thank the committee as well. I rise to support H.R. 2400. As the fourth largest city in the country, it is appropriate that we consider light rail as a substitute for using our streets and highways.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill with these exceptions. We need to continue the effective and efficient transportation system that this bill provides for the betterment of all Americans.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the end of a very long and productive general debate period when we have heard fulsome praise for this legislation from all sectors of this country, all spectrums of our society, from urban and suburban and exurban and rural America, from coastal and border America, from all spectrums, all aspects of the economic slices of our country.

It has been very encouraging to see the enormous outsourcing of support from Members across the body for a truly visionary piece of legislation. It does, indeed, do all these things that all of our colleagues have praised the legislation for.

I have a few things of my own that are very special to me. We continue the Rails to Trails Program, continue the Bicycling and Pedestrian Walkways Program that has made it possible for more than 10 million Americans to buy bicycles, become bicyclists.

I am an avid cyclist myself. I have pedaled over 2,100 miles on the open road last year. I want to see more people using bike to commute from home to work, as is done in Chicago. We preserve and continue the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program which, in Chicago, has enabled that city with wise use and wise investment of those dollars to improve its Air Quality Index over 15 percent in the 6 years of ISTEA.

We continue the Scenic America Program with the Scenic Byways Program that was initiated in ISTEA, again stimulating the tourism travel sector of our economy, which is nearly a $400 billion sector of our economy, one that generates a $20 billion balance of payments for this country, inbound tourism expenditures here over what Americans spend traveling abroad.
We will initiate in this legislation when it is finally enacted a very important part of our Welfare to Work Program that was passed in the last Congress. It is very hard to get people to jobs if they do not have the means to get to the places where the jobs are located.

My middle daughter, Annie, works in Jubilee Jobs in the Adams Morgan area of Washington, D.C., trying to place people from the homeless shelters, those who have fallen from the welfare net into a black economic and black community of Northeast/Northwest Washington. The biggest single problem she faces with her clients is getting them to and from their job.

This innovative experimental program, pilot program, will help cities across this country do there what Chicago has done in its city with a program of welfare to work, provide means of transportation for those who need to get to the places where the jobs are located.

All in all, all told, this is the bill that the visionaries of 1996 could not have foreseen. This is a bill that the Members of this Congress who stand on their shoulders, who look into the future have said to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), this bill will be an everlasting legacy of his service in this Congress. I hope he will serve many more years. But whatever those years, this will be his greatest achievement and the greatest legacy that we could leave to future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his great leadership and perseverance, intelligence and experience, the staff would not have been able to accomplish everything they did.

That staff and those who have contributed much include Roger Nobe, Debbie Gebhardt, Chris Bertram, Susan Lent, Adam Tsao, Darrell Wilson, Bill Hughes, Linda Scott, Patricia Law, and Mary Beth Will.

Certainly, the Members on the other side of the aisle equally stand shoulder to shoulder to recognize the staff on both sides, because, indeed, this is a joint staff working together for the betterment of our country.

Let me close by focusing on the two fundamental principles that we started out with in this debate today, the first fundamental principle being that this legislation puts the trust back in the Transportation Trust Fund. It is honest budgeting.

It says that the 18.4 cents gasoline tax that the Americans pay in the related transportation taxes, the revenue, and only that revenue, will be spent from the Trust Fund to rebuild America's infrastructure.

Indeed, there can be no deficit financing here. The money must be there. It is the most fiscally responsible kind of Federal spending we can have. With only spend the revenue that comes in. Indeed, as part of our agreement, we have agreed to forgo the interest on the balance in the Trust Fund, which means the national debt will be reduced by close to $15 billion over the life of the bill.

Beyond that, we have agreed to turn back $9 billion in the Transportation Trust Fund. So between the foregone interest and the $10 billion that we will turn back, it adds up to approximately $25 billion reduction in the national debt, real dollars, real reduction in the national debt. That $25 billion approximates the increased spending in this legislation.

The second fundamental principle is that we begin to meet the transportation needs of America. Our highways are in poor condition. There are 42,000 people killed on them every year, and 9,000 of those being killed are kids. In 1996 alone, about 12,000 to 13,000 are attributed to bad roads, which means we will be saving lives. I am told, over the life of this bill, we will be able to reduce fatalities by about 4,000 lives a year.

Beyond that, in addition to provide an economic stimulus, increase productivity, jobs, have tremendous support from all sectors of the country. The 50 governors, the cities, the counties, the environmentalists, safety leaders, labor, Chamber of Commerce, AAAAs, this bill has extraordinarily broad support. It is good for America. It puts honesty in budgeting. We spend only the revenue that comes into the bill.

For all those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that we are bringing to the floor, because we will rebuild America as we move into the 21st Century.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and PETRI as well as Ranking Democratic Members OBERSTAR and RAHALL for their cooperation in bringing a Research Title to the floor which incorporates most of the significant research and development provisions from H.R. 860 as reported by the House Committee. I believe our cooperative efforts of the past have contributed significantly to strengthening the Department of Transportation's surface transportation research and development portfolio, and I am equally convinced that our efforts during 1997 and 1998 will make these research programs to the next level.

I also appreciate the Transportation Committee's willingness to keep the dialog going in the areas in which we could not reach final agreement and their willingness to consider our few remaining concerns in the context of the upcoming conference with the Senate. I am convinced that this approach will lead to a unified House position in these negotiations and a stronger final product for the President to sign.

At this point, I would like to point out a number of the provisions of H.R. 860 which can be found in the Manager's Amendment. The provisions were crafted in a cooperative and bipartisan fashion by members of the Science Committee. First, the amendment includes H.R. 860's "Sense of Congress" that the Department of Transportation should place a high priority on addressing the Year 2000 problem in all of its computer and information systems. The amendment includes provisions from H.R. 860 to expand the Department's Research and Technology program to include: testing and evaluation of bridge, concrete and pavement structures; environmental research; human factors research; research on the use of recycled materials such as paper and plastic; the enforcement of the use of life testing for implementing life-cycle cost assessment; and standardized estimates of useful life for advanced materials.

Provisions from H.R. 860 are included in the amendment to commission a study by the National Academy of Sciences regarding the need for a new Strategic Highway Research Program or similar effort and to require the Department to establish a strategic planning process for surface transportation R&D. The Amendment further requires the plan to be consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. A surface Transportation-Environment Cooperative Research Program designed to provide State and local transportation officials with the tools and knowledge necessary to better understand the impacts of transportation decisions is also included in the amendment. Finally, the amendment includes small changes to the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) provisions of the bill to expand the goals of the program and to extend the research activities of the program to include factors research on the science of the driving process; the effects of cold climates on ITS; and magnetism.

Again, I wish to thank my colleagues on the Transportation Committee for their cooperation and I look forward to working with them in Conference. The remainder of my statement reflects the views of the Committee on Science on the legislation.

The Committee on Science, for almost twenty years, has worked closely with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to craft transportation research and development authorizing legislation. Our tradition, rather than to enact separate transportation research and development legislation, has been to write our own legislation and then to work out our differences with the other Committee prior to House floor consideration of transportation measures. In 1991, Congress Norman Mineta, who was both a member of our Committee and Chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, offered our compromise legislation during the Transportation Committee markup. This year our Committee agreed that the Managers Amendment on the House Floor would be the appropriate time to merge our work product, H.R. 860—
the Surface Transportation Research and Development Act of 1997 as reported by the Committee on Science, with the bill HR 2400—the Building Efficient Surface Transportation Equity Act of 1998 which is before us today.

The Science Committee is pleased the Manager's Amendment to H.R. 2400 includes a provision from H.R. 860 expressing the sense of Congress that the Department of Transportation should give high priority to correcting the Year 2000 problem in all of its computer systems to ensure effective operation in the Year 2000 and beyond. The Department needs to develop a plan and a budget to correct the problem for its mission-critical programs. Currently, the Department has only fixed 23 percent of its mission critical systems. The Department also needs to begin consideration of contingency plans, in the event that certain systems are unable to be corrected in time.

The Committee believes Congress should continue to take a leadership role in raising awareness about the issue with both government and the private sector. The potential impact on the Department's programs, if the Year 2000 problem is not corrected in an effective and timely manner, is substantial and potentially serious. It is imperative that such corrective action be taken to avert disruption to critical programs.

The Committee is pleased the Amendment includes important provisions from H.R. 860 which seeks to improve the performance of the federal investment in surface transportation research by requiring the Secretary to establish a needs-based strategy and planning process consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. The strategic planning process will address deficiencies in the current program, as identified by the General Accounting Office, Transportation Research Board, and other transportation research and development stakeholders, by setting a strategic direction, defining national priorities, coordinating federal efforts and evaluating the impact of the federal investment in surface transportation R&D. As envisioned by the Results Act, a strategic plan will be developed that include roadmaps, benchmarks, and comment from industry, the National Research Council and other advisory boards. The plan will be submitted to Congress within one year after enactment and updated as required by the Results Act.

H.R. 2400, as amended by the Manager's Amendment, includes language to reauthorize the Department's Highway Research and Development Act of 1997 as reported by the Committee on Science, with the bill HR 2400—the Building Efficient Surface Transportation Equity Act of 1998 which is before us today.

The Science Committee is pleased the Manager's Amendment to H.R. 2400 includes a provision from H.R. 860 requiring the Department to include in the advanced research program: (1) diagnostic tests for evaluating the condition of bridge and pavement structures to enable the assessment of risks of failure, including from seismic activity, vibration and weather; environmental research which may include among other things development of environmentally safe coatings for surface transportation infrastructure; and human factors research including the prediction of the response of current and future travelers to new technologies. In addition, the Committee believes that destructive testing simulating seismic activity, vibration and weather on certain bridges and pavement structures that are in the process of being replaced offers the potential to improve methods of structure design, construction and rehabilitation.

The Amendment further requires the Department's Highway R&D Program to include a program to strengthen and expand surface transportation infrastructure research and development. The program is required to include testing to improve the life of bridge structures, including tests simulating seismic activity, vibration and weather; research on the use of recycled materials, such as paper and plastic fiber reinforcement systems; expansion of knowledge of implementing life cycle cost assessment, including establishing the appropriate analysis period and discount rates, learning how to value and properly consider user costs, determining trade-off between reconstruction and rehabilitation, and establishing methodologies for balancing higher initial costs of new technologies and improved or advanced materials over the long term maintenance costs; and standardizing estimates of useful life under various conditions for advanced materials of use in surface transportation, developed in conjunction with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and other appropriate government agencies.

The Science Committee is especially interested in utilizing the R&D program to both save money and make sure that innovations penetrated the marketplace. Similarly, the Committee notes that the science community is very little follow-on to the experiments to date in alternatives to low-cost bidder contracting and feels the more that can be done to increase the knowledge base associated with contracting alternatives, the easier it will be to justify innovations in highway construction. In addition, the Committee supports research on the use of recycled materials such as paper and plastic fiber reinforcement systems. Research in this area indicates that technically equivalent recycled plastics are potentially much cheaper than the expensive welded fabric, which is becoming known added to standard concrete for crack control.

The Science Committee is pleased the Amendment includes a provision from H.R. 860 to commission a study to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences regarding the need for a new Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP) or similar effort. The original SHRP program has yielded over 100 pavement products that combines to save our nation over $690 million per year in highway operations and maintenance costs. The legislation requires the study to include a research technology transfer activities designed to improve the safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of the surface transportation system. The amendment includes provisions from H.R. 860 requiring the Department to include in the advanced research program: (1) diagnostic tests for evaluating the condition of bridge and pavement structures to enable the assessment of risks of failure, including from seismic activity, vibration and weather; environmental research which may include among other things development of environmentally safe coatings for surface transportation infrastructure; and human factors research including the prediction of the response of current and future travelers to new technologies. In addition, the Committee intends to require any additional reporting from the States. Its purpose is simply to provide a more accurate accounting of each state's surface transportation research and development activities. Currently, it is difficult to track research or to separate it from other permitted uses of funding through this program.

The Science Committee concurs with H.R. 2400's provisions to reauthorize the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP). LTAP improves access to surface transportation technology and serves as the primary channel through which innovative transportation technology and training are delivered to both urban and rural communities. The Manager's Amendment includes language from H.R. 860 to add concrete to the road and transportation areas of which the LTAP is to expand the knowledge and expertise of rural and local transportation agencies. Concrete is an area where substantial knowledge in the research community has not adequately filtered down to the working level and where universities who train the engineers and other experts involved in highway construction have a major contribution to make in solving the technology transfer problem. For instance, the Committee would like to see the development of partnerships among state Departments of Transportation, industry, and associations to address educational and training needs, to provide testing services and cooperative research, to demonstrate new technologies and product applications, and to link architects, engineers, and contractors to speed adoption of industry advancements for commercial benefit to the surface transportation industry, including the area of concrete materials.

Other provisions from H.R. 860 have also been included in the amendment to expand LTAP's modern highway technology to include implementing life-cycle costs assessment and standardized assessments of useful life under various conditions for advanced materials. The Committee understands that one of the impediments to rapid deployment of advanced materials in local high construction projects is the difficulty of estimating the contributions these materials can make to reducing life costs of roads, bridges and highway structures. The Committee feels a research program geared to understanding the likely useful life of these materials under a variety of conditions will decrease uncertainties associated with innovation and increase the comfort level of local officials as well as their willingness to buy new products.

The Committee is pleased H.R. 2400 includes provisions from H.R. 860 reauthorizing both The Dwight David Eisenhower Transportation Fellowship Program and the National Technical Training Institute. The Fellowship Program continues to attract qualified students to the field of transportation research to assist in developing the professional workforce necessary to face future transportation challenges. The National Highway Institute (NHI) continues to provide education and training to Federal, State and local transportation agencies in proactive effort to apply state of the art transportation technologies emanating from the Department's R&D programs. The NHI is the leading resource within the Department for providing high quality comprehensive education and training to meet the needs of transportation professionals at all levels of the Federal, State and local government, as well as industry.
The Committee recognizes the UTC Program has been shown to be an effective means of advancing transportation technology and expertise and believes that one of the program’s strengths is directly related to the fact that most ITS test beds are competitive, stimulating a high degree of continuous improvement raising the quality of the entire program. H.R. 860 requires participation in the UTC program on a peer-reviewed, competitive basis. H.R. 2400 allows all participants that receive fiscal Year Twenty-Two funds to automatically be awarded participation in the UTC program for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999. However, the Science Committee is pleased that, beginning in Fiscal Year 2000, participation in the UTC program will be based on competitive processes for at least the institutions participating in the program.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure did not decide to include specific legislative authority for awarding grants to researchers at primarily undergraduate institutions which involve undergraduate students in their transportation research. These schools are a major source of professional capacity for the surface transportation industry and we feel that when these engineers are acquainted with the purposes and practice of research during their university training that they will be more sensitive to innovative ideas throughout their careers. We note that it is within the power of the Department of Transportation to increase its efforts to promote undergraduate research and we urge the Department to do so.

The Science Committee is pleased that the Manager’s Amendment includes the Surface Transportation-Environment Cooperative Research Program (STECRP). This program was included to address the need for information which will assist transportation planners at the Federal, State, and local levels. They require information about the interrelationships between factors such as demographic change, land-use planning, and transportation system design that influence the demand for transportation. By creating the STECRP, the Committee ensures there will be a program in place to gather and disseminate this information to the individuals charged with the responsibility for making these decisions.

The Committee recognizes there is a perception by low-income and minority communities that they are disproportionately impacted by some transportation projects and that they derive fewer benefits from transportation expenditures. Federal and state laws currently require the social and economic impacts of transportation projects be assessed. The Committee feels these debates can best be resolved by doing rigorous studies designed to examine the nature of the relationship between transportation investments and community development. Research in this area, which is sometimes referred to as environmental justice, is eligible for funding under the STECRP.

The Committee recognizes that many communities have utilized funds available under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program to improve or construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities that will assist transportation planners at all levels. Funds for either operational tests or deployments carried out in compliance with this part of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program is eligible for funding under the STECRP. The Committee recognizes that the STECRP Program is one of the few areas where the Federal, State, and local levels in their efforts to build upon the preliminary work done by the Committee for purposes of floor consideration to work out all of our differences.

The Committee expects the advisory board to build upon the preliminary work done by the participants in the two conferences held to identify critical transportation environmental research needs in 1991 and 1996 published in Transportation Research Record: Circulars 389, 454, 469 and 469 in developing their recommendations. These documents identify the type of research needs this program is intended to fulfill.

The Intelligent Transportation Systems program is an area where the Committee on Science and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure did not have time before floor consideration to work out all of our differences. Therefore, the Committee on Science was willing to yield to the suggested text of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees which will be useful in facilitating the assurance that the provisions of H.R. 860 would be given due consideration as our Committees jointly conference with the Senate and work on a final version of the ITS section of this legislation.

The Committee’s concerns regarding ITS are straightforward. There are already examples of orphan ITS systems across the country paid for at taxpayer expense using protocols which are incompatible with other systems and with standards which were developed after the ITS system was deployed. There are also concerns where some of the ITS systems already installed are not compatible with others. We are concerned that this is a growing problem. The Administration’s proposal for ITS takes a sharp swing towards demonstrations and implementation of ITS systems and away from research and standardization. This approach places the cart before the horse. Further haste in deployment will waste even more tax dollars. We would rather defer the deployment of systems a little longer than to pay for both initial deployment and the subsequent retrofit of these systems to permit interoperability with future systems built subsequently in conformance with national standards.

The Committee recognizes that adequate emphasis be placed on operational tests which will provide information needed to finalize the standards rather than on deployments which may later be incompatible with the standards. The Committee recognizes that there is a need to conduct research and development on energy use and air quality as it relates to surface transportation efficiency. Research in this area may include new and innovative fuel technologies, such as biodiesel fuel, that enables recycled and renewable resources to be used as fuel. Biodiesel fuel, a renewable fuel product made using virgin soybean oil, may potentially help the U.S. achieve cleaner air and greater energy independence.

The Committee expects the advisory board to build upon the preliminary work done by the participants in the two conferences held to identify critical transportation environmental research needs in 1991 and 1996 published in Transportation Research Record: Circulars 389, 454, 469 and 469 in developing their recommendations. These documents identify the type of research needs this program is intended to fulfill.

The Intelligent Transportation Systems program is an area where the Committee on Science and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure did not have time before floor consideration to work out all of our differences. Therefore, the Committee on Science was willing to yield to the suggested text of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees which will be useful in facilitating the assurance that the provisions of H.R. 860 would be given due consideration as our Committees jointly conference with the Senate and work on a final version of the ITS section of this legislation.
on human factors research, including research into the science of the driving process, to improve the operational efficiency and safety of intelligent transportation systems; research conducted on environmental, weather, and natural conditions that impact intelligent transportation systems, including effects of cold climates. We feel advanced traffic management technologies will be such a fundamental shift in the use of motor vehicles that basic research to increase our understanding of the driving process, is in order. We are concerned that the ITS needs of cold climates, will be significantly different than those in other regions of the country and that the potential impact on ITS of natural phenomena such as earthquakes needs to be understood better. We also feel that magnetics will have major roles to play in advanced systems where cars will travel at rapid speeds at close differential.

Additionally, although not specifically referenced in H.R. 2400, the Committee supports research on new advanced ITS systems designed to reduce congestion, enhance safety and improve cost effectiveness. The Committee does not support revising the Automated Highway Systems, but endorses continuing advanced research on traffic technologies which may include information technologies such as Active Response Geographical Information Systems used to facilitate effective transportation decision-making, and advanced traffic management technologies, including the use of fiber optic cable and video, to monitor and control traffic control and volume.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, given all the stories in the papers about “pork,” the transportation bill, I rise today to tell you about a transportation project that I believe will benefit hundreds of thousands of schoolchildren and adults alike in the great State of Illinois and which I am proud to sponsor.

The Museum Campus Chicago, which is in my district, is made up of three world-famous institutions: the Adler Planetarium and Astronomy Museum, the Field Museum of Natural History, and the John G. Shedd Aquarium.

The Museum Campus has a plan to transport visitors to these cultural destinations and others along the lake in Chicago on free trolleys powered by ethanol. This is a worthy, environmentally beneficial project that will be enjoyed by literally millions of people. And I and others in the Illinois delegation believe it is exactly the type of local project that merits Federal “BESTEA” start-up funding in order to get it off the ground.

The Chicago Museum Campus was just created through the $92 million relocation of Lake Shore Drive, a major thoroughfare running along Lake Michigan. The Museum Campus, which is on Park District land, opens officially this June. It totals 57 acres, including 10 new acres of public parkland that allow a continuous link between the three museums, which, Mr. Speaker, already draw an average of 3 million visitors a year. The Museum Campus will offer outdoor exhibits and is expected to attract an additional 1 million visitors a year to the Chicago lakefront. It is expected to be one of the country’s most popular destinations.

Still, while we are excited about the reopening of Lake Shore Drive, they came to me because they have serious access problems that could reduce visitation. I am speaking of problems like the loss of several hundred parking spaces due to the Lake Shore Drive relocation, the long distances between the three institutions and to area parking lots, competition for parking with Soldier Field patrons, and inadequate links to local public transportation. All these obstacles make visits by the elderly, by the handicapped and by families with young children very difficult and frustrating.

It is for these reasons, that I and several of my colleagues in the Chicago delegation—and our colleagues in the Senate—hope to secure funding for a Museum Campus Transportation Project, which would largely eliminate the access problems while increasing public awareness of ethanol as a fuel choice. The project has two components. The first—free Museum Campus and Chicago Lakefront shuttle service—was recommended in a recent Lakefront Transportation Study. The Museum Campus took the report’s advice and launched a free trolley service last summer on a pilot basis. The trolleys were very popular—they shuttled more than 300,000 visitors, up to 6,000 people a day, between the museums and parking lots!

Besides being free and reducing people’s stress levels, the trolleys also reduced traffic congestion, and noise and air pollution. I think there’s no argument about the benefits of these trolleys.

I am pleased to join with several of my colleagues to seek BESTEA funds for the Museum Campus Transportation Project to establish a permanent Museum Campus shuttle system using ethanol-powered trolleys and to extend shuttle service along the Lakefront to other cultural destinations. Stops along the Lakefront Shuttle route would include the Art Institute, the Museum of Contemporary Art, the Chicago Cultural Center, the Spertus Museum, the Grant Park Festival Center, the Children’s Museum at Navy Pier, Columbia College, and Roosevelt and DePaul universities.

The second component of the Museum Campus Transportation Project is the creation of an intermodal transportation center at the Chicago and Roosevelt Road, which is also endorsed by the City’s Lakefront Transportation Study. This center would connect the trolley route to bus routes, the CTA and Metra stations—the local elevated train and subway—and to pedestrian walkways. It would also include construction of an 850-car decked parking garage nearby. Mr. Speaker, the intermodal transportation center will provide easier access to the Museum Campus and to other lakefront offerings for all visitors using all forms of transportation.

The Museum Campus and its private partners intend to run the shuttle systems in the future. They will raise the necessary funds through private contributions, increased museum entrance fees, projected parking fees and city funds.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will agree that this project is the type of project that we at the Federal level are happy to lend a helping hand to. It makes good economic sense, good environmental sense, and is an investment in the thousands of children and others who want to experience and learn from Chicago’s many cultural institutions. This Sunday afternoon, the Museum Campus is holding an open house for members of the Illinois delegation. I invite you and others in this Body to come visit the Field, the Shedd and the Adler and see why I believe in this project.
Sword of Damocles over the heads of our children and grandchildren.

Like many other Members, I cannot help but be impressed by what H.R. 2400 could do in the short term for my state and locally. Not only that but I like the idea of taking the Highway Trust Fund, which BESTEA would accomplish. However, last year’s balanced budget agreement, which BESTEA would shred, provides for a 20% increase in surface transportation spending which should be sufficient to fund the most pressing infrastructure needs. The most obvious of these demonstration projects. Moreover, the sanctity of the Highway Trust Fund can be restored by reducing gas taxes to the level of annual appropriations rather than by increasing spending so as to consume all of those revenues.

Furthermore, enactment of H.R. 2400 would appear to be entirely inconsistent with the nets of fiscal responsibility and restraint to which the majority in this Congress has here-tofore adhered. To many, it might smack of hypocrisy.

For all those reasons, I find myself obliged to oppose this edition of BESTEA. While it is possible that some of its excesses might be addressed in conference, there is no assurance that they will be corrected or that others will not. Thus, I believe the best way yet, approved by the House, is in keeping with the balanced budget agreement. Granted, that will not be easy and could take some time, but far better than the alternative. Believe me, our children and grandchildren will thank us for looking beyond our immediate interests to their prospects as well.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. I rise today in support of H.R. 2400. I commend Chairman SHUSTER for his hard work in constructing a bill that recognizes that the nation’s transportation infrastructure is in serious disrepair and that projects are in danger of being missed entirely.

The statistics speak for themselves. The number of people killed on our nation’s highways has risen to 42,000 a year. Every 13 minutes someone loses their life on our nation’s highways. Many of these deaths are the result of road and bridge conditions that are shameful.

We have a perfect example of this in my home state of Oklahoma. There is a cross-town bridge in Oklahoma City that is in a serious state of deterioration—so serious, in fact, that the Oklahoma Department of Transportation has to examine the structure every 6 months and has to spend over $300,000 a year in patchwork repairs.

Now, that’s not a mistake. This is not a local highway. This is a stretch of Interstate 40—a major, national East-West corridor that connects in Oklahoma City with two other Interstates which connect traffic from Mexico to Canada and from coast to coast. This cross-town bridge carries more than 100,000 vehicles a day, and over 60% of the truck traffic is from outside of Oklahoma.

With H.R. 2400, the critical repairs can finally begin on this important national highway. An accident-waiting-to-happen can be reconstructed into a safe, modern highway, and as a public official who is responsible for public safety, I can tell you that this gives me a great sense of relief.

I also want to commend the Chairman for returning “trust” to the “trust fund” in this legislation. It is time that the gas taxes paid by our constituents for highway maintenance and construction be directed to repairing and building safer highways for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2400 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act. I do so because it is imperative that Congress rectify the longstanding shortfall in transportation funds received by Michigan.

For as long as I served in the House and longer, my state of Michigan has been a donor state. Along with other donor states, Michigan has received far less than our fair share of transportation funding, averaging just 85 cents for every dollar we send to the federal government. Over the last 15 months, I have worked with the Michigan Delegation, Chairman SHUSTER, Representative OBERSTAR and others to address this longstanding injustice. I believe the bill before us today represents the only available vehicle to bring about a fairer deal for donor states. Under this bill, Michigan’s annual highway funding would rise to $872.3 million a year. That’s an increase of $358 million a year over what Michigan received under the 1991 ISTEA law. The basic formula remains inequitable; Michigan would remain a donor state. But at least this legislation is a step in the right direction.

At the same time, I want to reiterate my chagrin over the failure of the Majority in the House to put together a budget resolution which would make clear how this bill would fit into the overall budget. Where is the Majority’s budget resolution? Simply put, this process puts the cart before the horse. This bill is silent on the issue of spending offsets to pay for the increased funding of transportation needs. We cannot just pave over the commitment we made last year to live within the framework of a balanced budget. When 214 of us voted last year to support the Shuster/Oberstar amendment, we were saying: Yes, we need to spend more on infrastructure. Yes, more money has to be made available to donor states. The differential funding for donor states is not equitable. But this legislation is silent on this issue.

The Republican Leadership in the House is abdicating fiscal responsibility by continuing to delay a vote on the budget resolution. Unless Congress passes a balanced budget act as soon as possible, States are now operating under the short-term “Surface Transportation Extension Act” which expires on May 1, 1998. After that date, there will be no transportation funding available to the states. Most transportation programs will be completely shut down or severely curtailed. Northern states like Michigan are hit even harder. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2400. This legislation is extremely important to the State of Idaho and its citizens. This legislation addresses this longstanding injustice. I believe the House will vote this week on H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1997” (BESTEA). The passage of a new surface transportation act is extremely important to the State of Idaho and its citizens. I want to convey to you our thoughts on this critical vote.

First, we believe you should vote for the passage of BESTEA for two reasons: BESTEA provides a significantly higher level of funding for surface transportation program as compared to the level provided under the now expired Interstate Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). The House bill authorizes $218.3 billion in transportation funding over a six-year period, an increase of more than 40% over the ISTEA levels.

It is very important that Congress passes a new surface transportation act as soon as possible. States are now operating under the short-term “Surface Transportation Extension Act” which expires on May 1, 1998. After that date, there will be no transportation funding available to the states. Most transportation programs will be completely shut down or severely curtailed. Northern states like Michigan are hit even harder.

Secondly, we have the following major objection to the content of the House bill which should be corrected in Conference Committee with the Senate: The highway program formulas used to apportion funds to the states under BESTEA do not fairly and equitably address the needs or characteristics of rural states. An overview is placed on factors that favor urbanized states such as population, contributions to the Highway Trust Fund and total public road mileage. Urban highway miles and vehicle miles-of-travel are double counted while those in rural areas are not. Local road mileage and traffic are used as factors in determining the distribution of funds for the Interstate and National Highway System programs which are both strictly national and federal in character and use.

If you have any questions concerning the Transportation Department’s position on H.R. 2400, please don’t hesitate to call me at (202) 334-8807.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT M. BOWER, Director

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in reluctant opposition to HR 2400, the
Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act (BESTEA). Quite simply, this bill is too much of a good thing. Infrastructure funding is critical for the economic future of our nation, but this bill goes too far and in doing so breaks the bi-partisan balanced budget agreement of last year. We should be debating an incremental increase in funding and not have this debate as the first item on the agenda. This month we have a balanced budget for the first time in 30 years and today the House is being asked to pass a spending bill which blows a $40 billion hole in the budget.

Clearly, our states have transportation needs that are significantly underfunded and I agree that we should be increasing federal funding for transportation. For my home state of Florida, this bill does help address the fundamental inequities in the current funding formula. Under current law, Florida receives an average of 45 cents per dollar sent to Washington in gasoline taxes. BESTEA would increase this return to roughly 87 cents on the dollar. I commend the Chairman and Ranking Member for their commitment to addressing this issue and I urge them to continue to work on a fairer funding formula to ensure that every state receives its fair share of transportation dollars.

Mr. Chairman, despite this improvement in the funding formula and the fact that this bill funds many worthwhile and important transportation projects, I oppose it based on the overall levels of funding. I believe we can and must find a way to increase transportation funding without abandoning fiscal responsibility. This bill does not offset the increases in spending, leaving it only to a promise of future, unidentified cuts in other programs. Furthermore, the overall levels of funding under this bill set up a fiscal train wreck in the coming years as Congress will have to make massive cuts in other domestic priorities to maintain a balanced budget.

When I ran for a seat in Congress, I was skeptical that this body had the fiscal restraint to balance the budget. This past year, I had hope that things had changed. We worked together to pass a tough balanced budget act in a bi-partisan manner and proved to the American people that we were serious about ending decades of deficit spending. Now, no sooner than the Congressional Budget Office has certified that we have balanced the budget with the possibility of surpluses for the near future, Congress is rushing out to spend tens of billions of dollars that we simply do not have.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reaffirm this Congress’s commitment to fiscal responsibility and vote no on HR 2400.

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficiency and Surface Transportation and Equity Act (BESTEA). This legislation provides a total of over $218.3 billion over six years for federal highway and transit programs. This funding is much needed and overdue, and will provide Americans with a stronger transportation infrastructure.

The effects of BESTEA are clear. It will save lives by improving the safety of our highways, and will improve the environment by emphasizing mass transit, the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ), and non-motorized uses such as bike trails. The First Congressional District of Colorado is one of the top ten fastest growing metropolex areas in the country and has witnessed unprecedented demands on its transportation system. It is not come from important investments in transportation has never been greater for Denver metropolitan area. This legislation will address these needs, laying a sound foundation for federal-local partnership.

However, I believe that the offsets for BESTEA are not come from important domestic programs, such as education, environment or health care. Therefore, I will oppose efforts which seek to sacrifice the progress this country has made to improve the quality of life. Congress needs to work in a bipartisan manner to ensure that these offsets are fair and appropriate.

Mr. BLIBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my appreciation to Chairman Buhl and express my strong support for the provisions in H.R. 2400 that promote the use of clean fuel vehicles and technology in this country. This bill provides an incentive which allows consumers greater opportunity to travel in environmentally sound modes of transportation. The CMAQ research and development, bus and facility grant provisions of H.R. 2400 are examples of the Committee’s effort to begin coordinating federal transportation policy with federal environmental policy. Giving states the opportunity to allow an electric vehicle with fewer than two occupants to operate in an high occupancy vehicle lane is yet another example.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, promoting policies which improve our air quality is a subject near and dear to my heart. As a former mayor, county supervisor, member of my regional air resources board, and member of our county mass transit authority, I understand the difficulties local governments and the private sector face in meeting federal mandates. I saw first hand how the federal government subsidized polluting fuels, while at the same time heavily regulating small businesses over their emissions. Local governments, and consumer vehicles have stepped up to the plate. It’s time the Federal government do its share.

How many times have you been driving down the street and saw black smoke belching out of a bus and that black soot entering into the air? Ninety percent of all bus purchases are paid for with federal dollars. While the federal government has been paying for these polluting vehicles, small companies, local governments and the private sector have been reducing their emissions levels, often times under the threat of severe punitive action. It’s time that the federal government lead by example and operate under the same set of clean air rules we require of everyone else.

Yesterday, I testified before the Rules Committee in order to offer an amendment which would have phased out the spending of federal dollars in this bill on polluting fuels in mass transit. This amendment would have simply required that any federal funds in the bill which were to be spent on mass transit vehicles must be spent on technologies which meet EPA’s definition of clean fuel technology. This amendment would not have been retroactive, and would have only applied to future vehicle purchases. Unfortunately this amend-
Both of these projects are essential in meeting the increasing demands in these rapidly growing and developing areas. Further, as priorities of the state transportation officials, these projects are in the state’s long range plan and are thereby assured of receiving the requisite state matching funds.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation represents a balanced blue print for renewing America’s highway infrastructure and safety needs over the next six years. I am confident that the funding commitments of the bill will remain within our balanced budget structure, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act. I commend Chairman and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for their work in crafting legislation that meets the transportation needs of this nation.

For the last six years Alabama has received an average of $330 billion per year for transportation projects. If this bill becomes law, Alabama will receive $552 billion per year. This will mean a 67% increase and brings a level of fairness for Alabama since we have been getting the short end of the stick on transportation funding. Fairness in this process is crucial to our economy and infrastructure development.

However, I am most pleased with the creation of a specific category for the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) for the first time. The Fourth Congressional District of Alabama contains very few miles of four lane highways. Unfortunately, the Interstate Highway System did not include a route to connect Birmingham, Alabama with Memphis, Tennessee. This is an unacceptable omission from the Interstate Highway System. Thankfully, the Appalachian Development Highway System includes Corridor X which will connect these two cities, and runs through North Alabama. In addition, the system includes Corridor V which connects with Corridor X. This bill runs through Alabama to Chattanooga, Tennessee is part of the Appalachian Development Highway System.

Category funding for the Appalachian Development Highway System is crucial to the completion of these two highways. Traditionally, the Appalachian Development Highway System has had to rely on the annual appropriations process. Corridor X and Corridor V fared well in some years, but other years they received little, if any funds.

This made it difficult for long term planning and has needlessly delayed completion of both highways. In fact the Appalachian Development Highway System is only 78% complete while the Interstate Highway System is 95% complete.

Category funding ensures a stable source of funding that will complete the corridors in Alabama and throughout the thirteen states of Appalachia. I urge all Members to move this bill to Conference so we can complete this project in a reasonable time frame.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act. This bill authorizes highway, mass transit and highway safety programs for six years. By passing this legislation we will be renewing our commitment to investing in America’s infrastructure.

Our infrastructure is crumbling around us. In my home State of Illinois, for example, a quarter of all the bridges are structurally deficient. Forty-three percent of road in Illinois are in poor or mediocre condition. Driving on these roads costs Illinois motorists $1 billion a year in extra vehicle operating costs. That is $144 extra for every vehicle owner. As we enter the next millennium, we cannot allow our nation’s infrastructure to languish in the past. We have ignored these problems for too long.

As a Member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee which crafted this bill, I know this bill is a solid piece of legislation. H.R. 2400 will enable us to bring our transportation needs into the 21st Century. Under this bill, highways and transit systems will operate more efficiently. People and goods will travel more safely because of the highway safety programs and initiatives under this bill. I will promote a cleaner environment and decrease the red tape associated with environmental regulations.

I recognize that many have criticized the high priority projects included in this bill. They call these projects “pork.” However, I would like to clarify that these projects are included only after consulting with local elected officials, local highway departments and state departments of transportation about the transportation needs of the region. I would like to express the need to control the localities. That is exactly what these high priority projects are all about. The local governments know what their transportation priorities are. By including funding for local highway projects in H.R. 2400, we are allowing local and regional officials to decide on and meet their own transportation needs. Further, the authorization for high priority projects is only 5 percent of the total funding in the bill. No programs in the bill are compromised at the expense of including high priority projects.

In my district in Southwestern Illinois these projects are critical to meet the transportation needs of many communities. For example, the Metrolink Light rail system provides a vital transportation link for commuters and travelers in the St. Louis-MetroEast area. Under this bill, Metrolink will be expanded from East St. Louis to Belleville Area College and then to MidAmerica Airport. When this extension is complete, the region’s two airports, St. Louis-Lambert International in St. Louis, MO and MidAmerica Airport in St. Clair County, Illinois will be linked by one light rail line. Metrolink, whose ridership has surpassed all expectations, has had an enormous impact on the environment, transportation efficiency and economic development in my district and the entire St. Louis metropolitan region. It is precisely projects like these that are so important in this bill. These projects are vital to communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. We must pass this bill so critical infrastructure funding can get to our states. This bill is not about pork! It is about improving our transportation policies so that Americans and our goods can travel efficiently and safely throughout our nation.

Let’s pass this bill today so we can get it to the President before funding expires on May 1. I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.R. 2400.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleagues in strong support of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act. I want to thank the Chairman of the Transportation Committee, Mr. SHUSTER and the Ranking Democrat Mr. OBERSTAR for their strong leadership in getting this bill to the floor today. BESTEA as the bill is also known, will authorize $216 billion over six years for federal highways and mass transit programs. It would also modify highway funding formulas to ensure that each state receives 90% of the amount it pays to the federal government in gas taxes.

I also want to strongly urge my colleagues to support continuation of the Department of Transportation’s Disadvantage Enterprise Program, (DBE). This is an issue that is of the utmost importance to the President. And it is a program that was first enacted for highway transit construction projects under President Reagan.

It is an equal opportunity program which uses flexible goals established by state and local transportation programs to ensure that small businesses owned by women, minorities and other disadvantaged individuals have a fair chance to compete for federal transportation contracts.

Whether we believe so or not, it is a fact that minorities and women continue to face discrimination on a daily basis. We must turn the clock back on our country by eliminating a program that, since its inception, has significantly increased the percentage of women and minority-owned construction firms.

I want to defeat the Roukema amendment and protect economic opportunity for women and minorities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee for his willingness to support the transportation needs of my constituents. I also want to especially thank my colleague the Ranking Member of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee Mr. RAHALL, for his help as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will serve as the engine to further drive our nation’s economy into the 21st century and beyond.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1997 (BESTEA), provides much-needed funding for the improvement and renewal of highways across the country. I support this legislation because, as I see it, it is the first step towards improving our infrastructure. However, I would like to share my concerns that this legislation does not provide taxpayers in states like California with a fair share in federal transportation funding. This is an issue that we cannot ignore and must address in the near future.

Under BESTEA, Californians will pay $22 billion towards federal highway funding, but will only be guaranteed $19 billion in return. We must stop asking California taxpayers to pay for highway and infrastructure improvements that they may never see. They should not constantly be forced to sacrifice their hard-earned money to projects in some other town, in some other state.

As it stands, communities throughout California are struggling to maintain their infrastructure. For many quickly growing communities, it is nearly impossible to keep up, and this is not only unfair for taxpayers, it is becoming unsafe.
Mr. Chairman, while I support BESTEA, I urge my colleagues to keep California and other "donor states" across the country in mind when voting on this and related legislation. Let's not wait to address this dilemma and find a funding formula that is fair for California to taxpayers.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the Indian Reservation Roads program (IRR). As the House considers BESTEA, I urge the conference to fully support the Senate amount of $250 million annually for the program.

The roads of this reservation American community are often overlooked and underfunded. The conditions of reservation roads are the worst in this country and immediate attention and funding is badly needed in order for tribes to attract economic development. We must not ignore these needs.

In the bill under consideration today, the House has authorized up to $212 million annually for the IRR program. While I am pleased that the Committee recognized the need for an increase in the program, I am hopeful that the Committee will recognize the Senate's amount of $250 million annually for the IRR program. I believe that this modest increase is essential to the continued economic progress and improvement of our nation's tribal communities.

Again, I urge the conference to support this vital program for Indian reservations.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act (BESTEA) which reauthorizes federal highway funding. States desperately need adequate resources to keep pace with the stresses placed on their transportation infrastructure. While I am supportive of increased funding for transportation infrastructure, I believe the bill before us today contains a flawed funding formula which leaves rural states without the resources to address their transportation needs.

Highway funding is vitally important to every state in America, especially my state of North Dakota since we have more miles of road per capita than any other state in the nation. Highways are the lifeline of our economy, providing a means to transport commodities to market and linking the distance between our cities and towns. This bill unfortunately short changes several rural states. Large rural states face unique challenges in maintaining, repairing and building their transportation network. However, the funding distribution formula contained in the bill results in a drop in total spending for North Dakota and other rural states from the existing formula. North Dakota would receive $34 million a year less than what it would receive if the bill were enacted using the existing formula. Maintaining a sound and efficient transportation network across the country depends on adequate funding for both urban/suburban and rural areas.

The transportation bill which passed the Senate contained a funding formula which strikes a balance between the competing interests of urban/suburban and rural areas. I am hopeful that as the conference committee begins work on the two bills that we can reach a funding formula that recognizes the unique aspects of rural states.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Chairman for the highway bill we are voting on today, which is truly bipartisan and reflects a commitment to ensuring the continued viability of our national highway infrastructure.

I want to take a few moments to express my support for an important domestic renewable energy energy source, not included in this bill, but which I hope to see included in the final ISTEA reauthorization conference report. This program is the Federal Ethanol Program.

Ethanol is a very important, value-added market for corn, providing a critical economic stimulus throughout the Midwest. Today, the third largest use of corn is for ethanol production, behind only feed and export uses. Ethanol production utilizes approximately 7 percent of the nation's corn crop, increasing farm income and generating tremendous economic activity both within rural America and nationwide.

The use of ethanol also lessens our dependence on foreign oil. Today, we depend on oil imports to meet more than 54% of our consumption. Using ethanol decreases the dependence on foreign oil, thus increasing our energy independence and safeguarding against problems in the volatile Middle East.

Ethanol provides tremendous environmental benefits, including a reduction of harmful emissions of carbon monoxide, ozone, and toxicities. There are concerns about climate change and rising greenhouse gases. A recent study completed by the Argonne National Laboratory found that use of corn-ethanol results in a 50–60 percent reduction in fossil fuel use and a 35 to 46 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

The benefits of Ethanol are well documented, and I believe it is crucial for the federal government to maintain a strong ethanol policy. Mr. Chairman, I hope that, as this bill moves forward, you can support the Senate language on ethanol.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the ramifications of a rule, finalized by the U.S. Department of Transportation last year, known as HM–200. This rule needlessly imposes the will of the US Department of Transportation upon states with regard to the regulations governing the transport of Hazardous Materials in the agriculture industry. Mr. Chairman, this Committee and this Congress are right to take action to prevent the usurpation of state's rights and the resulting effect to commerce and safety of a rule which is not supported in its conclusions by any evidence of improved safety, or any consideration of its impact on the community it seeks to protect.

The farmers who produce the many crops that agriculture of the American agricultural community rely on agricultural production materials to aid in the development of a healthy and robust harvest that is the safest and most abundant in the world. These materials are sold by, delivered and applied by agricultural retailers who are among the most experienced men and women in the country in handling these types of materials. The rigor of continuous training and a lifetime of experience have taught them how to safely store, transport, and apply hazardous agricultural inputs.

As a result, some states with a large agricultural economy have given the retail community an exception to complying with Hazardous Materials (HAZMAT) transport regulations for the intrastate transport of hazardous agricultural inputs from retail facility to farm, farm to farm, and from farm to facility. My own home state of Illinois is one of these states, and despite having such an exception, the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) has closely monitored the agricultural community to ensure the safety of all. In recent years, IDOT has yet to find a reason to reverse these exceptions.

In early 1997, the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) to reconsider this aspect of its HM–200 rule, and numerous expressing industry sentiment, the administration refused to re-examine its position of the HM–200 rule.

Included within H.R. 2400 is language which would preserve the rights of states to provide HAZMAT transport exceptions for retailers and farming communities. This language by no means mandates nationwide exceptions, it only provides the option for states to provide them. Supporting this language are a wide bipartisan array of House members from across the U.S. and a majority industry coalition representing every aspect of the agricultural community.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that you have joined me in supporting this language which will prevent the federal government from imposing yet another onerous burden on states. The US DOT has produced no studies or accident reports to substantiate the policy of denying exceptions to retailers. In fact, the US DOT has joined several other public interest groups to counter our efforts with respect to DOT's HR 3282. The Agricultural community has attempted to substantiate this position by using the results of accident reports for interstate commerce.

This agriculture industry and the large, long-haul vehicles carrying thousands of gallons/lbs. of hazardous agents at high rates of speed down interstate highways have virtually nothing in common, and therefore accident statistics for one do not relate to the other. Under HAZMAT rules, placarding, shipping papers and toll-free 800 emergency response phone numbers are to be utilized as a measure to help in responding to a spill or fire. However, within agricultural communities, emergency responders are typically volunteers who are intimately familiar with the types of materials involved with production agriculture and who would have few problems in identifying the agencies involved in this type of incident.

Mr. Chairman, this language within H.R. 2400 is sorely needed. It is estimated that compliance with HM–200 could cost the average retail facility $12,300. In addition to being one of pocket cost to the retailer, this is going to be yet another expense that is passed along to the American farmer, who every year, sees his or her margins continue to shrink as the result of increased costs and
government intervention. I appreciate and gladly thank the Chairman and the other members of this committee for the inclusion of this language in H.R. 2400, and would hope that as this legislation moves into conference that we would all endeavor to ensure its inclusion in the final measure.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. TOWNS. Today is a very significant day for the residents of my congressional district and for the constituents of Chairman Towns. We have worked tirelessly for years with the communities in Brooklyn surrounding the Gowanus Expressway to find the best solution to the congestion and dilapidated condition of this major highway and key component in the New York area’s transportation network. These residents have patiently asked that a full study of alternatives to the planned reconstruction of the Gowanus Expressway be conducted.

For the economic viability of the area and the environment health of the families living near this planned reconstruction, it is crucial that the impact on the surrounding communities be adequately assessed. For these reasons, I thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, particularly Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman PETRI, Ranking Member OBERSTAR, and Ranking Member RAHALL, for undertaking these concerns and supporting our proposal.

The Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act finally responds to the needs of our New York area’s transportation network. These major highway and key component in the New York area’s transportation network. These

The MIS will include Phase I to IV civil engineering design documents so as to accurately determine the initial and long term fiscal, environmental, social and economic costs of replacing the current elevated structure of the Gowanus with a tunnel. This analysis will include a complete engineering study, including hydro-geologic study and the cost of tunnel connectivity with bridges and tunnels adjacent to the corridor.

Using the methodology devised in the “West Brooklyn Traffic Calming Study” CMAQ proposal, the MIS will devise mitigation measures to reduce traffic, road construction and traffic diversion from the Gowanus Expressway in adjacent neighborhoods. Additionally, the MIS will include an assessment of service improvements to all subway lines needed to produce an increase in ridership and reduction in motor vehicular traffic in the Gowanus corridor before, during and after the reconstruction of the highway. Upon completion of the MIS and tunnel alternative study, any remaining authorized funds should be held for the future planning and design phase of the Gowanus project.

The Gowanus MIS Project is part of a sound national and regional transportation policy. With this transportation proposal, the Gowanus neighborhoods are one step closer to real answers to this long-standing local transportation problem. This proposal is not only about transportation—it is also about the economic development and empowerment future of our communities.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, funding levels: $217 billion total over the next six years; $181 billion for road and highway safety; and $36 billion for transit.

Illinois will receive nearly 36 percent more per year under BESTEA.

Illinois received $684 million per year under ISTEA and will now receive over $1 billion per year under BESTEA.

Illinois needs: According to IDOT, more than 98 percent of highway and bridge funding will have to be allocated to the repair of existing roads and bridges over the next five years.

For the first time in 14 years, the number of road miles considered to be in poor condition will increase from 2,300 miles to 4,300 miles.

10,681 miles are considered to be in poor or mediocre condition—this is roughly ½ of the total federal aid miles for Illinois (i.e., ½ of Illinois’ federal aid highway miles are in poor or mediocre condition).

Illinois Citizens for Better Highways released a report that concluded that rural road repairs, upgrades and bridge replacements are underfunded.$7227 million annually.

For example, in Illinois, alone, we will need $8.3 million over the next five years for highway and bridge rehabilitation.

IDOT estimates that 42 percent of county roads and 51 percent of township roads are substandard.

Special additional federal funding is needed so that Illinois can restore and maintain such important roadways as the Stevenson Expressway and I-74 running through Peoria.

Stevenson Expressway repairs are expected to cost $67 million; I-74 rehabilitation re-construction is expected to cost $193.6 million.

National needs: The demand for high cost interstate highway reconstruction funds has outpaced the money available by more than 9 to 1.

In FY ‘96 alone, 18 states requested $687 million in project work, while only six states were awarded a total of $66 million in funding.

Limited funds meant that $621 million in requests went unfunded in 1996.

The current ISTEA I-55 (rehabilitation, resurfacing and repair program) level is averaging only $63 million per year.

In 1993, almost 32 percent of the Interstate pavement was in poor or mediocre condition, and 60% of the nation’s major roads are considered by the federal government to be substandard and in need of repair.

The FHWA estimated that $202.6 billion ($10.1 billion annually) is needed over the next 20 years to maintain the 1993 conditions and performance of the Interstate system. Of that amount, I-74 would be needed just for system preservation.

In order to preserve today’s pavement quality, 100,000 miles of roads would have to be restored every year.

Safety hazards caused by poor roads and highway structures according to the Keep America Moving Coalition, “Substandard designs, outdated safety features, poor pavement quality and other road conditions are a factor in 30% of all fatal highway accidents.”

The FHWA has found that converting two-lane roads to four-lane roads with a median decreased traffic deaths by 71%. Widening a two-lane road by just two feet reduces accidents by 23%.

Economic costs to motorists caused by poor roads and highways: American motorists suffer expenses of $21.5 billion annually in vehicle operating and maintenance costs due to damage caused by driving on poor roads. This translates to costs of $122 per driver.

Economic costs to the national road and highway investments: FHWA estimates that for every $1 billion in highway investment, 42,100 jobs are created. Every dollar invested in the Interstate Highway System generates $6 in economic returns.

Section 113 of BESTEA places to poor quality roads: Section 113 of BESTEA provides a formula and discretionary grant program that will provide significant amounts of money over the next 6 years to repair and resurface high cost interstate highways: $165 million for FY ‘98; $412.5 million for FY 99; $670 million for FY 2000 through 2003.

These funds would be available to fund “major reconstruction or improvement projects on the Interstate system. In order to be eligible, a project must cost over $200 million or cost more than 50% of a State’s Federal-aid highway.”

For example, Tazewell County, alone, will need $412.5 million for FY ‘99; $670 million for FY 2000 through 2003.

These funds would be available to fund “major reconstruction or improvement projects on the Interstate system. In order to be eligible, a project must cost over $200 million or cost more than 50% of a State’s Federal-aid highway.”

For example, Tazewell County, alone, will need $412.5 million for FY ‘99; $670 million for FY 2000 through 2003.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important legislation. The bill before us provides much needed funding for critical transportation projects across the country.

For a long time now, many of us here today have spoken about the need to rebuild critical parts of our transportation infrastructure. Pot holes, crumbling bridges, and inefficient and outdated transportation systems have crippled the economy of many parts of our country. We must continually rebuild our infrastructure if we are to ensure that our economy remains strong into the new century.

In addition, this bill maintains several critical programs to ensure that we are doing more than just paving roads. In particular, I am pleased that the bill contains the “enhancement set-aside” provision which allows states to use the funds for pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, scenic easements and other preservation activities. In addition, this bill continues the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program, which provides funding
to areas with air pollution problems for reduc-

ing traffic congestion. It is critically important

to believe this legislation continues to support alter-

native transportation systems that address quality

depends on the specific projects in this bill. I believe strongly

that Federal spending—be it for transpor-

tation, education or health care—has to be an

responsible and efficient use of our tax dollars.

I know that the projects I have requested and

received funding for in this bill meet that test. All of the projects I have

supported are widely supported by the public.

my constituents it is known as the road that is
dangerous for them today. Since 1992, 48

people have been injured due to the volatile mix of

traffic that uses this road, which includes

school buses, trucks going back and forth

from the coast to the Central Valley, farm and

ranch traffic, and daily commuters.

As a result, I believe it is essential to
capitalize on the power of the private sector to

help them build a safer and more produc-

tive community.

In addition to the Hwy 46 funding, this bill

also provides necessary funds for locally sup-

ported, fully vetted and important local trans-

portation projects such as the installation of

emergency call boxes on secluded Highway

166 near Santa Maria and the upgrade of the

332 call boxes throughout Santa Barbara

County to make them all handicapped and ac-

cessible. This legislation will also allow the

city of Guadalupe and the county of Santa

Barbara to undertake some much needed repav-

ing work, and the city of Santa Maria to fund

three new bikeway segments.

In addition, this bill will also provide funds

for a pedestrian safety project and pedestrian

boardwalks in the coastal cities of Grover

Beach and Pismo Beach, and for road recon-

struction in Arroye Grande. Finally, funds are

included for a street widening project in San

Luis Obispo and for road widening and bike

lane improvements throughout the city.

I am strongly in support of this legislation as

it responds to needs across the country and to

specific transportation needs on the Central

Coast. I urge my colleagues to support this

important bill.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to

speak today in support of H.R. 2400, the

Transportation Authorization bill. Our nation’s

infrastructure has been overlooked and treated

as a low priority for far too long. It is time to

re-invest in our nation’s roads, bridges, and

other surface transportation needs. By improv-

ing and properly maintaining our infrastructure, we will enhance new growth opportunities,

commerce, and safety. I believe this legislation

meets many of these goals.

In addition, the widespread distribution of gas

tax and user fees are more properly allocated

among all 50 states in this bill than in the past.

As a member of the Donor State Coalition,

this represents a hard fought victory for those

states, like Alabama, that have been paying

more in gas taxes then they have received in

federal highway funds. I pledge to continue my

efforts to see that donor states ultimately re-

ceive a 95 percent overall rate-of-return and,

further, that these states receive a rate-of-re-

turn of 100 percent of the funds distributed to

states.

Perhaps most importantly, H.R. 2400 ad-

dresses the infrastructure priorities of the

State of Alabama. Of our Governor’s top high-

way priorities, I am pleased to say that two of

these projects are located in my district in

southeast Alabama. In addition to providing
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and constituencies. U.S. Rt. 30 that runs through my district is a perfect example of this growing problem.

As a major east-west thoroughfare U.S. 30 is a integral trucking route serving the northern half of Ohio between I-70 and the Ohio Turnpike. This two-lane stretch of highway has logged a disturbing number of automotive accidents, which, when combined with the increase in truck traffic and lack of sufficient shoulder room, has all too often led to fatalities. With truck traffic on this route increasing since 1994, much of which can be attributed to an increase in tolls elsewhere that forced many trucks to re-route to rural thoroughfares like US 30, the need for a four-lane upgrade has never been more critical. I support BESTEA because it will give Ohio the needed resources and flexibility to bring much needed relief to those who live along and drive US. Rt. 30.

Of great importance to me is the fact that Chairman SHUSTER' bill finally provides equity for donor states like Ohio that have long provided more revenue than they have received back in transportation funds. By providing a true 95 percent return on contributions to the Highway Trust Fund Ohio will be able to complete many projects that have long been shelved due to lack of federal funding. Moreover, by taking the Highway Trust Fund off-budget, Chairman SHUSTER will restore the integrity of the fund and provide all states with the transportation funding their citizens have already contributed through gas taxes. While in 1991 we made great strides in improving our transportation system by passing ISTEA, in fact increasing the current highway funding levels to 64 cents on the dollar to 87 cents. Today's BESTEA legislation will significantly strengthen this commitment to our nation's infrastructure that we began many years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the Chairman of the Transportation Committee for his leadership in bringing this important piece of legislation to the House floor. I plan to support it and I look forward to its passage so we can ensure that our nation has the best and most modern transportation system in the world.

Mr. Chairman, roads, bridges, transit, and trails all play an important part in meeting the challenge of continuing to use transportation to benefit the economy, environment, and quality of life in all of our communities. Today's passage of H.R. 2400, the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act (BESTEA), means that the critical infrastructure needs of the people in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania will be addressed in a comprehensive manner.

The success of BESTEA is its preservation of the core comprehensive components of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). BESTEA continues to recognize and pay attention to, creating and maintaining transportation systems which reflect both environmental concerns and the needs of residents. BESTEA is a balanced bill which meets the needs of road repair, bridge rehabilitation, transit access, safety research, and pollution reduction.

Pennsylvania's overall network of 116,000 miles of highways and streets is the largest of any eastern state with 44% of the state's 22,327 bridges in disrepair. The support provided by BESTEA not only stimulates economic activity, but meets important safety concerns. BESTEA also provides critical assistance in improving other aspects of transportation that enhance the aesthetic of our local landscapes and improve the quality of our air. I am pleased that CMAQ and Recreational Trail Program funds were included in BESTEA.

It is important to note that BESTEA provides this critical assistance to cities, towns, and neighborhoods across our country in a fiscally responsible manner. As a strong balanced budget advocate, I am supportive of the requirement that any spending increases in BESTEA must be off-set. As a cosponsor of the Balanced Budget Act in both the 104th and 105th Congress, I am pleased that BESTEA addresses a tax fairness issue by moving the Highway Trust Fund "off-budget" beginning in FY 1999. Currently, with this fund "on-budget" the surpluses are used to mask a portion of our true budget deficit and prevents the funds from being used in the manner they were intended.

Without the critical support that BESTEA provides, countless communities in the 18th Congressional District would have to stave off economic decline due to deficiencies in infrastructure, rather than plan for future development and growth. By improving our communities' mobility we can directly benefit the quality of life and economic competitiveness of our country. I am pleased to support H.R. 2400.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I rise today in strong support of the Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) program. While the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act (BESTEA) increases current IRR funding levels to $212 million, I would urge the conferees to rescind the Senate funding level for IRR of $250 million.

Funding for the IRR program is critical to the safety and, ultimately, the health and welfare of Native American communities. The current state of tribal infrastructure often consists of dirt roads over which community members must travel for hundreds of miles to reach the nearest hospital or school. Crumbling infrastructure does nothing to induce safe travel and from community resources, and speaks poorly of our nation's regard for the treaties, relationships, and prioritization of Native Americans needs.

The Senate funding level for IRR of $250 million is a modest but necessary increase, and I urge my colleagues to respect the call for desperately needed resources.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure printed in the bill, modified by the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill, and the amendment printed in Part I of House Report 105-476, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, modified by the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill and the amendment printed in Part I of House Report 105-476 is as follows:
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such title $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(11) FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS PROGRAM.– For Federal lands highways programs under section 204 of such title $194,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $122,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(12) PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS.– For public lands highways under section 204 of such title $58,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $60,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(13) FOREST HIGHWAYS.– For forest highways under section 204 of such title $131,500,000 for fiscal year 1998, $130,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $130,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(12) HIGHWAY USE TAX EVASION PROJECTS.– For highway use tax evasion projects under section 1040 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 5726); $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(12) DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.–Except to the extent that the Secretary determines otherwise, not less than 10 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under titles I, III, and VI of this Act shall be expended with small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

(2) CONFORMANCE WITH COURT ORDERS.–Nothing in this section limits the eligibility of an entity or person to receive funds made available under titles I, III, and VI of this Act, if the entity or person complies with, in whole or in part, from complying with paragraph (1) because a Federal court issues a final order in which the court finds that the requirement of paragraph (1), or the program established under paragraph (1), is unconstitutional.

(3) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.–Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of, and publish and report to Congress findings and conclusions on, the program established under this Act in administering the requirement of paragraph (1), including an analysis of—

(A) in the case of small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals—

(i) the number of small business concerns; and

(ii) the participation rates of the small business concerns in prime contracts and subcontracts funded under titles I, III, and VI of this Act;

(B) in the case of small business concerns described in subparagraph (A) that do not receive prime contracts and subcontracts funded under titles I, III, and VI of this Act—

(i) the number of small business concerns; (ii) the annual gross receipts of the small business concerns; and

(iii) the net worth of socially and economically disadvantaged individuals that own and control the small business concerns;

(C) in the case of small business concerns described in subparagraph (A) that do not receive prime contracts and subcontracts funded under titles I, III, and VI of this Act—

(i) the annual gross receipts of the small business concerns; and

(ii) the net worth of individuals who own and control the business concerns;

(E) the rate of graduation from any programs to which paragraph (1) applies; and

(F) the impact on small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals of—

(i) the issuance of a final order described in paragraph (2) by a Federal court that suspends a program established under paragraph (1); and

(ii) the repeal or suspension of State or local disadvantaged business enterprise programs.

(4) DEFINITIONS.–For purposes of this subsection—

(A) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term ‘small business concern’ has the meaning such term has under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(d)); and

(B) DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS.—The term ‘socially and economically disadvantaged individuals’ has the meaning such term has under section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)); and

(C) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term ‘administrative expenses’ includes all costs of administering the program for which payments are authorized under this Act and title 23, United States Code, and includes all costs of administering the program for which payments are authorized under this Act and title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 103. OBLIGATION CEILING.

(a) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total of all obligations for Federal-aid highway programs shall not exceed—

(1) $21,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

(2) $25,300,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

(3) $28,400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitations under subsection (a) shall not apply to obligations—

(1) under section 125 of Title 23, United States Code; and

(2) under section 157 of such title;

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide all States with authority sufficient to prevent lapses of sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highway programs that are not obligated or distributed for such fiscal year.
(e) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS TO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—Securities limitations for Federal-aid highway programs established by subsection (a) shall apply to transportation research programs carried out under chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, as if such chapter were a division of title VI of this Act.

(f) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a) for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003, the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds (A) that are authorized to be appropriated to Federal-aid highway programs (other than the program under section 160 of title 23, United States Code) and for carrying out subparagraph 1 of chapter 1 of title 49, United States Code, and chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code, and (B) that the Secretary determines will not be allocated to the States, and will not be available for obligation, in such fiscal year due to the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year. Such distribution to the States shall be made in the same ratio as the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a) for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003, the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds that are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year to carry out the Interstate system reconstruction and improvement program under section 160 of title 23, United States Code, and that will not be available for obligation in such fiscal year due to the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year. Such distribution to the States shall be made in the same ratio as funds are apportioned under section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(2) COST INTERSTATE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the apportionment of obligation authority under subsection (c) for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003, the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds that are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year to carry out the Interstate system reconstruction and improvement program under section 160 of title 23, United States Code, and that will not be available for obligation in such fiscal year due to the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year. Such distribution to the States shall be made in the same ratio as funds are apportioned under section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 104. APPORTIONMENTS.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE TAKEDOWN.—Section 104(a) is amended to read as follows:

``(a) ADMINISTRATIVE TAKEDOWN.—Whenever an apportionment is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on Interstate system maintenance, the National Highway System, the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, and the high risk road safety program, the high cost Interstate System reconstruction and improvement program, the national corridor planning and development program, the border infrastructure and safety program, and the Federal lands highway program, the Secretary shall deduct a sum, in such amount not to exceed 1 percent of all sums so appropriated, for the purpose of promoting the Federal-aid highway system. The Secretary may, if the Secretary deems it necessary for administering the provisions of law to be financed from appropriations for the Federal-aid highway program, in making such determination, the Secretary shall take into account the unbudgeted balance of any sums deducted for such purposes in prior years. The sums so deducted shall remain available until expended. The Secretary may transfer such sums to a Federal entity other than the Federal Highway Administration.''

(b) APPORTIONMENTS.—Section 104(b) is amended to read as follows:

``(b) APPORTIONMENTS.—On October 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary, after making the deduction authorized by subsection (a) and the set-aside authorized by subsection (f), shall apportion the remainder of the sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on Interstate maintenance, the National Highway System, the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, and the high risk road safety program for the fiscal year among the several States in the following manner:

``(1) NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.—For the National Highway System, 1 percent to the Virginia coast line and the 1 percent to the middle of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the remaining 99 percent apportioned as follows:

``(i) In the case of a State with an average population density of 20 persons or fewer per square mile, and in the case of a State with a population of 1,500,000 persons or fewer and with a land area of 10,000 square miles or less, the greater of—
``(I) a percentage share of the remaining apportionment determined for the State in section 104(b)(1) of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998; or
``(II) a share determined under subparagraph (B).
``(B) Subject to subparagraph (A), in the case of any State for which the apportionment is not determined under subparagraph (A), a share of—
``(i) the remaining apportionments determined under subparagraph (A)(i),
``(ii) the remaining apportionments in the ratio that the total rural vehicle miles traveled in each State bears to the total rural vehicle miles traveled in all States for which the apportionment is not determined under subparagraph (A)(i),
``(iii) the remaining apportionments in the ratio that each State's annual vehicles bear to the total of such annual contributions by all States.
``(2) CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—For the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, in the ratio which the weighted nonattainment and maintenance area populations of each State bear to the total weighted nonattainment and maintenance area population of all States.
``(3) HIGH RISK ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—For the high risk road safety improvement program, in the ratio which the weighted nonattainment and maintenance area populations of each State bear to the total weighted nonattainment and maintenance area population of all States.
``(4) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—
``(A) IN GENERAL.—For the surface transportation program, 2 percent to the State of Alaska for any purpose described in section 149(b) and the remaining 98 percent apportioned as follows:
``(i) 1/5 of the ratio that each State's total population bear to the total of such annual contributions by all States, using the latest available annual data to the Federal decennial census, as prepared by the Secretary of Commerce.
``(ii) 1/5 in the ratio that each State's annual contributions to the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) attributable to commercial vehicles bear to the total of such annual contributions by all States for the fiscal year for Interstate maintenance, National Highway System, surface transportation program, bridge program, congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, high risk road safety program, Appalachian Development Highway System program, Appalachian Development Highway System program, and metropolitan planning will ensure that the aggregate of such contributions to the Federal Highway Trust Fund does not exceed the aggregate of such contributions to any State that does contribute to the Highway Trust Fund.
``(B) ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of funds which, but for this subparagraph, would be apportioned to each State for each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be decreased by an amount which, when added to or subtracted from the aggregate amount of funds apportioned or allocated to such State for such fiscal year for Interstate maintenance, National Highway System, surface transportation program, bridge program, congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, high risk road safety program, Appalachian Development Highway System program, Appalachian Development Highway System program, and metropolitan planning will ensure that the aggregate of such contributions to the Federal Highway Trust Fund does not exceed the aggregate of such contributions to any State that does contribute to the Highway Trust Fund.
``(C) A 1/5 in the ratio that each State's total vehicle miles traveled on public roads in each State bear to
the total vehicle miles traveled on public roads in all States:

"(5) INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE.—For resurfacing, restoring, rehabilitating, and reconstructing Interstate routes to the total vehicle miles traveled:

"(A) ½ in the ratio that each State's annual contributions to the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) attributable to contributions by all States;

"(B) ½ in the ratio that the total vehicle miles traveled on Interstate routes open to traffic in each State bear to the total vehicle miles traveled on such routes in all States; and

"(C) ½ in the ratio that the total lane miles on such routes in each State bear to the total lane miles on such routes in all States.

"(6) OPERATION LIFESAVER AND HIGH SPEED RAIL CORRIDORS.—Section 104(d) is amended—

(1) by striking "$300,000" and inserting "$500,000";

(2) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking "$5,000,000" and inserting "$5,250,000"; and

(3) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following: "Not less than $250,000 of such set-aside shall be available per fiscal year for eligible improvements to the Minneapolis/St. Paul-Chicago segment of the Midwest High Speed Rail Corridor;"

"(7) CERTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS.—Section 104(e) is amended—

(1) by inserting "Certification of Appointments." after "(e)"; and

(2) by inserting "(1) in General.—Before "On October 1":

(1) by striking the first parenthetical phrase; and

(2) by striking "and research" the first place it appears;

(3) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end the following: "Notice to States.—If the Secretary has not made an appointment under section 104, 144, or 157, or has not appointed a State meeting the requirements of section 120(b) of title 23, United States Code, on or before the 21st of a fiscal year, then the Secretary shall transmit, on or before such 21st day, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a written statement of the reason for not making such an appointment in a timely manner; and

(7) by indenting paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and aligning such paragraph (1) with paragraph (2) of such subsection, as added by paragraph (6) of this subsection.

"(8) METROPOLITAN PLANNING SET-ASIDE.—Section 104(f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "Interstate construction and Intestate substitute programs" and inserting "recreational trails programs";

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking "120(i)" and inserting "120(b)");

(9) RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM.—Section 104(g) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM.—Section 104(g) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) in General.—The percentage referred to in section 104(b)(1) of title 23, United States Code, for each State shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Adjustment percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Adjustment percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) ADDITIONAL RULE.—Any State with lane miles on the National Highway System totaling between 3,500 and 4,000 miles shall be treated as a State meeting the requirements of section 104(b)(1)(A) of title 23, United States Code, for purposes of such section.

(3) USE OF MOST UP-TO-DATE DATA.—The Secretary shall use the most up-to-date data available for the latest fiscal year for the purpose of making apportionments under this section and section 157 of title 23, United States Code.

(I) ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 1997.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to section 2(c) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997, the Secretary shall ensure that the total apportionments for a State for fiscal year 1998 made under the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 (including amendments made by such Act) shall be reduced by the amount apportioned to such State under section 1003(d)(1) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991.

(2) REPAYMENT OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—The Secretary shall ensure that any apportionments made to a State for fiscal year 1998 and adjusted under paragraph (1) shall first be used to restore in accordance with section 3(c) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997 any funds that a State transferred under section 3 of such Act.

(3) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR REPAYMENT.—If a State has insufficient funds apportioned in fiscal year 2000, the Secretary shall make adjustments made by such Act) for the purpose of making apportionments for fiscal year 1998 under the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 (including amendments made by such Act) to make the adjustment required by paragraph (1), then the Secretary shall make an adjustment to any funds apportioned to such State in fiscal year 1999.

(4) ALLOWED PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts made available for fiscal year 1998 by the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 (including amendments made by such Act) for a program that is continued by both of sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 and the Surface Transport Extention Act of 1997 (including amendments made by such sections) and the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 (including amendments made by such Act) shall be reduced by the amount made available by such sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 for such programs.

SEC. 105. INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM.

Section 119 is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "rehabilitating and reconstructing" and inserting "rehabilitating, and reconstructing";

(B) by striking "of this title and" and inserting a comma;

(C) by striking "this sentence" and inserting "the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998";
(D) by striking "of this title," and inserting "; and any segments that become part of the Interstate System under section 1105(e)(5) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991; and
(E) by striking "subsection (e)" and inserting "section 129 or continued in effect by section 102(d) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 and not voided by the Secretary under section 120(c) of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (101 Stat. 159)";
(by striking subsections (b), (c), (e), and (d), respectively.

SEC. 105. NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.
(a) COMPONENTS.—Section 103(b) is amended—
(1) by inserting after subparagraph (A), as so redesignated by paragraph (2)(B),
(2) by redesigning paragraphs (2)(C) by striking "and be subject to approval by Congress in accordance with paragraph (3)";
(b) MAXIMUM MILEAGE.—Section 103(b) is amended—
(1) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:
""(3) MAXIMUM MILEAGE.—The mileage of highways on the National Highway System shall not exceed 15 percent, except that the Secretary may increase or decrease such maximum mileage by not to exceed 15 percent; and
""(4) DESIGNATION.—Section 103(b)(4), as so redesignated by subsection (b)(2) of this section, is amended—
(1) by inserting ""(A) BASIC SYSTEM.—"" before ""The National"";
(2) by inserting subparagraph (A), as so designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, the following:
""(B) INTERMODOAL CONNECTORS.—The modifications to the National Highway System that consist of highway connections to major ports, airports, international border crossings, public transportation and transit facilities, interstate bus terminals, and rail and other intermodal transportation facilities, as submitted to Congress by the Secretary on the map dated May 24, 1996, are designated within the United States, including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and
(3) by redesigning subparagraph (A) and aligning it with subparagraph (B), as inserted by paragraph (2) of this subsection.
(c) MODIFICATIONS.—Section 103(b)(5)(A), as redesignated by subsection (b)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting "or, in the case of the strategic highway network, that are proposed by the Secretary in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and the States" before "if the Secretary".
(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 103(b) is amended—
(1) in paragraph (5), as redesignated by subsection (b)(2) of this section, by striking ""subject to paragraph (7), the"" and inserting ""The"";
(2) by striking paragraph (7);
(3) by redesigning paragraph (8) as paragraph (6) and
(4) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking "paragraph (5)" and inserting "paragraph (6)"
(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 103 is amended—
(1) by redesigning subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (i) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;
(2) by redesigning paragraphs (1) through (4), redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraphs (8) through (11); and
(3) by redesigning subsection (i) as paragraph (7);
(f) moving such paragraph (7) (including such subparagraphs and clauses) to the end of subsection (b); and
(g) by moving such paragraph (7) (including such subparagraphs and clauses) 2 ems to the right.

SEC. 106. NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.
(a) APPOINTMENT FORMULA.—Section 144(e) is amended by striking the end of the fourth sentence the following: "; and,
(b) if a State transfers funds apportioned to it under this section in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1997, to any other apportionment of funds to such State under this title, the total cost of deficient bridges in such State and pollution abatement projects that are to be funded for the succeeding fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount of such transferred funds".
(b) DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE SET-ASIDE.—Section 107(e) is amended—
(1) by inserting "(A) FISCAL YEARS 1992 THROUGH 1997." before "Of the amounts";
(2) by adding at the end the following:
""(B) FISCAL YEAR 1998.—The amounts authorized for fiscal year 1998 by section 127(a)(1) of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 shall be at the discretion of the Secretary. 25 percent of such amount shall be available only for projects for the seismic retrofit of a bridge described in subsection (l).
""(C) FISCAL YEARS 1999 THROUGH 2003.—The amounts authorized for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003 by section 127(a)(1) of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 shall be at the discretion of the Secretary. Not to exceed 25 percent of such amount shall be available only for projects for the seismic retrofit of bridges, including projects in the New Madrid fault region.
(3) by inserting paragraph (A), as so designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, and aligning such subparagraph (A), with subparagraphs (B) and (C), as inserted by paragraph (2) of this subsection.
(c) OFF SYSTEM BRIDGE-SET ASIDE.—Section 144(c)(3) is amended—
(1) by striking ""1998"" and all that follows through ""1997,"" and inserting ""through 2003;"
and
(2) by striking ""system"" each place it appears and inserting ""highway.""
except that the expenditure of funds under this section for any such environmental restoration or pollution abatement project shall not exceed 20 percent of the total cost of the restoration, rehabilitation, resurfacing, or restoration project."

(e) DIVISION OF FUNDSSection 133(d)(3)(B) is amended by adding at the end the following: "Notwithstanding section (c), the percent of the amounts required to be obligated under this subparagraph may be obligated on roads functionally classified as minor collectors.

(f) PROGRAM APPROVALSection 133(e)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) PROGRAM APPROVAL. Each State shall submit a project agreement for each fiscal year, certifying that the State will meet all the requirements of this section and notifying the Secretary of the amount of obligations needed to administer the surface transportation program. Each State shall request adjustments to the amount of obligations as needed. The Secretary's approval of the project agreement shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the United States for the payment of surface transportation program funds provided under this title."

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENT. Section 133(f) is amended by striking "fiscal year period 1992 through 1997" and inserting "fiscal years for which funds are available by the BuildIt Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998".

(h) ENCOURAGEMENT OF USE OF YOUTH CONSERVATION OR SERVICE CORPS. The Secretary shall encourage the States to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with qualified youth conservation or service corps to perform appropriate transportation enhancement projects under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 109. CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM. Section 154(a) is amended by inserting after "establish" the following: "and implement".

(b) CURRENTLY ELIGIBLE PROJECTS. Section 154(b) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A) by striking "clauses (xii) and (xii)"); and inserting "clause (xii)"); and

(2) by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (3).

(3) by striking "standard," at the end of paragraph (3).

(4) by striking after paragraph (4) the following: "If the program or project would have been eligible for or before September 30, 2007, under guidance issued by the Secretary to implement this section.

(c) STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CMAQ PROGRAM. The Secretary shall request the National Academy of Sciences to study the impact of the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program on the air quality of nonattainment areas. The study shall, at a minimum—

(1) determine the amount of funds obligated under such program in each nonattainment area and to make a comprehensive analysis of the types of projects funded under such program;

(2) identify any improvements to or degradations of the air quality in each nonattainment area;

(3) measure the impact of the projects funded under such program on the air quality of each nonattainment area; and

(d) assess the cost effectiveness of projects funded under such program in nonattainment areas, including, to the extent possible, the cost per ton of reductions of ozone and carbon monoxide and reduction of traffic congestion.

(2) REPORT. Not later than January 1, 2000, the National Academy of Sciences shall transmit to the Secretary, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the study with recommendations for modifications to the air quality improvement program in light of the results of the study.

(3) FUNDING. Before making the apportionment of funds under section 104(b)(2) for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, the Secretary shall deduct from the amount to be apportioned under such section for such fiscal year, and make available, $500,000 for each such fiscal year to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 110. HIGH RISK ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT. The Secretary shall establish and implement a high risk road safety improvement program in accordance with this section.

(b) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS. A State may obligate funds apportioned to it under section 104(b)(4) only for construction and operational improvement projects, and for paving maintenance and signing on high risk roads and only if the primary purpose of the project is to improve highway safety on a high risk road.

(c) STATE ALLOCATION SYSTEM. Each State shall establish a system for allocating funds apportioned to it under section 104(b)(4) among projects eligible for assistance under this section that have the highest benefit to highway safety. Such system may include a safety management system established by the State under section 303 or a survey established pursuant to section 152.

(d) TRANSFERABILITY. A State may transfer not to exceed 50 percent of the amount of funds apportioned to it under section 104(b)(4) for any fiscal year among the States, for the purpose of ensuring that a State's percentage of the total apportionments in each such fiscal year for Interstate maintenance, the National Highway System Program, the bridge program, the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the high priority projects program, the high risk road safety improvement program, the recreational trails program, the Appalachian Development Highway System program, and metropolitan planning shall not be less than 95 percent of the percent of the estimated tax payments attributable to highway users in the State paid into the Highway Trust Fund, other than the Mass Transit Account, in the latest fiscal year for which Federal-aid highway funds are available. After all other allocations under this paragraph, the Secretary shall not take into account the 2 percent set aside under section 104(b)(3)(A)."

SEC. 111. MINIMUM ALLOCATION.

(a) GENERAL RULES. Section 157(a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking "thereafter" and inserting "fiscal years 1992 and each fiscal year thereafter"; and

(B) by striking "fiscal years 1992 and each fiscal year thereafter" and inserting "each of fiscal years 1992 through 1997";

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) THEREAFTER. In fiscal year 1998 and each fiscal year thereafter on October 1, or as soon as possible thereafter, the Secretary shall allocate among the States amounts sufficient to ensure that a State's percentage of the total apportionments in each such fiscal year for Interstate maintenance, the National Highway System Program, the bridge program, the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the high priority projects program, the high risk road safety improvement program, the recreational trails program, the Appalachian Development Highway System program, and metropolitan planning shall not be less than 95 percent of the percent of the estimated tax payments attributable to highway users in the State paid into the Highway Trust Fund, other than the Mass Transit Account, in the latest fiscal year for which Federal-aid highway funds are available. After all other allocations under this paragraph, the Secretary shall not take into account the 2 percent set aside under section 104(b)(3)(A)."

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS. Section 157(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting before "Amounts allocated" the following: "All that follow through "Availability of Funds."";

(2) by striking "Interstate highway subbediute," and all that follows through "crossing projects" and inserting "any purpose described in section 133(b)";

(3) by inserting before the end of subsection (d) and "section 103(c) of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1991";

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS. Section 157 is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d) by striking "154(f)" and "154(g)";

(2) in subsection (e) by inserting before "in the following" the following: "Authorization of Appropriations";

(d) MINIMUM ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENT. If the Secretary—

(1) determines that—

(A) the aggregate of funds made available by this Act, including any amendments made by
this Act, that are apportioned to a State for Federal-aid highway programs (including funds allocated to the State under sections 104(i) and 157 of title 23, United States Code) for each fiscal year thereafter, or as soon as practicable thereafter, shall be in addition to any other allocation under title 157 of title 23, United States Code, including allocations required by subsection (d) of this section.

SEC. 112. APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY PROGRAM.

(a) APPORTIONMENT.—The Secretary shall apportion funds made available by section 102 of this Act for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 among the States in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned to the States for Federal-aid highway programs under this Act (including amendments made by this Act and allocations under sections 104(i) and 157) for such fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1997, as the case may be, or as soon as possible thereafter, and shall be in addition to any other allocation to the State under such section 157 for such fiscal year:

(1) the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A), is less than

(B) the ratio of—

(i) the aggregate of funds made available by the Appalachian Regional Development Efficiency Act of 1991, 1992, 1997, to the State amounts sufficient to ensure that the State's percentage of total apportionments for Federal-aid highway programs under this Act (including amendments made by this Act and allocations under sections 104(i) and 157) for such fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1997, is less than the Mass Transit Account in the latest fiscal year for which data are available, to

(ii) the estimated tax payments attributable to highways users in the State paid into the Highway Trust Fund, obtained in the Mass Transit Account, in the latest fiscal year for which data are available, to

(2) determines that—

(A) the ratio (determined under paragraph (1)(A), is less than

(B) the ratio of—

(i) the aggregate of funds made available by the Appalachian Regional Development Efficiency Act of 1991, including any amendments made by such Act, and section 202 of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 that are apportioned to the State for Federal-aid highway programs (other than Federal lands highway programs and projects under sections 1103-1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991) for fiscal years 1992 through 1997, to

(ii) the aggregate of such funds apportioned to all States for such programs for such fiscal years, to

the State shall allocate under section 157 to the State amounts sufficient to ensure that the State's percentage of total apportionments for Federal-aid highway programs under this Act (including amendments made by this Act and allocations under sections 104(i) and 157) for such fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992, as the case may be, or as soon as is practicable thereafter, shall be in addition to any other allocation to the State under such section 157 for such fiscal year:

(1) in general—

(A) each State's percentage of total apportionments for Federal-aid highway programs under this Act (including amendments made by such Act, and section 202 of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. The allocation shall be made on October 1 of fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, or 2003, as the Secretary determines will not be used for the purpose for which the fund was provided in the latest fiscal year for which data are available, to

(B) the project is a ready-to-commence project;

(2) the State agrees that it will not transfer funds apportioned to it under section 104(b)(5) for such fiscal year to any other program category;

(3) the applicant agrees to obligate the funds within 1 year of the date the funds are made available.

(b) REDISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (a), the Secretary shall allocate—

(1) not less than $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $412,500,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $670,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003 among States in the ratio that the estimated cost of carrying out projects determined by the Secretary to be eligible for funding under this section to carry out such projects in all of the States.

(2) At the discretion of the Secretary, not more than the amounts set forth in section 127(a)(2) for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 for projects eligible for assistance under this section to—

(A) meet an extraordinary need for funding; or

(B) expedite completion of a project of national significance.

(c) UNALLOCATED FUNDS.—

(1) APPORTIONMENT.—If, on August 1 of fiscal year 1998 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary determines that funds authorized to be allocated in such fiscal year for the program under this section shall be consistent with the requirements of sections 134 and 135 of this Act, the Secretary shall apportion such funds among the States for the Interstate maintenance program.

(2) REDISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall also redistribute on such August 1 any obligation authority that is not used for the program under section 103(c)(4) of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998 attributable to the program under this section and the Secretary determines will not be used before September 30 of such fiscal year among the States (other than a State from which obligation authority for such fiscal year is redistributed under section 103(c)(4) of such Act in the same ratio as set forth in section 103(c)(5) of such Act.

(3) APLICATION OF PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.—Programming and expenditure of funds for projects under this section shall be consistent with the requirements of sections 134 and 135 of this Act.

allocated pursuant to subsection (c)(1) shall be allocated in the same manner as funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5). Such funds shall only be available for projects eligible under subsection (b) if a State does not have a project eligible under subsection (b), funds allocated to such State under this paragraph shall be available for any project in such State on a segment of the Interstate System that is open to traffic.

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Secretary shall, in cooperation with States and affected metropolitan planning organizations, determine—

(A) the condition of the Interstate System over the next 10 years and the needs of States to undertake a plan for organizations to reconstruct and improve the Interstate System; and

(B) a method to allocate funds made available under this section that would provide a fair and equitable distribution of such funds; and

(i) address the needs identified in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) allow for States to address any extraordinary needs.

(3) FORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 160 and inserting the following:

160. High cost interstate system reconstruction program.

SEC. 114. RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 205 the following:

§ 206. Recreational trails program.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, shall administer a national program for the purposes of providing and maintaining recreational trails.

(b) STATEMENT OF INTENT.—Funds made available to carry out the recreational trails program under this section are to be derived from revenues collected through motor fuel taxes from nonhighway users and are to be used on trails and trail-related projects which have been planned and developed under the otherwise existing laws, policies, and administrative procedures within each State, and which are identified in, or which further a specific goal of, a trail plan in effect on December 31, 1972 ; and which are consistent with the management direction in such plan.

(c) STATEMENT OF INTENT.—Funds made available under this section (b) shall be used to contribute additional Federal funds to projects in such State that would otherwise be funded in accordance with the management direction in such plan.

(d) REQUIREMENT.—To the extent practicable and consistent with other requirements of this section, in complying with paragraph (4), a State shall give consideration to projects that address the following:

(i) the needs and desires of non-motorized recreational trail users;

(ii) the goals and objectives identified in section 120 of this Act; and

(iii) the needs of States that will ultimately be affected by projects funded under paragraph (4).
which nonhighway recreational fuel use accounts for less than 1 percent of such fuel use in the United States shall be exempted from the requirements of paragraph (4) upon application to the State demonstrating that it meets the conditions of this paragraph.

(8) STATE RECREATIONAL TRAIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—If approved by the State recreation committee in accordance with the requirements of subsection (c)(2), the State may be exempted from the requirements of paragraph (4).

(8) CONTINUING RECREATIONAL USE.—At the option of each State, funds apportioned to it under section 104(h) may be treated as Land and Water Conservation Fund moneys for the purposes of section 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

(9) CREDIT FOR DONATIONS OF FUNDS, MATERIALS, SERVICES, OR NEW RIGHT-OF-WAY.—Nothing in this title or any other law shall prevent a project sponsor from offering to donate funds, materials, services, or new right-of-way for the purposes of a project eligible for assistance. Any funds, or the fair market value of any materials, services, or new right-of-way may be donated by any project sponsor and shall be credited as part of the Federal agency’s share under subsection (d)(2).

(10) RECREATIONAL PURPOSE.—A project funded under this section is intended to enhance public access to the recreational trail improve funded by those funds.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and implement a program to make allocations to the Federal, State, local, or private recreation programs for purposes described in subsection (c), including programs for the construction and maintenance of recreational trails under section 206 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) ELIGIBLE USES.—Allocations under this section may only be used in a border region for—

(1) improvements to existing transportation and supporting infrastructure that facilitate cross-border vehicle and cargo movement;

(2) construction of highways and related safety and security enforcement facilities that facilitate vehicle and cargo movements related to international trade; and

(3) modifications to regulatory procedures to expedite cross-border vehicle and cargo movements;

(4) environmental reviews and permits, and construction of all segments.

(3) A finance plan, including any innovative financing and, if the corridor is a multistate corridor, a State-by-State breakdown of corridor finances.

(4) The results of any environmental reviews and mitigation plans.

In the case of a multistate corridor, the Secretary shall ensure that all States having jurisdiction over any portion of such corridor will participate in the development of such plan.

SEC. 115. NATIONAL CORRIDOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and implement a program to make allocations to the Federal, State, local, or private recreation programs for purposes described in subsection (c), including programs for the construction and maintenance of recreational trails under section 206 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) ELIGIBLE USES.—Allocations under this section may only be used in a border region for—

(1) improvements to existing transportation and supporting infrastructure that facilitate cross-border vehicle and cargo movement;

(2) construction of highways and related safety and security enforcement facilities that facilitate vehicle and cargo movements related to international trade; and

(3) modifications to regulatory procedures to expedite cross-border vehicle and cargo movements;

(4) environmental reviews and permits, and construction of all segments.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall establish and implement a coordinated border infrastructure and safety program, the purpose of which the Secretary may make allocations to any border State for projects to improve the safe movement of people and goods at or across the border between the United States and the border between the United States and Mexico.

(b) ELIGIBLE USES.—Allocations under this section may only be used in a border region for—

(1) improvements to existing transportation and supporting infrastructure that facilitate cross-border vehicle and cargo movement;

(2) construction of highways and related safety and security enforcement facilities that facilitate vehicle and cargo movements related to international trade;

(3) operational improvements, including improvements relating to electronic data interchange and use of telecommunications, to expedite cross-border vehicle and cargo movement;

(4) modifications to regulatory procedures to expedite cross-border vehicle and cargo movements;

(5) international coordination of planning, programming, and border operation with Canada and Mexico relating to expediting cross-border vehicle and cargo movements.

(c) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall make allocations under this section on the basis of—

(1) expected reduction in commercial and other motor vehicle travel time through an international border crossing as a result of the project;

(2) improvements in vehicle and highway safety and cargo security related to motor vehicles crossing a border with Canada or Mexico;

(3) strategies to increase the use of existing, underutilized border crossing facilities and approaches;

(4) leveraging of Federal funds provided under this section, including use of innovative financing mechanisms; and

(5) degree of multinational involvement in the project and demonstrated coordination with other Federal agencies responsible for the inspection of vehicles, cargo, and persons crossing international borders and their counterpart agencies in Canada and Mexico.

(d) PROGRAMS; AND

(7) demonstrated local commitment to implement the project, including other Federal agencies responsible for the inspection of vehicles, cargo, and persons crossing international borders and their counterpart agencies in Canada and Mexico;
such other factors as the Secretary de-
mines are appropriate to promote border trans-
portation efficiency and safety.

(d) STATE MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY INSPECTION FACILITIES.—In section 135(b) of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary shall establish, as part of an overall program to address the safety of vehicles in transit, a program to conduct inspection by State authorities of commercial motor vehicles crossing the border to ensure the safety of such vehicles.

(e) ALLOCATIONS.—(1) LOCS.—At least 40 percent of the funds made available for carrying out this section shall be allocated for projects in the vicinity of the border of the United States and Mexico, and at least 40 percent of such funds shall be allo-
cated for projects in the vicinity of the border of the United States and Canada.

(2) PROJECTS.—At least 2 of the projects in the vicinity of the border of the United States with Mexico for which allocations are made under this section and at least 2 of the projects in the vicinity of the border of the United States and Canada for which allocations are made under this section shall be located at ports of entry with high annual volumes of traffic.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23 FUNDING.—Section 202 is amended—

(1) by striking ``(c)'' and inserting ``(b)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:
``(l) FOREST HIGHWAYS.—

(1) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—On October 1 of each fiscal year during the transfer period provided for in section 204(g), the Secretary shall allocate the sums authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for forest highways as provided in section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987.

(2) PROJECT SELECTION.—With respect to allo-
cations under this subsection, the Secretary shall select in priority to projects that provide access to and within the National Forest System, as identified by the Secretary of Agriculture through renewable resources and land use plan-
ing and the implementation of plans and pro-
gram planning on existing transportation facilities.''

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) BORDER REGION.—The term ''border re-

(2) BORDER STATE.—The term ''border State'' means any State that has a boundary in com-
voyage of an international border with Canada or Mexico.

(3) B ORDER REGION .—The term ''border re-

(4) B ORDER STATE .—The term ''border State''

(h) APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $500,000 for fiscal year 1998 to carry out this subsection.

(i) M OTORS ON W ATER.—The term ''motor vehicle'',''

(j) FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO A FEDERAL LAND MANAGING AGENCY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the funds appropriated to any Federal land managing agency may be used for Federal-aid highway projects on account of any Federal-aid highway project the Federal share of which is payable with funds apportioned under section 104 or 144 or allocated under the Federal scenic byways program.

(K) FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for carrying out the Federal lands highways program under section 204 may be used as the non-Federal share payable on account of any project approved under this section (other than a project approved for the National Forest System) with funds apportioned under section 104 or 144 or allocated under the Federal scenic byways program if the project will provide access to, or be carried out within, Federal or Indian lands.

(l) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 202 is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:
``(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—On October 1 of each fiscal year during the transfer period provided for in section 204(g), the Secretary shall allocate the sums authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for Federal lands highways projects; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:
``(c) FOREST HIGHWAYS.—

(1) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—On October 1 of each fiscal year during the transfer period provided for in section 204(g), the Secretary shall allocate the sums authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for forest highways as provided in section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987.

(2) PROJECT SELECTION.—With respect to allo-
cations under this subsection, the Secretary shall select in priority to projects that provide access to and within the National Forest System, as identified by the Secretary of Agriculture through renewable resources and land use plan-
ing and the implementation of plans and pro-
gram planning on existing transportation facilities.''

(m) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 203 is amended—

(1) by striking ``(k)'' and inserting ``(j)''

(2) by adding at the end the following:
``(l) FOREST HIGHWAYS.—

(1) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—On October 1 of each fiscal year during the transfer period provided for in section 204(g), the Secretary shall allocate the sums authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for forest highways as provided in section 134 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987.

(2) PROJECT SELECTION.—With respect to allo-
cations under this subsection, the Secretary shall select in priority to projects that provide access to and within the National Forest System, as identified by the Secretary of Agriculture through renewable resources and land use plan-
ing and the implementation of plans and pro-
gram planning on existing transportation facilities.''

(n) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the follow-

(o) TRANSFERS TO SECRETARIES OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGING AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall transfer to the appropriate Federal land managing agency from the appropriation for public lands highways such amounts as may be needed to carry out:

(1) necessary administrative costs of such agency in connection with public lands high-
ways; and

(2) the cost to such agency of conducting necessary transportation planning serving Fed-
eral lands if funding for such planning is other-
wise not provided in this section.

(p) ACCESS TO JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the District of Columbia, the John F. Ken-
nedy Center for the Performing Arts, and the Department of the Interior and in consultation with other interested persons, shall conduct a study of methods to allow vehicle and vehicu-
lar access to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works the report containing the results of the study, to-
gether with an assessment of the impacts (in-
cluding environmental, aesthetic, economic, and historic impacts) associated with the implemen-
tation of each of the methods examined under the study.

(q) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $500,000 for fiscal year 1998 to carry out this subsection.

(r) UNIFORM POLICIES.—The Secretary shall develop transportation planning proce-
dures which are consistent with the metropoli-

tan and Statewide planning processes in sec-
tions 134 and 135 of this title. The transpor-
tation improvement program developed as a part of the transportation planning program under this section shall be approved by the Secretary.

(s) APPROPRIATIONS.—All regionally significant Federal Lands Highways Projec-
tes shall be developed in cooperation with the appropriate Federal land managing agency, and metropolitan plans and transportation im-

(t) APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $500,000 for fiscal year 1998 to carry out this subsection.

(u) M OTORS ON W ATER.—The term ''motor vehicle'',''

(v) Necessity of transportation planning and

(w) Appropriate use of the terms 'transportation planning' and

(x) APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $500,000 for fiscal year 1998 to carry out this subsection.

(y) UNIFORM POLICIES.—The Secretary shall develop transportation planning proce-
dures which are consistent with the metropoli-

tan and Statewide planning processes in sec-
tions 134 and 135 of this title. The transpor-
tation improvement program developed as a part of the transportation planning program under this section shall be approved by the Secretary.

(z) APPROPRIATIONS.—All regionally significant Federal Lands Highways Projec-
tes shall be developed in cooperation with the appropriate Federal land managing agency, and metropolitan plans and transportation im-

(a) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(b) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(c) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(d) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(e) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(f) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(g) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(h) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(i) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(j) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(k) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(l) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(m) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(n) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(o) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(p) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(q) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(r) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(s) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(t) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(u) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(v) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(w) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(x) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(y) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(z) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by strik-

(A) for transportation-related exhibitions, ex-
hibits, and educational outreach programs;

(B) to enhance the care and protection of the Nation's collection of transportation-related arti-
facts;

(C) to acquire historically significant trans-
portation-related artifacts; and

(D) to support research programs within the Smithsonian Institution that document the his-

tory and evolution of transportation, in co-
operation with other museums in the United States.

(E) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $500,000 for fiscal year 1998 to carry out this subsection.

(F) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be established by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution a transportation-related exhibition program; and

(2) ELIGIBLE USES.—Amounts allocated under paragraph (1) may be obligated only for transportation-related exhibitions, ex-
hibits, and educational outreach programs;

(3) TO HONOR THE NATIONAL COLLECTION OF TRANSPORTATION-RELATED ARTIFACTS.—The Secretary shall allocate amounts made available by this subsection to honor the national collection of transportation-related artifacts; and

(4) TO SUPPORT RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall allocate amounts made available by this subsection to support research programs.
SEC. 119. VARIABLE PRICING PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) Establishment.The Secretary shall establish a variable pricing pilot program that recognizes roads having outstanding scenic, historic, cultural, natural, recreational, and archaeological value, and designates them as National Scenic Byways or All-American Roads. The Secretary shall designate roads to be recognized under the national scenic byways program in accordance with criteria developed by the Secretary. To be considered for such designation, a road must be nominated by a State or Federal land management agency and must first be designated as a State scenic byway or, for roads on Federal lands, as a Federal land management agency byway.

(b) Allocations and Technical Assistance.

(1) General Authority.The Secretary shall make allocations and provide technical assistance to States to carry out such program.

(2) Implementation Projects.The Secretary shall implement projects that are eligible for Federal assistance under this section.

(3) Eligible Projects.The following are projects that are eligible for Federal assistance under this section:

(A) Projects related to planning, design, or development of State scenic byway programs.

(B) Development of corridor management plans for scenic byways.

(C) Safety improvements to a scenic byway to the extent such improvements are necessary to accommodate increased traffic and changes in the types of vehicles using the highway due to such design.

(D) Construction along a scenic byway of facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists, rest areas, turnouts, pullouts, high-speed toll plazas, service areas, and interpretive facilities.

(E) Improvements to a scenic byway that will enhance access to an area for the purpose of recreation, including recreation and cultural resources in areas adjacent to scenic byways.

(F) Development and provision of tourist information to the public, including interpretive information about scenic byways.

(G) Development and implementation of scenic byways marketing programs.

(H) Federal Share.The Federal share of the cost of restoration of the Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, train station under this subsection shall be 80 percent of the aggregate cost of the project carried out under this section.

(i) Period of Availability.Funds allocated under this subsection shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; except that the Federal share of the cost of any project under this subsection shall be 80 percent and such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 120. TOLL ROADS, BRIDGES, AND TUNNELS.

(a) Federal Share Payable.The Federal share payable for a pilot project under this section shall be 80 percent of the aggregate cost of the program and the Federal share payable for any portion of a pilot project under the program may not exceed 100 percent.

(b) Implementation Costs.The Secretary may fund all pre-implementation costs, including, but not limited to, administrative costs and all of the development and startup costs of a pilot project under this section, including salaries and expenses, until such time that sufficient revenues are being generated by the program to fund its operating costs without Federal participation; except that the Secretary may not fund the pre-implementation, development, and startup costs of a pilot project for more than 3 years.

(c) Use of Revenues.Revenues generated by any pilot project under this section must be applied to projects eligible for assistance under title 23, United States Code, and shall be treated in the same manner as such funds are authorized by this Act.

(d) Collection of Tolls.Notwithstanding sections 129 and 301 of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary shall allow the use of tolls for any State or Federal project or program under this section, but not as part of more than 3 of such programs.

(e) Financial Exemption for Low-Income Drivers.Any pilot program conducted under this section shall include an analysis of the potential effects of the pilot program on low-income drivers and may include mitigation measures to deal with any potential adverse financial effects on low-income drivers.

(f) Reports to Congress.The Secretary shall monitor the effect of the pilot programs conducted under this section and shall report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives biennially on the effects such programs are having on driver behavior, traffic volume, transit ridership, air quality, and all other adverse financial effects on low-income drivers.

SEC. 139. VARIABLE PRICING PILOT PROGRAM. (a) Establishment.The Secretary shall establish and implement a variable pricing program. In implementing such program, the Secretary shall solicit the participation of State and local governments and public authorities for 1 or more variable pricing pilot programs. The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with as many as 15 of such governments and public authorities to conduct and monitor the pilot programs.
(A) CREDIT FOR NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(i) a plan for implementing the imposition of tolls on the facility;

(ii) a schedule and finance plan for the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the facility using toll revenues;

(iii) a description of the public transportation agency which will be responsible for implementing and administering the toll reconstruction and rehabilitation program; and

(iv) a description of whether consideration will be given to privatizing the maintenance and other operational aspects of the converting facility while retaining legal and administrative control of the Interstate route section.

(E) Other information as the Secretary may require.

(4) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary may approve the application of a State under paragraph (3) only if the Secretary determines the following:

(A) The State is unable to reconstruct or rehabilitate the proposed toll facility using existing apportionments.

(B) The facility has a sufficient intensity of use, age, or condition to warrant the collection of tolls.

(C) The State plan for implementing tolls on the facility takes into account the interests of local, regional, and interstate travelers.

(D) The State plan for reconstruction or rehabilitation of the facility using toll revenues is reasonable.

(E) The State has given preference to the use of an existing public toll agency with demonstrated capability to build, operate, and maintain a toll expressway system meeting criteria for the future.

(F) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF REVENUES; AUDITS.—Before the Secretary may permit a State to participate in the pilot program, the State must enter into an agreement with the Secretary that provides that—

(A) all toll revenues received from operation of the toll facility, and be used only for debt service, for reasonable return on investment of any private person financing the project, and for any costs necessary for the improvement of and the operation and maintenance of the toll facility, including reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of the toll facility; and

(B) regular audits will be conducted to ensure compliance with subparagraph (A) and the results of such audits will be transmitted to the Secretary.

(G) LIMITATION ON USE OF INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE FUNDS.—During the term of the pilot program, funds apportioned for Interstate maintenance under section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, may be used only for a facility for which tolls are being collected under the program.

(H) PROGRAM TERM.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot program under this section for a term to be determined by the Secretary but not less than 10 years.

(2) BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION OR REPLACEMENT.—Section 129(a)(1)(C) is amended by striking “toll-free major bridge or toll-free tunnel”.

(3) CONSTRUCTION OF FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES.—

(a) Obligation of Amounts.—Section 1064(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (23 U.S.C. 129; note; 105 Stat. 2005) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) OBLIGATIONS.—Amounts made available out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner and to the same extent as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, for the Federal share of the cost of any project carried out under this section shall be 100 percent and such funds shall remain available for obligation for a period of 5 years after the last day of the fiscal year for which the funds are authorized.”.

(b) AUTOMATED FUEL REPORTING SYSTEM.—

Section 1040 of such Act (23 U.S.C. 101 note; 105 Stat. 1992) is amended by striking “by subsection (e)”.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1040(a) of such Act (23 U.S.C. 101 note; 105 Stat. 1992) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) AUTOMATED FUEL REPORTING SYSTEM. —

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall conduct and operate an automated fuel reporting system.”.

(2) High Risk Road Safety Improvement Program.—

The high risk road safety improvement program under section 133 of such title shall be available out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003, the Secretary shall make available sufficient funds to the Internal Revenue Service to establish and operate an automated fuel reporting system.”.

(3) Performance Bonus Program.—

(a) Study.—The Secretary shall develop performance-based criteria for the distribution of new funds under subsection (c) of such title (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003, the Secretary shall make available sufficient funds to the Internal Revenue Service to establish and operate an automated fuel reporting system.”.

(b) Technical Amendment.—Section 135(a) of such Act (23 U.S.C. 101 note; 105 Stat. 1992) is amended by striking “by subsection (a)”.

(c) Other Matters. —

(1) For the Interstate maintenance program, whether the level of safety on highways in the States has consistently been high or has recently improved.

(2) For the high risk road safety improvement program, whether the level of safety on highways in the States has consistently been high or has recently improved.

(3) For the surface transportation program, whether the level of financial effort in State...
funding for highway and transit investments has been high or has recently increased.

(5) For the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement programs, whether the environmental indicators that the metropolitan planning organization has consistently high or has improved.

(c) REQUIRED SUBMISSION.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the performance-based criteria developed under subsection (a).

SEC. 124. METROPOLITAN PLANNING. (a) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 134(a) is amended by inserting after "and goods" the following: "and foster economic growth and development".

(b) COORDINATION OF MPOS.—Section 134(e) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking "MPO's" and inserting "MPOS";

(2) by inserting before "If" the following: "(1) NONATTAINMENT AREAS";

(3) by adding at the end of the following:

"(2) PROJECT LOCATED IN MULTIPLE MPOS.—If a project is located within the boundaries of more than one metropolitan planning organization, the metropolitan planning organizations shall coordinate plans regarding the project.

(4) by indenting paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and aligning such paragraph (1) with paragraph (2), as added by paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(c) GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF PLANNING PROCESS.—Section 134(f) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;

(2) increase the safety and security of the transportation system for all users;

(3) increase the accessibility and mobility for people and freight;

(4) protect and enhance the environment, conserve energy, and enhance quality of life;

(5) enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, and freight;

(6) promote efficient system utilization and operation;

(7) preserve and optimize the existing transportation system; and

(8) improve the capacity and safety of congested highways, provide additional safe work space by providing additional safe work space by reducing congestion, and provide additional safe work space by reducing congestion.

(2) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum:

(a) the extent that a State determines appropriate, the State may consider goals and objectives in the transportation planning process that—

(1) support the economic vitality of the Nation, its States and metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;

(2) increase the safety and security of the transportation system for all users;

(3) increase the accessibility and mobility for people and freight;

(4) protect and enhance the environment, conserve energy, and enhance the quality of life;

(5) enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, and freight;

(6) promote efficient system utilization and operation;

(7) preserve and optimize the existing transportation system; and

(8) improve the capacity and safety of congested highways, provide additional safe work space by reducing congestion, and provide additional safe work space by reducing congestion.

(3) SCOPE OF PLANNING PROCESS.—To the extent that a State determines appropriate, the State may consider goals and objectives in the transportation planning process that—

(a) support the economic vitality of the Nation, its States and metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;

(b) increase the safety and security of the transportation system for all users;

(c) increase the accessibility and mobility for people and freight;

(d) protect and enhance the environment, conserve energy, and enhance the quality of life;

(e) enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, and freight;

(f) promote efficient system utilization and operation;

(g) preserve and optimize the existing transportation system; and

(h) improve the capacity and safety of congested highways, provide additional safe work space by reducing congestion, and provide additional safe work space by reducing congestion.

SEC. 125. STATEWIDE PLANNING.

(a) SCOPE OF PLANNING PROCESS.—Section 135(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "transportation improvement plan" and inserting "transportation plan if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available. For the purpose of developing the transportation plan, the metropolitan planning organization and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support plan implementation."

"(2) by striking paragraph (4) by inserting after "employees," the following: "freight shippers and providers of freight transportation services;"

"(3) in paragraph (5) by inserting "transportation before plan prepared."

(b) TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 134(h) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by inserting after "employees," the following: "freight shippers and providers of freight transportation services;"

(2) by striking paragraph (4) by striking "long-range plan" and inserting "3 years"; and

(3) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(B) the following: "The financial plan may include, for illustrative purposes, additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available."

(c) TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREAS.—Section 134(i) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by inserting after "System" the following: "place it appears the following: "under the high risk road safety program,"; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "(1)" and inserting "(A)"; and

(B) by striking "(2)" and inserting "(B).

(d) T RANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 135(d) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking "RE-

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(B) the following: "(1) S TUDY.ÐThe Secretary shall conduct a study on the effective of the participation of different relevant factors. The guidance shall include recommendations on the most appropriate circumstances for utilizing of the guidance issued under this subsection in evaluating the safety and cost-effectiveness of utilizing different crash cushion design and determine whether directive or non-directive crash cushions or other safety appurtenances should be installed at specific highway locations.

(e) TRAFFIC FLOW AND SAFETY APPLICATIONS OF ROAD BARRIERS.—

(2) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, uses of positive separation technologies related to—

(A) separating workers from traffic flow when work is in progress;

(B) providing additional safe work space by utilizing adjacent and available traffic lanes during off-peak hours;

(C) rapid deployment to allow for daily or periodic restoring lanes for use by traffic during peak hours as needed;

(D) mitigating congestion caused by construction by—

(i) opening all adjacent and available lanes to traffic during peak traffic periods;

(ii) providing for reversible lanes to optimize capacity of the highway by adjusting to directional traffic flow; and

(E) permanent use of positive separation technologies that create contraflow and provide for reversible lanes to increase the capacity of congested highways, bridges, and tunnels.
SEC. 127. DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) EXECUTIVE BRANCH DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS.—

(1) BRIDGE DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM.—The amount made available by paragraph (1) of title 23, United States Code, shall be no more than $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $295,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $252,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $252,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $397,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(b) HIGH COST INTERSTATE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—The amount the Secretary shall allocate for the high cost Interstate System reconstruction and improvement program under section 106(c)(2) of title 23, United States Code, shall not be more than $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(c) TERMINAL FACILITIES.—For construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities under section 605 of title 23, United States Code, $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(d) HIGHWAY RESEARCH.—For highway research under sections 307, 308, and 325 of title 23, United States Code, $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $185,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $195,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(e) TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.—For transportation education, professional training, or deployment under sections 321, 322, and 326 of title 23, United States Code, and section 5505 of title 49, United States Code, $130,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(f) TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—For transportation technology innovation and demonstration program under section 632 of this Act $43,667,000 for fiscal year 1998, $44,667,000 for fiscal year 1999, $48,167,000 for fiscal year 2000, $47,717,000 for fiscal year 2001, $47,967,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $48,217,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(g) INTELLIGENCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS PROGRAM.—For intelligent transportation systems programs under title B of title VI of this Act $175,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(h) TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE FOR OLYMPIC CITIES.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(1) LEGISLATIVE BRANCH DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS.—Section 104 is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

``(jj) HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS PROGRAM.—

(A) In general.—Of amounts made available by paragraph (1) of title 23, United States Code, $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(B) NATIONAL CORRIDOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—For the national corridor planning and development program under section 115 of this Act $70,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.


(D) NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS PROGRAM.—For the national scenic byways program under section 162 of title 23, United States Code, $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(E) VARIABLE PRICING PILOT PROGRAM.—For the variable pricing pilot program under section 119 of this Act $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 and $14,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(F) HIGHWAY RESEARCH.—For highway research under sections 307, 308, and 325 of title 23, United States Code, $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $185,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $195,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(G) TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.—For transportation education, professional training, or deployment under sections 321, 322, and 326 of title 23, United States Code, and section 5505 of title 49, United States Code, $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(H) TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—For transportation technology innovation and demonstration program under section 632 of this Act $43,667,000 for fiscal year 1998, $44,667,000 for fiscal year 1999, $48,167,000 for fiscal year 2000, $47,717,000 for fiscal year 2001, $47,967,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $48,217,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(I) INTELLIGENCE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS PROGRAM.—For intelligent transportation systems programs under title B of title VI of this Act $175,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(J) TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE FOR OLYMPIC CITIES.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Of amounts made available by paragraph (1) of title 23, United States Code, $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(3) ALLOCATION PERCENTAGES.—For each project to be carried out with funds made available by paragraph (1)—

(a) 11 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 1998;

(b) 15 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 1999;

(c) 18 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2000;

(d) 18 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2001;

(e) 19 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2002; and

(f) 19 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2003.

(3) ALLOCATION PERCENTAGES.—For each project to be carried out with funds made available by paragraph (1)—

(A) 11 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 1998;

(B) 15 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 1999;

(C) 18 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2000;

(D) 18 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2001;

(E) 19 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2002; and

(F) 19 percent of such amount shall be available for obligation beginning in fiscal year 2003.

(4) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share payable on account of any project carried out with funds made available by paragraph (1) shall be 80 percent of the total cost thereof.

(5) DELEGATION TO STATES.—Subject to the provisions of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary shall delegate responsibility for carrying out each project or projects with funds made available by paragraph (1), to the State in which such project or projects are located upon request of such State.

(6) ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION.—When a State which has been delegated responsibility for a project under this subsection—

(A) has obligated all funds allocated under this subsection for such project; and

(B) has obligated all funds allocated under this subsection for such project, except insofar as such procedures and requirements limit the State to the construction of projects with the aid of Federal funds previously allocated to it;

the Secretary, upon the approval of the application of a State, shall pay to the State the Federal share of the cost of construction of the project when additional funds are allocated for such project under this subsection and such section of this Act as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(7) NONAPPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—Funds made available by paragraph (1) shall not be subject to any obligation limitation.

(8) HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS.—Subject to section 104(j)(3) of title 23, United States Code, the amount listed for each high priority project in such section is increased by such amount (if any) as is made available by section 104(f)(3) of such title for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 to carry out each such project:

[Data in Millions of Dollars]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct California University of Pennsylvania intermodal facility</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Upgrade roads within Leakin Park Intermodal Corridor, Baltimore</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Johnstown-Cambria County Airport Relocation Road</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>State Highway 109 upgrade planning and engineering</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct circumferential freeway loop around Texarkana</td>
<td>9.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Widen North Main Street, Columbia</td>
<td>9.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Undertake transportation infrastructure improvements within Baltimore Empowerment</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct Greenfield-Montague Bikeways, Franklin Co.</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-710/Firestone Blvd. interchange</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 4 East in Contra Costa</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Upgrade North Road between US 422 and East Market St., Trumbull Co.</td>
<td>13.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct bike path between Mount Clemens and New Baltimore</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Upgrade US 29 interchange with Randolph Road, Montgomery Co.</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Texas State Highway 49 between FM 1735 to Titus/Morris Co. line</td>
<td>6.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Upgrade Marshfield Blvd., Marshfield</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Reconstruct the I-105/Firestone Blvd. interchange</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Undertake safety and capacity improvements to Rt. 309 and Old Packhouse Road</td>
<td>8.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Relocate US 61 to bypass Fort Madison</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Install directional signs in Newport and surrounding communities</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct access to Tioga Marine Terminal, Ports of Philadelphia and Camden</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Chemical Bikeways, Rochester</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Upgrade U.S. Route 422 through Girard</td>
<td>4.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>State Highway 109 upgrade planning and engineering</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct transportation demonstration project utilizing magnetic levitation technology</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct Nowotuck-Manhan Bike Trail connections, Eastampton, Amherst, Holyoke</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Reconstruct Essex Street Bridge, Bergen Co.</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Undertake traffic mitigation and circulation enhancements, 57th and Lake Shore Drive</td>
<td>1.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Upgrade County Road 39 between Highway 84 and Silver Creek Park, Clarke Co.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct road improvements, trailhead and related facilities for Birch Knob Trail</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct SR 167 bypass to Philadelphia</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Johnstown-Cambria County Airport Relocation Road</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Construct connector between US-90 and I-10 in Biloxi</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 5 in Bibb Co.</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Complete road mid-County Park and Baltimore</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct US Route 67 bypass project around Roselle</td>
<td>11.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct California University of Pennsylvania intermodal facility</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (Dollars in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Planning and design for Coalfields Expressway, Buchanan, Dickenson and Wise Counties</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Design and engineering for Tualatin-Sherwood Bypass</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 4 West in Contra Costa Co.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Construct I-95 interchange, New Haven</td>
<td>26.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Replace Lebanon Ave. Bridge and approaches, B. Belleville</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Upgrade Highway 73 from 4.5 miles north of Flandwood to 22.5 miles north of Flandwood.</td>
<td>3.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Reconstruct Mt. Erie Blacktop in Mt. Erie</td>
<td>5.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct grade separation on Shadyside Rd., Pryadol.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Construct the U.S. R t. 7 bypass project, Brookfield to New Milford town line.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Upgrade Cowan-Lorraine Rd. between I-10 and U.S. 90, Harrison Co.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct repairs to Pratt Highway Bridge, Birmingham.</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Upgrade W0k 215 and construct HOV lanes between 2nd Street and 9th Street, San Antonio.</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade Walton Blvd. between Odpkye and Squirel, Oakland Co.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct Monroe Rail Consolidation Project, Monroe</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Renovate Union Station Intermodal Transportation Center in Worcester.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Arbor Vitae Street improvements, Inglewood.</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Refurbish Satartia Bridge, Yzoo City.</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Construct Main Street Station in Richmond.</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct US Route 17, Elizabeth City Bypass.</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Upgrade capital improvements to facilitate traffic between Lansing and Port Huron.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Convert access road and entranceway improvements to airport in Niagara Falls.</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade Baldwin Ave. intersection to facilitate access to waterfront and ferry, Weehawken.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Undertake vehicular and pedestrian movement improvements within Central Business District of Foxborough.</td>
<td>2.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct I-680 HOV lanes between Marina Vista toll plaza to North Main Street, Martinez to Walnut Creek.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Improvements to Card Road between 21 mile road and 23 mile road in Macomb Co.</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade (all weather) on US 2, US 4L and MW 35.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Relocate 101 and rebuild intersection of Highway 101 and Highway 105, Clatsop Co.</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Undertake Linden Place reconstruction project, Queens.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct Houston Street Viaduct project in Dallas.</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Improve US 65/A 5 interchange, Polk Co.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct south approach south of U.S. 60 on south of US 180 on south of U.S. 180 and south of US 180 on north of US 180.</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Timber Bridge over Little Muddy River and approach roadway, Perry Co.</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Reconstruct cross road over I-95, Waterford.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Upgrade I-84, Hartford.</td>
<td>9.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Upgrade Kaumualili Highway.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Undertake improvements to South Station Intermodal Station.</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct Marina Access Road, East Chicago.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Construct North Street, Fitchburg.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Replace Shore Drive Bridge over Petty Lake, Norfolk.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade Urban University Heights Connector, Newark.</td>
<td>9.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Implement City of Compton traffic signal systems improvements.</td>
<td>5.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct I-101/Pacific project.</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct grade separations in Murchison.</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Upgrade TH6 between Talmoon to Bowstring River.</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Construct US Route 27, Elizabeth City Bypass.</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>UTC 279 and Smithfield County Parkway construction activities within the Lebanon-Lockport Area of the Delaware and Lehigh Canal National Heritage Corridor.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade State Highway 24 from Commerce to State Highway 19 north of Cooper.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-215 and construct HOV lanes between 2nd Street and 9th Street, San Bernardino.</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Undertake safety enhancements along Monterey County Railroad highway grade, Monterey Co.</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade I-94 between M-39 and I-69.</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Widen and make improvements to Baldwin and Joy Rds, Oakland Co.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct Geyer Springs RR grade separation, Little Rock.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct Route 4/17 interchange in Paramus.</td>
<td>8.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Upgrade US Rt. 35 between I-64 and South Buffalo Bridge.</td>
<td>35.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct I-101/Pacific project.</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Independence Gateway Transportation Center project, Philadelphia.</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Implement Trunk Highway B corridor projects, Chisago Co.</td>
<td>15.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct extension of bike path between Souris market area and Riverfront bike trail in St. Louis</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Construct US 12 HOV lanes between Marina Vista toll plaza to North Main Street, Martinez to Walnut Creek.</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade U.S. 45 between Eldorado and Harrisburg.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Replace U.S. 45 between Eldorado and Harrisburg.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-95, Hartford.</td>
<td>9.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Improve and complete Reconstruction of I-95, Sudbury.</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Design and ROW acquisition for “Interown South” route of U.S St bypass.</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Undertake improvements to Campus Transportation System.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Improve streets in Canoga Park and surrounding areas, Los Angeles.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade Bishop Ford Expressway/142nd St. interchange.</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct Galveston Island Causeway expansion project, Galveston.</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct Linda Vista Road extension, City of Mission, TX.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Undertake capital improvements to facilitate traffic between Lansing and Saginaw.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct Main Street Station in Richmond.</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct Houston Street between Avenue B to the West Side Highway, New York City.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Upgrade US 15 freeway project at Horicon, Mason and Littleton. in Halifax and Warren Counties.</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Upgrade Baldwin Ave. intersection to facilitate access to waterfront and ferry, Weehawken.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Undertake vehicular and pedestrian movement improvements within Central Business District of Foxborough.</td>
<td>2.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct I-680 HOV lanes between Marina Vista toll plaza to North Main Street, Martinez to Walnut Creek.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade State Highway 24 from Commerce to State Highway 19 north of Cooper.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-215 and construct HOV lanes between 2nd Street and 9th Street, San Bernardino.</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Undertake safety enhancements along Monterey County Railroad highway grade, Monterey Co.</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Construct controlled access four-lane highway between Des Moines and Burlington</td>
<td>14.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Construct improvements to Route 50 interchange with Columbia Pike, Prince Georges Co.</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct Landport regional transportation hub, Louisville</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct interchange improvements in San Francisco Regional</td>
<td>12.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Relocate railroad tracks to eliminate road crossings, and provide for the rehabilitation of secondary roads providing access to various parts of the Port and the construction of new connecting roads to access new infrastructure safely and efficiently, Bro ..................................................</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Replace Right Street Bridge in 1340  .........................................................................</td>
<td>13.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Alameda Corridor East project</td>
<td>12.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade US Rt. 27</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade Davison Rd. between Belas and Irish Roads, Gensee Co. ................................</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade PA 211 between North of University Ave. to US Rt. 211 ................................</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Replace Singing Bridge across Taunton Bay</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Roadway improvements to provide access to Hansen Dam Recreational Area in Los Angeles</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct R. 819Rt. 119 interchange between Mt. Pleasant and Scottsdale ................</td>
<td>14.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Replace US Rt. 22 at Junction with US Rt. 2 ......................................................</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Replace McCreery Road Bridge, Mahoning Co.</td>
<td>3.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade Rochester Road between I-75 and Torpsey St.</td>
<td>12.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct 8th Street Bridge over San Dimas Creek ...................................................</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct improvements to Mckinley Bridge over Mississippi River with terminus points in Venice, Illinois, and St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>5.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Construct I-295 connector, Portland</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Studies and planning for reconstruction of East-West Highway</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade PA Route 21, Fayette and Greene Counties</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct VC Campus Parkway Loop System in Merced ................................................</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Replace deck of Chain Bridge over Mississippi River ...............................................</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Edgewater Road Dedicated Truck Route .......................................................</td>
<td>12.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Banquet Street Overpass in Effingham</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Replace Masonbridge, Fayette and Greene Counties...................................................</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade US Rt. 20 at Junction with US Rt. .............................................................</td>
<td>10.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Upgrade Lallie St., Frenchtown Rd., and Penheck Rd., Ironwood</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Upgrade US Highway 301 within Bamberg .....................................................................</td>
<td>2.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Construct Veterans Memorial overpass in Pima Co.</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Improve traffic flow at the intersection of US Rt. 27 and I-94 ................................</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct intermodal freight terminal in Wayne Co.</td>
<td>24.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Replace grade crossing with separated crossing and related improvements, Linn Co.</td>
<td>6.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct State Route 81 (Sierra Ave.) and I-10 interchange in Fontana ......................</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct four-lane highway facility (Hollister Bypass), San Benito Co. ....................</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Construct new bridge over Kennebec River (Carlton Bridge replacement) ......................</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Upgrade I-5 Highway 217 interchange, Portland</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Upgrade village roads on Tutuila Island, American Samoa ...................................</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Implement Melrose Commons geographic information system .........................................</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Parkover Interchange on I-70, Washington Co. ........................................</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Acquire land and construct segment of Daniel Boone Heritage Trail (Kane Gap section), Jefferson National Forest</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Sacramento Intermodal Station</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct intermodal facility in New Rochelle, Westchester Co.</td>
<td>9.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct 79th Street Traffic Circle in York Co.</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Extend North Delaware Ave. between Lewis St. and Ortho St., Philadelphia ..................</td>
<td>5.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade Route M O 291 Connector</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade US Rt. 119 between Homer City and Blairsville ...........................................</td>
<td>6.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Upgrade I-41 between Rockville and Scott Road (Bypass), Rock County .........................</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct intermodal facility at Missouri Botanical Garden ......................................</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Piscataqua River bridges, Kittery</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Upgrade STH 29 between I-94 and Chippewa Falls</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Extend and reconstruct roadways through多少项 .........................................................</td>
<td>5.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct road from the Military Ocean Terminal to the Port Jersey Pier, Bayonne ....</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Relocate and reconstruct Route 21 between Schenck Rd. to Town of DeSoto .................</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Improve drainage on 6th Street in Menomonee ..........................................................</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Reconstruc 22nd to four-lane expressway between Lansdowne, Harrisburg/Erks ................</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Relocate and complete construction of new multi-modal facility, Weehawken ..............</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Rehabilitate pavement throughout Santa Barbara Co. ..................................................</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Repair historic wooden bridges along portion of Virginia Creeper Trail maintained by Town of Abingdon</td>
<td>2.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Roadway improvements at I-10 and 28th Ave...............................................................</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Conduct planning and engineering for connector route between I-95 and industrial/busi-</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Undertake Perimeter Central Parkway Overpass project and Ashford Dunwoody interchange improvements at I-285, Dekalb Co.</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Construct Wilmington Bypass, Wilmington</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Western Springs Pedestrian and Tunnel project, Cook Co. ..........................</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Upgrade Cass County Road 105 and Crow Wing County Road 125, East Gull Lake ..........</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct interchange improvements in San Francisco Regional ......................................</td>
<td>5.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct and widen Mission Road, Alhambra</td>
<td>3.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct and widen I-35 between North of Georgetown at Loop 418 to US Rt. 100 ........</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct access road to St. Johns Ave. Industrial Park ............................................</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Construct improvements at 90th and Charleston Branch ........................................</td>
<td>1.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct Tawas Beach Road US 23 interchange improvements, East Tawas ....................</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Lawrenceville Industrial Access Road .......................................................</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade Del Almo Boulevard at I-405</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Reconstruct and replace I-494 Wakota Bridge from South St. Paul to Newport, and approaches</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct ramp connection between Hammett St. to Highway 54 to ramp to provide access to I-10 in El Paso</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Undertake studies, planning, engineering, design and construction of a tunnel alternative to reconstruction of existing expressway (Gowanus tunnel project)</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct Broad Street between Maple St. to Sixth St., Evansville</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade pedestrian traffic facilities, Bristol</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Upgrade I-580 interchange, Livermore</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Uphage Industrial Parkway Southwest between Whipple Rd. and improved segment of the parkway, Hayward</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Upgrade Western Reserve Road, Mahoning Co.</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 124 between Five Points and Ravenswood Bridge, Macks Co.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 114 between 5th Street Station, San Antonio</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade I-80 interchange, Livermore</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade Interstate 80, Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Upgrade access improvements to Port of Rochester Harbor, Rochester</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Upgrade interchange on Rt. 136 between Rt. 146 and Ashtown Viaduct, Lincoln</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Preliminary design and for access road to proposed location of regional airport, Lincoln Co.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 2 between Philipston and Greenfield</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade access to Route 66 between Frankfurt and I-35</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Relocate PA 18 between 9th Ave. and 32nd St., Beaver Falls</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Construct right-of-way improvements to provide improved pedestrian access to MAX light rail, Gresham</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-10 and Ryan Street access ramps and frontage street improvements, Lake Charles</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 92/E1 Camino interchange, San Mateo</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade United Loop 197, Galveston</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Upgrade Highway 53 between Virginia and Cook</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade intersection of Folson Blvd. and Power Inn Rd., Sacramento</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Upgrade Grand Avenue between Elm Street and Halo Road, Arroyo Grande</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct intermodal facility in Yonkers, Westchester Co.</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct bike path between Rt. 16 (Everett) to Lynn Oceanside</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct bike path between I-40 and Golden 33rd St., San Leandro</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Port of Oakland intermodal terminal</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Upgrade Skyline Drive to LaPorte County</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Replace bridge over Tombigbee River, Nashville</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct bike path between I-70/I-25 Interchange, Denver</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Reconstruct and upgrade I-70/I-25 Interchange, Denver</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Improve safety and traffic flow on Rt. 13 through Clinton</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct bike/pedestrian path between Delmar Metrolink Station and University City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Upgrade U.S. Route 52 between Donnybrook and US Route 2</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Environmental studies, preliminary engineering and design of North-South Connector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve walking and biking trails between Easton and Lehigh Gorge State Park within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct railroad at-grade crossings, San Leandro</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade FM 225, Nacogdoches</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct improvements to 19th Street between I-59 and Tuxedo Junction, Birmingham</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-75/M-57 interchange</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian bridge over TH 169 in Eki River</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Reconstruct 1-75/M-57 interchange</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Reconstruct SE Main Ave/I-94 interchange</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct improvements to 19th Street between I-59 and Tuxedo Junction, Birmingham</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Upgrade Main and First Streets to two-way traffic, Miamisburg</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct railroad at-grade crossings, San Leandro</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve walking and biking trails between Easton and Lehigh Gorge State Park within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Upgrade Naito Parkway, Portland</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Install safety improvements on PA Rt. 935 (Dusselfink Safety Project) between Rt. 183</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Capital improvements for the car float operations in Brooklyn, New York</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Backbone Trail through San Francisco</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct Greenfield Road, Montague</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Upgrade U.S. Route 52 between Donnybrook and US Route 2</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Philadelphia Intermodal Gateway Project at 30th St. Station</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian path between Delmar MetroLink Station and University City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Replace Sand island tunnel with bridge</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Reconstruct alignment on Rt. 19 through Clinton</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct improvements to Moorpark/Highway 101 interchange, Bouchard/Highway 101</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct extension of West Austin Street (FM 2690) between Old Tyler Road and Loop 224, Nacogdoches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct passenger ferry to serve Southworth-Seattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct interchange at junction of I-73/8-93 and I-10 between Edinburg and Harlingen, Hidalgo County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378.</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Construct I-95/526 interchange, Orangeburg Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379.</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 46 between Mahoning Ave. and Salt Springs Rd., Mahoning and Trumbull Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Reestablish Highway 1 in Guadalupe County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct Great River Bridge improvements, Westfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382.</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Studies and planning for extension of I-95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383.</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade Greenville Rd. and construct railroad underpass, Livermore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct access to Hinkley Point; Union Station to Mill River Parkway and Hutchinson River Parkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct accessibility improvements to Charles Street T Station, Boston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386.</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Purchase and install emitters and receiving equipment to facilitate movement of emergency and transit vehicles at key arterial intersections, Portland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct bicycle and pedestrian facility between Boston Bridge and Hinkley Point Park, Allegheny Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388.</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Restore transportation connection between Wauna, Astoria and Port of Astoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Design, engineer, ROW acquisition and construct the Luzerne County Community College Road between the intersection of S.R. 2002 and S.R. 3004 and put to use, Scranton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390.</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Undertake improvements to Hennepin County Bikeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Design, engineer, ROW acquisition and construct the Luzerne County Community College Road between S.R. 2002 and S.R. 3004 one-mile west of Center Street through S.R. 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade bridge over Nautuck River, Easthampton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Construct access road to Hastings Industrial Park, Cambria Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct I-5 interchange, City of Lacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Planning, engineering and first phase construction of beltway connecting Defiance and America, Defiance County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade I-78 interchange and West Peddie St. ramps, Newark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct I-75/80 interchange, City of Lacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Upgrade Highway 55 between US 64 and State Route 1121, Wake and Durham Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 501 in Bedford County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct I-205/Sunnybrook interchange and related extension road, Clackamas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian and bicycle path between the Mill on the Lehigh and the Mill on the Susquehanna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402.</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Design, engineer, ROW acquisition and construct the Luzerne County Community College Road between the intersection of S.R. 2002 and S.R. 3004 one-mile west of Center Street through S.R. 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct two-lane parallel bridge, State Highway 146, FM 517 to vicinity of Dickinson Bayou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404.</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Upgrade US Rt. 52, MacDill Air Force Base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405.</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Improve roads, Edge of Wilderness, Grand Rapids to Effie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct access road, walking trail and related facilities for the Nicholsville Center, Scott Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407.</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian and bicycle path between the Mill on the Lehigh and the Mill on the Susquehanna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct access road to Melvin Price Locks and Dam Visitors Center, Madison Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Marion Street multi-modal project in Village of Oak Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade roadway in the Princeton/I-95 interchange and related improvements, Philadelphia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411.</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Upgrade roadway in the Princeton/I-95 interchange and related improvements, Raleigh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412.</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Union Station in Springfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Rehabilitate interchanges on Santa Fe Avenue and the Arizona State Route 24 in Tucson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Extend Martin Luther King Jr. East Busway to link with Mon-Fayette Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct improvements to I-77/SC #5-20-30 interchange, Fairfield Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416.</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Mon弗雷特丘赫斯大桥,彭赫尔斯。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Upgrade highway between I-77 and I-40, Johnston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418.</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Upgrade I-5, Salem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Install call boxes along Highway 166 between intersection with Highway 101 and junction with Highway 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade Rt. 600 to facilitate access between I-81 and Mount Rogers National Recreation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421.</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Upgrade Rt. 600 to facilitate access between I-81 and Mount Rogers National Recreation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Undertake median improvements along E. 14th St., San Leandro</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct new entrance to Midway Airport Terminal</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade access road to M.are Island</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Resurface S. Chicago Ave. From 71st to 95th Streets, Chicago</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade Industrial Road between Carteret and Woodbridge Township</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Restore MN Transportation facility, Jackson Street Roundhouse, St. Paul</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Upgrade access to Mare Island</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct I-81 interchange, Martinsburg</td>
<td>5.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct roundabout at intersection of Highway 101 and Highway 202, Clatsop Co.</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct 2nd Street improvements between W. D. Street and Fort Bridgeway, Long IslandPark and bicycle/pedestrian facility between Island Park and Willamaline Senior Center, Springfield</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Undertake multimodal transportation improvements, Dayton</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Upgrade Highway 128 between Rt. 38 and New Hampshire State Line</td>
<td>8.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Conduct M I S for Multimodal Downtown Improvement Project, San Antonio</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct improvements to Route 101/Lost Hills Road interchange, Calabasas</td>
<td>5.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct John Young Parkway/4 interchange</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Conduct Calhoun/Clarendon Causeway</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct Austin to San Antonio Corridor</td>
<td>9.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct East Loop, Brownsville</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade South Lake Shore Drive between Fullerton and Hayes, Chicago</td>
<td>7.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct Finn Avenue/Interstate 85 project</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Implement middle Tennessee alternative transportation system along the Stones River</td>
<td>9.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Construct improvements to H-1 between the Waiakea interchange and the Halawa inter</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade interchange improvements and flyover ramps at I-80W to Route DZN in Passaic Co.</td>
<td>4.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct new entrance to Midway Airport Terminal</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Construct Cameron Branch 300</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade 95th St. between Western Ave. and Stony Island Blvd., Chicago</td>
<td>3.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade Rt. 9/Calvin Coolidge Bridge, Hadley</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Acquire and renovate facility to serve as multimodal transportation center, Eugene</td>
<td>3.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade US 31 to the Goshen Bypass, Sumner Co.</td>
<td>3.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Conduct drainage system improvements associated with highway construction on Tutuila Island, American Samoa</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Replace I-280 bridge over Maumee River, Toledo area</td>
<td>24.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade interchange improvements and flyover ramps at I-80W to Route DZN in Passaic Co.</td>
<td>2.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Upgrade State Highway 29 between Green Bay and Wausau</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct State Route 905 between I-80S and the Otay Mesa Border Crossing, San Diego Co.</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Undertake improvements along I-77</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Conduct preliminary engineering on I-73 between Roanoke and Virginia/North Carolina State line</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (Dollars in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Upgrade Cross-Range Expressway between Coleraine to CSAH 7</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Upgrade I-680 Corridor, Alameda Co.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Conduct MIS of light rail corridors, D.C.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Replace Grant Street Bridge, New Castle</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Third Avenue Bridge over Harlem River, New York City</td>
<td>1.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct Phase 3 of Alameda Street project, Los Angeles</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Extend SR 149 between SR 130 to US Rt. 30, Valparaiso</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Implement safety and congestion mitigation improvements along Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Upgrade I-95I-495 interchange at Ritchie Marlboro Rd., Prince Georges</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Construct arterial connector between US41/M28 and Co. Rd. 480, Marquette</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Study four I-386 interchange over Mississippi River with terminus points in St. Clair County and St. Louis, MO.</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Upgrade Three Mile Road, Grand Traverse</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Construct Abbotsford Bypass</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct Airport Blvd. interchange in Salinas</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 79 between Milian and McKenzie</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct highway between Interstate Route 169 (Tonelle Ave.) and the New Jersey Turnpike at Secaucus Intermodal Transfer Rail Station</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Recruit US Highway 238 between 7th and 20th Streets including center turn lane from Hubenthal Place to South Main Ave.</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Construct grade crossing improvements, Morrison County</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Upgrade Bristol St., Santa Ana</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Undertake access improvements to U.S. Rt. 41, Chicago</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Reconstruct Dixie Highway, Harvey</td>
<td>2.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Upgrade CSAH between TH 324 and Snake River</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Rehabilitate B Street between Foothill Blvd. and Kelly St., Hayward</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Construct access improvements to various roads, Humphreys Co.</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Safety enhancements at rail crossings, Linden, Fenton, Swartz Creek and Gaines</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Implement city-wide signal control system replacements and improvements in Baltimore</td>
<td>17.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Construct road drainage improvements, Suttons Bay Village</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 10 between Logan and Man</td>
<td>50.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct Gene Autry Way 5 Access project, Anaheim</td>
<td>9.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 79 between Milian and McKenzie</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Reconstruct Midlothian Turnpike, Robbins</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Connector between I-5 and SR 113 and reconstruct I-5 interchange with Road 102, Woodland</td>
<td>11.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Reconstruct Marlboro Road interchange, Lancaster</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct Airport Blvd. interchange in Salinas</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct Third Street South Bay Basin Bridge, San Francisco</td>
<td>12.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Reconstruct CSAH between Price Canyon and Brawley, CA</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Upgrade U.S. 319 between Four Points and Oak Ridge Road, Tallahassee</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-84 between vicinity of Route 69 in Waterbury and Marion Avenue in South-</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Upgrade Richardson Avenue to 10th Street, San Diego</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Consolidate rail tracks and eliminate grade crossings as part of Gateway Intermodal Terminal access project</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Construct Robinson Town Centre intermodal facility</td>
<td>2.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Investigate strategies to reduce congestion and facilitate access at the international border crossing in Roma</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Construct Waimea Bypass</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-5 interchange over I-90</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Construct Intermodal Industrial Park in Wellsville</td>
<td>2.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 82, Strongsville</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian promenade, Pismo Beach</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct M 15 of light rail corridors, D.C.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Upgrade I-680 Corridor, Alameda Co.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Reconstruct new bridge over Muskingum River and highway approaches, Washington County</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Construct improvements along Route 18 for access to waterfront and downtown areas, New Bedford</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Upgrade Cross Range Expressway between Coleraine to CSAH 7</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Construct transportation improvements to Industrial Viaduct, Chicago</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Replace Grant Street Bridge, New Castle</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Extend South 74th Street, Belleville</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Construct Phase 3 of Alameda Street project, Los Angeles</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 2 in Cabell Co., including the relocation of Route 2 to provide for a connection to I-64 (Merrick Creek Connector)</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Construct Shepard Road/Upper Landing interceptor, St. Paul</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct improvements to segment of Town Creek Road, Jackson Co.</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Complete construction of Forest Highway 11, Lake Co.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Replace Sauk Rapids Bridge over Mississippi River, Stearns and Benton Counties</td>
<td>10.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Replace Jacobs Road Bridge, Mahoning Co.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Make improvements to I-95SR-1162 interchange in Johnston Co.</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Construct bikeway, Santa Maria</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Construct Trunk Highway 169 Causeway, Itasca Co.</td>
<td>8.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Construct Cass County Public Trails Corridors</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Construct park and ride intermodal centers for Nashville/Middle Tennessee Commuter Rail</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct bicycl path, Calaveras Co.</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade Hampton Lake Road, Tallahatchie Co.</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade M.L. King Drive, Genese Co.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Midtown West Intermodal Ferry Terminal, New York City</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct Jackson Road project (demonstrating performance of paper and plastic reinforced concrete), Scio Township</td>
<td>4.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct Bagley Street and improve Genshaw Road, Alpena</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct State Highway 87 between Sabine Pass and Bolivar Peninsula, McAden Beach</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct little</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct I-10/Louisiana Ave. interchange</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Construct regional multimodal transportation center in Albany</td>
<td>10.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Upgrade Cross Bay Bridge, Port of Cedar Bay</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade Illinois 336 between Illinois 61 to south of Lorain</td>
<td>5.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Right-of-way acquisition for segment of Alton Bypass between Illinois 143 to Illinois 140 near Alton</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Restore the historic Columbia River Highway including construction of a bicycle path under I-84 at Tanner Creek and restoration of the Tanner Creek and Moffett Creek bridges</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct intermodal transportation facility on Bergenline Ave., Union City</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Upgrade SR 22 between SR 269 and WF Hill, Puthford</td>
<td>5.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Extend County State Highway 61 extension into Two Harbors</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade roads, Washington Co.</td>
<td>4.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade M-24 from I-75 to the northern Oakland Co. border</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct Sequim-Glenorch Valley project</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct HOV lane and bicycle lane within the Glendale Blvd. corridor in Los Angeles</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade Groveland M Rail, Dickinson</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 219 between Meyersdale and Somerset</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade H-30 between Dallas and Ft. Worth</td>
<td>29.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Upgrade U.S. 319 between I-10 and the Florida/Georgia State line</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Construct Rhode Island Greenways and Bikeways projects with the amount of provided $5,700,000 for the Washington Secondary Bikepath, and $2,100,000 for the South County Bikeway Phase 2</td>
<td>7.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility study on upgrading SH 16 in South Texas</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct road improvement, trailhead development and related facilities for Hayesi to Breaks Interstate Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail between Haysi and Garden Hole area of Breaks Interstate Park</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Upgrade CSAH 16 between TH 53 and CSAH 4</td>
<td>5.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Construct bicycle and pedestrian facility (Mesabi Trail), St. Louis County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Black Creek and Kanawha Intermodal Center, Blairsville</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Reconstruct structures and adjacent roadway, Etna and Aspersville (design and right-of-way acquisition phases), Allegheny Co.</td>
<td>3.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct safety improvements and beautification along I-95, Daytona Beach</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Undertake arterial enhancements in Dekalb Co. with the amount provided as follows: $7,000,000 for Candler Rd., $5,700,000 for Memorial Highway and $900,000 for Buford Highway</td>
<td>15.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Construct highway construction between Highway 494 and Carver Co. Rd. 147</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct improvements to segment of I-880, Alameda</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 11</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Upgrade 77th St. between I-35W and 24th Ave. to four lanes in Richfield</td>
<td>22.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Construct improvements to Environ Dr., between 200th St. and Environ Dr., Birmingham</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Upgrade Fitch Road over Olmsted Falls</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade Market St./Essex St. and Rochelle Ave./Main St. to facilitate access to Routes 17 and 80, Bergen Co.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct improvements to Environ Dr., between 200th St. and Environ Dr., Birmingham</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Seismic retrofit of Golden Gate Bridge</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Extend Rogers Street to mitigate congestion, Waterloo</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct I-95/I-93 interchange, Boston</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade TI 13 between I-75 and I-45</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct bikeways, Santa Maria</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Upgrade Ridge Road between Griffith and Highland</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (Dollars in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Upgrade Alva-Stage Rd., Montgomery Co.</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Construct South Rivergate rail overcrossing in Portland</td>
<td>13.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Reconstruct Pleasant Street-River Terrace, Holyoke</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Implement Phase II of unified signage system, Essex Co.</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Design and engineering for Newberg-Dunde Bypass</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct Landing Enhancement and Restoration Project, Town of Yarmouth</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Construct SR 22 Bypass, Obion Co.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construct US Rt. 231 between junction of State Road 66 to Dubois Co. line</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Broadway Bridge, New York City</td>
<td>3.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Redesign Grand Concours to enhance traffic flow and related enhancements</td>
<td>13.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Upgrade Spring St. between Bank and Latham Streets, Williamstown</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Construct bikeway between Blackstone and Worcester</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Repair signal wires, grade crossing warning devices and other safety protections along South Shore Railroad which pass through the Northeast Bronx</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade Aliso Viejo N Rd. to Caps Rd. and Saticoy .............................................................................</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 6 between I-29 and Route A.C., St. Joseph</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade Highways 133 between Platteville and Du Quoin</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 36 between Hamilton and Chillicothe</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Extend Martin Luther King Busway, Allegheny Co.</td>
<td>2.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Implement project to improve mobility of traveling public, Cambridge, Boston</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct access to site of former Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and Base, Philadelphia</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct extension of State Route 180 between Rt. 99 and the Hughes/West DIagonal</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Construct overpass to eliminate railroad crossing in Burlington</td>
<td>3.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct South Weymouth Naval Air Station Connectivity Improvements</td>
<td>16.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct Eastern US Rt. 23 bypass of Portsmouth</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct highway-rail-marine intermodal project, Corpus Christi</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Preliminary design of Route 2 connector to downtown Fitchburg</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Implement Trinity College Area road improvements, Hartford</td>
<td>6.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct Collingswood Circle eliminator, Cazen</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Upgrade Virginia Route 10, Surrey Co.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct repairs to viaducts connecting downtown and midtown areas, Birmingham</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Replace Windham Road bridge, Windham</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Implement rural ITS</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Construct SR 22 Bypass, Obion Co.</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct Black River intermodal transportation center</td>
<td>5.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct the South Central Los Angeles Exposition Park Intermodal Urban Access Project in Los Angeles</td>
<td>26.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Upgrade I-75 between the Crisp/Dooly co. to the Florida State line</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct bicycle paths as part of regional system, Agoura Hills</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct bicycle and pedestrian facility (The Riverwalk), Peabody</td>
<td>1.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct improvements between I-605 and State Road 111, Los Angeles and Orange Counties</td>
<td>20.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct tunnel with approaches as part of Devils Slide project in San Mateo Co.</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct US Highway 99 railroad crossing overpass in Texas</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct improvements to USSC 35 interchange</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Cleveland Bypass</td>
<td>13.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Implement ITS technologies in Employment Center area of City of El Segundo</td>
<td>4.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct grade separated bicycle path along Los Angeles River between Fulton Ave. to the vicinity of Sepulveda Blvd. and the Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area, Los Angeles</td>
<td>3.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Replace Barton Rd./M-14 interchange, Ann Arbor</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade Mo. Rt. 150, Jackson Co.</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Upgrade M-10 Corridor through Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>4.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade Route 58 from Stuart up Lovers’ Leap Mountain towards Carroll Co.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Implement Cape and Islands Rural Roads Initiative, Cape Cod</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct Broadway Bridge, New York City</td>
<td>1.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Replace AL-35 Village, Tuscaloosa, AL-53 Villages</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Design, engineering and ROW acquisition for Area Service Highway, Yuma</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct Decatur Southern Bypass</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct new I-58 interchange with Highway 99W, Tehama County</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct US Highway 115 improvements in San Joaquin County</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Alameda Corridor East, San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>2.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Reconstruct Pleasant Street-Terrace, Holyoke</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct phase II of unified signage system, Escondido</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Upgrade Frederick Douglas Circle, New York City</td>
<td>14.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct New River Parkway</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Upgrade Wood Street between Little Calumet River to 171st St., Dixmoor, Harvey, Markham, Hazelcrest</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Improve Hoban Road and Grand Avenue, City of Mackinac Island</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct South Rivergate rail crossing overcrossing in Portland</td>
<td>13.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade State Highway 35 Houston District Brazoria County</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Install citywide signalization (SAMI) project in Lebanon</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct Florida Expressway in St. Bernard and Orleans Parishes</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Port of Kalama River Bridge</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design, engineer, ROW acquisition and construct the Wilkes-Barre/Scranton</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade West County Line Road, City of Jackson</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement directional sign program between Worcester CBD and regional airport</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade D Street between Grand and Second Streets, Hayward</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Route 28, Apartment Community</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade Tittabawassee Road between Mackinaw Road and Midland Road, Saginaw Co.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct North Charleston Regional Intermodal Center</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade SR 7 (Eastern Ave.) to improve traffic flow to Gallipolis, Gallia Co.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve I-893 over I-93 Highway in Manchester, Co.</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Highway 210 trail/underpass, Brainerd/Baxter</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade NC 48 in Halifax and Northampton Counties</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise interchange ramp on Route 72 northbound from I-84 East in Plainville, Conn</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen and reconstruct State Route 82 from Laramie/Cheyenne County line to I-87</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen US-321 from Kinz Springs to Wean Valley Road</td>
<td>9.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct US 22C/Cannon Airpark</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade US-60 in Carter County, Missouri</td>
<td>27.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocate State Route 60 from Zanesville to Dresden, Muskingum County</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct I-35 Truck Climbing lane in Washington County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct railroad relocation study in Muncie</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct highway-transit transfer facility in Lemoine</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct surface transportation facilities along Atlanta-Griffin-Macon corridor</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve I-295 from Alexandria to Manhattan</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade US-39 from Wooster to Riverside</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Edmounds Crossing Multi-modal transportation project in Edmonds, Washing</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove and replace Route 130 Bridge in Hollywood</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct exit ramp on I-180 at State Route 31 in Williamsport</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct pedestrian access and safety on Deception Pass Bridge, Deception Pass</td>
<td>10.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve and construct grade separation on Cockrell Lane in Springfield</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct the Kemer Street Station connector road in Lynchburg</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct and widen I-205 on Columbia Bridge and Realignment in downtown Oregon</td>
<td>97.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Historic Whistle Stop Bike Trail in Pochard, Alabama</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct an interchange to the Alaska Marine Highway and facilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000,000 for Seward, $3,000,000 for Ketchikan, and $3,000,000 for Holits</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Route 202 bridge in New Milford, Connecticut</td>
<td>2.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct U.S. Highway 10, Fremont to Appleton</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct median barrier for US-60 Loop freeway extension between I-30 west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Highway 170 and State Highway 199 in Tarrant County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure US-133 Pennsylvania Turnpike interchange</td>
<td>2.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Washington Pass visitor facilities on North Cascades Highway</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Huntington Avenue South in the Rock</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Center City Transportation Corridor</td>
<td>21.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend Hurstbourne Parkway from Bardstown Road to Fern Valley Road</td>
<td>8.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate 16 at-grade rail crossings through Erie</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct bike lanes in the City of Mobile</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West 1060 South from I-15 to Wanship Highway in North Jordan</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade 11 warning devices on the north/south line from Toledo to Deshler</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Port of Kalamazoo River Bridge</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Colfax Boulevard-Highway 50 in the city of Great Falls</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct the Broad Street Parkway in Nashua</td>
<td>16.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct County Road 93 between NYS 27 and NYS 454</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Clinton Ferry Terminal in Clinton</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install Illinois I-80 Smart Corridor project along the I-880 corridor</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Veterans Parkway from Eastland Drive to Commerce Parkway in Bloomington</td>
<td>11.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Drexel University Infrastructure Research Facility roadway improvements</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Route 1 from Pierson Avenue to Inman Avenue in Middlesex County</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Illinois Route 35 corridor on Illinois Highway</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct US-3 Carroll town line 2.1 miles north</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade State Highway 35 Houston District Brazoria County</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct US-27 from State Route 69 to Morgan County line</td>
<td>5.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrad e US-13 north of US-50 to MD-589 in Worcester County, Maryland</td>
<td>24.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Florida Expressway in St. Bernard and Orleans Parishes</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
803. Colorado ............................................. Construct I-25 truck lane from Lincoln Avenue to Castle Pines Parkway in Douglas County... 3.000
804. Oklahoma ............................................ Conduct study of Highway 3 in McCurtain, Pushmataha and Atoka Counties ..................... 0.300
805. Texas .................................................. Reconstruct 186 on Highway 78 in Bexar County ................................................................. 10.000
806. Georgia ................................................ Construct noise barriers on the westside of I-185 between Macon Road and Airport Thruway and I-75 between Mt. Zion Road and Old Dixie Highway in the Atlanta area .................................................. 1.000
807. Arkansas ............................................. Construct the I-635 Bypass/Overside Ashdown ...................................................................... 5.000
808. Illinois .................................................. Construct Peoria City River Center parking facility in Peoria ..................................................... 4.000
809. Arkansas ............................................. Study and construct a multi-modal facility Russellville, Arkansas .................................................. 1.000
810. Washington .......................................... Design and implement report and environmental study of the I-5 corridor in Everett, Washington .......................................................................................................................... 1.000
811. Pennsylvania ........................................ Construct Newton Hamilton SR 3201 over Juniata River in Mifflin County .................................................. 2.000
812. Texas .................................................... Widen State Highway 6 from Senior Road to FM 521 ................................................................. 12.100
813. South Dakota ........................................ Construct Eastern Dakota Expressway (Phase I) ........................................................................... 15.790
814. Kentucky ............................................. Construct necessary connections for the Taylor South Gate Bridge in Newport and the City of Wades Bailey Bridge in Covington ................................................................. 9.500
815. Washington .......................................... Construct traffic signals on US-2 at Olds Owens Road and 5th Street in Sultan, Washington ................................................................. 0.257
816. Minnesota ............................................. Widen Trunk Highway 14/S2 from 75th Street, NW to Trunk Highway 63 in Rochester .................. 13.000
817. New Jersey ............................................ Improve Old York Road/Rising Run Road intersection in Burlington .......................................... 6.640
818. Pennsylvania ......................................... Construct I-81 noise abatement program in Dauphin County ...................................................... 0.640
819. Alabama ............................................... Construct Crepe Myrtle Trail near Mobile, Alabama ........................................................................... 1.680
820. California ............................................. Improve grade separations on the Garden State Parkway in Cape May County, New Jersey ... 14.000
821. New Jersey ............................................ Construct Western Inner Loop from PA-26 to State Route 304 .................................................. 3.680
824. New Hampshire .................................... Construct Hillsdale Bridge ........................................................................................................ 3.000
825. Washington .......................................... Construct I-5 interchanges in Lewis County ................................................................................. 6.650
826. Georgia ............................................... Widen Georgia Route 60/US-278 in Polk County ........................................................................... 10.980
827. Pennsylvania ......................................... Improve access from I-375 to the international terminal at Philadelphia International Airport ... 5.000
828. Pennsylvania ......................................... Construct rail mitigation and improvement projects from Philadelphia to New Jersey Line (I-580) from Washoe and Douglas Counties ........................................................................................................ 12.800
829. Nevada .................................................. Resurface Davis Drive, Green Street, and North Houston Road in Warner Robins ...................... 5.000
830. Georgia ............................................... Repair Port of Hood River Bridge Lift Span project ........................................................................... 23.500
832. New York ............................................. Improve access to I-84/Dutchess intermodal facility in Dutchess County .................................................. 3.000
833. Georgia ................................................ Construct a study of an interstate multimodal transportation corridor from Atlanta to Chattanooga .......................................................................................................................... 5.000
834. Nebraska ............................................. Corridor study for Louisville South bypass from State Highway 66 to State Highway 50 .... 0.100
835. Michigan .............................................. Conduct feasibility study on widening US-12 to three lanes between US-127 and Michigan Highway 50 .............................................................................................................................. 0.257
836. Kentucky ............................................. Correct rock hazard on US-127 in Russell County ................................................................................... 0.035
837. New York ............................................. Construct new exit 46A on I-90 at Route 170 in North Chili ........................................................................... 10.000
838. California ............................................. Construct parking lot, pedestrian bridge and related improvements to improve multimodal transportation in Yorba Linda .......................................................................................................................... 3.800
839. Missouri .............................................. Construct US-412 corridor from Kennett to Hayti, Missouri ........................................................................ 8.000
840. Florida .................................................... ITS improvements on US-19 in Pasco County ........................................................................... 2.000
841. Florida .................................................... Construct I-4 reversible safety lane in Orlando .................................................................................. 14.000
842. Connecticut .......................................... Improve and rewinch Route 8 in Winchester ........................................................................... 2.030
843. Louisiana ............................................. Construct State Highway 324/U.S. Highway 1088/I-12 interchange in St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana ................................................................................................................................. 10.000
844. Nebraska ............................................. Corridor study for Plattsburg Bridge and Highway 47 ................................................................. 0.250
845. Michigan .............................................. Construct US-131 business route/industrial connector in Kalamazoo .................................................. 2.000
847. California ............................................. Ontario International Airport ground access program ........................................................................... 10.500
848. Texas .................................................... Construct the Presidio to Port Isabel Corridor from Brownsville to I-45 ........................................... 10.000
849. Virginia ................................................ Construct I-73 from Roanoke to the North Carolina border ........................................................................... 8.500
850. Louisiana ............................................. Kerner's Ferry Bridge Replacement project ........................................................................... 1.000
851. Washington .......................................... Widen SR-522 in Snohomish County: $3,650,000 for phase 1 from SR-19 to Lake Road; $1,500,000 for SR-522 to Snohomish River Bridge ................................................................................................................................. 5.200
852. California ............................................. Plan and design interchange between I-15 and San Diego Freeway in Barstow, California ........... 4.000
853. California ............................................. Upgrade Ft. Irwin Road from I-15 to Fort Irwin ........................................................................... 1.500
854. Nebraska ............................................. Construct bridge in Newcastle ........................................................................................................ 3.000
855. Indiana .................................................. Conduct rail-highway feasibility study in Monroe County ......................................................................... 0.100
856. New Jersey ............................................ Replace the Ocean City-Longport bridge in Cape May County, New Jersey .................................................. 26.000
857. Kentucky ............................................. Construct a segment of the I-66 corridor from Somerset to I-75 ........................................................................... 10.000
858. Ohio ..................................................... Improve and widen SR-85 from North of the I-90 interchange to North Bend Road in Ashland County, Ohio ................................................................................................................................. 7.920
859. Illinois .................................................. Construct I-88 interchange at Peace Road in Dekalb ........................................................................... 4.300
860. Virginia ................................................ Widen Route 123 from Prince William County line to State Route 645 in Fauquier County, Virginia ................................................................................................................................. 10.000
861. Pennsylvania ........................................ Construct I-702 in Butler County ........................................................................................................ 1.000
862. Ohio ..................................................... Widen and improve Route 448 in Putnam County ........................................................................... 1.000
863. New Hampshire ..................................... Conduct feasibility study for inclusion of US-22 as part of the Interstate System .................................................. 0.100
864. Louisiana ............................................. Improve the Bridge Street bridge in Plymouth ........................................................................... 1.000
865. Louisiana ............................................. Construct a feasibility and design study of Louisiana Highway 30 between Louisiana Highway 44 and I-10 between Lake Charles and Lake Arthur ........................................................................... 2.000
866. New York ............................................. Construct North Road Corridor study in Oswego County ........................................................................... 1.500
867. Kansas .................................................. Construct Geary County I-475 interchange at Antioch and I-435 ........................................................................... 8.400
868. Iowa ..................................................... Reconistitute I-225 in Polk County ........................................................................................................ 6.900
869. Florida ................................................. Construct Port of Palm Beach road access improvements, Palm Beach County, Florida ................................................................................................................................. 21.000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve the I-73 corridor in Jackson and Lenawee Counties</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Improve Arkansas State Highway 59 from Rena Road to Old Unióntown Road in Van Buren</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Richon Road, Crete</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Widen Licking SR-79-06-05 (P1D B314) in Licking County</td>
<td>9.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve and reconstruct Commerce Street in York Town</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct Highway 371 from Magnolia to Prescott</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct Highway 82 from Hamburg to Montrose</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Improve SR-90-Green River Road interchange</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Widen and improve I-55 State Route 26 interchange in Valdosta</td>
<td>13.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-30 Bypass from Exton Bypass to PA-10</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Replace State Route 47 Bridge in Morris</td>
<td>19.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct County Route 67 at Long Island Expressway Exit 57 between County Road 17</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Reconstruct US-309 in Eastern Montgomery with $4,000,000 for noise abatement</td>
<td>17.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct Peace Arch Crossing of Entry (PACE) lane in Blaine</td>
<td>4.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Widen 28th Street and related improvements in Van Buren</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Construct I-75 advanced transportation management system in Cobb County</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct $200 million expansion of Exit 5, I-81 in Washington County</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Realign and extend Hart Street in New Britain</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construct SR-2030 over Great Trough Creek in Huntington County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Tulear County roads in Tulear County</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Widen PA-228 from Crider's Corners to State Route 315</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Contribute to the 2010 State capital plan for Texas</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Erie Eastside Connector</td>
<td>21.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct New Cumberland Route 6 in Franklin County</td>
<td>2.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct I-793 over Great Trough Creek in Huntingdon County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Relocate Harrison/Belmont US-250</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Widen U.S. 322 in Mifflin and Juniata County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Construct the U.S. 395 Carson City Bypass</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct I-73 through Pennsylvania</td>
<td>12.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct intermodal transportation hub in Patchogue</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Conduct a study of a multimodal transportation corridor in Lawrenceville</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility study for the Evergreen Meridian Project</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Replace St. Johns River Bridge in Volusia and Seminole Counties</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Upgrade and relocate Utica-Rome Expressway in Oneida County, New York</td>
<td>20.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construct grade separations on US-36 and US-77 in Marysville, Kansas</td>
<td>4.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Relocate Harrison/Belmont US-250</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Widen 28th Street and related improvements in Van Buren, Arkansas</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Improve County Road 734 in Montgomery County</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Construct feasibility study for the construction 1–66 from Lynchburg to the West Virginia border</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Expand Palm Valley Bridge in St. Johns County</td>
<td>3.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Construct I-81 over Patuxent River in Montgomery County</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct PA-309 in Eastern Montgomery with $4,000,000 for noise abatement</td>
<td>17.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Construct I-255 Mill Avenue interchange in Aurora</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Widen US-101 from Windsor to Arata Interchange</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct the Seacoast Project in the Town of North Haven, New Jersey</td>
<td>4.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct East-West Corridor Project in Southwest Louisiana</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct US-127 and East Beltway</td>
<td>5.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility study for Northern Kentucky High Priority Corridor (I–74)</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct US-70 East-West Corridor in Hot Springs</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve Route 31 from Baldwinsville to County Route 5</td>
<td>11.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Widen West Phoenix Avenue and related improvements in Fort Smith, Arkansas</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Improve Arkansas State Highway 12 from US-71 at Rainbow Curve to Northwest Arkansas Regional Airport</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Widen State Highway 35 from SH 288 in Angelton to FM 521</td>
<td>6.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Widen US 278 from Sandlewood to US-70 in Onslow County, Carteret County</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct US-13 from the Wilson US-264 Bypass to Goldsboro in Wayne County</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Improve Route 7 utility and landscaping in New Milford</td>
<td>7.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct access improvements between exits 56 and 57 off I–81 in Lackawanna</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Construct the Antelope Valley Overpass in Lincoln</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Beautification project in Daytona, Florida</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Widen and improve US-34 interchange in Aurora</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Expand US-278 in Cullman County</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Improve and construct I-80 reliever route project; Walters Road and Walters Road Extention</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct PA-283 North Union Street ramps in Dauphin County</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct East Windsor Bear Brook pathway system</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Upgrade US-101 from Eureka to Arcata</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Expand Harding Road from Scenic Highway to the Mississippi River and construct an information center</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Improve Southwest Highway from Bloomington to Evansville</td>
<td>30.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Route 72 overpass at Conrail in Lebanon</td>
<td>8.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct Hazel Dell Parkway from 96th Street to 146th Street in Carmel</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Extend Main Street from 5600 South to Vine Street in Murray</td>
<td>11.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-30 at PA-772 and PA-41</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Improve Sugar Grove US30</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Route 99 Route 120 interchange in Manteo County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Widen US-11/15 between M.T. Patrick and Mechanics Half Falls in Perry County</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Add lanes and improve intersections on Route 20 in Lake County, Ohio</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct PA-39 North Union Street in Dauphin County</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve and construct I-80 reliever route project; Walters Road and Walters Road Extention Segments</td>
<td>7.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Expand US-278 in Cullman County</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct Coldwater Ridge Brook corridor greenway along US-40 in Lake County</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct State Route 9 in Phillipston</td>
<td>3.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Enhance area in the vicinity of Dickson Street in Fayetteville</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct US-67/Route 60 interchange in Poplar Bluff, Missouri</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Widen US-61 from Minneapolis, Kansas to Nebraska</td>
<td>27.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct new I-10 bridge over the Mobile River in Mobile, Alabama</td>
<td>14.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Upgrade and widen US-49 in Rankin, Simpson, and Covington Counties</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Realign and improve California Route 79 in Riverside County</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct Hutton Bridge Project</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Improve State Route 800 in Monroe County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve PA-41 between Delaware State line and PA-926</td>
<td>7.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Replace Delville Bridge in Wheatfield</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct I-490 Young Parkview interchange project in Orlando</td>
<td>13.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Reconstruc Broad Street in New Britain</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Widen US-395 in the vicinity of mile post 170 north of Spokane</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct NY S Route 27 at intersection of North Monroe Avenue</td>
<td>4.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruc Route 23 Route 205 intersection in Oneonta</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Construct Pt. Mackenzie Intermodal Facility</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Design and construct Route 70-700 interchange in Frederick County</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Widen and improve US-34 interchange in Aurora</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>A-1-A Beautification project in Daytona, Florida</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct I-49 interchange at Caddo Port Road in Shreveport</td>
<td>5.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Improve 3 Pisquataqua River Bridges on the New Hampshire-Maine border</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Construct the Antelope Valley Overpass in Lincoln</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1021. Pennsylvania .............................................. Install traffic signal upgrade in Clearfield Borough in Clearfield County ........................................... 0.500
1023. California ................................................... Design and initiation of long term improvements along Highway 199 in Del Norte County, California ........................................................................................................... 0.500
1024. Virginia ...................................................... Improve Lee Highway Corridor in Fairfax, Virginia ........................................................................... 1.800
1025. Illinois ........................................................ Improve roads in the Peoria Park District ........................................................................... 0.810
1026. California ................................................... Construct Overland Drive overcrossing in Temecula ........................................................................ 5.000
1027. Iowa ............................................................... Construct a bridge over the Mississippi River at Dubuque ........................................................................ 28.000
1028. Kentucky ................................................... Construct highway-rail grade separations along the City Lead in Paducah ........................................................................... 1.100
1029. Indiana ........................................................ Safety improvements to McKinley and Riverside Avenues in Muncie ........................................................................... 9.000
1030. Pennsylvania ................................................ Gettysburg comprehensive road improvement study ........................................................................... 4.000
1031. Louisiana ..................................................... Construct Will Rolling complex in Monroe ........................................................................... 1.600
1032. Indiana ........................................................ Construct Hoosier Heartland from Lafayette to Ft. Wayne ........................................................................... 25.000
1033. Louisiana ..................................................... Upgrade and widen I-10 between Williams Boulevard and Tulane Avenue in Jefferson and Orleans Parishes ........................................................................... 12.000
1034. Louisiana ..................................................... Construct Metairie Rail Improvements and project in Jefferson and Orleans Parishes, Louisiana ........................................................................... 7.000
1035. Wisconsin ..................................................... Construct STH-26/S-41 Interchange in Oshkosh ........................................................................... 3.000
1036. Pennsylvania ................................................ Improve Sidling Hill Curve and Truck Escape in Fulton County ........................................................................... 0.500
1037. New York ...................................................... Construct Willows Avenue from Freemont Street to Montauk Highway in Lindenhurst ........................................................................... 1.200
1038. New York ...................................................... Improve ferry infrastructure in Greenport ........................................................................... 1.000
1039. Alaska ........................................................ Construct Suicide Creek Bridge in Soldotna ........................................................................... 0.350
1040. Alabama ...................................................... Construct East Foley corridor project from Baldwin County Highway 20 to State Highway 99 in Alabama ........................................................................... 7.000
1041. Louisiana ...................................................... Construct North/South Road/I-10-US-61 connection in the Kenner, Louisiana ........................................................................... 7.000
1042. Texas ............................................................. Construct FM 2234 (Chard Road) from SH-35 to Beltway B at Monroe Boulevard ........................................................................... 6.400
1043. Missouri ...................................................... Construct M-55 (Grayson Connector) ........................................................................... 3.200
1044. Kentucky ...................................................... Ohio River Major Investment Study Project, Kentucky and Indiana ........................................................................... 40.100
1045. Ohio ............................................................. Construct Muskingum-SR-16 ........................................................................... 8.000
1046. Ohio ............................................................. Relocate SR-30 for final design of south alternative in Carroll County, Ohio ........................................................................... 1.000
1047. Ohio ............................................................. Upgrade US-63 in Highland County, Middletown, Ohio ........................................................................... 8.000
1048. California ..................................................... Widen SR-23 between Moorse Park and Thousand Oaks ........................................................................... 14.000
1049. Connecticut ................................................... Construct Post Office Farm Road in Enfield, Connecticut ........................................................................... 1.500
1050. Washington .................................................. Improve I-90/520 Sunset Way Interchange in Issaquah, WA ........................................................................... 19.800
1051. Virginia ...................................................... Construct Elms Arterial from Millard to Cedar ........................................................................... 3.000
1052. California ..................................................... Construct Imperial Highway grade separation and sound walls at Esperanza Road/Orangethorpe Avenue in Yorba Linda, California ........................................................................... 14.500
1053. Wyoming ...................................................... Widen and improve Cody—Yellowstone Highway from the entrance to Yellowstone National Park to Cody ........................................................................... 10.170
1054. Florida .......................................................... West Palm Beach Traffic Calming Project on US-1 and Flagler Drive ........................................................................... 15.000
1055. Missouri ...................................................... Construction and upgrade of US-71/J-49 in Newton and McDonald County, Missouri ........................................................................... 33.303
1056. Virginia ...................................................... Commuter and freight rail congestion and mitigation project over Quantico Creek ........................................................................... 10.000
1057. California ..................................................... Complete Citraadeo Parkway project in San Diego County ........................................................................... 3.000
1058. Tennessee ..................................................... Improve State Route 92 from I-40 to South of Jefferson City ........................................................................... 4.550
1059. Washington .................................................. Redisvelop Port of Anacortes waterfront ........................................................................... 0.077
1060. Mississippi ..................................................... Widen US-98 from Pine County to Frenchton, Mississippi ........................................................................... 1.250
1061. New York ...................................................... Construct US-219 from Route 39 to Route 17 ........................................................................... 20.000
1063. California ..................................................... Construct highway-rail grade separation for Fairway Drive and Union Pacific track ........................................................................... 4.215
1064. California ..................................................... Reconstruct Madison and Little River in Townsend ........................................................................... 1.680
1065. California ..................................................... Construct I-10 Tippicanoe/Fenby interchange project in Loma Linda and San Bernardino County, California ........................................................................... 2.000
1066. California ..................................................... Construct State Route 76 in Northern San Diego ........................................................................... 10.000
1067. Arkansas ...................................................... Implement and maintain new or modified route expression in Riverdale and Wayne ........................................................................... 4.500
1068. Arkansas ...................................................... Construct Highway 425 from Pine Bluff to the Louisiana State line ........................................................................... 7.000
1069. Tennessee ..................................................... Construct bridge and approaches on State Route 33 over the Tennessee River (Henley Street Bridge) ........................................................................... 13.200
1070. Mississippi ..................................................... Construct Jackson Airports International slapway and connection from High Street to the Jackson International Airport in Jackson, Mississippi ........................................................................... 10.000
1071. Wisconsin ..................................................... Reconstruct U.S. Highway 10, Waupaca County ........................................................................... 12.000
1072. Ohio ............................................................. Construct highway-rail grade separations on Heisley Road between Hendricks Road and Jackson Street in Mentor ........................................................................... 8.205
1073. Virginia ...................................................... Widen I-66 Bland Boulevard interchange ........................................................................... 30.675
1074. Illinois .......................................................... Improve IL-159 in Edwardsville ........................................................................... 4.275
1075. Iowa ............................................................. Extend NW 88th Street from NW 70th Street to Beaver Drive in Polk County ........................................................................... 7.000
1076. New York ...................................................... Construct I-481 Route 21, Pekiss Hollow Road renovation project ........................................................................... 7.577
1077. Iowa ............................................................. IA-192 relation and Avenue G viaduct in Council Bluffs ........................................................................... 6.000
1078. Ohio ............................................................. Upgrade and widen US-24 from US-49 to I-475 ........................................................................... 23.000
1079. Illinois .......................................................... Complete crossings over Fox River in Kane County ........................................................................... 10.200
1080. Florida .......................................................... Construct North East Dade Bike Path in North Miami Beach, Florida ........................................................................... 1.600
1081. Pennsylvania ................................................ Improve Oxford Valley Road/US-1 interchange in Bucks County ........................................................................... 4.000
1082. California ..................................................... Improve highway access to Humboldt Bay and Harbor Port ........................................................................... 0.500
1084. Pennsylvania ................................................ Reconstruct I-81 Exit 2 ramp in Franklin County ........................................................................... 0.700
1085. Indiana ........................................................ Feasibility study of State Road 37 improvements in Noblesville, Elwood and Marion ........................................................................... 0.600
1086. New Jersey .................................................... Revitalize Route 130 from Cinnaminson to Willingboro ........................................................................... 4.000
1087. Ohio ............................................................. Upgrade I-71/U.S.-250/I-37 interchange in Tuscarawas County ........................................................................... 1.000
1088. Ohio ............................................................. Upgrade US-2 to I-77 in the Cleveland area ........................................................................... 2.700
1089. Arkansas ...................................................... Widen Highway 85/60 from Pine Bluff to the Mississippi State line ........................................................................... 7.000
1090. New Jersey .................................................... Construct Route 31 Flemington Bypass in Hunterdon County, New Jersey ........................................................................... 15.400
1091. New York ...................................................... Conduct safety study and improve I-290 in Downtown Buffalo ........................................................................... 0.400
1092. Idaho ............................................................. I-84 SR-36 from I-84 to I-86 ........................................................................... 9.000
1093. Alabama ...................................................... Construct the Montgomery Outer Loop from US-80 to I-85 via I-65 ........................................................................... 17.650
1094. Tennessee ..................................................... Construct Foothills Parkway from Walland to Weans Valley ........................................................................... 11.500
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[Table containing various construction projects with states, projects, costs, and states, projects, costs, ...]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Widen US-192 between County Route 352 and I-95 in Brevard and Osceola Counties</td>
<td>Brevard and Osceola Counties</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Widen US-84 South from US-82 to the Ware County Line in Waycross and Ware Counties</td>
<td>Waycross and Ware Counties</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Reconstruct bridge over the Connecticut River between Lebanon, NH and White River Junction, VT</td>
<td>Lebanon, NH and White River Junction, VT</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility study for the construction of Muskingum County South 93-22-40 connector</td>
<td>Muskingum County</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Reconstruct SR-62US-60 from Bull River to Lazaretto Creek</td>
<td>Gwinnett County</td>
<td>3.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Improve Janeville transportation</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Reconstruct US-30 in Joliet</td>
<td>Joliet</td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Complete the Paseo del Norte East Corridor in Bernalillo County</td>
<td>Bernalillo County</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct I-968 Eck Wixom Road interchange</td>
<td>Wixom</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-309/US-220 approaching at light</td>
<td>Luzerne County</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Extend Nueva Albuquerque</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Conduct planning for highway 278 and rail for the Warren/Monticello Arkansas Intermodal Complex</td>
<td>Warren/Monticello</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Widen SR-53W in Seattle to International District</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>3.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct congestion mitigation project for Smithtown</td>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Widen MS-15 from Laurel to Louisville</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Abbey Trails in Abington Township</td>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Construct East Metro Corridor in Rankin County, Mississippi</td>
<td>Rankin County</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Construct I-15 interchange at Atkinville</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Improve SR-70 from Marysville Bypass to Oroville Freeway</td>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Construct Conway bypass from to Madison at Bartlett</td>
<td>Merrimack County</td>
<td>7.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Relocate PA-113 at Creamery Village in Slippery Rock</td>
<td>Beaver County</td>
<td>2.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Upgrade 4 warning devices on north/south rail line from Terre Haute to Evansville</td>
<td>Vigo County</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct noise abatement barriers along US-591 from I-93 to 2 miles west in Cumberland County</td>
<td>Allegheny County</td>
<td>0.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Install computer signal synchronization system in Baton Rouge</td>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct US-231-US-10 Freeway Connector from the Alabama border to Dothan</td>
<td>Baldwin County</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Improve I-94 in Kalamazoo County</td>
<td>Kalamazoo County</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct Englewood Interstate connector from River Road to I-75 in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties</td>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Conduct scope and design study of Hamilton Street interchange in Erwin</td>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>16.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Extend I-755 in Macon County</td>
<td>Macon County</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct the Fall Line Freeway from Bibb to Richmond Counties</td>
<td>Bibb County</td>
<td>23.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construct SR-9 bypass in Greenfield</td>
<td>Hamilton County</td>
<td>3.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct I-55 bypass from IL-40 to I-44 in St. Louis County</td>
<td>St. Louis County</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Replace of Route 92 Limestone Creek Bridge in Manlius</td>
<td>Madison County</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Upgrade 14 warning devices on east/west rail line from Gary to Auburn</td>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve 68 and Columbus Street project in Elmhurst</td>
<td>Queens County</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct noise abatement barriers along US-591 from I-83 2 miles west in Cumberland County</td>
<td>Cumberland County</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct Eastern Long Island Scenic Byway in Suffolk County</td>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Widen SR-247 and SR-2008 between 84 and Lackawanna Valley Industrial Highway for the Monticello Business Park</td>
<td>Lackawanna County</td>
<td>10.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct and equip Transportation Technology and Emergency Preparedness Center in the Moosic Business Park</td>
<td>Lackawanna County</td>
<td>5.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct I-95/Statesville Road interchange in Bucks County</td>
<td>Bucks County</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Extend State Route 96 and US-321 to I-55</td>
<td>DeSoto County</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Initiate study and subsequent development and engineering of an international trade corridor in St. Lawrence County</td>
<td>St. Lawrence County</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct Highway 36 Hannibal Bridge and approaches in Marion County</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>3.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct South Pemberton Road from Route 206 to Hanover Street</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Improve Alum Creek Drive from I-270 to Frischs Avenue in Franklin County</td>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct SR-315 Ohio State University ramp project in Franklin County</td>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Construct US-84/964 in Dare County</td>
<td>Dare County</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>US-70 from I-25 to Organ in New Mexico</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct connection between Natchez Bridge and KY-60 east of Owensboro</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Widen 5th Street and replace 5th Street bridge in Highland, California</td>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct US-9W/US-285 from Santa Fe to Española</td>
<td>Taos County</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Improve IA-60 Corridor from LeMars to MN State Line</td>
<td>Plymouth County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct Lafayette Bridge on LA-1</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Construct US-27 in Morgan County</td>
<td>Morgan County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Construct US-231/US-85 from Santa Fe to Española</td>
<td>Santa Fe County</td>
<td>16.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct Eastern Black Warrior River Bridge and right-of-way acquisition and construction of an extension of the Black Warrior Parkway from US-32 to US-43 in Tuscaloosa County</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa County</td>
<td>23.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Construct US-177 in Richland County</td>
<td>Richland County</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct Cross Seminole Trail connection in Seminole County</td>
<td>Seminole County</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct County Road 50 in the vicinity of Windsor Avenue</td>
<td>Dutchess County</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct greenway enhancements in Madison</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Conduct corridor study of NE-35 alternative and modified route in Norfolk</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Extend Louisiana Highway 42 between US-61 and I-10 in Ascension Parish</td>
<td>2.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Extend Kenai Spur Highway-North Road in Kena Peninsula Borough</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Construct underpass at 100th South in Sandy</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Replace Seward Avenue Bridge over Pocohuck Creek in Sussex County</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct congeration mitigation project for Riverhead</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve PA 453 from Water Street to Tyrone in Huntingdon County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Reconract County Route 37 from Indiana to Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct 192nd Street from SR-14 to SE 15th</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct Licking-Tornwood Connector in Licking County</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Improve I-95/PA-413 Interchange in Bucks County</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct US-807 homas Drive Interchange</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Widen Meacham Boulevard from I-35W to FM-146 and extend Meacham Boulevard from west of FM-156 to North Main Street</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Construct Cache Valley Highway in Logan</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Relocation of Indian Avenue between 15th street to North Loop 288 and Quaker Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>9.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Reconstruct KY-210 from Hodgenville to Morning Star Road, Larue County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Construct Rome to Memphis Highway in Floy and Bartow Counties</td>
<td>4.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Study and construct Van Buren intermodal facility in Van Buren, Arkansas</td>
<td>7.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Upgrade Chenango County Route 32 in Norwich</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of historic train depot in San Bernadino</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct the South Extension of I-635 from San Antonio to the Westbank Expressway</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Replace Kennedy-class ferries, Staten Island</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct South Connector Road and Airport Road interchange in Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct the Lynchburg/Madison Heights bypass in Lynchburg</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Widen I-15 to I-70 in Barstow, California</td>
<td>24.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Traffic Mitigation Project on William Street and Rosson Road in Cheektowaga</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve PA 56 from I-99 to Somerset County Line in Bedford County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct improvements at I-270/MD-187 interchange</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Renovate Harrisburg Transportation Center in Dauphin County</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Expand 126th Street in Carmel</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian access bridge from Utica Union Station</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct State Road 9 in Columbus</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian access bridge from Town Center in New Mexico</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade 1 warning device on the rail line from Mardi to Ridgeway</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Conduct Midwest Regional intermodal facility feasibility study in Rochelle</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Construct Nebraska Department of Transportation I-1 from I-35 to US-70</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Improve Battist-Pickens Road between Battist and Pickens in McCurtain County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Widen US-61 from Louisiana State line to Adams County</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct improvements along US-213</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Study and construct Van Buren intermodal port facility in Van Buren, Arkansas</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct access road from Lake Avenue to Milestrip Road in Blasdell</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Construct I-29 airport interchange of 351 at Emporia</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Construct US-40 connector between I-35 and North Kansas</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct Savage-Cedar Knob Bridge at Koger Creek</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Widen SR-527 from 112th SE to 132nd SE in Everett</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Complete I-65 upgrade from Elizabethville to Tennessee State line</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Regain Water Street in Monroeville</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Construct I-260-S-1 connector in Columbia</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Sullivan Bridge over the Fox River</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Extend State Route 7 in Imperial County</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Construct 10 projects in Port Byron</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Erie Canal Preserve I-90 rest stop in Port Byron</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Improve Harrisonburg East Side roadways in Harrisonburg</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct Nebraska Department of Transportation I-35W to Old Fort Worth</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-202 Section 600 Phase I Early Action project in Upper Gwynedd and Lower Gwynedd</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA 26 over Pine Creek 2-bridges in Bedford County</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct high priority surface transportation Flights eligible for Federal-aid highway</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Improve access to Rantoul Airport in Rantoul</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Deploy magnetic lane marking system on I-4</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Construct the a bridge joining the Island of Gravina to the Community of Ketchikan on Revilla Island</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Conduct feasibility study, design and construction of connector between Louisiana Highway 16 to I-12 in Livingston Parish</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve Hardscrabble Road from Route 22 to Route 15 in North Salem</td>
<td>2.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Enhance Fort Bragg and Willis passenger stations</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Improve Uptown in Bernalillo County</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construction of an airport ground transportation facility</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Widen US-421 from North Carolina Route 194 to two miles East of US-221</td>
<td>7.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct US-127: $800,000 for the segment between the Albany Bypass and KY-90, $10,375,000 for the segment between the Albany Bypass and Clinton County State Road; $40,000 for the segment between KY-696 and the Tennessee State line</td>
<td>11.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Upgrade US-71 interchange in Carthage, Missouri</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Reconstruct Morgan County 37 in Morgan County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-404 crash facility on Delaware Canal Bridge</td>
<td>1.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Poughkeepsie Intermodal Facility in Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Construct Orchard Road Bridge over the Fox River</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve PA-23 Corridor from US-30 Bypass between Lancaster County line and Morgantown</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Improve State Route 57 interchange at Lambert Road in Brea</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Upgrade State Highway 35 Yoakum District in Matagorda and Brazoria Counties</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve T-344 Bridge over the Manor Creek in Snyder County</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Complete safety/bicycle path in Madison Township</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Upgrade Montvale/Chestnut Ridge Road and Grand Avenue intersection at Garden State Parkway in Bergen County</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Widen US-27 from Norwood to Eubank</td>
<td>30.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Extend US-29 in the Catskills Region</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve and reconstruct Stony Street in York Town</td>
<td>0.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Complete Broad Street ramps at Route 611 bypass in Bucks County</td>
<td>1.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct Richmond-Oakland Bridge</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Construct the Savannah River Parkway in Bullock, Jenkins, Screven and Effingham Counties</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Improve Illinois Route 29 in Sangamon and Christian Counties</td>
<td>2.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Widen State Route 6 from Pontotoc to a point 12 miles South of Tupelo</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Construct road and rail grade separations in Wichita</td>
<td>35.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Widen US-20 in Freeport</td>
<td>5.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Complete Mankato South Route in Mankato</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Complete interchange at Eastman Avenue-US-20</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Highway 65 improvement and mitigation project</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Improve access to Raystown in Huntingdon County</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construct East 79th from Sunny side Road to Oakland Road in Lawrence</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Widen and reconstruct Corridor Road to Pineview Drive to the Russell Parkway</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Jay Covered Bridge in Essex County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve Long Ridge Road from Pound Ridge Road to Connecticut State line</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Widen MS-45 from Brooksville to US-82 in Mississippi</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Upgrade US-36 in Hockom</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Complete interchange at I-94 and US-12 in Kankakee</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Route 17-Lowman Crossover in Ashland</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Rehabilitate East Ridgewood Avenue over Route 27 in Bergen County</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Complete interchange at Eastman Avenue-US-10 in Midland</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Improve Route 9 in Dutchess County</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Rail mitigation and improvement projects from Vermilion to Conneaut</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Complete Norfolk Northern in Fairfax County Parkway in Fairfax County</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Conduct design study and acquire right of way on US-71 in the vicinity of Fort Chaffee</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Realign Moulstown Road/Route 194/isenhower Drive York County</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct an interchange at Orange Blossom in Seminole County</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct U.S. 319/92 and SR-436 interchange in Orange/Seffner/Seminole County</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct State Route 7—Elbe rest area and interpretive facility in Pierce County, WA</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Improve the RIC airport connector road in Richmond</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Relocate US-219 to the former route of the Pennsylvania Turnpike</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Complete PA-36 Convention Center Connector in Blair County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct US-22/Chimney Rock Road interchange in Somerset County</td>
<td>23.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Complete interchange at Five Points</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Allentown Trail from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to Cumberland, Maryland</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Reconstruct I-215/294 S connector in Yakima</td>
<td>8.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Upgrade 2 sections of US-6 in Tioga County</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Rebuild US-93 Hoover Dam Bridge</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct Towanda-Barnes Road in Mecosta County</td>
<td>7.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct Lackawanna River Heritage Trail in Lackawanna</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Reconstrct I-81 Fairview interchange in Columbia County</td>
<td>3.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct interchange at 1-15 and SR-18 in San Bernardino, California</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Improve Route 39/90/94 corridor between the Lake County and Kane County line</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Complete interchange at SR-47 and US-1 in Madison</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Resurface current 219 bypass at Bradford</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Construct Route 17 bridge over the Susquehanna and Western Rail line in Rochelle Park</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Replace ferry in Plaquemines Parish</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Hudson River scenic overlook from Route 9 to Waterfront in Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Complete State Route 56 in San Diego</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Replace Clove Road bridge over tributary of Mill Brook in Sussex County</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Replace Bridge over Salmon River in Contra Costa County</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Construct US-16 Bridge over Honey Creek in Custer County</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Rebuild U.S. Highway 151 from Waukon to Fond du Lac</td>
<td>26.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Construct I-70-Six Points interchange in Marion and Hendricks County</td>
<td>19.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Construct Cheyenne Area Norris Viaduct in Cheyenne</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct I-79-Six Points interchange in Syracuse and Onondaga Counties</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Construct K-7 from Lone Elm Road to Harrison</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct U.S-84 from Eddicott to Auburn Road</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct County Road 470 at Interchange in Lake County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Improve and modify the Port of Hueneme Intermodal Corridor—Phase II in Ventura</td>
<td>22.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Complete I-79 interchange in Monroe County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Complete I-59 interchange in Dekalb County</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct interchange at U.S.-108 and U.S. 15 in Midland</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Improve Route 4 intersection in Hartford, Connecticut</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Construct Wadsworth Boulevard Improvement project in Arvada</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct I-71 interchange between Farmington and Enfield</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-41 interchange in Ahoskie</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct Bay Shore Road from SR-231 to SR-27 in Suffolk County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Construct US-95 from Bellgrove to Mica</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct US-95 from Sand Creek to Mica</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct highway-rail grade separations on Snow Road in Brook Park</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct Southern Parkway I-77 interchange with US-20 in Long Island</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-176 in Monroe County</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Construct US-395 interchange in Farmington</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Construct Louisiana Highway 1 from the Gulf of Mexico to Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct Kentucky 311 from Bardstown to Salt River</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct Third Bridge/Streetover Crossing in Hampton Road</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct Washington Road in Skagit County, Washington</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct Port of South Louisiana Connector in Saint John the Baptist Parish</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct CR-96 from Great South Bay to Montauk Highway in Suffolk County</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Construct US-20 interchange in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Construct Eastern Shore Trail in Fairhope, Alabama</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Construct North River Causeway Bridge, St. Mary's County</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Construct Phase I of the University Avenue Interchange in Provo</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Complete I-71 interchange between North Dakota and Illinois</td>
<td>13.901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Construct access route to Northwest Arkansas Regional Airport in Highfill, Arkansas</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Construct Ocean Boulevard and Terminal Island Freeway interchange in Long Beach,</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Widen and reconstruct I-680 from Pacific Street to Dodge Street in Douglas County</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Lafayette Railroad reconstruction project in Lafayette, Indiana</td>
<td>29.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct pedestrian overpass from Florida National Scenic Trail over I-4</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Construct interchange at I-75/2-74 and I-27 in Kalamazoo</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct CR-96 from Montauk Highway to Sunrise Highway in Suffolk County</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Construct US-20 interchange in Armstrong County, Kentucky</td>
<td>20.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Widen Route 4 from I-77 to I-84</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Construct Port of Longview Industrial Rail Corridor in Longview</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Construct I-95/South Route 627 interchange in Stafford County</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Complete the Powers Boulevard north extension in Colorado Springs</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Construct Aberdeen Truck bypass</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Construct extended service road for the Tappan Zee Bridge</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Widen SR-99 between 148th Street and 156th Street</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Construct US-69 interchange in Carbondale</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Reconstruct US-70 from Broken Bow to Arkansas State line in McCurtain County</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Construct a multimodal transportation corridor along GA-400</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct and widen Route 78 from I-90 to US-15</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Construct South Beltway in Lincoln</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Replace US-81 bridge between Yankton, South Dakota and Cedar County, Nebraska</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Construct Alden Road Improvement Project in Orange County</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Improve and widen Forest Hill Road in Placer County</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Improve Hillsboro Street/Highway 395 intersection in Pasco</td>
<td>3.350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Construct Hermann Bridge on Highway 19 in Montgomery and Gasconade County</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Widen and improve 123rd Street from 700 South to Jordan River in Draper</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Improve Constitution Avenue in Peoria</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct Washington County covered bridge project</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Reconstruct Stoneleigh Avenue in Putnam County</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD – HOUSE

SEC. 128. WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Section 407(a) of the National Highway Sys-
tem Designation Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 630–631) is amended
(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);
(2) by striking “(a)” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(a) CONVEYANCE—

(1) CONVEYANCE TO STATES AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—

(2) ESTABLISHMENT—The Secretary shall make grants to the State of Pennsylvania to es-

cit and operate an advanced tractor trailer training facility under this subsection shall be 80 percent of the Federal share of the cost of establishment of the facility under this subsection and such funds shall remain available until ex-
ded.

(b) MOTOR CARRIER OPERATOR VEHICLE AND TRAINING FACILITY—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT—The Secretary shall make grants to the State of Pennsylvania to es-

SEC. 129. TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL—The Secretary may carry out a project for the recon-

toration of such highway or portion of high-

(b) FUNDING—The Secretary may make available, from funds appropriated for expenditure on the National Highway System for the years 1998 through 2000, such funds shall remain available until ex-

tation programs.

(a) INFRASTRUCTURE AWARENESS PROGRAM—

SEC. 131. NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS.

(a) RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—If the Sec-

cy recognizes or is projected to exist, and propose an inventory of current facilities serving the Na-

(b) FUNDING—There is authorized to be ap-

SEC. 132. MISCELLANEOUS SURFACE TRANSPOR-

(a) IN GENERAL—The Secretary is authorized to

SEC. 130. TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE FOR OLYMPIC EVENTS.

(a) PURPOSE—The purpose of this section is to

(b) PRIORITY FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

The Secretary may participate in planning ac-

(c) TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES—

The Secretary may participate in planning ac-

(d) USE OF INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT EXPENSES—

The Secretary may provide assistance from funds de-

(3) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23—Funds au-

(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY—The Secretary may provide assistance to States and local govern-

ments in carrying out transportation projects re-

ted to an international quadrennial Olympic event. Such assistance may include planning, capital, and operating assistance.

(2) STATE FUNDING—The Federal share of the costs of projects assisted under this subsection shall not exceed 80 percent. For purposes of de-

termining the non-Federal share, highway, aviation, and transit projects shall be consid-

ered a program of projects.

(F) ELIGIBLE GOVERNMENTS—A State or local government is eligible to receive assistance under this section only if it is hosting a venue that is part of an international quadrennial Olympics that is officially selected by the Inter-

national Olympic Committee.

(g) AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS—

(1) AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT DEFINED—Section

47102(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding after the term “venue” the fol-

lowing:“(H) Developing, in coordination with State and local transportation agencies, intermodal transportation plans necessary for Olympic-re-

lated projects at an airport.”

(2) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS—Section 47115(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(a) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(b) by striking the period at the end of para-

graph (6) and inserting “;”;

and (c) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) the need for the project in order to meet the unique demands of hosting international quadrennial Olympic events.”

SEC. 133. NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.

(1) AMENDMENTS—(A) by inserting “and technology” after “con-

struction of such highway or portion of high-

way, located outside the United States is important to the national defense, the Sec-

cy may carry out a project for the recon-

struction of such highway or portion of high-

way.”

(2) FUNDING—(A) by inserting “and technology” after “con-

struction of such highway or portion of high-

way, located outside the United States is important to the national defense, the Sec-

cy may carry out a project for the recon-

struction of such highway or portion of high-

way.”

(1) IN GENERAL—The Secretary is authorized to

SEC. 134. NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.

The Secretary shall carry out a study to determine the location and quantity of facilities at commercial truck stops and travel plazas and public rest areas that could be used by motor carriers to comply with Federal hours of service rules. The study shall include an inventory of current facilities serving the Na-

tional Highway System, analyze where short-

ages exist or are projected to exist, and propose
a plan to reduce the shortages. The study shall be carried out in cooperation with research entities representing motor carriers, the travel plaza industry, and commercial motor vehicle drivers.

(2) Not later than January 1, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study with any recommendations the Secretary determines appropriate for final action.

(3) FUNDING.—From amounts set aside under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000, the Secretary shall allocate an amount no less than $500,000 per fiscal year to carry out this section.

SEC. 133. ELIGIBILITY.

(a) AMBASSADOR BRIDGE ACCESS, MICHIGAN.—Notwithstanding section 129 of title 23, United States Code, or any other provision of law, a project to construct a new bridge over the Cuyahoga River between Cleveland, Ohio, and Detroit, Michigan, to be eligible for funds apportioned under section 104(b)(1) and 104(b)(3) of such title.

(b) CUYAHOGA RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO.—Notwithstanding section 140 of title 23, United States Code, or any other provision of law, a project to construct a new bridge over the Cuyahoga River between Cleveland, Ohio, shall be eligible for funds apportioned under section 104(b)(2) of such title.

(c) CONNECTICUT.—In fiscal year 1998, the State of Connecticut may transfer any funds remaining available for obligation under the section 104(b)(3)(A) of title 23, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, for construction of the Interstate System to any other program eligible for assistance under chapter 1 of such title, if the State of Connecticut finds that such transfer would result in an efficient use of Federal-aid highway funds.

(d) SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE, CALIFORNIA.—In accordance with section 502 of this Act, a project to reconstruct the Interstate System approach to the western end of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and the ramps connecting the bridge to Treasure Island shall be eligible for funds apportioned under title 23, United States Code, relating to the high-cost Interstate System reconstruction and improvement program.

(e) IN REESE, CALIFORNIA.—Notwithstanding section 120(1)(1) of title 23, United States Code—

(1) private entity expenditures to construct the SR–91 toll road located in Orange County, California; and

(2) private entity expenditures to construct the SR–125 toll road in San Diego County, California, from SR–505 to San Miguel Road may be credited against the share for Federal-aid highway projects beginning after SR–125 is opened to traffic.

(f) INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE, SAULT ST. MARIE.—The International Bridge Authority, or its successor organization, shall be permitted to continue collection of tolls for the maintenance, operation, capital improvements, and future expansions of the International Bridge and its approaches, plaza areas, and associated buildings and structures.

(g) INFORMATION SERVICES.—A food business that wishes to display a current California Bridge logo shall be eligible to display a mainline business logo on a specific service food sign described in section 2G–5.7(4) of part IIG of the 1988 edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, as the Secretary determines appropriate under the requirements specified in that section, but for the fact that the business is open 6 days a week, cannot be prohibited from inclusion on such a food sign.

SEC. 134. FISCAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND OTHER AMENDMENTS.

(a) ADVANCED CONSTRUCTION.—Section 115 is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by moving the text of paragraph (1) (including subparagraphs (A) and (B)) 2 ems to the left;

(B) by striking ``(1) IN GENERAL.—'';

(C) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3), and

(D) by striking ``(A) prior'' and inserting ``(1) prior'';

and (E) by striking ``(B) the project'' and inserting ``(2) the project'';

(2) by striking subsection (c); and

(3) by redesigning subsections (d) as subsection (c).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 118 is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading for subsection (b) by striking ``(discretionary Projects''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

Effect of Release of Funds.—Any Federal-aid highway funds released by the final payment on a project, or by the modification of the project agreement, shall be credited to the same program funding category previously apportioned to the State and shall be immediately available for expenditure.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE PAYABLE.—Section 120 is amended in each of subsections (a) and (b) by striking ``shall be'' and inserting ``shall not exceed''.

(d) PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION.—Section 121 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the second sentence; and

(B) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following:

``(1) PROJECT AGREEMENT.—No payment shall be made under this section for a project covered by a project agreement. After completion of the project in accordance with the project agreement, the Secretary shall make available to the State of Connecticut such funds as may be made for the value of the materials (1) which have been stockpiled in the vicinity of such construction in conformity to plans and specifications for the purposes, and (2) which are not in the vicinity of such construction if the Secretary determines that because of required fabrication at an off-site location the materials cannot be stockpiled in such vicinity;'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

``(b) PROJECT AGREEMENT.—No payment shall be made under this section for a project covered by a project agreement. After completion of the project in accordance with the project agreement, the Secretary shall make available to the State such funds as may be made for the value of the materials (1) which have been stockpiled in the vicinity of such construction in conformity to plans and specifications for the purposes, and (2) which are not in the vicinity of such construction if the Secretary determines that because of required fabrication at an off-site location the materials cannot be stockpiled in such vicinity;'';

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

``(3) by redesigning subsection (c) as subsection (b).''

(e) ADVANCES TO STATES.—Section 124 is amended—

(1) by striking ``(a)'' the first place it appears; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(f) DISTRIBUTION.—Section 126, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for chapter 1, are repealed.

(g) STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT.—Section 302 is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

``(A) Compliance with this provision shall have no effect on the eligibility of costs;''

(2) by striking ``(b)''; and

(3) by striking subsection (b).

(h) BRIDGE COMMISSIONS.—Public Law 87–441, relating to bridge commissions created by Congress, and the general approval of membership of such commissions, is repealed.

(i) OTHER AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 102(b)(1) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (23 U.S.C. 127 note) is amended by striking ``the date on which Federal-aid highway and transit pro-

grams are reauthorized after the date of the enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991'' and inserting ``September 30, 2003''.

(2) Section 127(a) is amended by inserting before the next to the last sentence the following:

``With respect to the State of Colorado, vehicles designed to carry 2 or more precast concrete panels shall be considered public service.''

(3) Section 127(a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

``The State of Louisiana may allow, by special permit, the operation of vehicles with a gross vehicle weight of up to 100,000 pounds for the hauling of sugarcane during the harvest season, not to exceed 100 days annually.''

(4) Section 127 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

``(h) MAINE AND NEW HAMPSHIRE.—With respect to Interstate Route 95 in the State of New Hampshire, State laws or regulations in effect on January 1, 1987, shall be applicable for purposes of this section. With respect to that portion of the Maine Turnpike designated Interstate Route 95 and 495, and that portion of Interstate Route 95 from the southern terminus of the Maine Turnpike to the New Hampshire State line, the Secretary shall conduct a study to examine the operation of the truck weight standards on specialized hauling vehicles.

``(i) SPECIALIZED HAULING VEHICLES.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to examine the operation of the truck weight standards on specialized hauling vehicles.

``(j) PROJECT AGREEMENT.—No payment shall be made under this section for a project covered by a project agreement.''

SEC. 135. AMENDMENTS TO PRIOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZATION LAWS.

(a) ISTE A HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 110(c) of the Interstate Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2032–2033) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5)(B)(iii)(I)(ff) by inserting before the semicolon `, including a connection to Andrews following the Route 41 corridor';

(B) in paragraph (9)(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

``(A) in paragraph (5)(B)(iii)(I)(ff) by inserting before the semicolon ', including a connection to the routes forty-one following the Route 41 corridor'; and

(C) in paragraph (18) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

``(i) by inserting before ``Indianapolis, Indiana'' the following: `Sarnia, Ontario, Canada, the Port Huron–Sarnia Transporter, arbitrarily along I–69 and from Windsor, Ontario, Canada, through Detroit, Michigan, westerly along I–94 via Marshall, Michigan, thence south to'; and

``(ii) by striking `and to include' and inserting the following:

``as follows:

``(A) In Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana, the Corridor shall be identified in the Corridor 18 Special Issues Study Final Report; and

``(ii) by running in an East/South direction to United States Route 61 and cross the Mississippi River (in the vicinity of Memphis, Tennessee) to Highway 79, and then follow Highway 79 south to 2 miles west of Altizer, Arkansas, and across the Mississippi River on Bridge Number 4, Arkansas, and then proceed south in the direction of Monticello, Arkansas, and link up with the
route proposed in the Corridor 18 Special Issues Study Final Report which would continue to Haynesville, Louisiana.

"(B) In the Lower Rio Grande Valley, the Corridor—

"(i) include United States Route 77 from the Rio Grande River to Interstate Route 37 at Corpus Christi, Texas, and to Victoria, Texas, via United States Route 69;

"(ii) include United States Route 281 from the Rio Grande River to Interstate Route 37 and then to Victoria, Texas, via United States Route 59; and

"(iii) include;

"(D) in paragraph (21) by striking "United States Route 99 from the vicinity of Salamanca, New York" and inserting "Interstate Route 80";

"(E) by inserting "I-29 between Kansas City and the Canadian border" before the period at the end of paragraph (22); and

"(F) by inserting after paragraph (29) the following:

"30 Interstate Route 5 in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, including California State Route 905 between Interstate Route 5 and the Otay Mesa Port of Entry.

"31 The Mon-Fayette Expressway and Southern Beltway in Pennsylvania.

"32 The Wisconsin Development Corridor from the Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin border near Dubuque, Iowa, to the Upper Mississippi River Basin near Eau Claire, Wisconsin, as follows:

"(A) United States Route 151 from the Iowa border to Fond du Lac via Madison, Wisconsin, then U.S. Route 43 toward Fond du Lac via Marquette, Oshkosh, Appleton, and Green Bay, Wisconsin.

"(B) State Route 29 from Green Bay to I-94 via Wausau, Chippewa Falls, and Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

"(C) United States Route 10 from Appleton to Marshfield, Wisconsin.

"(D) The Capital Gateway Corridor following United States Route 50 from the proposed intermodal transportation center connected to I-395 in Washington, D.C., to the intersection of United States Route 50 with Kenilworth Avenue and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in Maryland.

"(E) The Alameda Corridor East generally described as 52.8 miles from east Los Angeles (terminus of Alameda Corridor) through the San Gabriel Valley terminating at Colton Junction in San Bernardino.

"(F) Everett-Tacoma FAST Corridor.

"(G) New York and Pennsylvania State Route 17 from Harriman, New York, to its intersection with State Route 9 in Pennsylvania.

"(H) United States Route 90 from I-49 in Lafayette, Louisiana, to I-10 in New Orleans.

"(I) The Ports-to-Plains Corridor from the Mexican Border via I-27 to Denver, Colorado.

"(J) United States Route 63 from Marked Tree, Arkansas, to I-55.

"(2) PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO CORRIDORS.—Section 1003(a)(5) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by inserting after "the" the first place it appears the following: "in subsection (c)(1);"

"(B) by striking "and" the second place it appears; and

"(C) by inserting after "(c)(20)" the following:

"in subsection (c)(36), and in subsection (c)(37)."

"(3) ROUTES.—Section 1105(e)(5) of such Act is further amended—

"(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

"(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(3) ROUTES.—

"(i) Designation.—The routes referred to in subsections (c)(18) and (c)(20) shall be designated as Interstate Route I-69. A State having jurisdiction of routes referred to in subsections (c)(18) and (c)(20) shall erect signs identifying such segment that is consistent with the criteria set forth in subsections (e)(5)(A)(i) and (e)(5)(A)(ii) as Interstate Route I-69, including segments of United States Route 59 in the State of Texas. The segment identified in subsection (c)(18)(B)(ii) shall be designated as Interstate Route I-69 East, and the segment identified in subsection (c)(18)(B)(iii) shall be designated as Interstate Route I-69 Central. The State of Texas, in consultation with States identifying such routes as segments of future Interstate Route I-69.

"(ii) Rulemaking to determine future Interstate System designation criteria.—The Secretary shall conduct a rulemaking to determine the appropriate criteria for the creation of signs for future routes on the Interstate System identified in this paragraph, and those rulemakings shall be undertaken in consultation with States and local officials and shall be completed not later than December 31, 1990.

"(3) BICYCLE SAFETY.—In carrying out projects under this section, a State shall take into account bicycle safety.

"(4) RAILWAY-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS.—Section 130 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) Designation.—In the route authority described in subsection (a), the State shall designate bicycle safety corresponding to highway and street design standards to accommodate bicyclists.

"(5) ELECTRIC BICYCLE.ÐThe term 'electric bicycle' means any bicycle with an electric motor功率, unless such project or regulatory action provides for a reasonably alternate route or such a route exits."

"(6) ELECTRIC BICYCLE.ÐThe term 'electric bicycle' means any bicycle or tricycle with a low-powered motor of less than 100 pounds, with a top motor-powered speed not in excess of 20 miles per hour.

"(7) PEDESTRIAN.ÐThe term 'pedestrian' means any person traveling by foot and any mobility impaired person using a wheelchair.

"(8) WHEELCHAIR.—The term 'wheelchair' means a mobility aid usable indoors and designed for and used by individuals with mobility impairments, whether operated manually or powered.
(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "with a cost of $25,000,000 or more"; and
(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following: "The program shall be based on the principles contained in section 2 of Executive Order 12893; and
(3) in paragraph (2) by inserting after "maintenance," the following: "user costs,"
(b) by inserting at the end the following:
10402. Service and use by other Governments or Intergovernmental Organizations.-(A) Congress determines that the State opt-out period for the contract administration procedures has expired, States that have opted out under subpart F of part 26 of title 23, United States Code, may request permission from the Secretary regarding the requirements of section 307 of the National Highway Designation Act of 1995, as of the date of the enactment of this clause, shall not be subject to the requirements of subparagraph (A), and
(C) by indenting clause (i), as designated by subparagraph (A), and aligning it with clause (ii), as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph; and
(4) by adding at the end the following: ``(H) The Board shall comply, with respect to any architecture, engineering, or related services contract for any phase of a Federal-aid highway project, with the qualifications and procedures of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and with the single audit procedures required under this paragraph, or with an existing State law or statute enacted in accordance with the single audit exemption provided by subparagraph (G).''.

SEC. 141. COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE STUDY.
(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall request the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study regarding the regulation of weights, lengths, and widths of commercial motor vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, in order to conduct it with clause (ii), as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph; and
(b) FACTORS TO CONSIDER AND EVALUATE.—In developing recommendations under subsection (a), the Board shall consider and evaluate the impact of the recommendations described in subsection (a) on the economy, the environment, safety, and service to communities.
(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study, the Board shall consult the Department of Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study regarding the regulation of weights, lengths, and widths of commercial motor vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, in order to conduct it with clause (ii), as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph; and
(d) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under this section.
(e) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of receipt of the report, the Authority shall act to submit to Congress a report containing comments or recommendations of the Secretary regarding the report.
(f) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Highways Trust Fund $250,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 1998 to carry out this subsection.
(g) APPLICABILITY OF TITLES 23.—Funds made available to carry out this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were appropriated under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; except that the Federal share of the cost of the study under this section shall be 100 percent and such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 142. NEW YORK AVENUE TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.
(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Authority to be known as the New York Avenue Transportation Development Authority (hereinafter in this section referred to as "Authority").
(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Authority shall be composed of 5 members appointed as follows:
(1) 3 individuals appointed by the President,
(2) 2 individuals appointed by the mayor of the District of Columbia,
(c) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Authority may not receive pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Authority.
(d) DUTIES.—The Authority shall develop a comprehensive scheme of Transportation Gateway Corridor and vicinity following United States Route 50 from I-395 in Washington, D.C., to the intersection of United States Route 50 with Kenilworth Avenue and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in Maryland, which shall include—
(1) comprehensive engineering, pre-design, and design necessary to improve the corridor; and
(2) economic feasibility studies of financing the project, including the feasibility of repaying such funds from Federal-aid, Transportation Development Authority (herein-
over highways, any local government unit vested with jurisdiction over local highways.

"(5) FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS.—The term 'Federal-aid highways' means highways eligible for assistance under other Federal-aid highways classified as local roads or rural minor collector roads.

"(6) FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM.—The term 'Federal-aid system' means any one of the Federal-aid highway systems described in section 103.

"(7) FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS.—The term 'Federal lands highways' means Federal lands highways, public lands highways, park roads, parkways, and Indian reservation roads which are public highways.

"(8) FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS.—The term 'forest development roads and trails' means a forest road or trail under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.

"(9) FOREST HIGHWAY.—The term 'forest highway' means a highway under the jurisdiction of, and maintained by, a public authority and open to public travel.

"(10) FOREST ROAD OR TRAIL.—The term 'forest road or trail' means a road or trail wholly or partly within, or adjacent to, and serving the National Forest System and which is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the National Forest System and the use and development of the resources.

"(11) HIGHWAY.—The term 'highway' includes roads, streets, and parkways, and also includes rights-of-way, bridges, railroad-highway crossings, terminal facilities, signs, signals, rail, and protective structures, in connection with highways. It further includes that portion of any interstate or international bridge tunnel and the approaches thereto, the cost of which is assumed by a State highway department and the approaches thereto, the cost of any interstate or international bridge or tunnel which the Secretary of the Interior determines to be located within, or provides access to, an area in the National Park System with title and maintenance responsibilities vested in the United States.

"(12) HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.—The term 'highway safety improvement project' means a project which corrects or improves high hazard locations, eliminates roadside obstacles, improves highway signing and pavement marking, installs priority control systems for emergency vehicles at signalized intersections, installs or replaces emergency motorist aid call boxes, or installs traffic control or warning devices at high accident potential locations.

"(13) INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS.—The term 'Indian reservation roads' means public roads that are maintained within or provide access to an Indian reservation or Indian trust land or restricted Indian land which is not subject to fee title alienation without the approval of the Federal Government and Alaska Native villages, groups, or communities in which Indians and Alaskan Natives reside, whom the Secretary of the Interior has determined are eligible for services generally available to Indians under Federal laws specifically applicable to Indians.

"(14) INTERSTATE SYSTEM.—The term 'Interstate System' means the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways described in section 103(e).

"(15) MAINTENANCE.—The term 'maintenance' means the preservation of the transportation environment, including surface, shoulders, roadsides, structures, and such traffic-control devices as are necessary for its safe and efficient utilization.

"(16) NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.—The term 'National Highway System' means the Federal-aid highway system described in section 103(b).

"(17) OPERATING COSTS FOR TRAFFIC MONITORING, MANAGEMENT, AND CONTROL.—The term 'operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control' includes labor costs, administrative expenses, utilities and rent, and other costs associated with the continuous operation of traffic control, such as integrated traffic control systems, incident management programs, and mobile control centers.

"(18) OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT.—The term 'operational improvement' means a capital improvement for installation of traffic surveillance and control equipment, computerized signal systems, motorist information systems, integrated traffic control systems, incident management programs, motorist assistance, maintenance facilities, strategies, and programs and such other capital improvements to public roads as the Secretary may designate, by regulation; except that the term shall not include the resurfacing, restoring, or rehabilitating improvements, construction of additional lanes, interchange, and grade separations, and construction of a new interchange, in connection with a highway.

"(19) PARK ROAD.—The term 'park road' means a public road, including a bridge built primarily for pedestrian use, but with capacity for use by bicycles, which is located within, or provides access to, an area in the National Park System with title and maintenance responsibilities vested in the United States.

"(20) PARKWAY.—The term 'parkway', as used in chapter 2 of this title, means a parkway authorized by Act of Congress on lands which title is vested in the United States.

"(21) PROJECT.—The term 'project' means an undertaking to construct a particular portion of a highway, or if the context so implies, the particular portion constructed or any other undertaking eligible for assistance under this title.

"(22) PROJECT AGREEMENT.—The term 'project agreement' means an agreement by which a Federal-aid highway instrument shall be executed by the State highway department and the Secretary as required by section 110(a).

"(23) PUBLIC AUTHORITY.—The term 'public authority' means the State, county, town, or township, Indian tribe, municipal or other local government or instrumentality with authority to finance, build, operate, or maintain toll or toll-free facilities.

"(24) PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS.—The term 'public lands development roads and trails' means a forest road or trail under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service in connection with the operation of an interstate bridge or tunnel.

"(25) PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAY.—The term 'public lands highway' means any highway through, or partly within, Federal lands, Federal reservations, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority and open to public travel.

"(26) PUBLIC ROAD.—The term 'public road' means any road or street, or any highway. Any road or street which the Secretary of Transportation determines are of primary importance for the development, protection, administration, and utilization of public lands and resources under its control.

"(27) PUBLIC ROADS.—The term 'public road' means any road, street, or highway lawfully dedicated by the people of any city or other political subdivision of the State, or for any public purpose and open to public travel.

"(28) RURAL AREAS.—The term 'rural areas' means all areas of a State not included in urban areas.

"(29) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means Secretary of Transportation.

"(30) STATE FUNDS.—The term 'State funds' means any funds raised under the authority of the State or any political or other subdivision thereof, and any funds authorized by the direct control of the State highway department.

"(31) STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT.—The term 'State highway department' means that department, commission, board, or official of any State charged by its laws with the responsibility for highway construction.

"(32) TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—The term 'transportation enhancement activities' means, with respect to any project or the area to be served by the project, any of the following activities: (A) any activity which has a direct link to surface transportation: provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles, provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicycle riders, acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites, scenic or historic highway programs, landscaping and other scenic beautification, including removal of graffiti and litter to the extent that such removal is in excess of fiscal year 1997 maintenance levels for removal of graffiti and litter, historic preservation to address water pollution, due to highway construction, transportation buildings, structures, or facilities (including historic railroad facilities and canals), preservation of abandoned railway corridor land (including the right of way thereof for pedestrian or bicycle trails), control and removal of outdoor advertising, archaeological planning and research, environmental mitigation to address water pollution, due to highway runoff or reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity, and provision of tourist and welcome centers.

"(33) URBAN AREA.—The term 'urban area' means an urbanized area or, in the case of an urbanized area encompassing more than one State, that part of the urbanized area in each State in which the Federal funds were charged by the Secretary of Transportation for the purposes of this title.

"(34) URBANIZED AREA.—The term 'urbanized area' means an area with a population of 50,000 or more designated by the Bureau of the Census, within boundaries to be fixed by responsible State and local officials in cooperation with the Secretary. Boundaries shall, at a minimum, encompass the entire urbanized area within a State as designated by the Bureau of the Census.

TITLE II—HIGHWAY SAFETY

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of a provision by the list of sections and paragraphs of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 202. HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS...

(a) Uniform Guidelines.—Section 402(a) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(4)" and inserting "(4) (a) prevent accidents and"

(2) by inserting "(4)" and inserting "(4) (a) prevent accidents and"

(b) Administration of State Programs.—Section 402(b) is amended—

(1) by striking "(1)(i)" and all that follows through paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

(2) by redesigning paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(3) by redesigning paragraph (3) as paragraph (3), by striking "paragraph (5)" and inserting "paragraph (3)"; and

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking "(C)(C)' and inserting "paragraph (3)(C)'".

(c) Appropriation of Funds.—The 7th section of section 402(c) is amended by inserting the apportionment to the Secretary of the Interior shall not be less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the total apportionment and after "except that"

(d) Application in Indian Country.—Section 402(d) is amended to read as follows:...
Secretary of the Interior and the term ‘political subdivision of a State’ includes an Indian tribe. Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1)(C), 95 percent of the funds apportioned to the Secretary of the Interior under this section shall be expended by Indian tribes to carry out highway safety programs within their jurisdictions. The requirements of subsection (b)(1)(D) shall be applicable to those tribal interests with respect to which the Secretary of Transportation determines that application of such provisions would not be practicable.

(2) ‘Indians’ is defined—In this subsection, the term ‘Indian country’ means—

(A) all land within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States, notwithstanding the issuance of any patent, and including rights-of-way running through the reservation;

(B) all land allotted to any Indian tribe or individual Indian; and

(C) all Indian allotments, the Indian titles to which have not been extinguished, including rights-of-way running through such allotments.

(e) Rulemaking Proceeding.—Section 402(j) is amended to read as follows:

(1) GENERAL.—The Secretary may from time to time conduct a rulemaking process to identify highway safety programs that are highly effective in reducing motor vehicle crashes, injuries, and deaths. Any rulemaking shall take into account the major role of the States in implementing such programs. When a rule promulgated in accordance with this section takes effect, States shall consider these highly effective programs when developing their highway safety programs.

(h) In General.—Chapter 4 is amended by inserting in section 111 the text of this section.

(i) Rulemaking Proceedings.—Section 403 is amended to read as follows:

(1) Rulemaking proceeding.—In applying provisions of chapter 1 to the extent necessary.

SEC. 203. HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 403 is amended to read as follows:

(b) Research and Development.—The Secretary may, from time to time, carry out research and development programs to carry out this section.

SEC. 204. OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 4 is amended by inserting in section 404 the following:

405. Occupant protection incentive grants.

(a) In General.—Chapter 4 is amended by inserting in section 404 the following:

(1) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(2) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(3) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(4) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(5) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(6) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(7) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(8) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(9) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(10) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(11) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(12) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(13) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(14) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(15) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(16) Survey method.—The method that makes unlawful throughout the State the operation of a passenger motor vehicle whenever a child up to 4 years of age in the vehicle is not properly restrained in a child safety seat.

(17) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(18) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(19) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(20) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(21) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(22) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.

(23) Grant for a State to adopt and implement effective programs to reduce traffic safety problems resulting from individuals riding unrestrained or improperly restrained in motor vehicles. Such programs may be used by recipient States only to implement and enforce, as appropriate, in such fiscal year such programs.
under the influence of alcohol. Such grants may only be used by recipient States to implement and enforce such programs.

(a) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—No grant may be made to a State under this section in any fiscal year unless the State enters into such agreements with the Secretary as the Secretary may require to ensure that the State will maintain its aggregate nondiscretionary funding from all other sources for alcohol traffic safety programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in its 2 fiscal years preceding the date of the enactment of this title.

(iii) a statewide special traffic enforcement program for impaired driving that emphasizes publicity for the program.

(E) Effective sanctions for repeat offenders convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol. Such sanctions, as determined by the Secretary, may include electronic monitoring, vehicle impoundment, confinement, or forfeiture; dedicated detention facilities; special measures to reduce driving with a suspended license; and assignment of treatment.

(F) DRIVERS WITH HIGH BAC’S.—Programs to target individuals who operate a motor vehicle with concentrations who operate a motor vehicle. Such programs may include implementation of a system of graduated penalties and assessment of individuals convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol.

(G) YOUNG ADULT DRINKING PROGRAMS.—Programs to reduce drinking by individuals under age 21 that are easily distinguishable from drivers’ licenses issued to individuals age 21 and older, and the issuance of drivers’ licenses that are tamper resistant.

(iii) a statewide program for stopping motor vehicles on a nondiscriminatory, lawful basis for the purpose of determining whether the operators of such motor vehicles are driving while under the influence of alcohol.

(iv) a statewide traffic enforcement program for impaired driving that emphasizes publicity for the program.

(F) DRIVERS WITH HIGH BAC’S.—Programs to target individuals who operate a motor vehicle with alcohol concentrations who operate a motor vehicle. Such programs may include implementation of a system of graduated penalties and assessment of individuals convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol.

(G) YOUNG ADULT DRINKING PROGRAMS.—Programs to reduce drinking by individuals under age 21 that are easily distinguishable from drivers’ licenses issued to individuals age 21 and older, and the issuance of drivers’ licenses that are tamper resistant.

(H) TESTING FOR BAC.—An effective system for increasing the rate of testing for blood alcohol concentrations of drivers in relation to fatal accidents and, in fiscal year 2000 and in each fiscal year thereafter, a rate of such testing that is equal to or greater than the national average.

(I) BASIC GRANT B.—A State shall become eligible for a grant under this paragraph by adopting or demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Secretary at least 5 of the following:

(A) BAC PER SE LAW.—A law that provides that any individual with a blood alcohol concentration of 0.08 percent or greater while operating a motor vehicle shall be deemed to be driving while intoxicated.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE LICENSE REVOCATION.—An administrative driver’s license suspension or revocation system for individuals who operate motor vehicles while under the influence of alcohol that requires that—

(ii) in the case of an individual who, in any 5-year period beginning after the date of the enactment of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998, is determined on the basis of a chemical test to have operated a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol, to have refused to submit to a chemical test or received notice of having been determined to be driving under the influence of alcohol, in accordance with the State’s procedures.

(C) UNDERAGE DRINKING PROGRAM.—An effective system, as determined by the Secretary, for preventing persons from consuming alcoholic beverages available to individuals under age 21. Such system may include a graduated licensing system for drivers’ licenses to individuals under age 21 that are easily distinguishable in appearance from drivers’ licenses issued to individuals age 21 years of age or older, and the issuance of drivers’ licenses that are tamper resistant.

(D) ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Either—

(1) in the first and second fiscal years in which the State receives a grant under this section, 75 percent of the cost of implementing and enforcing in such fiscal year a program adopted by the State pursuant to subsection (a); and

(2) in the third and fourth fiscal years in which the State receives a grant under this section, 50 percent of the cost of implementing and enforcing in such fiscal year such program; and

(3) in the fifth and sixth fiscal years in which the State receives a grant under this section, 25 percent of the cost of implementing and enforcing in such fiscal year such program.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A State shall become eligible for a grant under this paragraph by adopting or demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Secretary each of the following:

(A) FATAL IMPAIRED DRIVER PERCENTAGE REDUCTION.—The percentage of fatally injured drivers with 0.10 percent or greater blood alcohol concentration in the State has decreased in each of the 3 most recent calendar years for which statistics are available.

(B) FATAL IMPAIRED DRIVER PERCENTAGE COMPARISON.—The percentage of fatally injured drivers with 0.10 percent or greater blood alcohol concentration in the State has been lower than the average percentage for all States in each of the calendar years referred to in subparagraph (A).

(C) BASIC GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a basic grant made to a State for a fiscal year under this subsection shall be equal to 10 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for fiscal year 1997 under section 402 of this title.

(D) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(i) In general.—Upon receiving an application from a State, the Secretary may make discretionary grants to a State only if the State is eligible for a grant under subsection (d) in such fiscal year.

(ii) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, not to exceed 12 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for carrying out this section shall be available for making grants under this subsection.

(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section shall be available for administrative expenses for carrying out this section.

(H) TESTING FOR BAC.—An effective system for increasing the rate of testing for blood alcohol concentrations of drivers in relation to fatal accidents and, in fiscal year 2000 and in each fiscal year thereafter, a rate of such testing that is equal to or greater than the national average.

(I) BASIC GRANT B.—A State shall become eligible for a grant under this paragraph by adopting or demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Secretary each of the following:

(A) FATAL IMPAIRED DRIVER PERCENTAGE REDUCTION.—The percentage of fatally injured drivers with 0.10 percent or greater blood alcohol concentration in the State has decreased in each of the 3 most recent calendar years for which statistics are available.

(B) FATAL IMPAIRED DRIVER PERCENTAGE COMPARISON.—The percentage of fatally injured drivers with 0.10 percent or greater blood alcohol concentration in the State has been lower than the average percentage for all States in each of the calendar years referred to in subparagraph (A).

(C) BASIC GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a basic grant made to a State for a fiscal year under this subsection shall be equal to 10 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for fiscal year 1997 under section 402 of this title.

(D) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(i) In general.—Upon receiving an application from a State, the Secretary may make discretionary grants to a State only if the State is eligible for a grant under subsection (d) in such fiscal year.

(ii) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, not to exceed 12 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for carrying out this section shall be available for making grants under this subsection.

(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section shall be available for administrative expenses for carrying out this section.

(H) TESTING FOR BAC.—An effective system for increasing the rate of testing for blood alcohol concentrations of drivers in relation to fatal accidents and, in fiscal year 2000 and in each fiscal year thereafter, a rate of such testing that is equal to or greater than the national average.

(I) BASIC GRANT B.—A State shall become eligible for a grant under this paragraph by adopting or demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Secretary each of the following:

(A) FATAL IMPAIRED DRIVER PERCENTAGE REDUCTION.—The percentage of fatally injured drivers with 0.10 percent or greater blood alcohol concentration in the State has decreased in each of the 3 most recent calendar years for which statistics are available.

(B) FATAL IMPAIRED DRIVER PERCENTAGE COMPARISON.—The percentage of fatally injured drivers with 0.10 percent or greater blood alcohol concentration in the State has been lower than the average percentage for all States in each of the calendar years referred to in subparagraph (A).

(C) BASIC GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a basic grant made to a State for a fiscal year under this subsection shall be equal to 10 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for fiscal year 1997 under section 402 of this title.

(D) DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(i) In general.—Upon receiving an application from a State, the Secretary may make discretionary grants to a State only if the State is eligible for a grant under subsection (d) in such fiscal year.

(ii) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section, not to exceed 12 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for carrying out this section shall be available for making grants under this subsection.

(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section shall be available for administrative expenses for carrying out this section.
Such grants may be used by recipient States only to implement such programs.

"(b) MODEL DATA ELEMENTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with States and other appropriate entities, shall determine the model data elements necessary to observe and analyze national trends in crash occurrences, rates, outcomes, and causation. A State’s multiyear highway safety data and traffic records coordinating committee described in subsection (e)(1) shall demonstrate how the model data elements will be incorporated into the State’s data systems for the State to be eligible for grants under this section.

"(c) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—No grant may be made to a State under this section in any fiscal year unless the State enters into such agreements with the Secretary as the Secretary may require to ensure that the State will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all other sources for highway safety data programs or, at a minimum, the amount determined by multiplying—

(i) the ratio that the funds apportioned to the State under section 402 for fiscal year 1997 bears to the funds apportioned to all States under section 402 for fiscal year 1997, except that no State shall receive less than $225,000, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(ii) the amount appropriated to carry out this section for such fiscal year; by

(iii) the ratio that the funds apportioned to the State under section 402 for fiscal year 1997 bears to the funds apportioned to all States under section 402 for fiscal year 1997, except that no State shall receive less than $225,000, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(i) ELIGIBILITY.—A State shall be eligible for a grant under this subsection in any fiscal year succeeding the first fiscal year in which the State receives a grant under subsection (e) if the State, to the satisfaction of the Secretary—

(A) submits or updates a multiyear plan described in subsection (e)(1)(A)(iii);

(B) certifies that the highway safety data and traffic records coordinating committee of the State continues to operate and supports the multiyear plan; and

(C) reports annually on the State’s progress in implementing the multiyear plan.

(ii) GRANT AMOUNTS.—The amount of a succeeding year grant made to the State for a fiscal year under this subsection shall be equal to the amount determined by multiplying—

(A) the amount appropriated to carry out this section for such fiscal year; by

(B) the ratio that the funds apportioned to the State under section 402 for fiscal year 1997 bears to the funds apportioned to all States under section 402 for fiscal year 1997, except that no State shall receive less than $225,000, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(iii) INCONSISTENT PROVISIONS.—(1) APPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER 1.—In general.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, all provisions of chapter 1 of this title that are applicable to National Driver Register’s computer timeshare and user assistance functions, except that the Secretary may, by rule, by regulation, or otherwise, implement such provisions.

(2) FEES.—The total of the fees charged by the National Driver Register to the States in any fiscal year for the use of the National Driver Register’s computer timeshare and user assistance functions shall not exceed the total cost to the States for providing the functions in such year.

(3) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to diminish, limit, or otherwise affect the authority of the Secretary to carry out this chapter.

(4) CREDIT FOR STATE AND LOCAL EXPENDITURES.—The aggregate of all expenditures made during any fiscal year by a State and its political subdivisions (exclusive of Federal funds) for carrying out the State highway safety program under section 402 (other than planning and administration) shall be available for the purpose of crediting such State during such fiscal year for the non-Federal share of the cost of any project under this section (other than one for planning or administration) without regard to whether such expenditures were actually made in connection with such project.

(5) TREATMENT OF TERM ‘STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT’.—In applying provisions of chapter 1 in carrying out this section, the term ‘State highway department’ as used in such provisions shall be interpreted as the Governor of a State and in the case of an Indian tribe program, the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for this chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

"411. State highway safety data improvement programs."

SEC. 207. NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.

(a) TRANSFER OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS TO NON-FEDERAL MANAGEMENT.—Section 30302 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) TRANSFER OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS TO NON-FEDERAL MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with an organization that represents the interests of the States to manage, administer, and operate the National Driver Register’s computer timeshare and user assistance functions. If the Secretary decides to enter into such an agreement, the Secretary shall ensure that the management of these functions is compatible with this chapter and that the regulations issued to implement this chapter.

(2) REQUIRED DEMONSTRATION.—Any transfer of functions under this subsection shall be made to an organization that represents the interests of the States and is composed of the State agencies involved.

(b) C ONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of provisions for this chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) TRANSFER OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS TO NON-FEDERAL MANAGEMENT—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with an organization that represents the interests of the States to manage, administer, and operate the National Driver Register’s computer timeshare and user assistance functions. If the Secretary decides to enter into such an agreement, the Secretary shall ensure that the management of these functions is compatible with this chapter and that the regulations issued to implement this chapter.

(2) REQUIRED DEMONSTRATION.—Any transfer of functions under this subsection shall be made to an organization that represents the interests of the States and is composed of the State agencies involved.

(c) TRANSFER OF SELECTED FUNCTIONS TO NON-FEDERAL MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with an organization that represents the interests of the States to manage, administer, and operate the National Driver Register’s computer timeshare and user assistance functions. If the Secretary decides to enter into such an agreement, the Secretary shall ensure that the management of these functions is compatible with this chapter and that the regulations issued to implement this chapter.

(2) REQUIRED DEMONSTRATION.—Any transfer of functions under this subsection shall be made to an organization that represents the interests of the States and is composed of the State agencies involved.
(b) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

"(6) The head of a Federal department or agency that issues motor vehicle operator's license to a driver for the State shall be authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $150,700,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $195,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(2) FHWA HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—For carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code, by the Federal Highway Administration $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $20,000,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) NHTSA HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—For carrying out section 403 of such title by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration $55,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(4) FHWA HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—For carrying out section 403 of such title by the Federal Highway Administration $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(5) OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.—For carrying out section 405 of such title $9,000,000 for fiscal years 1998 and 20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) ALCOHOL-IMPARED DRIVING COUNTER-MEASURES INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—For carrying out section 410 of such title $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 and $45,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(7) STATE HIGHWAY SAFETY DATA GRANTS.—For carrying out section 411 of such title $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1998 and $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(8) NATIONAL MAP FUND.—For carrying out chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration $22,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(b) TRANSFERS.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary may transfer any amounts remaining available under paragraph (3), (4), (6) or (7) of subsection (a) to the amounts made available under any other of such paragraphs in order to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that each State receives the full amount for which the State is eligible under sections 405, 406, and 410 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 211. TRANSPORTATION INJURY RESEARCH.

(a) CENTER FOR TRANSPORTATION INJURY RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to establish and maintain a center for transportation injury research at the California University of Buffalo Research Center affiliated with the State University of New York at Buf-

(f) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section 127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $2,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this section.

(g) HEAD AND SPINAL CORD INJURY RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to the Neuroscience Center for Excellence at Louisiana State University and the Virginia Transportation Research Institute at George Washington University for research and technol-

(iii) would frustrate substantially legislative purposes or functionally to that mass transportation project or establishes new or enhanced coordination between mass transportation and other transportation; and

(iii) provides a fair share of revenue for mass transportation that will be used for mass transpor-

(j) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF A STATE.—

The term 'chief executive officer of a State' includes the designee of the chief executive officer who has responsibility for making grants under the emergency regulation and the term 'emergency regulation' means a regulation—

(a) that is effective temporarily before the expiration of the otherwise specified periods of time for public notice and comment set forth under section 533(b)(1) of this title; and

(b) prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation as a result of a finding that a delay in the effective date of the regulation—

(i) would injure seriously an important public interest;

(ii) would frustrate substantially legislative policy and intent; or

(i) enhances the effectiveness of a mass transportation project or otherwise physically or functionally to that mass transportation project or establishes new or enhanced coordination between mass transportation and other transportation; and

(ii) provides a fair share of revenue for mass transportation that will be used for mass transpor-

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision of law, the reference shall be considered to be to section or other provision of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

Section 5302 shall be read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In this chapter, the following definitions apply:

"(b) The term 'capital project' means a project for—

(1) acquiring, constructing, supervising, or inspecting equipment or a facility for use in mass transportation, expenses incidental to the acquisition or construction (including design, engineering, location surveying, mapping, and acquiring rights of way), payments for the capital cost of facilities and agreements, transit-related intelligent transportation sys-

(6) The head of a Federal department or agency that issues motor vehicle operator's license to a driver for the State shall be authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) $50,700,000 for fiscal year 1999, and $195,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(2) FHWA HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—For carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code, by the Federal Highway Administration $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $20,000,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2003, $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) NHTSA HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—For carrying out section 403 of such title by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration $55,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(3) NHTSA HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—For carrying out section 403 of such title by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration $55,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(b) TRANSFERS.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary may transfer any amounts remaining available under paragraph (3), (4), (6) or (7) of subsection (a) to the amounts made available under any other of such paragraphs in order to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that each State receives the full amount for which the State is eligible under sections 405, 406, and 410 of title 23, United States Code.

(f) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section 127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $2,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this section.

(g) HEAD AND SPINAL CORD INJURY RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to the Neuroscience Center for Excellence at Louisiana State University and the Virginia Transportation Research Institute at George Washington University for research and technol-

(iii) would frustrate substantially legislative purposes or functionally to that mass transportation project or establishes new or enhanced coordination between mass transportation and other transportation; and

(iii) provides a fair share of revenue for mass transportation that will be used for mass transpor-

(2) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF A STATE.—

The term 'chief executive officer of a State' includes the designee of the chief executive officer who has responsibility for making grants under the emergency regulation and the term 'emergency regulation' means a regulation—

(a) that is effective temporarily before the expiration of the otherwise specified periods of time for public notice and comment set forth under section 533(b)(1) of this title; and

(b) prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation as a result of a finding that a delay in the effective date of the regulation—

(i) would injure seriously an important public interest;

(ii) would frustrate substantially legislative policy and intent; or

(iii) would damage seriously a person or class without serving an important public interest.

(2) FIXED GUIDEWAY.—The term 'fixed guideway' means a mass transportation facility—

(a) using and occupying a separate right of way, or for the exclusive use of, a mass transportation and other high occupancy vehicles; or

(b) using a fixed catenary system and a right of way usable by other forms of transporta-

(5) HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'handicapped individual' means an individual who, because of illness, injury, age, congenital malfunction, or other incapacity or temporary or permanent disability (including an individual who is a wheelchair user or has semiautomatic capability), cannot use effectively, without special facilities, facilities, planning, design, mass transportation service or a mass transportation facil-

(6) LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY.—The term 'local governmental authority' includes—

(A) a political subdivision of a State or political subdivision of a State;

(b) a public corporation, board, or commis-

sion established under the laws of a State.

(c) The term 'mass transportation' means transportation by a conveyance that provides regular and continuous transportation service or a mass transportation service to the public, but does not include school bus, charter, or sightseeing transportation.

(3) FHWA HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—For carrying out section 403 of such title by the Federal Highway Administration $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(4) FHWA HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—For carrying out section 403 of such title by the Federal Highway Administration $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(5) OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.—For carrying out section 405 of such title $9,000,000 for fiscal years 1998 and 20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(7) STATE HIGHWAY SAFETY DATA GRANTS.—For carrying out section 411 of such title $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1998 and $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(8) NATIONAL MAP FUND.—For carrying out chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration $22,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(9) ALCOHOL-Impaired Driving Counter-Measures Incentive Grant Program.—For carrying out section 410 of such title $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 and $45,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.
"(8) NET PROJECT COST.—The term 'net project cost' means the part of a project that reasonably cannot be financed from revenues.

(9) NEW BUS MODEL.—The term 'new bus model' means a bus model (including a model using alternative fuel)—
(A) that has not been used in mass transportation in the United States before the date of production of the model or
(B) used in mass transportation in the United States but being produced with a major change in configuration or components.

(10) PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE.—The term 'preventive maintenance' means a major activity intended to improve or upgrade a transit vehicle or facility or repair or replace a damaged, malfunctioning, struck, or outdated transit vehicle or facility system, subsystem, element, or component. Such term does not include any activity of a routine or servicing nature, such as checking and replenishing fluid levels, adjusting settings on otherwise properly operating components, washing and cleaning a transit vehicle or facility, changing tires and wheels, or repairing damage to a vehicle or facility caused by an accident.

(11) PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.—The term 'public transportation' means mass transportation services.

(12) REGULATION.—The term 'regulation' means any part of a statement of general or particular applicability and having of force or effect as a rule prescribe law or policy in carrying out this chapter.

(13) STATE.—The term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(14) TRANSIT.—The term 'transit' means mass transportation.

(15) TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT.—The term 'transit enhancement' means with respect to any project or an area to be served by the project, historic preservation, rehabilitation, and improvement of historic mass transportation buildings, structures, and facilities (including historic bus and railroad facilities and canals); projects that enhance transit safety and security; landscaping and other scenic beautification and art in and around mass transportation stations, facilities, bus shelters, bridges, and buses; bicycle and pedestrian access to mass transportation, including bicycle storage facilities and installing equipment for transporting bicycles on mass transportation projects that enhance access for the disabled to mass transportation; and archaeological planning and research related to mass transportation projects.

(16) THE URBAN AREA.—The term 'urban area' means an area that includes a municipality or other built-up place that the Secretary of Transportation, after considering local patterns and trends of urban growth, decides is appropriate for a local mass transportation system to serve individuals in the locality.

(17) URBANIZED AREA.—The term 'urbanized area' means an area—
(A) encompassing at least an urbanized area within a State that the Secretary of Commerce designates; and
(B) designated as an urbanized area within boundaries fixed by State and local officials and approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

(b) AUTHORITY TO MODIFY 'HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUAL.'—The Secretary of Transportation by regulation may modify the definition of subsection (a) (5) as it applies to section 5307(d)(1)(D) of this title.

SEC. 303. METROPOLITAN PLANNING.—
(a) GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF PLANNING PROCESS.—Section 5303(b) is amended to read as follows:

(1) CONSIDERATION.—To the extent that the metropolitan planning organization determines appropriate, the metropolitan transportation planning process may include consideration of goals and objectives that—
(A) support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
(B) increase the safety and security of the transportation system for all users;
(C) improve the accessibility and mobility for people and freight;
(D) protect and enhance the environment, conserve energy, and enhance quality of life;
(E) enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
(F) promote efficient system utilization and operation; and
(G) preserve and optimize the existing transportation system.

This paragraph shall apply to the development of long-range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs.

(2) CONVERSION TO GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.—The metropolitan planning organization shall cooperatively determine with the State and mass transportation operators how the considerations listed in paragraph (1) are translated into metropolitan goals and objectives and how they are factored into the planning process.

(b) COORDINATION.—Section 5303(e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(4) PROJECT FLEXIBILITY.—If a project is located within the boundaries of more than one metropolitan planning organization, the metropolitan planning organizations shall coordinate the regulation of the project.

(c) LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.—Section 5303(f) is amended—
(I) in paragraph (1) by inserting 'transportsation' after the period at the end of subparagraph (b);
(II) in paragraph (1) by striking 'at least shall—' and inserting 'shall contain, at a minimum, the following;'
(III) in paragraph (1) by inserting 'An identification of';
(IV) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;
(V) in paragraph (1) by striking 'the period' and inserting 'incorporate activities';
(VI) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

(B) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to operate the plan and reasonably recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. The financial plan may include, for illustrative purposes, additional resources that are reasonably expected to be included in the adopted transportation plan if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available. For the purpose of developing the transportation plan, the metropolitan planning organization and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support plan implementation;
(2) in paragraph (1) by striking 'at least shall—' and inserting 'shall contain, at a minimum, the following;';
(3) in paragraph (1) by inserting 'An identification of';
(4) in paragraph (1) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;
(5) in paragraph (1) by inserting 'An assess-';
(6) in paragraph (1) by striking 'and' and inserting a period;
(7) in paragraph (4) by inserting after 'employees,' the following: 'freight shippers and providers of freight transportation services;'
(8) in paragraph (4) by inserting 'between plan.'
(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 5309 in the table of sections for chapter 53 is amended by striking "Discre- tionary" and inserting "Capital program".

(c) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 5309(a) is amended—
(1) by striking paragraph (1)(E) and inserting the following:
"(E) the costs of projects to modernize existing fixed guideway systems;"
(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (1)(G) and inserting ";"; and
(3) by inserting after paragraph (1)(G) the following:
"(H) capital projects to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities.";

(d) DECREASED COMMUTER RAIL TRANSPORTATION.—Section 5309(c) is re- pealed.

(e) CRITERIA FOR GRANTS AND LOANS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS.—Section 5309(e) is amended to read as follows:
"(e) CRITERIA FOR GRANTS AND LOANS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS.—
(I) GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may approve a grant or loan under this section for a capital project for a new fixed guideway system or extension of an existing fixed guideway system only if the Secretary de- termines that the proposed project is—
(A) based on the results of an alternatives analysis and preliminary engineering;
(B) supported by a detailed and comprehensive ex- amination of its mobility improvements, environmental benefits, cost effectiveness, and operating efficiencies;
(C) supported by an acceptable degree of local financial commitment, including evidence of stable and dependable financing sources to construct, maintain, and operate the system or extension;
(D) ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS AND PRELIMI- NARY ENGINEERING.—In evaluating a project under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall analyze and consider the results of the alter- natives analysis and preliminary engineering for the project.
(E) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—In evaluating a project under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall—
(A) consider the direct and indirect costs of relevant projects, including the anticipated cost increases as required by section 5338(b) for grants and loans under this section for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003;
(B) consider factors such as congestion re- lief, improved mobility, air pollution, noise pol- lution, energy consumption, and all associated ancillary and related migration costs necessary to carry out each alternative analyzed;
(C) identify and consider existing mass transportation service; land use policies and future land use patterns and the costs of urban sprawl;
(D) consider the degree to which the project increases the mobility of the mass transportation dependable population or promotes economic de- velopment;
(E) consider population density, current transit ridership in the corridor, and cost per new rider;
(F) consider the technical capability of the grant recipient to construct the project;
(G) adjust the project justification to reflect differences in local land, construction, and operating costs; and
(H) consider other factors the Secretary de- termines appropriate to carry out this chapter.
(I) LOCAL FINANCIAL COMMITMENT.—
(IA) EVALUATION OF PROJECT.—In evaluating a project under paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary shall consider—
(i) the project's need for funds; and
(ii) the degree to which financing sources are dedicated to the purposes proposed;
(B) STABILITY, RELIABILITY, AND AVAILA- BILIT Y OF LOCAL FINANCING.—In assessing the sta- bility, reliability, and availability of proposed sources of local funding for the project, the Secretary shall con- sider—
(i) the degree to which financing sources are dedicated to the purposes proposed;
(ii) any debt obligation that exists or is pro- posed by the recipient for the proposed project or other mass transportation purpose; and
(iii) the extent to which the project has a local financial commitment that exceeds the re- quired non-Federal share of the cost of the project.
(J) REGULATIONS.—No later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations setting forth the criteria and procedures for local financial commitment as required under this subsection.
(K) PROJECT EVALUATION AND RAT ING.—A proposed project may advance from preliminary analysis to preliminary engineering, and may advance from preliminary engineering to final design and construction, only if the Secretary finds that the project meets the requirements of this section and there is a reasonable likelihood that the project will continue to meet such re-quirements. In making such findings, the Sec- retary shall evaluate and rate the projects on the following factors: the project's projected benefits, cost effectiveness, and the degree of local financial commitment as required under this subsection.
(L) PROJECT EVALUATION AND RATING.—A proposed project may advance from preliminary analysis to preliminary engineering, and may advance from preliminary engineering to final design and construction, only if the Secretary finds that the project meets the requirements of this section and there is a reasonable likelihood that the project will continue to meet such re-quirements. In making such findings, the Sec- retary shall evaluate and rate the projects on the following factors: the project's projected benefits, cost effectiveness, the degree of local financial commitment as required under this subsection.
(M) LIMITATIONS ON APPLICABILITY.—
(A) PROJECTS WITH A SECTION 5309 FEDERAL SHARE OF LESS THAN $25,000,000.—A project for a new fixed guideway system or extension of an existing fixed guideway system is subject to the requirements of this subsection, and the Secretary shall not find that the project meets the requirements of this subsection for projects with a Federal share of less than $25,000,000.
(B) PROJECTS IN NONATTAINMENT AREAS.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(C) PROJECTS IN NONATTAINMENT AREAS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(2) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(3) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(D) PROJECTS IN NONATTAINMENT AREAS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(2) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(3) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
(4) IN GENERAL.—The simultaneous evaluation of projects in at least 2 corridors in a metropolitan area may not be limited, if the assistance provided under this section with respect to the project is less than $25,000,000.
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``(A) conduct an annual review of—

(1) PROJECT DEFINED.—Section 5309 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(i) PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term `project' means, with respect to a new fixed guideway system and the relationship of mobility improvements to the overall transportation justification of a new fixed guideway system or extension to an existing system.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than April 30, 2000, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on the results of the pilot program, including a description of the projects carried out, the amounts obligated, and the status of the test and deployment activities undertaken.''.

(k) REPORTS.—Section 5309 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) FUNDING LEVELS AND ALLOCATIONS OF FUNDS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS.—

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the first Monday in February of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report that includes a proposal on the allocation of amounts to be made available to finance grants and loans for capital projects for new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing fixed guideway systems among applicants for those amounts.

(2) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON NEW STARTS.—

(3) FUNDING LEVELS AND ALLOCATIONS OF FUNDS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS.—

The annual report under this paragraph shall include evaluations and ratings, as required under subsection (e), for each project that is authorized to receive funds under this section since the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1 of the preceding fiscal year, whichever date is earlier. The report shall also include recommendations of projects for funding based on the evaluations and ratings and on existing commitments and anticipated funding levels for the next 3 fiscal years and for the next 10 fiscal years on information currently available to the Secretary.

(3) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON NEW STARTS.—

The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the status of each project that is authorized to receive funds under this section since the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1 of the preceding fiscal year, whichever date is earlier. The report shall include all relevant information that supports the evaluation and rating of each project, including a summary of each project's financial plan.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—
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(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall—

(a) conduct an annual review of—

(i) the Secretary's methods and procedures for evaluating and rating projects and recommending projects; and

(ii) the Secretary's implementation of such procedures and;

(b) shall report to Congress on the results of such review by April 30 of each year.''

Sec. 310. FORMULA GRANTS AND LOANS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) SECTION HEADING.—Section 5310 is amended by adding at the end the following:

(b) FORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 5310 in the table of sections for chapter 53 is amended by inserting "formula grant" before "grants and;

(c) FORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 5310 in the table of sections for chapter 53 is amended by inserting "Formula grants" after "grants and;

Sec. 312. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND TRAINING PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5312 is amended—

(b) FORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 5312 in the table of sections for chapter 53 is amended by inserting "Formula grants" after "grants and;

Sec. 313. FORMULA PROGRAM FOR OTHER THAN URBANIZED AREAS.

Sec. 314. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND TRAINING PROJECTS.

Sec. 315. FORMULA PROGRAM FOR RURAL AREAS.
(1) General Authority.—The Secretary may make grants and enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other agreements with eligible consortia to promote the development and early deployment of innovation in mass transportation technology, services, management, or operational practices. The Secretary shall coordinate activities under this section with related activities under programs of other Federal departments and agencies.

(2) Eligibility Criteria.—To be qualified to receive funding under this section, an eligible consortium:

(A) shall be organized for the purpose of designing, developing, and deploying advanced mass transportation technologies that address identified technological impediments in the mass transportation field;

(B) have an established mechanism for designing, developing, and deploying advanced mass transportation technologies as evidenced by participation in a Federal program such as the consortia funded pursuant to Public Law 102-396;

(C) facilitate the participation in the consortium of small- and medium-sized businesses in conjunction with large established manufacturers, as appropriate;

(D) is correct to use State and Federal funding to attract private capital in the form of grants or investments to further the purposes of this section; and

(E) for the purpose of the sharing of costs, risks, and rewards of early deployment of innovation in mass transportation technologies.

(3) Grant Requirements.—Grants, contracts, and agreements pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be eligible under and consistent with section 5312 of title 49, United States Code, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary prescribes.

(4) Federal Share of Costs.—The Federal share of costs for a grant, contract, or agreement with an entity under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent of the net project cost.

(5) Eligible Consortium Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘‘eligible consortium’’ means a consortium of—

(A) businesses incorporated in the United States;

(B) public or private educational or research organizations located in the United States;

(C) entities of State or local governments in the United States;

(D) independent contractors; or

(E) existing consortia funded pursuant to Public Law 103-396.

(6) Funding.—

(A) Set-Aside of Amounts Made Available Under Section 5338(d).—Of the funds made available by or appropriated under section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, for a fiscal year $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out this subsection.

(B) Fuel Cell Bus and Bus Facilities Program.—Of the funds made available for a fiscal year to carry out the bus technology pilot program under section 5338(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $5,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this subsection.

(C) Federal Share.—The Federal share payable on account of activities carried out using a grant made under this subsection shall be 80 percent of the cost of such activities.

(D) Intelligent Transportation Systems Applications.—

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall make grants for the study, design, and demonstration of fixed guideway technology in North Orange-South Seminole County, Florida, and in Galveston, Texas.

(2) Funding.—Of the amounts made available pursuant to section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, for a fiscal year $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out this subsection. Of such sums, $750,000 shall be available for fixed guideway activities in North Orange-South Seminole County, Florida, and $750,000 shall be available for fixed guideway activities in Galveston, Texas.

SEC. 313. National Planning and Research Projects.

Section 5331(a)(2) is amended by striking ‘‘$2,000,000’’ and inserting ‘‘$3,000,000’’.

SEC. 314. National Transit Institute.

(a) In General.—Section 5315 is amended by—

(1) inserting ‘‘mass transportation’’ before the term ‘‘mass transportation’’ in the second sentence and inserting ‘‘transit’’.

(2) reenactment.

SEC. 315. University Research Institutes.

Section 5316 and the item relating to section 5316 in the table of sections for chapter 53, are repealed.

SEC. 316. Transportation Centers.

Section 5317 and the item relating to section 5317 in the table of sections for chapter 53, are repealed.


(a) Operation and Maintenance.—Section 5318(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting ‘‘make a contract with’’ and inserting ‘‘enter into a contract or cooperative agreement with, or make a grant to,’’ before the semicolon at the end of paragraph (11);

(2) by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end of paragraph (13);

(3) by striking by the paragraph at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting ‘‘and’’; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(12) innovative finance.’’

(b) Conforming Amendments.—The item relating to section 5315 in the table of sections for chapter 53 is amended by striking ‘‘mass transportation’’ and inserting ‘‘mass transportation’’.

SEC. 318. Bicycle Facilities.

Section 5319 is amended by striking ‘‘under this section is for 90 percent of the cost of the project’’ and inserting ‘‘made eligible by this section for a project for the purpose of acquiring vehicle-related equipment required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) or vehicle-related equipment (including clean fuel or alternative fuel vehicle-related equipment) for purposes of complying with section 203 or 204 of such Act’’.

SEC. 319. General Provisions on Assistance.

(a) Technical Amendment.—Section 5323(d) is amended by striking ‘‘BUYING AND OPERATING BUSES.’’ and inserting ‘‘CONDITION ON CHARTERING CONTRACTS FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICE’’.

(b) Government’s Share.—Section 5323(i) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(I) Government Share of Costs for Certain Projects.—A grant for a project to be assisted under this chapter that involves acquiring vehicle-related equipment required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) or vehicle-related equipment (including clean fuel or alternative fuel vehicle-related equipment) for purposes of complying with section 203 or 204 of such Act is for 90 percent of the net project cost of such equipment attributable to compliance with such Acts. The Secretary shall have discretion, through practicable administrative procedures, the costs of such equipment attributable to compliance with such Acts.’’.

(c) Buy America.—Section 5323(j)(7) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(7) OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT INADVERTENT ERROR.—The Secretary may allow a manufacturer or supplier of steel, iron, or manufactured equipment, after certifying made under this subsection if the Secretary is satisfied that the manufacturer or supplier submitted an incorrect certification as a result of an inadvertent error.’’

(d) Participation of Governmental Agencies in Design and Delivery of Transportation Services.—Section 5323 is amended by striking subsections under sections (I) and (M) and by inserting after subsection (I) the following:

‘‘(K) Participation of Governmental Agencies in Design and Delivery of Transportation Services.—To the extent feasible, governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations that receive assistance from Government sources (other than the Department of Transportation) for nonemergency transportation services shall participate and coordinate with recipients of assistance under this chapter in the design and delivery of transportation services and shall be included in the planning for such services.’’

(e) Submission of Certifications.—Section 5323 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(R) Submission of Certifications.—A certification required under this chapter and any additional certification required by law or regulation to be submitted to the Secretary may be consolidated into a single document to be submitted annually as part of a grant application under this chapter. The Secretary shall publish annually a list of all certifications required under this chapter with the publication required under section 5336(e)(2).’’

(f) Required Payments and Eligible Costs.—Section 5323 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(O) Required Payments and Eligible Costs of Projects That Enhance Economic Development or Incorporate Private Investment.—

(1) Required Payments.—Each grant or loan under this chapter for a capital project described in section 5302(a)(1)(G) shall require that a person making an agreement to occupy space in a public facility or transportation mall, or any other facility or transportation mall, pay a reasonable share of the costs of the facility through rental payments and other means.

(2) Eligible Costs.—Eligible costs for a capital project described in section 5302(a)(1)(G) shall be—

(A) include property acquisition, demolition of existing structures, site preparation, utilities, building foundations, walkways, open space, and停车场, or any part of the equipment or a facility for an intermodal transfer facility or transportation mall; but

(B) do not include construction of a commercial, commuter, or other non-mass transportation facility of a public facility not related to mass transportation.’’
SEC. 320. CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.
(a) EFFICIENT PROCUREMENT.—Section 5325 is amended—
(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c); (2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b); and (3) by adding at the end the following:

(c) EFFICIENT PROCUREMENT.—A recipient may enter into contracts under this chapter to the other than the lowest bidder when the award furthers an objective consistent with the purposes of this chapter, including improved long-term operating efficiency and lower long-term costs.

(b) ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN CONTRACTS.—Section 5325(b), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), is amended—
(1) by inserting "or requirement" after "A contract"; and
(2) by inserting before the last sentence the following: "When awarding such contracts, recipients of assistance under this chapter shall maximize efficiencies of administration by accepting non-disputed audits conducted by other government agencies, as provided in subparagrapes (C) through (F) of section 112(b)(2) of title 23."

SEC. 321. SPECIAL PROCUREMENTS.
(a) TURNKEY SYSTEM PROJECTS.—Section 5326(a) is amended—
(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(1) TURNKEY SYSTEM PROJECT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "turnkey system project" means a project under which a recipient enters into a contract with a seller, firm, or consortium of firms to design and build a mass transportation system or an operable segment thereof that meets specific performance criteria. Such project may also include an option to finance, on a debt or equity basis for a period of time, the system or segment or any combination of designing, building, operating, or maintaining such system or segment.

(2) In paragraph (2)—
(A) by inserting "or segment of a mass transportation system after "transportation system";
(B) by striking subsection (d) and inserting whatever of the item; and
(C) by striking "(1) the manufacturer or supplier is the only source for the item; and"
(2) by adding at the end the following:
"(1) based on —
(A) initial capital costs; or
(B) performance, standardization, life cycle costs, and other factors; or
(2) with a party selected through a competitive procurement process.

(d) PROCUREMENT ASSOCIATED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE ITEMS.—A recipient of a grant under section 5307(b) of this title may enter into a contract to acquire fixed maintenance equipment—
(1) by striking "and segment or any combination of designing, building, operating, or maintaining such system or segment.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 5326 is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(C) ACQUIRING ROLLING STOCK.—A recipient of financial assistance of the United States Government under this chapter may enter into a contract to acquire fixed maintenance equipment under this subsection to the extent that the item—
(1) based on —
(A) initial capital costs; or
(B) performance, standardization, life cycle costs, and other factors; or
(2) with a party selected through competitive procurement processes.

SEC. 322. PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT AND REVIEW.
Section 5327(c)(2) is amended—
(1) by striking "make contracts" and inserting "enter into contracts"; and
(2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: "and to provide technical assistance to correct deficiencies identified in compliance reviews and audits carried out under this section."

SEC. 323. STUDY ON ALCOHOL AND CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES TESTING RATE CALCULATION.
(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine how the alcohol and controlled substances testing rate under section 5331 of title 49, United States Code, should be calculated.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study under this section, the Secretary shall consider—
(1) the differences in random testing results among employers subject to section 5331 of title 49, United States Code;
(2) the differences in random testing results among employers subject to such section in areas with populations of at least 200,000, in areas with populations of less than 200,000, and in other than urbanized areas;
(3) the deterrent effect of random testing; and
(4) the effect of random testing on public safety.

SEC. 324. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDURES.
(a) TRAINING AND CONFERENCE COSTS.—Section 5334(a) is amended—
(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (8); and
(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting "."

(b) FLEXIBILITY FOR AREAS WITH POPULATIONS UNDER 200,000.—Section 5334 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) FLEXIBILITY FOR AREAS WITH POPULATIONS UNDER 200,000.—Section 5334 is amended by inserting "provisions" after "Administrative".

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The item relating to section 5334 in the table of sections for chapter 33 is amended by inserting "provisions" after "Administrative".

SEC. 325. REPORTS AND AUDITS.
(a) NATIONAL TRANSPORT DATABASE.—Section 5335(a) is amended—
(1) by striking "REPORTING SYSTEM AND UNIFORM SYSTEM OF ACCOUNTS AND RECORDS" and inserting "National Transit Database"; and
(2) in paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking "by uniform categories," and inserting whatever of the item; and
(B) by striking subsection (d) of section 5323 and subsection (e) of section 5324.

(b) REPORTS.—Section 5335 is further amended—
(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and
(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

SEC. 326. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANT FORMULA GRANTS.
Section 5336 is amended—
(1) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting whatever of the item; and
(2) by striking paragraph (d) and inserting the following:

"(D) LIMITATION ON OPERATING ASSISTANCE AND PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE.—Of the funds apportioned under this section for urbanized areas, such sums as may be necessary shall be available for apportioned for urbanized areas with populations under 200,000, except that the total amount of such funds made available for such operating assistance and for urbanized areas for preventive maintenance activities that become eligible for capital assistance under section 5307 on the date of the enactment of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Quality of Life Equity Act of 1998 may not exceed $400,000,000 for any fiscal year."

SEC. 327. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION.
(a) DISTRIBUTION.—Section 5337(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall apportion amounts made available for fixed guideway modernization under section 5309 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 as follows:

(1) The first $479,700,000 shall be apportioned in the following urbanized areas as follows:

(A) Baltimore, $8,372,000.
(B) Boston, $38,948,760.
(C) Chicago/Northern Indiana, $78,169,000.
(D) Cleveland, $9,509,500.
(E) New Orleans, $1,730,588.
(F) New York, $176,034,461.
(G) Northeastern New Jersey, $50,604,653.
(H) Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey, $58,924,764.
(I) Pittsburgh, $13,662,463.
(J) San Francisco, $33,989,571.
(K) Southern California, $27,755,000.
(L) The next $74,849,950 shall be apportioned as follows:

(A) $4,849,950 to the Alaska Railroad for improvements to its passenger operations.
(B) Of the remaining $70,000,000—
(i) 50 percent in the urbanized areas listed in paragraph (1) as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A); and
(ii) 50 percent in other urbanized areas eligible for assistance under section 5363(b)(2)(A) to which amounts were apportioned under this section for fiscal year 1997, as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(2) The next $5,700,000 shall be apportioned in the following urbanized areas as follows:

(A) Pittsburgh, 61.76 percent.
(B) Cleveland, 10.73 percent.
(C) New Orleans, 5.79 percent.
(D) 21.72 percent in urbanized areas to which paragraph (2)(B) (iii) applies, as provided in section 5363(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(3) The next $186,600,000 shall be apportioned in each urbanized area to which paragraph (1) applies and in each urbanized area to which paragraph (2)(B) applies, as provided in section 5363(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(4) The next $140,000,000 shall be apportioned as follows:

(A) 65 percent in the urbanized areas listed in paragraph (1) and provided in section 5363(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.
(B) 35 percent to other urbanized areas eligible for assistance under section 5336(b)(2)(A) of this title that are areas of the fixed guideway systems placed in revenue service at least 7 years before the fiscal year in which amounts
are made available and in any urbanized area if, before the first day of the fiscal year, the area satisfies the Secretary that the area has modernization needs that cannot adequately be met by amounts received under section 5336(b)(2)(A), as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(6) The next $100,000,000 shall be apportioned as follows:

(A) 60 percent in the urbanized areas listed in paragraph (1) as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(B) 50 percent to urbanized areas to which paragraph (5)(B) applies, as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(7) Remaining amounts shall be apportioned as follows:

(A) 50 percent in the urbanized areas listed in paragraph (1) as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

(B) 50 percent to urbanized areas to which paragraph (5)(B) applies, as provided in section 5336(b)(2)(A) and subsection (e) of this section.

SEC. 328. AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) In General.—Section 5338 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5338. Authorizations

(a) FORMULA GRANTS.—

(1) FROM THE TRUST FUND.—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to carry out sections 5307, 5310, and 5313(b) $38,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(2) FROM THE TRUST FUND.—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to carry out sections 5307, 5310, and 5313(b) $54,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(2) FROM THE GENERAL FUND.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for grants under this section $9,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and $11,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(3) FROM THE GENERAL FUND.—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to carry out sections 5311(b)(2), 5312, 5313(a), 5314, 5315, and 5322 $38,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(b) ROUTE SEGMENTS TO BE INCLUDED IN APPORTIONMENT FORMULAS.—Section 5337 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(e) ROUTE SEGMENTS TO BE INCLUDED IN APPORTIONMENT FORMULAS.—(1) Amounts apportioned under paragraphs (2)(B), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) shall have attributable to each urbanized area the number of fixed guideway revenue miles of service and number of fixed guideway route-miles for segments of fixed guideway systems used to determine apportions-

SEC. 329. OBLIGATION CEILING.

(a) CAPITAL PROGRAM GRANTS AND LOANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total obligations made available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund by section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, shall not exceed:

(1) $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1998;

(2) $2,12,000,000 in fiscal year 1999; and

(3) $2,613,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(b) FORMULA GRANTS, PLANNING, RESEARCH, ADMINISTRATION, AND STUDIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total obligations made available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund by subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 5338 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 351 and 332 of this Act shall not exceed:

(1) $2,260,000,000 in fiscal year 1998;

(2) $3,213,000,000 in fiscal year 1999; and

(3) $3,703,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(c) PIlot PROGRAM.

(1) In sections 5303(h)(1), 5303(h)(2)(A), and 5303(h)(3)(A) by striking "5338(g)(1)" and inserting "5338(c)(3)(A)".

(2) In section 5303(h)(1) by striking "5306" and inserting "5308".

(3) In section 5303(h)(4) by striking "5338(g)" and inserting "5338(c)(3)(D)".

(4) In section 5309(f)(4), as redesignated by section 308(b)(1)(B) by striking "5338(a)" and inserting "5338(b)".

(5) In section 5310(b) by striking "5338(a)" and inserting "5338(a)(3)(B)".

(6) In section 5310(c) by striking "5338(g)" and inserting "5338(d)(3)(A)".

(7) In section 5310(d) by striking "5338(a)" and inserting "sections 5338(d)3(b)(3) and 5338(b)(3)(D)".

(8) In section 5313(b)(1) by striking "5338(g)(3)" and inserting "5338(c)(3)(B)".

(9) In section 5313(b) by striking "5338(g)(4)" and inserting "5338(d)(3)(D)".

(10) In section 5313(b)(1) by striking "5338(j)(5)" and inserting "5309(m)(j)(B)".

(11) In section 5338(b) by striking "5338(c)(3)(B)" and inserting "5338(a)(3)(A)".

(12) In section 5338(a) by striking "5338(c)(3)" and inserting "5338(a)(3)(C)".

(13) In section 308(b)(1) by striking "5338(a)" and inserting "5338(a)(3)(A)".

SEC. 330. ACCESS TO JOBS CHALLENGE GRANT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) General Authority.—The Secretary may make grants under this section to States, local governmental authorities, and nonprofit organizations in financing transportation services designed to transport welfare recipients to and from jobs and activities related to their employment. The Secretary shall coordinate activities under this section with related activities under programs of other Federal departments and agencies.

(b) Grant Criteria.—In selecting applicants for grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(1) The percentage of the population in the area to be served that are welfare recipients.

(2) The need for additional services (including bicycling) to transport welfare recipients to and from specified jobs, training, and other employment support services, and the extent to which the proposed services will address those needs.

(3) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates coordination with, and the financial commitment of, existing transportation service providers and the extent to which the applicant demonstrates coordination with the State agency that administers the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act.

(4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates maximum utilization of existing transit networks or hours of service or both.
(5) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates an innovative approach that is responsive to identified service needs.
(6) The extent to which the applicant presents a comprehensive approach addressing the needs of welfare recipients and identifies long-term financing strategies to support the services under consideration.
(c) Eligible Projects. The Secretary may make grants under this section for—
(1) capital projects and to finance operating costs, equipment, facilities, and associated capital maintenance items related to providing access to jobs under this section;
(2) the construction or repair of transit or rail projects for access to jobs under this section; and
(3) the use of employer-provided transportation including the transit pass benefit program under subsections (a) and (f) of section 312 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
No planning or coordination activities are eligible for assistance under this section.
(d) Competitive Grant Selection. The Secretary shall conduct a national solicitation for applications for grants under this section. Grants shall be awarded on a competitive basis. The Secretary shall select not more than 10 demonstration projects for the pilot program, including 6 projects from urbanized areas with populations of at least 200,000; 2 projects from urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000; and 2 projects from other urbanized areas.
(e) Federal Share of Costs. The Federal share of costs under this section shall be provided from funds appropriated to carry out this section. The Federal share of the costs of a project under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the net project cost. The remainder shall be provided in cash from sources other than funds from provider of transportation.
(f) Program Evaluation. The Secretary shall conduct a national solicitation for applications for grants under this section. The Secretary shall select not more than 10 demonstration projects for the pilot program, including 6 projects from urbanized areas with populations of at least 200,000; 2 projects from urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000; and 2 projects from other urbanized areas.
(g) Grant Requirements. A grant under this section shall be subject to all of the terms and conditions developed by the Secretary and granted on a competitive basis. The Secretary shall ensure that the total apportionments and allocations made to a designated grant recipient under section 312 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be reduced by the amount apportioned to such designated recipient pursuant to section 8 of the Surface Transportation Act of 1997 (11 Stat. 2559).
(h) Fixed Guideway Modernization Adjustment. In making the apportionments described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the amount apportioned to each urbanized area for fixed guideway modernization for fiscal year 1998 to reflect the method for apportioning funds under section 337(a).
(i) Final Design and Construction. The following projects are authorized for final design and construction for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 under section 300(m)(11)(B) of title 49, United States Code:
(1) Atlanta—Athens Commuter Rail.
(2) Atlanta—Griffin Commuter Rail.
(3) Atlanta—North Line Extension.
(4) Austin—NW/North Central/SE—Airport LRT.
(5) Baltimore—Central LRT Extension to Glen Burnie.
(6) Boston—Massport Airport Intermodal Transit Connector.
(7) Boston—North Shore Blue Line Extension to Beverly.
(8) Charlotte—South Corridor Transitway.
(9) Chicago—Navy Pier-McCormick Place Busway.
(10) Chicago—North Central Urban Commuter Rail.
(11) Chicago—Ravenswood Line Extension.
(12) Chicago—Southwest Extension.
(13) Chicago—West Line Extension.
(14) Cleveland—Akron-Canton Commuter Rail.
(15) Cleveland—Berea Metropole Line Extension.
(16) Cleveland—Blue Line Extension.
(17) Cleveland—Euclid Corridor Extension.
(18) Cleveland—I-90 Corridor to Ashtabula County.
(19) Cleveland—Waterfront Line Extension.
(20) Dallas—North Central Extension.
(21) Dallas—Fort Worth RAILTRAN (Phase I).
(22) Denver—East Corridor (Airport).
(23) Denver—Southwest LRT (I–25 between 6th & Lincoln).
(24) Denver—Southwest LRT.
(25) Denver—West Corridor LRT.
(26) East St. Louis–St. Clair County—Mid-America Corridor.
(27) Ft. Lauderdale-West Palm Beach-Miami Tri-County Commuter Rail.
2003 under section 5309(m)(1) of title 49, United States Code:
(1) Albuquerque—High Capacity Corridor.
(2) Atlanta—Georgia 400 Multimodal Corridor.
(3) Atlanta—MARTA Extension (S. Dekalb-Lindbergh).
(4) Atlanta—MARTA I-285 Transit Corridor.
(5) Atlanta—MARTA Marietta-Lawrenceville Corridor.
(6) Atlanta—MARTA South Dekalb Comprehensive Transit Program.
(7) Baltimore—Metropolitan Rail Corridor.
(8) Baltimore—People Mover.
(9) Bergen County Cross—County Light Rail.
(10) Birmingham Transit Corridor.
(11) Boston—Urban Ring.
(12) Charleston—Monobeam.
(13) Chicago—Cominsky Park Station.
(14) Chicago—Inner Circumferential Commuter Rail.
(15) Cumberland/Dauphin County Corridor 1
Commuter Rail.
(16) Dallas—DART LRT Extensions.
(17) Dallas—Las Colinas Corridor.
(18) Dayton—Regional Riverfront Corridor.
(19) El Paso—International Fixed Guideway
(El Paso-Juarez).
(20) Fremont—South Bay Corridor.
(21) Georgetown Branch (Bethesda-Silver
Springs).
(22) Houston—Advanced Transit Program.
(23) Jackson ville—Fixed Guideway Corridor.
(24) Kenosha-Racine—Milwaukee Rail Extension.
(25) Knoxville—Electric Transit.
(26) Kenosha—Racine—Milwaukee Rail Extension.
(27) Long Beach—Artesia/Paramount Line.
(28) Los Angeles—MOS-4 East Side Extension
(El Segundo).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 1999 (in millions)</th>
<th>FY 2000 (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Birmingham-Jefferson County, AL buses</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Boulder/Denver, CO RTD buses</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Bradford County, Endless Mountain Transportation Authority buses</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Brookhaven Town, NY elderly and disabled buses and vans</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Brooklyn-Staten Island, NY Mobility Enhancement buses</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Broward County, FL buses</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Buffalo, NY Auditorium Intermodal Station</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Bufalal NY Intermodal Station</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cambria County, PA bus facilities and buses</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Centre Area, PA Transportation Authority buses</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Chambersburg, PA Transit Authority buses</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Chambersburg, PA Transit Authority Intermodal Center</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Chatham, GA Downtown Transfer Center, Multimodal Circulator and Southside Transit Center</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Chester County, PA Paoli Transportation Center</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Clark County, NV Regional Transportation Commission buses</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Cleveland, OH Triskett Garage bus maintenance facility</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Crawford Area, PA Transportation Authority buses</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Culver City, CA CityBus buses</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Davis, CA Unitrans transit maintenance facility</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Dayton, OH Multimodal Transportation Center</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Daytona, FL Intermodal Center</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Duluth, MN Transit Authority community circulation vehicles</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Duluth, MN Transit Authority intelligent transportation systems</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Duluth, MN Transit Authority Hub</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Dutchess County, NY Loop System buses</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. East Hampton, NY elderly and disabled buses and vans</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEC. 334. PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of the Secretary of Transportation’s implementation of project management oversight under section 5327 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall include the following:

(1) A listing of the amounts made available under section 5327(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, for project management oversight in each of fiscal years 1992 through 1997 and a description of the activities funded using such amounts.

(2) A description of the major capital projects subject to project management oversight.

(3) A description of the contracts entered into for project management oversight, including the scope of work and dollar amounts of such contracts.

(4) A determination of whether the project management oversight activities conducted by the Secretary are authorized under section 5327.

(5) A description of any cost savings or program improvements resulting from project management oversight.

(6) Recommendations regarding any changes that would improve the project management oversight function.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report containing the results of the study.

SEC. 335. PRIVATIZATION.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the effect of privatization or contracting out mass transportation operation and administrative functions, including availability and level of service, efficiency, safety, quality of services provided to transit-dependent populations, and employer-employee relations.

(b) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—The agreement entered into in subsection (a) shall provide that—

(1) the Transportation Research Board, in conducting the study, consider the number of grant recipients that have privatized or contracted out services, the size of the population served by such grant recipients, the basis for decisions regarding privatization or contracting out, and the extent to which contracting out was affected by the integration and coordination of resources of transit agencies and other Federal agencies and programs; and

(2) the panel conducting the study shall include representatives of transit agencies, employees of transit agencies, private contractors, academic and policy analysts, and other interested persons.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of entry into the agreement under subsection (a), the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report containing the results of the study.

(d) FUNDING.—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highways Trust Fund to carry out this section $200,000 for fiscal year 1998, subject to the obligation limitation set forth in section 2303.

(e) CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION.—Entry into an agreement to carry out this section that is financed with amounts made available under subsection (c) is a contractual obligation of the United States to pay the Government’s share of the cost of the study.

SEC. 336. SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the safety issues attendant to transportation of school children to and from school and school-related activities by various transportation modes.

(b) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—The agreement entered into in subsection (a) shall provide that—

(1) the Transportation Research Board, in conducting the study, consider—

(A) in consultation with the National Transportation Safety Board, the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, and other relevant entities, available crash injury data, and if unavailable or insufficient, recommend a new data collection regimen and implementation guidelines; and
(8) vehicle design and driver training requirements, routing, and operational factors that affect safety and other factors that the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(9) the results of the study shall include representatives of highway safety organizations, school transportation, mass transportation operators, employee organizations, bicycling organizations, and policy analysts, and other interested parties.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of entry into the agreement under subsection (b), the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report containing the results of the study.

(d) FUNDING.—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to carry out this section $200,000 for fiscal year 1998, subject to the obligation limitation set forth in section 329(b).

(e) Grant Obligation.—Entry into an agreement to carry out this section that is financed with amounts made available under subsection (c) is a contractual obligation of the United States to pay the Government’s share of the cost of the study.

SEC. 337. URBANIZED AREA FORMULA STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine whether the current formula for apportioning funds to urbanized areas accurately reflects the transit needs of the urbanized areas and if not whether any changes should be made either to the formula or through some other mechanism to reflect the fact that some urbanized areas with a population between 50,000 and 200,000 have transit systems that carry more passengers per mile or hour than the average systems in urbanized areas with a population over 200,000.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1999, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on the results of the study conducted under this section together with any proposed changes to the method for apportioning funds to urbanized areas with a population over 50,000.

SEC. 338. COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of Federal departments and agencies to determine if transportation decisions (other than the Department of Transportation) that receive Federal financial assistance for non-emergency transportation services are in keeping with the traffic safety, commercial motor vehicle, and driver safety requirements for final assembly of buses of section 5323(d) of title 49, United States Code.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report containing the results of the study.

TITLE IV—MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

SEC. 403. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed to apply to a section or other provision of law, the reference shall be made to be a section or other provision of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 402. STATE GRANTS.

(a) OBJECTIVE AND DEFINITIONS.—Section 31101 is amended—

(1) by inserting "safe and efficient" in clause (ii) of paragraph (a)(5) of section 31101; and

(2) in paragraph (b)(2) by inserting "and commercial motor vehicle safety and enforcement" before "enforce".

(b) OBJECTIVE AND DEFINITIONS.—Section 31101 is amended—

(1) by inserting "motor carrier" in clause (ii) of paragraph (a)(5) of section 31101; and

(2) in paragraph (a)(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(M) ensures participation in motor carrier, commercial motor vehicle safety and enforcement interdiction activities;'';

(3) in paragraph (a)(7) by inserting the following: "(a) AMOUNTS.—(1) Not more than $78,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;''; and

(4) in paragraph (a)(8) by adding at the end the following:

"(A) ENFORCEMENT.—The funds shall be used to improve the enforcement of commercial motor vehicle safety and enforcement regulations; and

"(B) TO PROVIDE.—These funds shall be used to purchase the following:

(i) enforcement equipment and supplies;

(ii) training for enforcement personnel; and

(iii) providing and maintaining enforcement information systems with State highway safety programs to improve data and results of enforcement programs and make available to carry out section 31102 for fiscal year 1999.''

(c) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Section 31104(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(f) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Section 31104(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than $110,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;''

(3) in paragraph (a)(9) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) AVOIDANCE.—The funds shall be used to improve the enforcement of commercial motor vehicle safety and enforcement regulations; and

"(C) TO PROVIDE.—The funds shall be used to purchase the following:

(i) enforcement equipment and supplies;

(ii) training for enforcement personnel; and

(iii) providing and maintaining enforcement information systems with State highway safety programs to improve data and results of enforcement programs and make available to carry out section 31102 for fiscal year 1999.''

(d) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—Section 31104(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—The funds shall be used to improve the enforcement of commercial motor vehicle safety and enforcement regulations; and

"(C) TO PROVIDE.—The funds shall be used to purchase the following:

(i) enforcement equipment and supplies;

(ii) training for enforcement personnel; and

(iii) providing and maintaining enforcement information systems with State highway safety programs to improve data and results of enforcement programs and make available to carry out section 31102 for fiscal year 1999.''

(e) A VAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Section 31104(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(f) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Section 31104(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than $110,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;''

(3) in paragraph (a)(9) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) AVOIDANCE.—The funds shall be used to improve the enforcement of commercial motor vehicle safety and enforcement regulations; and

"(C) TO PROVIDE.—The funds shall be used to purchase the following:

(i) enforcement equipment and supplies;

(ii) training for enforcement personnel; and

(iii) providing and maintaining enforcement information systems with State highway safety programs to improve data and results of enforcement programs and make available to carry out section 31102 for fiscal year 1999.''

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 31104(b) is amended by striking "(1)" and by striking paragraph (2).

(g) ALLOCATION CRITERIA AND ELIGIBILITY.—Section 31104 is further amended—

(1) by striking subsections (f) and (g) and inserting the following:

"(f) ALLOCATION CRITERIA AND ELIGIBILITY.—

"(1) In general.—On October 1 of each fiscal year or as soon after that date as practicable and after making the deduction under subsection (e), the Secretary shall allocate amounts made available to carry out section 31102 for such fiscal year among the States with plans approved under section 31102. Such allocations shall be made under such criteria as the Secretary prescribes by regulation.
"(2) High-priority activities and projects.—The Secretary may designate up to 5 percent of amounts available for allocation under paragraph (1) to reimburse—

(A) for carrying out high-priority activities and projects that improve commercial motor vehicle safety and compliance with commercial motor vehicle safety regulations, including activities that are part of a program to increase public awareness and education, and

(B) local governments and other persons that use trained officers and employees, for carrying out activities and projects described in subparagraph (A) in coordination with State motor vehicle safety agencies;

(2) redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(3) by striking subsection (d); and

(4) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(5) in the first sentence of subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking 'tolerance'.

h) Conforming amendment.—The table of sections for chapter 311 is amended by striking the item relating to section 31101 and inserting the following:

31101. Objective and definitions.

SEC. 4. INFORMATION SYSTEMS.

(a) In general.—Section 31106 is amended to read as follows:

§ 31106. Information systems

"(a) Information systems and data analysis.

(1) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall establish and operate motor carrier, commercial motor vehicle, and driver information systems and data analysis programs to support safety activities required under this title.

(2) Coordination into network.—In cooperation with States, the information systems under this section shall be coordinated into a network providing identification of motor carriers and drivers, commercial motor vehicle registration and license tracking, and motor carrier, commercial motor vehicle, and driver safety performance data.

(3) Data analysis capacity and programs.—The Secretary shall develop and maintain under this section data analysis capacity and programs that provide the means to—

(A) identify and collect necessary motor carrier, commercial motor vehicle, and driver data;

(B) evaluate the safety fitness of motor carriers, commercial motor vehicles, and drivers;

(C) develop strategies to mitigate safety problems and improve the effectiveness of such strategies and related programs;

(D) determine the cost-effectiveness of Federal and State safety and enforcement programs and other countermeasures; and

(E) adapt, improve, and incorporate other information and information systems as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(4) Implementation.—In implementing this section, the Secretary may prescribe technical and operational standards to ensure—

(A) that the technical and operational standards prescribed by the Secretary are met;

(B) that the Secretary shall require States, as a condition of participation in the program, to—

(1) comply with the technical and operational standards prescribed by the Secretary; and

(2) decide, in cooperation with the Secretary, whether and what types of sanctions or operating limitations to impose on the motor carrier or registrant.

(3) Conditions for participation.—The Secretary shall require States, as a condition of participation in the program, to—

(A) develop appropriate strategies and related programs to improve driver safety;

(B) provide information to the Secretary on the availability of information on motor carrier, commercial motor vehicle, and driver performance data.

(4) Developing appropriate strategies and countermeasures to improve driver safety.

(5) Cooperative agreements, grants, and contracts.—The Secretary may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with States, local governments, associations, institutions, corporations, and other persons.

(6) Information availability and privacy protection.

(7) Availability of information.—The Secretary shall make data collected in systems and programs under this section available to the public to the maximum extent permissible under the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a) and the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

(8) Review of data.—The Secretary shall allow individuals and motor carriers to whom the data pertains to review periodically such data and to request corrections or clarifications.

(3) State and local officials.—State and local officials shall have access to data made available under this subsection to the same extent as Federal safety and enforcement officials.

(b) Authorization of appropriations.—Section 31107 is amended to read as follows:

§ 31107. Authorization of appropriations for information systems

(a) In general.—There shall be available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out sections 31106 and 31309 of this title—

(1) $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

(2) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000;

(3) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

(b) Contract authority.—Approval by the Secretary of a grant with funds made available under this section shall remain available until expended.

(c) Subchapter heading.—The heading for subchapter I of chapter 311 is amended by inserting after "STANDBY" the following: AND OTHER COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE PROGRAMS.

(d) Conforming amendments.—The section of this title shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4.40. Authorization of appropriations for information systems.

Section 31107(a)(1) is amended by striking "section 31106" and inserting "section 31107".

SEC. 4.50. Authorization of appropriations for information systems.

Section 31107(a)(1) is amended by striking "section 31106" and inserting "section 31107".

SEC. 4.60. Authorization of appropriations for information systems.

Section 31107(a)(1) is amended by striking "section 31106" and inserting "section 31107".

SEC. 4.70. Authorization of appropriations for information systems.

Section 31107(a)(1) is amended by striking "section 31106" and inserting "section 31107".

SEC. 4.80. Authorization of appropriations for information systems.

Section 31107(a)(1) is amended by striking "section 31106" and inserting "section 31107".
"(A) The provisions from which the person requests exemption.

"(B) The time period during which the exemption would apply.

"(C) The specific nature of the safety impacts the exemption may cause.

"(D) The specific countermeasures the person would undertake, if the exemption were granted, to ensure that the State law or regulation would not be achieved absent the exemption.

"(4) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—

"(A) UPON RECEIPT OF A REQUEST.—Upon receipt of a request, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice explaining the request that has been filed and shall give the public an opportunity to inspect the State law or regulation, information known to the Secretary and to comment on the request. This subparagraph does not require the release of information protected by law from public disclosure.

"(B) UPON GRANTING A REQUEST.—Upon granting a request for exemption, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the name of the person granted the exemption, the provisions from which the person will be exempt, the effective period, and all terms and conditions of the exemption.

"(C) UPON DENYING A REQUEST.—Upon denying a request for exemption, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the name of the person denied the exemption and the reasons for such denial.

"(5) APPLICATIONS TO BE DEALT WITH PROMPTLY.—The Secretary shall grant or deny an exemption request after a thorough review of its safety implications, but in no case later than 180 days after the filing date of such request, or the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the reason for the delay in the decision and an estimated date when the decision will be made.

"(6) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall establish terms and conditions for each exemption to ensure that it will achieve an overall safety level equal to or greater than the level that would be achieved absent such exemption. The Secretary shall monitor the implementation of the exemption to ensure compliance with its terms and conditions.

"(7) NOTIFICATION OF STATE COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.—Before granting a request for exemption, the Secretary shall notify State and local enforcement personnel, including roadside inspectors and, the public that a person will be operating pursuant to an exemption and any terms and conditions that will be imposed by the exemption.

"(b) PILOT PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may conduct pilot programs to evaluate innovative approaches to motor carrier, vehicle, and driver safety. Such pilot programs may include exemptions from a regulation prescribed under this chapter or section 31136 if the pilot program contains, at a minimum, the elements described in paragraph (2). The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the program and the exemptions to be considered and a schedule and opportunity for public comment before the effective date of any exemptions.

"(2) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—In proposing a pilot program and before granting exemptions for purposes of a pilot program, the Secretary shall include, at a minimum, the following elements in each pilot program plan:

(A) A program scheduled life of not more than 3 years.

(B) A scientifically valid methodology and study design, including a specific data collection plan that identifies appropriate control groups for comparison.

(C) The fewest participants necessary to yield statistically valid findings.

(D) Appropriate ethical protocols for the use of human subjects in field experiments.

"(E) An oversight plan to ensure that participants comply with the terms and conditions of participation.

"(F) Adequate countermeasures to protect the health and safety of study participants and the general public.

"(G) A plan to inform State partners and the public about the pilot program and to identify approved participants to safety compliance and enforcement personnel and to the public.

"(3) AUTHORITY TO REVOKE PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall immediately revoke participation in a pilot program if its continuation would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of this chapter or section 31136, as the case may be.

"(4) AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall immediately terminate a pilot program if its continuation would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of this chapter or section 31316, as the case may be.

"(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of each pilot program, the Secretary shall promptly report to Congress the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the program, including suggested amendments to law or regulation that would enhance motor carrier, vehicle, and driver safety and improve compliance with national safety standards.

"(c) PREEMPTION OF REGULATIONS.—During the period that an exemption or pilot program is in effect under this section, no State shall enforce any law or regulation that conflicts with it or an exemption or pilot program with respect to a person exercising the exemption or participating in the pilot program.

"(d) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 313 is amended by striking the item relating to section 31313 and inserting the following:

"(31316. Exemptions and pilot programs.

"(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 31136(e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may grant exemptions from any regulation prescribed under this Act in accordance with section 31315.

"(f) PROTECTION OF STATES PARTICIPATING IN STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 31142(c)(1)(C) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "from" the following: "participating in the activities of a voluntary group of States"; and

(2) by striking "that meets" and all that follows through "1984".

"(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the status of implementation of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 407. SAFETY REGULATION.

(a) COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE DEFINED.—Section 31212(1) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting "or gross vehicle weight" after "rating"; and

(B) by inserting ", whichever is greater" after "pounds"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting "or livery" after "taxicab"; and

(B) by striking "6 passengers" and inserting "8 passengers, including the driver.".

(b) REPEAL OF REVIEW PANEL.—Section 31314, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for chapter 313, are repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF SUBMISSION TO REVIEW PANEL.—Section 31140, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for chapter 313, are repealed.

(d) REVIEW PROCEDURE.—Section 31411 is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

(2) "SUBMISSION OF REGULATION.—A State that enacts a State law or issues a regulation on commercial motor vehicle safety shall submit a copy of the regulation to the Secretary of Transportation immediately after the enactment or issuance.

"(1) REVIEW AND DECISIONS BY SECRETARY.—

"(2) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review State laws and regulations on commercial motor vehicle safety. The Secretary shall decide which State laws or regulations

"(A) has the same effect as a regulation prescribed by the Secretary under section 31316;

"(B) is less stringent than such regulation; or

"(C) is additional to or more stringent than such regulation.

"(2) REGULATIONS WITH SAME EFFECT.—If the Secretary decides a State law or regulation has the same effect as a regulation prescribed by the Secretary under section 31316 of this title, the State law or regulation may be enforced.

"(3) LESS STRINGENT REGULATIONS.—If the Secretary decides a State law or regulation is less stringent than a regulation prescribed by the Secretary under section 31316 of this title, the State law or regulation may be enforced.

"(4) ADDITIONAL OR MORE STRINGENT REGULATIONS.—If the Secretary decides a State law or regulation is additional to or more stringent than a regulation prescribed by the Secretary under section 31316 of this title, the State law or regulation may be enforced unless the Secretary also decides that—

(A) the State law or regulation has no safety benefit;

(B) the State law or regulation is incompatible with the regulation prescribed by the Secretary; or

(C) enforcement of the State law or regulation would cause an unreasonable burden on interstate commerce.

"(5) CONSIDERATION OF EFFECT ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.—In deciding under paragraph (4) whether a State law or regulation will cause an unreasonable burden on interstate commerce, the Secretary may consider the effect on interstate commerce of implementation of that law or regulation with the implementation of all similar laws and regulations of other States.

"(6) INSPECTION OF SAFETY EQUIPMENT.—Section 31412(a) is amended by striking "part 393 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations" and inserting "the regulations issued under section 31316".

"(f) PROTECTION OF STATES PARTICIPATING IN STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 31142(c)(1)(C) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "from" the following: "participating in the activities of a voluntary group of States"; and

(2) by striking "that meets" and all that follows through "1984".

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the status of implementation of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 408. IMPROVED INTERSTATE SCHOOL BUS SAFETY.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY REGULATIONS TO INTERSTATE SCHOOL BUS OPERATIONS.—Section 31316 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) APPLICABILITY TO SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations to conform with the regulation prescribed by the Secretary under section 31316 of this title, the State law or regulation may be enforced.

"(h) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the
status of compliance by private for-hire motor carriers and local educational agencies in meeting the requirements of section 31136 of title 49, United States Code, and any activities of the Secretary or the States to enforce such requirements.

SEC. 409. REPEAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES.

Subchapter V of chapter 311 (including sections 31161 and 31162), and the items relating to such subchapter and sections in the table of sections for chapter 311, are repealed.

SEC. 410. COMMERCIAL VEHICLE OPERATORS.

(a) COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE DEFINED.—Section 31301(4) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A)(i) by striking “gross vehicle weight” after “rating” the first 2 places it appears; and

(B) by inserting “, whichever is greater,” after “pounds” the first place it appears;

and

(2) in subparagraph (C)(ii) by inserting “is” before “transporting” each place it appears.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CMV OPERATION WITHOUT LICENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 31302 is amended to read as follows:

“§ 31302. Driver’s license requirement

“An individual may operate a commercial motor vehicle only if the individual has a valid commercial driver’s license. An individual operating a commercial motor vehicle may have only one commercial license at any time.

(2) COMPLETING A COMMERCIAL DRIVER’S LICENSE APPLICATION.—The item relating to section 31302 in the table of sections for chapter 313 is amended to read as follows:

“31302. Driver’s license requirement.”.

(c) USE OF INFORMATION FROM CDLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 31308(b) is amended by inserting before the semicolon “and each license issued after January 1, 2000, include unique identifiers to minimize fraud and duplication”.

(2) DEADLINE FOR ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out the amendment made by paragraph (1).

(d) COMMERCIAL DRIVER’S LICENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM.—Section 31309 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking “make an agreement under subsection (b) of this section for the operation of, or establish under subsection (c) of this section, and inserting “maintain”;

(2) by inserting after the first sentence of subsection (b) the following: “The system shall be maintained, updated, and used to collect and issue regulations to carry out the amendment made by paragraph (1).”;

(3) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(4) in subsection (d)(1) by striking “and” and inserting “or”;

(b) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E); and

(c) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) information on all fines, penalties, convictions, and failure to appear for a hearing or trial incurred by the operator with respect to operation of a motor vehicle for a period of not less than 3 years beginning on the date of the imposition of the penalty or the date of such a conviction or failure to appear;”;

(5) by striking subsection (d)(2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The information system under this section must accommodate any unique identifiers required to minimize fraud or duplication of a commercial driver’s license under section 31308(2).”;

(b) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Information in the information system shall be made available and subject to review and correction in accordance with section 31106(e).”;

(7) by striking “If the Secretary establishes an information system under this section, the” and inserting “The”;

(by striking “shall” in the first sentence of subsection (f) and inserting “may”;

and

(by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

(8) in section 31302(b), and

(9) in sections 31312 and 31313, and the items relating to such sections in the table of sections for chapters 313, are repealed.

SEC. 411. UPDATE AMENDMENTS.—Section 31314 is amended—

(1) by striking “(2), (5), and (6)” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “(1) Amounts” and all that follows through “(2) Amounts” and inserting “Amounts”;

(3) by striking subsection (d); and

(4) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

SEC. 412. INTERIM BORDER SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to improve commercial motor vehicle safety in the vicinity of borders between the United States and Canada and the United States and Mexico.

(b) GRANT AND OTHER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make grants available to carry out this section—

(1) for making grants to border States, local governments, organizations, and other persons to carry out activities described in subsection (c);

(2) for personnel of the Department of Transportation to conduct such activities; and

(3) for entry into contracts for the conduct of such activities.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Activities for which funds may be expended under this section include—

(1) employment by the Department of Transportation or a border State of additional personnel to enforce commercial motor vehicle safety regulations described in section (a);

(2) training of personnel to enforce such regulations;

(3) development of data bases and communication systems to improve commercial motor vehicle safety; and

(4) education and outreach initiatives.

(d) CRITERIA.—In selecting activities and projects for funding under this section, the Secretary shall consider current levels of enforcement by border States, cross border traffic patterns (including volume of commercial motor vehicle traffic), and such other factors as the Secretary determines will result in the greatest safety improvement and benefit to border States and the Nation.

(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share payable under a grant made under this section for any activity described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (c) shall be 80 percent; and

(2) any activity described in subsection (c)(1) shall be—

(i) 80 percent for the first 2 years that a State receives a grant under this section for such activity;

(ii) 50 percent for the third and fourth years that a State receives a grant under this section for such activity; and

(iii) 25 percent for the fifth and sixth years that a State receives a grant under this section for such activity.

(f) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—In determining the non-Federal costs under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include in-kind contributions by the grant recipient, of which up to $2,500,000 may be used to upgrade earthquake simulation facilities. To carry out the program, the Secretary may use not to exceed $300,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 to carry out this section.

(g) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—A grant may not be made to a State under this section for an activity described in subsection (c)(1) in any fiscal year to the extent that such agreement with the Secretary as the Secretary may require to ensure that the State will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all other sources for employment of personnel to enforce commercial motor vehicle safety regulations in the vicinity of the border at or above the average level of expenditures in the last full fiscal year preceding the date of the enactment of this section.

(h) FUNDING.—Of amounts made available to carry out the coordinated border infrastructure and safety program under section 116 of this Act, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 and $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003 shall be available to carry out this section.

(i) BORDER STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “border State” means any State that has a boundary in common with Canada or Mexico.

SEC. 413. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION PLAN AND INTERNATIONAL POINT AGREEMENT.

Sections 31702, 31703, and 31708, and the items relating to such sections in the table of sections for chapter 317, are repealed.

SEC. 414. TELEPHONE HOTLINE FOR REPORTING VIOLATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For a period of not less than 2 years beginning on or before the 90th day following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall maintain, establish, and promote the use of a nationwide toll-free telephone system to be used by drivers of commercial motor vehicles and others to report potential violations of Federal motor carrier safety regulations and any laws or regulations relating to the safe operation of commercial motor vehicles and to report potentially improper inspections, audits, and enforcement activities.

(b) MONITORING.—The Secretary shall monitor reports received by the telephone system and shall consider nonfrivolous information provided by such reports in setting priorities for motor carrier safety audits and other enforcement activities.

(c) PROTECTION OF PERSONS REPORTING VIOLATIONS.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—A person reporting a potential violation to the telephone system while acting in good faith may not be discharged, disciplined, or discriminated against regarding terms, conditions, or other aspects of employment because of the reporting of such violation.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—For purposes of section 31105 of title 49, United States Code, a violation described in subsection (a) of such section shall be treated as a violation of section 31105(a) of such title.

(d) FUNDING.—From amounts made available under subparagraphs (F) through (I) of section 127(a)(3) of this Act, the Secretary may use not to exceed $300,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 415. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION PLAN AND INTERNATIONAL POINT AGREEMENT.
Act, the Secretary shall determine whether a practicable and cost-effective screening, operating, and monitoring protocol could likely be developed for insulin treated diabetes mellitus individuals driving commercial motor vehicles in interstate commerce that would ensure a level of safety equal to or greater than that achieved with the current prohibition on individuals with insulin treated diabetes mellitus driving such vehicles.

(b) Compilation and Evaluation.—Prior to making a determination in subsection (a), the Secretary shall compile and evaluate research and other information on the effects of insulin treated diabetes mellitus on driving performance.

(c) Technology Approval.—Pursuant to the compilation and evaluation, the Secretary shall, at a minimum—

(1) consult with States that have developed and implemented a screening process to identify insulin treated diabetes mellitus individuals who may obtain waivers to drive commercial motor vehicles in intrastate commerce;

(2) evaluate the Department's policy and actions to permit certain insulin treated diabetes mellitus individuals who meet selection criteria and who successfully comply to demonstrate safety fitness;

(3) analyze available data on the safety performance of diabetic drivers of motor vehicles;

(4) assess the relevance of intrastate driving and experiences of other modes of transportation and interstate commercial motor vehicle operations; and

(5) consult with interested groups knowledgeable about diabetes and related issues.

(d) Recommendation of Protocol.—If the Secretary determines that no protocol described in subsection (a) could likely be developed, the Secretary shall report to Congress a description of the elements of such protocol and shall promptly initiate a rulemaking proceeding to implement such protocol.

SEC. 416. PERFORMANCE-BASED CDL TESTING.

(a) Review.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a review of the protocol and monitoring program developed and implemented by States under section 31305 of title 49, United States Code, to determine if the current system for testing is an accurate reflection of an individual's knowledge and skills as an operator of a commercial motor vehicle and to identify methods to improve testing and licensing standards, including identifying the benefits and costs of a graduated licensing system.

(b) Regulations.—Not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall issue regulations under section 31305 reflecting the results of the review.

SEC. 417. POSTACCIDENTAL TESTING.

(a) Study.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of utilizing qualified emergency responders and law enforcement officers for postaccidental alcohol testing of commercial motor vehicle operators under section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, as a method of obtaining more timely information and reducing the burdens that employers may encounter in meeting the testing requirements of this section.

(b) Report.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a) with recommendations regarding the utilization of emergency responders and law enforcement officers in conducting testing described in subsection (a).

SEC. 418. DRIVER FATIGUE.

(a) TECHNOLOGIES TO REDUCE FATIGUE OF COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGIES.—As part of the activities of the Secretary relating to the fatigue of commercial motor vehicle operators, the Secretary shall encourage the research, development, and implementation of technologies that may aid in reducing such fatigue.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF TECHNOLOGIES.—In identifying technologies pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into account—

(A) the degree to which the technology will be cost efficient;

(B) the degree to which the technology can be effectively used in diverse climatic regions of the Nation; and

(C) the degree to which the application of the technology will further emissions reductions, energy conservation, and other transportation goals.

(3) FUNDING.—The Secretary may make available amounts made available under subparagraphs (F) through (I) of section 127a(3) of this Act to carry out this subsection.

(b) NONSEEDING ANTIHISTAMINES.—The Secretary shall report available information on the effects of antihistamines on driver fatigue, awareness, and performance and shall consider encouraging the use of nonseeding antihistamines as a means of reducing the adverse effects of the use of other antihistamines by drivers.

SEC. 419. SAFETY FITNESS.

(a) In General.—Section 31144 is amended to read as follows:

§ 31144. Safety fitness of owners and operators.

(1) General. The Secretary shall—

(A) determine whether an owner or operator is fit to operate safely commercial motor vehicles;

(B) periodically update such safety fitness determinations;

(C) make such safety fitness determinations readily available to the public; and

(D) prescribe by regulation penalties for violations of this section consistent with section 521.

(2) Procedure. The Secretary shall maintain by regulation a procedure for determining whether an owner or operator is fit to operate safely commercial motor vehicles. The procedure shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(A) Specific initial and continuing requirements with which an owner or operator must comply to demonstrate safety fitness;

(B) A methodology the Secretary will use to determine whether an owner or operator is fit;

(C) Specific time frames within which the Secretary will determine whether an owner or operator is fit.

(3) PROHIBITED TRANSPORTATION.—

(A) G lap. In general.—Except as provided in sections 521(b)(5)(A) and 5113 and this subsection, an owner or operator who the Secretary determines is not fit may not operate commercial motor vehicles in interstate commerce beginning on the 61st day after the date of such fitness determination and until the Secretary determines such owner or operator is fit.

(B) OWNERS OR OPERATORS TRANSPORTING PASSENGERS.—With regard to owners or operators of commercial motor vehicles designed or used to transport passengers, an owner or operator who the Secretary determines is not fit may not operate in interstate commerce beginning on the 46th day after the date of such fitness determination and until the Secretary determines such owner or operator is fit.

(C) OWNERS OR OPERATORS TRANSPORTING HAZARDOUS MATERIAL.—With regard to owners or operators of commercial motor vehicles designed or used to transport hazardous material for which placarding of a motor vehicle is required under regulations prescribed under chapter 51, the Secretary shall review such owner's or operator's compliance with those requirements with which the owner or operator failed to comply and resulted in the Secretary determining that the owner or operator was not fit.

(D) OWNERS OR OPERATORS TRANSPORTING HAZARDOUS MATERIAL.—Not later than 30 days after an unfit owner or operator of commercial motor vehicles designed or used to transport hazardous material for which placarding of a motor vehicle is required under regulations prescribed under chapter 51, the Secretary shall review such owner's or operator's compliance with those requirements with which the owner or operator failed to comply and resulted in the Secretary determining that the owner or operator was not fit.

(E) OWNERS OR OPERATORS TRANSPORTING HAZARDOUS MATERIAL.—Not later than 30 days after an unfit owner or operator of commercial motor vehicles designed or used to transport hazardous material for which placarding of a motor vehicle is required under regulations prescribed under chapter 51, the Secretary shall review such owner's or operator's compliance with those requirements with which the owner or operator failed to comply and resulted in the Secretary determining that the owner or operator was not fit.

(F) OWNERS OR OPERATORS TRANSPORTING HAZARDOUS MATERIAL.—Not later than 30 days after an unfit owner or operator of commercial motor vehicles designed or used to transport hazardous material for which placarding of a motor vehicle is required under regulations prescribed under chapter 51, the Secretary shall review such owner's or operator's compliance with those requirements with which the owner or operator failed to comply and resulted in the Secretary determining that the owner or operator was not fit.
in this section, each State highway department shall submit to the Secretary for approval such plans, specifications, and estimates for each proposed project as the Secretary may require.

(b) PROVISION OF FUNDING.—The Secretary shall act upon the plans, specifications, and estimates as soon as practicable after the date of their submission and shall enter into a formal agreement with the highway department formalizing the conditions of the project approval.

(3) CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION.—The execution of the project agreement shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its proportional contribution thereto.

(4) GUIDANCE.—In taking action under this subsection, the Secretary shall be guided by the provisions of section 109.

(b) PROJECT AGREEMENT.—

(1) PROVISION OF STATE FUNDS.—The project agreement shall make provision for State funds required for the State's pro rata share of the cost of construction of the project and for the maintenance of the project after completion of construction.

(2) REPRESENTATIONS OF STATE.—The Secretary may rely upon representations made by the State highway department with respect to the arrangements or agreements made by the State highway department and appropriate local officials if a part of the project is to be constructed at the expense of, or in cooperation with, local subdivisions of the State.

(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR PROJECT OVERSIGHT.—

(1) NHS PROJECTS.—

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Except as otherwise provided in section (d), the Secretary may discharge to the State any of the Secretary's responsibilities under this Act for design, plans, specifications, contract awards, and inspection of projects on the National Highway System.

(b) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the State shall reach an agreement to the extent the State may assume the Secretary's responsibilities under this subsection. The Secretary may not assume any greater responsibility than the Secretary is permitted under this section on December 30, 1997, except upon agreement by the Secretary and the State.

(2) NON-INTERSTATE SYSTEM PROJECTS.—For all projects under this title that are not on the National Highway System, the State shall assume the Secretary's responsibility under this Act for design, plans, specifications, estimates, contract awards, and inspections of projects. For projects that are on the National Highway System but not on the Interstate System, the State shall assume the Secretary's responsibility under this Act for design, plans, specifications, estimates, contract awards, and inspections of projects unless the State or the Secretary determines that such assumption is not appropriate.

(d) SECRETARY'S RESPONSIBILITIES.—Nothing in this Act shall affect or discharge any responsibility or obligation of the Secretary under any Federal law other than this title. Any responsibility or obligation of the Secretary under sections 103, 105, 110, and 111 of this title and section 3333 of title 49 shall not be affected and may not be discharged under this Act.
consistent with those established by the Council on Environmental Quality under the provisions of sections 150.18 and 150.10 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) (a) The Secretary shall extend any time periods for review under this section if, upon good cause shown, the Secretary and any Federal agency concerned determine that additional time is necessary. Any extension of time shall be in writing and shall include a statement of the facts and circumstances indicating the necessity for the extension, together with a statement of the time period for which the extension is sought.

(b) The Secretary shall extend any time periods for review under this section if, upon good cause shown, the Secretary and any Federal agency concerned determine that additional time is necessary. Any extension of time shall be in writing and shall include a statement of the facts and circumstances indicating the necessity for the extension, together with a statement of the time period for which the extension is sought.

(c) If the Secretary finds that an environmental issue related to the highway project that an affected Federal agency has jurisdiction over by operation of Federal law has not been resolved, then the Secretary and the head of such agency shall resolve the matter within 30 days of the finding by the Secretary.

(d) Acceptance of Purpose and Need. For any environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and any other applicable provisions of State law that the Secretary may specify for the affected project.

(e) Oversight. For any State selected to participate in the pilot program, the Secretary shall provide for the certification of the comity agency to the Secretary.

(f) Assumption of Environmental Responsibilities. The Secretary shall extend any time periods for review under this section if, upon good cause shown, the Secretary and any Federal agency concerned determine that additional time is necessary.

(g) Federal Agency Definition. For purposes of this section, the term "Federal agency" means any Federal agency that may, in accordance with section 104(b)(1), appropriate funds apportioned under section 104 for such fiscal year, then the Secretary may not transfer to another State any portion of the funds apportioned under section 104 for such fiscal year.

(h) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year, then the Secretary may not transfer to another State any portion of the funds apportioned under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(i) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(j) Compliance. The Secretary shall provide for the certification of the comity agency to the Secretary.

(k) Federal Agency Definition. For purposes of this section, the term "Federal agency" means any Federal agency that may, in accordance with section 104(b)(1), appropriate funds apportioned under section 104 for such fiscal year, then the Secretary may not transfer to another State any portion of the funds apportioned under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(l) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(m) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(n) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(o) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(p) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(q) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.

(r) Application to Certain CMAQ Funds. The maximum amount that a State may transfer under this section of the State's set-aside under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of such set-aside, less the maximum amount that a State may transfer under section 104(b)(2) for a fiscal year.
funds are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (including the Mass Transit Account) by this Act (including the amendments made by this Act), the Secretary shall publish the criteria established under subsection (a). Such publication shall identify all statutory criteria and any criteria established by regulation that will apply to such program.

(2) In making a grant under a discretionary program described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit to the respective committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate having jurisdiction over such program, and shall publish, an explanation of how projects will be selected based on the criteria established for such program under paragraph (1).

(c) MINIMUM PROGRAMS.—At a minimum the criteria established under subsection (a) and the process established by subsection (b) shall apply to the following:

(1) The high cost Interstate System reconstruction and improvement program.

(2) The research program under title VI of this Act.

(3) The national corridor planning and development program.

(4) The coordinated border infrastructure and safety program.

(5) The construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities.

(6) The scenic byway program.

(7) The discretionary bridge program.

(8) New fixed guideway systems and extensions to fixed guideway systems under section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the expenditures under subsection (a).

SEC. 507. ELIMINATION OF REGIONAL OFFICE RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall eliminate any programmatic responsibility of the regional offices of the Federal Highway Administration to restructure its field organization, including elimination of regional offices, creation of technical resource centers, and maximum delegation of authority to its State offices.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a detailed implementation plan not later than September 30, 1998, and thereafter provide periodic progress reports to such Committees.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall begin implementation of the plan transmitted under subsection (b) not later than December 31, 1998.

SEC. 508. AUTHORITY FOR CONGRESS TO MAKE MICROCOURSE CORRECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT PROGRAMS.

The Congress shall not appropriate or allocate, prior to August 1, 2001, any funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2001 under title 23, United States Code (other than sections 125 and 157 and amounts necessary for the administration of the Federal Highway Administration under section 104(a), title I of this Act (other than section 127(b), section 3110(a) of title 49, United States Code, section 5309 of title 49, United States Code (other than amounts necessary for the administartion of the Federal Transit Administration), and title III of this Act, unless a law has been enacted making midcourse corrections to the Federal-aid highway and transit programs authorized by this Act (including amendments made by this Act) which would, at a minimum—

(1) approve a funding distribution for the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year 2001; and

(2) appropriate a proposed system of performance bonuses to States pursuant to the bonus program established under section 123 of this Act.

SEC. 602. APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever the word or phrase is used in this title or a section or other provision of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary shall make grants and enter into cooperative agreements and contracts for the program described in such section or other provision of title 23 in the same manner as if such grants and contracts were authorized under section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 603. TRANSFERS OF FUNDS.

The Secretary may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of the amounts made available by each of subparagraphs (F) through (I) of section 127(a)(3) of this Act to amounts made available by any other of such subparagraphs.

Subtitle A—Surface Transportation Research, Technology, and Education

PART I—HIGHWAY RESEARCH

SEC. 601. RESEARCH.

(a) RESEARCH.—Section 307(a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) MATTEOS DEPOSITED BY COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS.—There shall be available to the Secretary for carrying out this subsection, of which up to $2,500,000 may be deposited by any cooperating organization or person in a special account established for such purpose.

(2) LONG-TERM PAVEMENT PERFORMANCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—As part of the highway research program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall carry out a long-term pavement performance program to complete the long-term pavement performance tests initiated under the strategic highway research program.

(B) GRANTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, AND CONTRACTS.—In carrying out subsection (A), the Secretary shall make grants and enter into cooperative agreements and contracts for the following purposes:

(i) To continue the monitoring, material-testing, and evaluation of the highway test sections established under the long-term pavement performance program.

(ii) To carry out analyses of the data collected under this part.

(iii) To prepare the products required to fulfill the original objectives of the program and to meet future pavement technology needs.

(C) ADVANCED RESEARCH.—Section 307(b)(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) ADVANCED RESEARCH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The highway research program under subsection (3) shall include an advanced research program that addresses longer-term, high-risk research that shows potential benefits for improving the durability, efficiency, environmental impact, productivity, and safety (including bicycle and pedestrian safety) of highway and intermodal transportation systems. The Secretary shall carry out the program through a competitive process.

(B) DATE OF COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall complete the research program under this subsection not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998."
SEC. 612. STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH.
(a) In General.—Chapter 3 is amended by inserting after section 312 the following:

§313. State planning and research.

‘‘(a) General Rule.—Two percent of the sums apportioned for each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1997, under section 104 (other than sections 104(f) and 104(h)) and under section 144 shall be available for expenditure by the State, in consultation with the Secretary, only for the following purposes:

(1) Engineering and economic surveys and investigations.

(2) The planning of future highway programs and local public transportation systems and the planning of the financing of such programs and systems, including statewide planning under section 135.

(3) Development and implementation of management systems under section 303.

(4) Studies of the economy, safety, and convenience of highway usage and the desirable regulation and taxation thereof.

(5) Research, development, and technology transfer activities necessary in connection with the planning, design, construction, management, and operation of a wide variety of highway, public transportation, and intermodal transportation systems and study, research, and training on the engineering standards and construction materials, including the evaluation and accreditation of inspection and testing and the regulation and taxation of their use.

(b) Minimum Expenditures on Research, Development, and Technology Transfer Activities.—Not less than 25 percent of the funds which are apportioned to a State for a fiscal year and are subject to subsection (a) shall be expended by the State for research, development, and technology transfer activities described in subsection (a) relating to highway, public transportation, and intermodal transportation systems unless the State certifies to the Secretary for such fiscal year that total expenditures by the State for transportation planning under sections 134 and 135 will exceed 75 percent of the funds which the State accepts under this section.

(c) Federal Share.—The Federal share payable on account of any project financed with funds which are subject to subsection (a) shall be subject to an assessment under the Small Business Act of 1953.

(d) Local Technical Assistance Program.ÐThe Secretary may, acting either independently or in cooperation with other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentality, make grants for research fellowships for any purpose for which research is authorized by this section.

SEC. 613. INTERNATIONAL HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.
(a) Activities.—Section 325(a) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ‘‘expertise’’ the following: ‘‘; goods, and services’’;

(2) by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end of paragraph (4); and

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(4) by adding after the following:

‘‘(6) gathering and disseminating information on foreign transportation markets and industries.’’

(b) Funds.—Section 325(c) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(c) Funds.—Funds available to carry out this section shall include funds deposited by any operating organization or person in a special account for such purpose with the Secretary of the Treasury. The funds deposited in the special account and other funds available to carry out this section shall be available to cover the cost of any activity eligible under this section, including the cost of promotional materials, travel, reception and representation expenses, and related benefits. Reimbursements for salaries and benefits of Department of Transportation employees providing services under this section shall be credited to the special account.

(c) Eligibility.—Section 325 is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(d) Eligible Use of State Planning and Research Funds.—A State, in coordination with the Secretary, may obligate funds made available to carry out section 313 for any activity authorized under subsection (a).

PART II—TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, AND TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT

SEC. 621. NATIONAL HIGHWAY INSTITUTE.

Section 321 is amended by striking subsection (f) and redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

SEC. 622. NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) In General.—Chapter 3 is further amended by inserting after section 321 the following:

§322. National technology deployment initiative.

‘‘(a) In General.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a national technology deployment initiative by the surface transportation community of innovative technologies to improve the safety, efficiency, reliability, service life, and sustainability of transportation systems and to reduce environmental impact.

(b) Integration with Other Programs.—The Secretary shall integrate activities undertaken pursuant to this section with the efforts of the Department to disseminate the results of research supported by the Department and to facilitate technology transfer.

(c) Leveraging of Federal Resources.—In selecting projects to be carried out under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to projects that leverage Federal funds with other significant public or private resources.

(d) Grants, Contracts, and Cooperative Agreements.—The Secretary may carry out this section either independently or in cooperation with Federal agencies, other Federal or State agencies, or any other organization, for-profit or nonprofit, organization, or person.

(b) Conforming Amendment.—The table of sections for chapter 3 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 321 the following:

‘‘313. State planning and research.’’
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127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $1,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this sub-section.

SEC. 613. INTERNATIONAL HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.
(a) Activities.—Section 325(a) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ‘‘expertise’’ the following: ‘‘; goods, and services’’;

(2) by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end of paragraph (4); and

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(4) by adding after the following:

‘‘(6) gathering and disseminating information on foreign transportation markets and industries.’’

(b) Funds.—Section 325(c) is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(c) Funds.—Funds available to carry out this section shall include funds deposited by any operating organization or person in a special account for such purpose with the Secretary of the Treasury. The funds deposited in the special account and other funds available to carry out this section shall be available to cover the cost of any activity eligible under this section, including the cost of promotional materials, travel, reception and representation expenses, and related benefits. Reimbursements for salaries and benefits of Department of Transportation employees providing services under this section shall be credited to the special account.

(c) Eligibility.—Section 325 is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(d) Eligible Use of State Planning and Research Funds.—A State, in coordination with the Secretary, may obligate funds made available to carry out section 313 for any activity authorized under subsection (a).

PART II—TRANSPORTATION EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, AND TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT

SEC. 621. NATIONAL HIGHWAY INSTITUTE.

Section 321 is amended by striking subsection (f) and redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

SEC. 622. NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) In General.—Chapter 3 is further amended by inserting after section 321 the following:

§322. National technology deployment initiative.

‘‘(a) In General.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a national technology deployment initiative by the surface transportation community of innovative technologies to improve the safety, efficiency, reliability, service life, and sustainability of transportation systems and to reduce environmental impact.

(b) Integration with Other Programs.—The Secretary shall integrate activities undertaken pursuant to this section with the efforts of the Department to disseminate the results of research supported by the Department and to facilitate technology transfer.

(c) Leveraging of Federal Resources.—In selecting projects to be carried out under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to projects that leverage Federal funds with other significant public or private resources.

(d) Grants, Contracts, and Cooperative Agreements.—The Secretary may carry out this section either independently or in cooperation with Federal agencies, other Federal or State agencies, or any other organization, for-profit or nonprofit, organization, or person.

(b) Conforming Amendment.—The table of sections for chapter 3 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 321 the following:

‘‘313. State planning and research.’’

SEC. 623. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.
(a) Local Technical Assistance Program.—

(1) by striking ‘‘Authority’’ and inserting ‘‘Local Technical Assistance Program’’; and

(2) by striking ‘‘transformation assistance program’’ and inserting ‘‘local technical assistance program’’.

(b) Research Fellowships.—Section 326 is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c);

(2) by redesigning subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

‘‘(D) Research Fellowships.—The Secretary may, acting either independently or in cooperation with other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentality, make grants for research fellowships for any purpose for which research is authorized by this section.

SEC. 624. UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH.

(a) In General.—Subchapter I of chapter 55 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

§5305. University transportation research.

‘‘(a) Regional Centers.ÐThe Secretary of Transportation shall establish and operate 1 university transportation center in each of the 10 United States Government regions shall establish and operate a regional transportation research center in addition to the centers receiving grants under subsection (a), to address transportation management and research problems, with the purpose of increasing the number of highly skilled individuals entering the field of transportation.

‘‘(b) Selection of Grant Recipients.ÐIn order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a nonprofit institution of higher learning shall submit to the Secretary an application that is in such form and contains such information as the Secretary may require.

‘‘(c) Application.—In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an application must demonstrate that the nonprofit institution will:

(1) select and establish a transportation research program with the capability of the recipient to provide leadership in making national and regional contributions to the solution of immediate and long-range transportation problems; and

(2) establish and operate a regional transportation research center. The Secretary shall implement a competitive process on the basis of the following:

(A) For regional centers, the location of the center within the Federal region to be served.

(B) The demonstrated research and extension resources available to the recipient to carry out the research.

(C) The capability of the recipient to provide leadership in making national and regional contributions to the solution of immediate and long-range transportation problems.

(D) The recipient’s establishment of a surface transportation research program encompassing several modes of transportation.

The Secretary shall provide 15 percent of the total funds for each recipient that the Secretary determines to have made grant commitments of at least $200,000 in regularly budgeted institutional amounts each year to support ongoing
transportation research and education programs.

"(f) The recipient’s demonstrated ability to disseminate results of transportation research and education programs throughontechnology transfer, research and technology transfer, and outreach activities that grant recipients carry out under this section, shall be eligible to receive grants under this section.

"(g) An ongoing program of technology transfer that makes research results available to potential users in a form that can be implemented, utilized, or otherwise applied.

"(h) Maintenance of Effort.—In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a recipient shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary to ensure that the recipient will maintain at least equal to the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 1998 and 1999 prior to award of a grant under this section.

"(i) Federal Share.—The Federal share of the costs of activities carried out using a grant made under this section is 50 percent of costs.

"(j) Program Coordination.—

(1) Coordination.—The Secretary shall coordinate the research, education, training, and technology transfer activities that grant recipients carry out under this section, disseminate the results of the research, and establish and operate a clearinghouse.

(2) Annual Review and Evaluation.—At least annually, the Secretary shall review and evaluate programs the grant recipients carry out under this section.

"(k) Funding Limitation.—

(1) Grants.—The Secretary shall make grants under section 5505 of title 49, United States Code, to operate an Institute of Transportation Technology, to be located at the University of Wyoming, to conduct research, education, and development activities that focus on transportation management, environmental effects, and enhancement of transportation systems in the Appalachian region, including the Appalachian Development Highway System.

(2) Funding.—The amounts made available to carry out such section 5505, $2,000,000 shall be available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 to carry out paragraph (1).

"(l) Federal Share.—The Federal share shall be 80 percent; except that the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable cost associated with the establishment and administration of the institute referred to in paragraph (1).
and metropolitan planning organizations. The data base shall include, at a minimum—

(1) information on the volumes and patterns of movement of goods, including local, inter-
regional, and international movements, by all modes of transportation and intermodal com-
binations, and by relevant classification;

(2) information on the volumes and patterns of movement of people, including local, inter-
regional, and international movements, by all modes of transportation and intermodal com-
binations, and by relevant classification; and

3. the sale of data products may be credited to the
National Transportation Library containing a col-
lection of statistical and other information need-
ed for transportation decisionmaking at the Federal, State, and local levels.

(f) NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ATLAS DATA BASE.—The Director shall develop and maintain geographic data bases depicting transportation networks; flows of people, goods, vehicles, and craft equipment; and social, economic, and environmental conditions affecting or af-
fected by those networks. These data bases shall be able to support intermodal network analysis. This paragraph shall only apply to infor-
mation or used for any purpose in any action, contract, or proceeding, or by any individual respondent. Copies of
information obtained under long-
term data collection program.—An officer or employee of the Bureau may not—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall conduct
research on improvements in the use of concrete pavements in the construction, reconstruction,
and repair of Federal-aid highways.

(B) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section
127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $10,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this paragraph.

(2) MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WARNING SYS-
tem.—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall expand and continue the study by section
358(c) of the National Highway System Designa-
tion Act of 1995 (23 U.S.C. 401 note; 109 Stat. 625) relating to the development of a motor vehi-
icle safety system and shall conduct tests of such system.

(b) CONTENTS OF PROGRAM.—

(1) INFORMATION OBTAINED UNDER LONG-
term data collection program.—An officer or employee of the Bureau may not—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall conduct
research on improved methods of using concrete pavements in the construction, reconstruction,
and repair of Federal-aid highways.

(B) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section
127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $10,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this paragraph.

(c) USE OF ASPHALT PAVEMENT.—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall conduct
research on improved methods of using asphalt pavements in the construction, reconstruction,
and repair of Federal-aid highways.

(B) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section
127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $10,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this paragraph.

(2) Steel bridge construction.—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall make
grants to the States to continue ITS activities in the corridor serving the Greater
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Chicago, Illinois, and Detroit Metropolitan areas initiated under the Inter-

(B) FUNDING.—Of the amounts allocated for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 under sec-
tion 657(a) of this Act, $2,000,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this paragraph.

(4) MOTOR CARRIER ADVANCED SENSOR CON-
trol.—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall conduct
research on improved methods of deploying and integrating existing ITS projects to include haz-
ardous materials monitoring systems across var-
ious modes of transportation and intermodal sys-
(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—
There is authorized to be appropriated out of the
Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass
Transit Account) $31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section
127(a)(3)(I) of this Act, $1,500,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this para-
graph.

(6) MOTOR CARRIER ADVANCED SENSOR CON-
trol.—
(A) in general.—The Secretary shall conduct
research on the deployment of a system of ad-
vanced sensors and actuators in trucks and
tractor trailers to determine axle and wheel align-
ment, monitor collision alarm, check tire pressure and tire balance conditions, measure
speed, monitor and adjust automatic braking systems.

(B) FUNDING.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by sec-
tion 127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $700,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this para-
graph.
SEC. 651. DEFINITIONS. As used in this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS; ITS.—The term "intelligent transportation systems" and "ITS" means the integrated application of such technologies as computer, communications, informatics, or information processing, used singly or in combination, to improve the efficiency and safety of surface transportation systems.

(2) INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term "intelligent transportation infrastructure" means fully integrated public sector ITS components, as defined in the Secretary's guidelines and requirements issued under this Act.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation.

(4) STATE.—The term "State" has the meaning given such term under section 101 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 652. SCOPE OF PROGRAM.

(a) SCOPE.—Subject to the provisions of this subtitle, the Secretary shall conduct an ongoing ITS program to research, develop, and operate systems and technologies for the Nation's surface transportation systems, and advance nationwide deployment of such systems as a component of the Nation's surface transportation systems.

(b) GOALS.—The goals of the ITS program include:

(1) enhancement of surface transportation efficiency by meeting a significant portion of future transportation needs and to reduce regulatory, financial, and other transaction costs to public agencies and system users;

(2) enhancement of safe operation of motor vehicles, including motorcycles, and nonmotorized vehicles on the Nation's surface transportation systems, over a particular transportation corridor or region, and advance nationwide deployment of such systems as a component of the Nation's surface transportation systems;

(3) protection and enhancement of the natural environment and communities affected by surface transportation, with particular emphasis on assisting States to attain air quality goals established pursuant to the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(4) accommodation of the needs of all users of the Nation's surface transportation systems, including the operators of commercial vehicles, passenger vehicles, and motorcycles;

(5) improvement of public access to employment, goods, and services;

(6) development of a technology base and necessary standards and protocols for intelligent transportation systems;

(7) improvement of the Nation's ability to respond to emergencies and natural disasters, and enhancement of national defense mobility; and

(8) promotion of the access and use of data collected from projects conducted under the program by public and private organizations.

SEC. 653. GENERAL AUTHORITIES AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) COOPERATION WITH GOVERNMENTAL, PRIVATE, AND EDUCATIONAL ENTITIES.—The Secretary shall carry out the ITS program in cooperation with State and local governments and other public authorities, the United States private sector, and colleges and universities, including historically black colleges and universities and other minority institutions of higher education.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL OFFICIALS.—In carrying out the ITS program, the Secretary, as appropriate, shall consult with the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies.

(b) STANDARDS.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE.—The Secretary shall develop, implement, and maintain a national ITS architecture and standards and protocols to promote the widespread use and evaluation of ITS technology as a component of the Nation's surface transportation systems.

(2) INTEROPERABILITY AMONG ITS TECHNOLOGIES.—The national ITS architecture shall promote interoperability among ITS technologies implemented throughout the United States.

(3) USE OF SERVICES OF STANDARDS-SETTING ORGANIZATIONS.—In carrying out this sub-section, the Secretary may use the services of standards-setting organizations.

(4) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEDICATED SHORT-RANGE VEHICLE TO WAYSIDE WIRELESS STANDARDS.-The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, and the Federal Communications Commission, shall take such actions as may be necessary to secure the necessary spectrum for the near-term establishment of a dedicated short-range vehicle to wayside wireless standard.

(c) EVALUATIONS.—

(1) GUIDELINES AND REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall issue guidelines and requirements for the evaluation of field and related operational tests carried out under section 653 of this Act.

(2) OBJECTIVITY AND INDEPENDENCE.—The guidelines and requirements issued under paragraph (1) shall include procedures to ensure the objectivity and independence of the evaluator and to avoid any real or apparent conflict of interest or potential influence on the outcome by parties to the tests or other formal evaluation conducted under this subtitle.

(d) INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.—

The Secretary shall establish and maintain a repository for technical and safety data collected as a result of federally-sponsored projects under this subtitle and shall make such information available (except for proprietary information and data) readily available to all users of the repository at an appropriate cost.

(e) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may delegate the responsibility of the Secretary under this subsection, with continuing oversight by the Secretary, to an appropriate entity that is not within the Department of Transportation. Any entity to which such responsibility is delegated shall be eligible for Federal assistance under this subtitle.

(f) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall utilize 1 or more advisory committees in carrying out this subtitle.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Secretary shall ensure that ITS projects carried out using funds made available under this Act are in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App., B, §770).

(3) AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE ANALYSIS.—Funding provided for an advisory committee utilized under this subsection shall be subject to the primary committee's written request for an analysis of the life-cycle costs of each project carried out using funds provided in connection with such committee.

(4) RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES.—The Secretary shall require an analysis of the life-cycle costs of each project carried out using funds provided in connection with such committee, and each project authorized in section 653 of this Act, for operations and maintenance of ITS elements, and for the evaluation of field and related operational tests carried out under section 653 of this Act.
where the total initial capital costs of the such elements exceed $3,000,000.

(h) PROCUREMENT METHODS.—

(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide appropriate technical assistance and guidance to assist State and local agencies in evaluating and selecting appropriate methods of procurement for its projects carried out using funds made available under this subtitle from the Highway Trust Fund, including innovative and nontraditional methods of procurement.

(2) ITS SOFTWARE.—To the maximum extent practicable, contracting officials shall use, as a critical evaluation criterion the Software Engineering Institute's Capability Maturity Model, or another similar recognized standard risk assessment methodology, to reduce the cost, schedule, and performance risks associated with the development, management, and integration of ITS software.

SEC. 654. NATIONAL ITS PROGRAM PLAN.

(a) NATIONAL ITS PROGRAM PLAN.—

(1) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall maintain and update, as necessary, the National ITS Program Plan developed by the Department of Transportation and the Intelligent Transportation Society of America.

(2) SCOPE.—The National ITS Program Plan shall—

(A) specify the goals, objectives, and milestones for the deployment of intelligent transportation infrastructure in the context of major metropolitan and rural areas, and commercial vehicle information systems and networks;

(B) specify how specific programs and projects relate to the goals, objectives, and milestones referred to in subparagraph (A), including consideration of the 5-, 10-, and 20-year timeframes for the goals and objectives;

(C) establish a course of action necessary to achieve the program's goals and objectives;

(D) provide for the evolutionary development of standards and protocols to promote and ensure interoperability in the implementation of ITS technologies; and

(E) establish a cooperative process with State and local governments for determining desired surface transportation system performance levels and developing plans for national incorporation of specific ITS capabilities into surface transportation systems.

(b) RESEARCH AND OPERATIONAL TESTS REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on implementation of the National ITS Program Plan.

SEC. 655. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND OPERATIONAL TESTS.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND INFORMATION.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, training, and information to State and local governments seeking to implement, operate, evaluate, and evaluate ITS technologies and services.

(b) TRANSPORTATION PLANNING.—The Secretary may provide funding to support adequate consideration of transportation system management and operations, including ITS, within metropolitan and statewide transportation planning processes.

(c) RESEARCH AND OPERATIONAL TESTS.—The Secretary may provide funding for research and operational tests relating to ITS.

(d) DEMONSTRATION AND EVALUATION OF INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.—The Secretary may conduct research and development activities for the purpose of demonstrating integrated intelligent vehicle highway systems and integrated intelligent transportation systems. Such research shall include state-of-the-art systems and shall integrate collision avoidance, in-vehicle information, and other safety related systems (including infrastructure-based systems). Development work shall incorporate human factors research findings.

SEC. 656. ITS DEPLOYMENT.

(a) INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a program to promote the deployment of regionally integrated, interoperable intelligent transportation systems and, through financial and technical assistance under this subsection, shall assist in the development and implementation of such systems.

(b) GOALS.—In accordance with the National ITS Program Plan under section 654 of this Act, the Secretary shall provide incentives for the deployment, in rural and urban areas, of modal, intelligent transportation infrastructure and system technologies to—

(I) stimulate sufficient deployment to validate and accelerate the establishment of national ITS standards and protocols;

(II) realize the benefits of regionally integrated, interoperable intelligent transportation infrastructure and commercial vehicle operations, including electronic border crossing applications; and

(III) motivate innovative approaches to overcoming non-technical constraints or impediments to deployment.

(c) PROJECT SELECTION.—In order to be eligible for funding under this section, a project shall—

(I) contribute to national deployment goals and objectives outlined in the National ITS Program Plan under section 654 of this Act;

(II) demonstrate a strong commitment to cooperation among agencies, jurisdictions, and the private sector, as evidenced by signed memorandums of understanding that clearly define the responsibilities and relation of all parties to a partnership arrangement, including institutional relationships and financial agreements needed to support deployment, and commitment to the criteria provided in paragraphs (3) through (7);

(III) demonstrate commitment to a comprehensive plan of fully integrated ITS deployment in accordance with the national ITS architecture and standards and protocols established under section 653(b) of this Act;

(IV) be a project that the plan and programs developed under applicable statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes and applicable State air quality implementation plans, and appropriate, at the time Federal funds are sought;

(V) minimize the relative percentage and amount of Federal contributions under this section to total costs; and

(VI) ensure continued, long-term operations and maintenance without continued reliance on Federal funding under this subtitle, along with the documentation of any adverse impacts on commitment from anticipated public and private sources;

(VII) demonstrate technical capability for effective operations and commitment to acquiring necessary skills; and

(VIII) identify the impacts on bicycle and pedestrian transportation and safety and evaluate options to reduce bicycle and pedestrian transportation and safety.

(d) FUNDING LIMITATIONS.—

(I) PROJECTS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS.—Funding under this section for intelligent transportation infrastructure projects in metropolitan areas shall be limited to activities primarily necessary to integrate intelligent transportation infrastructure systems. Costs necessary to deploy such systems shall not exceed 50 percent of the Federal share of costs.

(II) OTHER PROJECTS.—Funding under this section for intelligent transportation infrastructure projects in non-metropolitan areas or for the construction and maintenance of any project shall not exceed 50 percent of the total project costs.

(e) PRIORITIES.—In providing funding for projects under this section, the Secretary shall allocate—

(I) not less than 10 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section to eligible State and local entities for the implementation of ITS technologies and services.

(II) at least 15 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section to eligible State and local entities for the implementation of ITS technologies; and

(III) not less than 5 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section to eligible entities for the implementation of ITS technologies.

(f) INCONSISTENT USE.—The Secretary shall not provide funding under this section to entities that are inconsistent with this Act, or that have not been provided with such amounts for any fiscal year under this Act. Such amounts shall not exceed 15 percent of the total funds made available to carry out this section.

(g) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on implementation of the National ITS Program Plan.

SEC. 657. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

(a) INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—

(1) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section 127(a)(3)(I) of this Act, $75,000,000 per fiscal year shall be made available for projects under this section.

(2) USE OF UNALLOCATED AMOUNTS.—In addition to amounts made available by subsection (a), up to $100,000,000 of the amounts made available by paragraph (1) and not allocated by the Secretary for carrying out section 656 of this Act may be used by the Secretary for carrying out other activities under this subtitle.

(b) ITS RESEARCH AND PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section 127(a)(3)(I) of this Act, $100,000,000 per fiscal year shall be made available for projects under this section.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE PAYABLE.—

(1) INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—For activities funded with amounts allocated under subsection (a), the Federal share payable from such amounts shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs of the activities, and the total Federal share payable from all eligible sources (including subsection (a)) shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of the activities.

(2) OTHER PROGRAMS.—For activities funded with amounts allocated under subsection (b), unless the Secretary determines otherwise, the Federal share payable on account of such activities shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of the activities.

(3) Long-range activities.—For long-range activities undertaken in partnership with private entities for the purposes of section 655(d) of this Act, the Federal share payable from funds allocated under this subtitle on account of such activities shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs of the activities, and the total Federal share payable from all eligible sources (including subsection (a)) shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of the activities.

(4) PARTICIPATION OF OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SOURCES.—The Secretary shall seek maximum participation of the funding of activities under this subtitle from other public and private sources, and shall minimize the use of funds provided under this subtitle for the construction or long-term acquisition of buildings and grounds.
Turnpike Commission, to establish an advanced traffic monitoring and emergency response center at Letterkenny Army Depot in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. The center shall develop a transportation monitoring and ITS systems on the entire Pennsylvania Turnpike system and I-81, coordinate emergency response with State and local governments in the Central Pennsylvania region, and conduct research:

(1) FUNDING—Of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003 by section 127(a)(3)(H) of this Act, $1,667,000 per fiscal year shall be available to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 658. GLOBAL POSITIONING SATELLITE DATA.

(a) MORATORIUM.—Before the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act or the 90th day after a study has been submitted under subsection (c), whichever is later, records produced by global positioning satellite systems shall not be subpoenaed or otherwise used by the Secretary in enforcement cases to verify compliance with hours-of-service requirements for employees of motor carriers.

(b) EXCEPTIONS TO MORATORIUM.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may use such records in a case in which any of the following conditions exist:

(1) Global positioning satellite systems are a motor carrier's primary method of maintaining or verifying records of duty status.

(2) State or Federal safety officials are investigating the cause of a fatal crash involving a motor carrier.

(3) A motor carrier has an unacceptable safety profile under section 127(b) of this Act or the Secretary and the Governor of Pennsylvania approve for an examination of the global positioning satellite records.

In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may seek access to data from an information technology provider only if access to such data cannot be obtained from the motor carrier.

(c) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall contract with an entity that is independent of the Department of Transportation to conduct a study to identify, examine, and evaluate current and future issues and policies related to government access to data produced by electronic systems for motor carriers. The entity shall have demonstrated knowledge about the motor carrier industry, motor carrier safety regulations, and the electronic information industry.

(2) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall approve the statement of work of the entity selected in paragraph (1) and the Secretary gives approval for an examination of the global positioning satellite records.

In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may seek access to data from an information technology provider only if access to such data cannot be obtained from the motor carrier.

(d) IN GENERAL.—

The Secretary shall use amounts allocated to the Secretary $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, for carrying out section 6301 (including payment of administrative expenses related thereto).

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Recreational Boating Safety Improvement Act of 1998".

SEC. 802. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REC- CREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13106 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "(1)" and all that follows through the first sentence and inserting the following:

"(1) Of the amount transferred for each fiscal year the Secretary shall authorize for the purpose of carrying out section 26102 (including payment of administrative expenses related thereto)."

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c)(1) Of the amount transferred for each fiscal year the Secretary shall authorize for the purpose of carrying out section 26102 (including payment of administrative expenses related thereto)."

(3) by striking subsection (d); and

(b) D EFINITION.—Section 26105(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ``(1)'' after ``(c)''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(c) REQUIREMENT TO USE STATE PROGRAM AS- ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ACCESS FACILI- TIES.—Section 9503(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9503(c)(4))—

"(3) This subsection applies to any fiscal year for which the total amount appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this chapter exceeds $35,000,000." (d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect October 1, 1998.
(b) LIMITATIONS.—Grants under this section may be made only for pilot projects for making capital improvements or for rehabilitation, publicly and privately owned rail line structures, and may not be used for providing operating assistance.

(c) PRIVATE OWNER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Grants made under this section for projects on privately owned rail line structures shall include contributions by the owner of the rail line structures, based on an ability to contribute to those structures, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study and prepare a report to carry out this section $5,250,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(f)密碼。
established with the proceeds of the obligation will be economically and efficiently utilized;

(4) the obligation can reasonably be repaid, using an appropriate combination of credit risk premiums and financial assistance, offered by the Secretary, and such other assistance as the Secretary may determine to be significant to protect the Federal Government; and

(5) the purposes of the direct loan or loan guarantee are consistent with subsection (b).

(h) CONDITIONS OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall, before granting assistance under this section, require the applicant to agree to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may impose, including that the applicant agree to:

(1) if a payment of principal or interest under the loan is in default for more than 30 days, the Secretary shall pay to the holder of the obligation, or the holder's agent, the amount receivable under such loan guarantee;

(2) if the default has continued for more than 90 days, the Secretary shall pay to the holder of the obligation, or the holder's agent, 90 percent of the outstanding principal;

(3) if the Secretary has determined that the default has been remedied, the Secretary shall make available to the Secretary all records and information relating to such default that may be necessary to determine whether any principal or interest is due and payable under the obligation, or whether the default has continued, and that such obligation has been in compliance with the provisions of this title, and that such obligation has been received payment or be entitled to retain payment in a total amount which, together with all other recoveries (including any recovery based upon a security interest in equipment or facilities) exceeds the actual loss of such holder.

(i) RIGHTS OF THE SECRETARY.—(1) SUBROGATION.—If the Secretary makes payment to a holder, or a holder's agent, under subsection (g) in connection with a loan guarantee made under section 502, the Secretary shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the holder with respect to the obligor under the loan.

(2) DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY.—The Secretary may complete, recondition, reconstruct, renovate, repair, maintain, operate, charter, rent, sell, or otherwise dispose of any property or other interests obtained pursuant to this section. The Secretary shall not be subject to any Federal or State regulatory requirements when carrying out this paragraph.

(j) ACTION AGAINST OBLIGOR.—The Secretary may bring a civil action in an appropriate Federal court in the name of the United States in the event of a default on a direct loan made under section 502, or in the name of the United States or of the holder of the obligation in the event of a default on a loan guaranteed under section 502. The holder of a guarantee shall make available to the Secretary all records and evidence necessary to prosecute the civil action. The Secretary may accept property in full or partial satisfaction of any sums owed as a result of a default. The Secretary may liquidate through the sale or other disposition of such property, an amount greater than the aggregate of—

(1) the amount paid to the holder of a guarantee under subsection (g); and

(2) any other cost of the United States remedying the default.

(k) BREACH OF CONDITIONS.—The Attorney General shall commence a civil action in an appropriate Federal court to enjoin any activity that the Secretary determines, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, to be a change in programs or benefits administered by the Secretary of Transportation shall not apportion, allocate, obligate, or otherwise cause or require an increase in outlays for the Highway Trust Fund caused by this Act above the levels assumed for those programs under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in the baseline projections contained in the Congressional Budget Office document entitled "Revised Baseline Budget Projections for Fiscal Years 1999-2008," dated March 3, 1998, except that for programs with discretionary outlays the projections shall assume obligation authority at the 1998 enacted level and that the programs shall be adjusted for the transfer of general fund programs to the trust fund, is fully offset through mandatory and discretionary offsets set forth in this Act.

(l) DUTY IMPOSED ON SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Transportation shall not apportion, allocate, obligate, or otherwise cause or require an increase in outlays for the Highway Trust Fund caused by this Act above the levels assumed for those programs under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in the baseline projections contained in the Congressional Budget Office document entitled "Revised Baseline Budget Projections for Fiscal Years 1999-2008," dated March 3, 1998, except that for programs with discretionary outlays the projections shall assume obligation authority at the 1998 enacted level and that the programs shall be adjusted for the transfer of general fund programs to the trust fund, by reducing mandatory and discretionary spending.

SEC. 1002. SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTIGATION CHARGE.

It is the sense of the Congress that provisions referred to in section 1001(c) that are to be contained in this Act to offset increases described in that section in outlays from the Highway Trust Fund should not include provisions making a change in programs or benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE XI—EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HIGHWAY-RELATED TAXES AND TRUST FUND

Sec. 1101. Short title; amendment of 1986 Code.
Sec. 1101. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the “Surface Transportation Revenue Act of 1998.”

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF TAXES AND TRUST FUND.

(a) EXTENSION OF TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions are each amended by striking “1999” each place it appears and inserting “2005”:

(A) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(ii) (relating to rate of tax on certain busses).
(B) Section 4041(a)(2)(B) (relating to rate of tax on special motor fuels), as amended by section 907(a)(1) of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.
(C) Section 4041(m)(1)(A) (relating to certain alcohol fuels), as amended by section 907(b) of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.
(D) Section 4051(c) (relating to termination).
(E) Section 4081(d)(1) (relating to termination).
(F) Section 4481(e) (relating to period tax in effect).
(G) Section 4482(c)(4) (relating to taxable period).
(H) Section 4482(d) (relating to special rule for taxable period in which termination date occurred).

(2) TAX ON TIRES EXTENDED ONLY THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2000.—Section 4071(d) (relating to termination) is amended by striking “1999” and inserting “2000”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION RELATING TO TRANSFERS TO MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503(e)(2) is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “For purposes of the preceding paragraph, such Acts shall be applied as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998.”

(2) EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.—

(A) EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.—

Paragraph (3) of section 9503(c) is amended by striking “1998” and inserting “2003”.

(B) EXTENSION OF PURPOSES.—Paragraph (1) of section 9503(c) is amended—

(i) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (C), and
(ii) by striking “1991” in subparagraph (D) and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting “1991 or”.

(C) authorized to be paid out of the Highway Trust Fund under the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998.

SEC. 1103. MODIFICATIONS TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) DETERMINATION OF TRUST FUND BALANCES AFTER SEPTEMBER 30, 1998.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503 (relating to Highway Trust Fund) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DETERMINATION OF TRUST FUND BALANCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 9503 (relating to transfers to Highway Trust Fund) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(G) 14.9 cents per MCF (determined at standard temperature and pressure) on October 1, 2000, and $8,000,000,000, and

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect after September 30, 1998.

(b) REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES ADDED BY TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 1997.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 9503 (relating to expenditures from Highway Trust Fund) is amended by striking paragraph (7).
(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 9503(c)(4), as amended by section 1102(c)(2)(A), is amended to read as follows:

"(A) TRANSFERS TO BOAT SAFETY ACCOUNT.—

"(i) GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pay from time to time from the Highway Trust Fund into the Boat Safety Account in the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund amounts (as determined in accordance with subsection (a)) in an amount equal to one-half of the motorboat fuel taxes received after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(ii) LIMIT ON AMOUNT IN FUND.—No amount shall be transferred under this subparagraph unless the Secretary determines that such transfer would result in increased revenues to the boat safety account.

"(iii) TRANSFERS TO BOAT SAFETY ACCOUNT.—The Secretary shall not transfer to the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund, as determined by the Secretary, more than the amount required to liquidate any contract entered into before October 1, 2003, and after the date of any expenditure from any such account which is not permitted by this section. The determination of whether an expenditure is so permitted shall be made without regard to—

"(A) any provision of law which is not contained or referenced in this title or in a revenue act, and

"(B) whether such provision of law is a subsequently enacted provision or directly or indirectly seeks to waive the application of this subsection.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR PRIOR OBLIGATIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any expenditure to liquidate any contract entered into after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1105. REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON TIRES.

"(a) DIESEL FUEL.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Clause (ii) of section 4041(a)(1)(C) (relating to rate of tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) RATE OF TAX ON TRAINS.—In the case of any sale for use on a diesel train, the rate of tax imposed by this paragraph shall be—

"(I) 5.5 cents per gallon after September 30, 1995, and before October 1, 1999,

"(II) 4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 1999, and before October 1, 2000, and


"(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6427(h)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) so much of the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A) as does not exceed—

"(i) 5.5 cents per gallon after September 30, 1995, and before October 1, 1999,

"(ii) 4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 1999, and before October 1, 2000, and


"(b) GASOLINE.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6427(h)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) so much of the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A) as does not exceed—

"(i) 5.5 cents per gallon after September 30, 1995, and before October 1, 1999,

"(ii) 4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 1999, and before October 1, 2000, and


(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1106. DELAY IN EFFECTIVE DATE OF NEW REQUIREMENT FOR APPROVED DIESEL OR KEROSENE TERMINALS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1032 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 is amended to read as follows:

"(f) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 1998.

"(2) The amendment made by subsection (d) shall take effect on October 1, 2000.

SEC. 1108. SIMPLIFIED FUEL TAX REFUND PROCEDURES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (A) of section 6427(2)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at the close of any quarter of the taxable year of any person, at least $750 is payable in the aggregate under subsections (a), (b), (d), (h), (l), and (q) of this section and section 6421 to such person with respect to fuel used—

"(i) during such quarter, or

"(ii) prior to such quarter during the taxable year for which no other claim has been filed, a claim may be filed under this section with respect to such fuel.

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Subsection (1) of section 6427 is amended by striking paragraph (4) and by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

"(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6427(k) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a payment of a claim filed under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a).

"(3) Paragraph (2) of section 6421(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) EXCEPTION.—For payments per quarter based on aggregate account balances payable under this section and section 6427, see section 6427(i)(2).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

SEC. 1109. REPEAL OF NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS TRUST FUND.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9511 (relating to National Recreational Trails Trust Fund) is repealed.

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Subsection 9503(c)(4) is amended by striking paragraph (6).

"(2) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98 is amended by striking the item relating to section 9511.
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amendment no. 1 offered by mr. shuster

mr. shuster. mr. chairman, i offer an amendment.

the chairman. the clerk will designate the amendment.

the text of the amendment is as follows:

part ii, amendment number 1 offered by mr. shuster:

in section 106(b)—

(1) redesignate paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively, and

(2) insert before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

"(1) by striking "that was designated as a nonattainment area under section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)) during any part of fiscal year 1994" and inserting the following: "that is or was designated as a nonattainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter under section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)) and classified pursuant to section 185(a), (a) (a), 198(a), or 199(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511(a), 7512(a), 7513(a), or 7513(b)) or is or was designated as a nonattainment area under such section 107(d) after December 31, 1997."

in section 109 of the bill—

(1) redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) insert after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) public-private partnerships.—section 109 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) partnerships with nongovernmental entities.—"(1) in general.—notwithstanding any other provision of this title and in accordance with this subsection, a metropolitan planning organization, state transportation department, or other project sponsor may enter into an agreement with any public, private, or nonprofit entity to cooperatively implement any project carried out under this section.

"(2) forms of participation by entities.—participation by an entity under paragraph (1) may consist of—

"(A) ownership or operation of any land, facility, vehicle, or other physical asset associated with the project;

"(B) cost sharing of any eligible project expense;

"(C) any other form of participation approved by the secretary.

"(3) alternative fuel projects.—a state may allocate funds apportioned under section 104(b)(2) to an entity described in paragraph (1).

"(4) alternative fuel projects.—in the case of a project that will provide for the use of alternative fuels by privately owned vehicles or vehicle fleets, activities eligible for funding under this subsection—

"(a) may include the costs of vehicle refueling infrastructure, including infrastructure that would support the development, production, and use of innovative water-phased hydrocarbon fuel emulsion technologies, and other capital investments associated with the project;

"(B) shall include only the incremental cost of an alternative fueled vehicle compared to a conventionally fueled vehicle that would otherwise be borne by a private party; and

"(C) shall apply other governmental financial purchase contributions in the calculation of net incremental cost.

"(5) definition of federal participation with respect to required activities.—a federal participation payment under this subsection may not be to an entity to fund a project or program imposed under the clean air act (42 u.s.c. 7401 et seq.) or any other federal law.

"(6) water-phased hydrocarbon fuel emulsion.—in this subsection, the term 'water-phased hydrocarbon fuel emulsion' consists of a hydrocarbon base and water in an amount not exceeding by volume of the total water-phased fuel emulsion."

in the matter proposed to be inserted as section 200(e)(3)(I) of title 25 united states code, by section 114(a) of the bill, insert "of 1999" after "national environmental policy act.""

in the last sentence of section 111(d) of the bill, strike "fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, or 2003, as the case may be" and insert "the fiscal year beginning after september 30, 1997."

in section 117(b) of the bill—

(1) strike "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3) and

(3) insert after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) fiscal year 2000 and thereafter.—

"(A) in general.—all funds authorized to make federal-aid highway road projects by the secretary."

in section 120 of the bill—

"(5) treatment as states.—except as otherwise provided by the secretary, an indian tribal government participating in the program shall be treated as a state for purposes of this title."

in section 125 of the bill—

"(2) purpose.—the purpose of the program shall be to permit an indian tribal government to apply directly to the secretary for authorization to conduct projects on indian reservation roads using amounts allocated to the indian tribal government by the department of transportation."

in section 126 of the bill—

"(3) maximum number of participants.—the secretary shall select not more than 10 indian tribal governments to participate in the program."

in section 130 of the bill—

"(7) report.—not later than september 30, 2001, the secretary shall transmit to congress a report on the results of the program."

in section 132 of the bill—

"(1) designate subsections (a), (b), and (c), as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively; and

"(2) strike the period at the end of paragraph (4) and insert ";"; and

"(3) add at the end the following:

"(5) set-aside for administrative expenses of indian tribal governments.—" (k) set-aside for administrative expenses of indian tribal governments."

in general.—up to 1 percent of the funds made available for indian reservation roads for each fiscal year shall be set aside by the secretary of the interior for transportation planning activities or is in the process of establishing such a capability.

"(5) applications.—to receive funds under this paragraph, an indian tribal government must submit to the secretary of the interior for approval an application in accordance with the requirements of the indian self-determination and education assistance act. the secretary of the interior shall approve an application if the applicant has the capability to carry out transportation planning activities or is in the process of establishing such a capability."

in approval of indian reservation road projects by the secretary—

"(1) establishment of pilot program.—the secretary shall establish a pilot program (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'program') for the purposes described in paragraph (2) and shall carry out such program in each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

"(2) purpose.—the purposes of the program shall be to permit an indian tribal government to apply directly to the secretary for authorization to conduct projects on indian reservation roads using amounts allocated to the indian tribal government by the department of transportation, and

"(3) maximum number of participants.—the secretary shall select not more than 10 indian tribal governments participating in the program."

in technical assistance—

"(5) technical assistance.—the secretary, in cooperation with the secretary of the interior, shall provide technical assistance to indian tribal governments participating in the program."

in transitional assistance—

"(7) report.—not later than september 30, 2001, the secretary shall transmit to congress a report on the results of the program."

in transitional authority—

"(4) transition to the program.—the secretary shall solicit the comments of indian tribal governments participating in the program."

in section 120 of the bill—

"(1) designate subsections (a), (b), and (c), as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively; and

"(2) strike the period at the end of paragraph (4) and insert ";"; and

"(3) add at the end the following:

"(5) by adding at the end the following: 
(2) insert before subsection (b) (as so redesignated) the following:

(a) INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE FOR CERTAIN SAFETY PROJECTS.—The first sentence of section 120(c) is amended by inserting “and transit vehicles” after “emergency vehicles”.

In the matter proposed to be inserted after the second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 135(f) of title 23, United States Code, by section 125(d)(1) of the bill, strike “elected” each place it appears.

In section 127(b) of the bill, strike “Section 104” and all that follows through the first colon and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 104 is amended by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (k), and by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

At the end of section 127(b) of the bill, insert the following:

(2) DIVISION OR SEGMENTATION OF PROJECTS.—Section 145 is amended—

(A) by inserting “(a) PROTECTION OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY,—” before “The authorization”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DIVISION OR SEGMENTATION OF PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State carrying out a project with funds made available by section 104(j) of this title or section 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, or 1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 or section 149(b) or 149(c) of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 may divide or segment the project if such division or segmentation meets the standards established by the Secretary for division or segmentation (as the case may be) of projects under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

“(2) AUTHORITY OF STATES TO CONSTRUCT WITHOUT FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—Any portion of any project divided or segmented under this section may be constructed without Federal assistance.”.

244. Indiana Upgrade 93rd Avenue in Merrillville ......................................................... 5,900

(29) in item 248 strike “3.000” and insert “4.000”;

(30) in item 254 strike “Angelese” and insert “Agesle”;

286. Indiana Construct Marina Access Road in East Chicago ........................................... 1,000

(34) in item 300 strike “7.000” and insert “8.000”;

(35) in item 303 strike “13.000” and insert “12.000”;

(36) in item 342—

(A) strike “Construct” and insert “Reconstruct”;

(B) strike “to” and insert “at”;

(C) strike “8.000” and insert “15.000”;

(37) in item 391 strike “Construct” and all that follows through “Westfield” and insert “Design, engineer, and right-of-way acquisition of the Great River Bridge, Westfield”;

(38) in item 391 strike “Kapowsk” and insert “Kapowsk”;

(39) in item 394 strike “10.300” and insert “2.000”;

(40) in item 415 after “College” insert “, including a new interchange on S.R. 2029”;

(41) in item 444—

(A) after “Project” insert “in Passaic County”;

(B) after “for the Route” the last place it appears insert “46Uninon Blvd. Interchange reconstruction project”;

(42) in item 447 strike “Desrehan Ave. and Lapanese Blvd.” and insert “Barataria Blvd. and US Hwy. 90”;

(43) in item 474 strike “9.500” and insert “7.500”;

(44) in item 478 insert “in Murfreesboro after “River”;

(45) in item 482 strike “Kawaiihe” and insert “Kawaihae”;

(46) in item 484 strike “Upgrade” and insert “Operational improvements on”; and

(47) in item 497 strike “40” and insert “45”;

(48) in item 535 strike “2.000” and insert “4.500”;

(49) in item 544 strike “3.500” and insert “1.000”;

(50) in item 558 strike “4.000” and insert “5.000”;

(51) in item 564 strike “0.250” and insert “0.500”;

(52) in item 596 strike “1.000” and insert “0.500”;

(53) in item 610 strike “Upgrade” and all that follows through “Hill” and insert “Operational improvements on”;

(54) in item 613 strike “Upgrade” and insert “Operational improvements on”;

(55) in item 615 strike “Construct” and all that follows through “Los Angeles” and insert “Upgrade CA Rt. 2 Southern Freeway terminus and transportation efficiency improvements to Glendale Blvd. in Los Angeles”;

(56) in item 619—

(A) strike “George” and insert “Georgia”;

(B) strike “4.000” and insert “5.000”;

(57) in item 625—

(A) strike “Ohio” and insert “West Virginia”;

(B) “Construct” and all that follows through “Lorain” and insert “Construct I-73/74 Corridor including connectors with WV Rt. 44 and Co. Rt. 13 (Gilbert Creek), Mingo County”;

(C) strike “2.400” and insert “10.000”;

(58) in item 636 strike “2.000” and insert “2.197”;

(59) strike item 662 and insert the following:
Louisiana Construct the Zachary Taylor Parkway project

(62) strike item 738 and insert the following:

North Carolina Upgrade US-158 in Warren and Halifax Counties

(76) in item 971 strike “12.000” and insert “14.000”;

New York Construct CR-3 at Southern State Parkway overpass between Long Island Expressway and Colonial Springs

(90) in item 1291 strike “15.000” and insert “16.000”;

Pennsylvania Conduct preliminary engineering on the relocation of exits 4 and 5 on I-83 in York County

(90) in item 1362 strike “14.000” and insert “14.200”;

Kansas Construct Phase II Improvements to US-59 from US-56 to Ottawa

(91) strike item 1362 and insert the following:

Pennsylvania Rehabilitate Kenmawr Bridge, Swissville

(92) strike item 1368 and insert “6.000” and insert “5.000”;

Pennsylvania Construct Steel Heritage Trail between Glenwood Bridge to Clairton via McKeesport

(93) strike item 1373 strike “Reconstruct” and all that follows through “Yakima” and insert the following: “Reconstruct I-80/SR-24 intersection and add lanes on SR-24 to Keys Road”;

Illinois Construct Technology Ave. between US Rt. 45 East to Willenborg St., Effingham

(94) in item 1379 strike “US-127” and insert “US-231”;

Illinois Conduct preliminary engineering and design for US-219 bypass of Bradford

(95) in item 1387 strike “San Bernardino” and insert “Victorville/Apple Valley”; (96) in item 1412 insert a slash after “Office”;

Texas Construct relief route around Alice

(97) in item 1423 strike “4.825” and insert “4.800”;

Ohio Upgrade State Rt. 18 between I-71 and I-77

(98) strike item 1443 strike “Construct” and all that follows through “Road” and in place it appears, insert “and Indiana”;

Illinois Upgrade St. Marie Township Rd., Jasper County

(99) in item 1444 strike “CR-96” and insert “CR-82”; and (100) after item 1467 insert the following:
1476. Illinois ...... Upgrade US 40 in Martinsville ................................................................. 0.094
1477. Michigan .. Repair 48th Ave., Menominee ................................................................. 0.270
1478. Illinois ...... Undertake improvements to Campus Transportation System, Chicago ....... 2.000
1479. Maine ...... Construct I-95/Stillwater Avenue interchange ........................................ 2.000
1480. Maine ...... Improve Route 26 ..................................................................................... 1.500
1481. Maine ...... Improve Route 23 ..................................................................................... 0.500
1482. Massachusetts. Construct Minuteman Commuter Bikeway—Charles River Bikeway connector, Cambridge and Watertown ................................................................. 0.750
1483. Massachusetts. Construct Cambridge Roadways Improvement project, Cambridge ........ 3.000
1484. Massachusetts. Upgrade Sacramento Street underpass, Somerville .......................... 0.250
1485. Massachusetts. Reconstruct roadways, Somerville .................................................... 3.000
1486. Michigan .. Construct improvements to 23 Mile Rd. between Mound Rd. and M-53, Macomb ................................................................. 3.000
1487. Minnesota Conduct study of potential for diversion of traffic from the I-35 corridor to commuter rail, Chisago County north of Forest Lake along I-35 corridor to Rush City .......................................................... 0.500
1488. Minnesota Construct Elk River bypass from 171st Ave. at Highway 10 to intersection of County Roads 12 and 13 at Highway 169 ................................................................. 3.200
1489. Minnesota Construct grade separated interchange at south junction of TH 371/Brainerd bypass ................................................................. 1.000
1490. New York .. Construct Fordham University regional transportation facility ................ 3.000
1491. New York .. Construct bike paths in the Riverdale section of the Bronx ....................... 0.500
1492. New York .. Construct Phase II of the City of Mount Vernon’s New Haven Railroad Redevelopment ................................................................. 2.000
1493. New York .. Construct Bike Paths along the Bronx River in Bronx Park ..................... 0.500
1494. New York .. Rehabilitate transportation facilities in CO-OP City ................................. 1.000
1495. New York .. Construct sound barriers on both sides of Grand Central Parkway between 172nd St. to Chevy Chase Rd ................................................................. 1.940
1496. New York .. Construct sound barriers on east side of Clearview Expressway between 15th Rd. and Willets Point Blvd. ................................................................. 0.400
1497. New York .. Construct sound barriers on Grand Central Parkway between 244th St. and Douglaston Parkway ................................................................. 0.500
1498. New York .. Rehabilitate roads, Village of Great Neck .................................................. 0.160
1499. Tennessee Construct pedestrian and bicycle pathway to connect with the Mississippi River Trail, and restore adjacent historic cobblestones on riverfront, Memphis ................................................................. 3.000
1500. Texas ....... Expand Winters Freeway (US 83/84) in Abilene between Southwest Drive and US 277 ................................................................. 11.200
At the end of section 133 of the bill, add the following:
(h) SURVEY OF STATE PRACTICES ON SPECIFIC SERVICE SIGNING.—(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the practices in the States for specific service food signs described in sections 2G-5.7 and 2G-5.8 of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways. The study shall, at a minimum, examine—
(A) the practices of States for determining businesses eligible for inclusion on such signs;
(B) whether States allow businesses to be removed from such signs and the circumstances for such removal;
(C) the practices of States for erecting and maintaining such signs, including the time required for erecting such signs;
(D) whether States contract out the erection and maintenance of such signs; and
(E) a survey of States’ practices on the issues identified in subparagraphs (A) through (D).
(2) REPORT.—Before the last day of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including such recommendations and modifications to the Manual as the Secretary determines appropriate as a result of the study. Such modifications may be made as part of any revision to the Manual. In section 2G-5.5(b) of the bill, redesignate subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), and (F) as subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G), respectively, and strike subparagraph (A) and insert the following:
(A) by striking paragraph (B)(iii)(I)(ff) and inserting the following:
"(ff) South Carolina State line to the Myrtle Beach Conway region to Georgetown, South Carolina, including a connection to Andrews following the route 41 corridor and to Manning following the U.S. Route 521 corridor; and"
(B) by striking paragraph (B)(iii)(I)(hh) and inserting the following:
"(hh) South Carolina State line to the Myrtle Beach Conway region to Georgetown, South Carolina;"
In the matter proposed to be inserted as paragraph (34) of section 1105(c) of the Interstate Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 by section 130(a)(1)(F) of the bill—
(1) insert after “Alameda Corridor East” the following: “and Southwest Passage, California. The Alameda Corridor East is;” and
(2) insert after “Bernardino.” the following: “The Southwest Passage shall follow I-10 from San Bernardino to the Arizona State line and I-8 from San Diego to the Arizona State line.”
Strike the closing quotation marks and the final period at the end of the matter proposed to be inserted as paragraph (39) of section 1105(c) of the Interstate Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 by section 130(a)(1)(F) of the bill and insert the following:
1(40) United States Route 277/United States Route 83 Corridor between I-44 in Wichita Falls, Texas, and I-20 in Abilene, Texas.
In section 140 of the bill—
(1) insert “(a) CONTRACTING PROCEDURES.— before “Section 112(b)(2)”;
(2) insert at the end the following:
(b) SELECTION PROCESS.—Section 112 is further amended by adding at the end the following:
1(g) SELECTION PROCESS.—A State may procure, under a single contract, the services of a consultant to prepare any environmental impact assessments or analyses required, including environmental impact statements, as well as subsequent engineering and design work on the same project if the State has conducted a review that assesses the objectivity of any analysis, environmental assessment, or environmental impact statement prior to its submission to the Secretary.
After section 143 of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 134. SUBSTITUTE PROJECT.
(a) APPROVAL OF PROJECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Mayor of the District of Columbia, the Secretary may approve substitute highway and transit projects under section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, by the Secretary, in conjunction with the American Indian and Alaska Native Council, the American Indian and Alaska Native Circles.
(b) APPROVAL OF SUBPROJECT.—The Secretary shall withdraw approval of the substitute project approved pursuant to subsection (a) if the requirements of section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, are not satisfied.
(c) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY.—Any substitute project approved pursuant to subsection (a) (for which the Secretary finds that sufficient Federal funds are available) must be under contract for construction, or construction must have commenced, before the last day of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. If the substitute project is not under contract for construction, or construction has not commenced, by such last day, the Secretary shall withdraw approval of the substitute project.
SEC. 135. USE OF HOV LANES BY ELECTRIC VEHICLES.
Section 102(a) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, before September 30, 2003, a State may permit an electric vehicle with fewer than 2 occupants to operate in high occupancy vehicle lanes if the vehicle is certified and labeled as an Inherently Low Emission Vehicle pursuant to section 88.313-93 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, provided that such permission may be revoked by the State should the State determine it necessary.”.
Conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly.
At the end of section 202 of the bill, add the following:
(f) HIGHWAY SAFETY EDUCATION AND INFORMATION.—(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal years 1999 and 2000, the Secretary shall provide to any State any television display and radio兴建 project to provide a public service message related to the implementation of chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, and the program under section 3106 of title 23, United States Code, to provide television and radio time for the placement of highway safety public service messages.
(2) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the effectiveness of the public service messages and transmit a report on the results of the study together with the transmittal under section 508 of this Act.
At the end of section 207, add the following:
(c) EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES.—(1) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the implementation of chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, and the program under sections 3106 and 3109 of such title and identify alternatives to improve the ability of the States to exchange information about unsafe drivers and to identify drivers with multiple licenses.
(2) TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the American

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1993</td>
<td>1501. New York Reconstruct Springfield Blvd. between the Long Island Rail main line south to Rockaway Blvd., Queens County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1502. Pennsylvania Construct Frazier Township interchange on SR-28 in Allegheny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1503. Minnesota Reconstruct St. Louis CSAH 9 (Wallace Avenue) in Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1504. California Reimburse costs associated with the relocation and protection work performed relating to pipelines, cables, and other facilities impacted by the construction of the Mid-Trench section of the Alameda Corridor project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1505. Ohio Construct grade separation at Dille Road in Euclid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1506. Nevada Widen I-15 from the California State line to Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1507. Nevada Improve at-grade railroad crossings in Reno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, shall conduct an assessment of available electronic technologies to improve access to and exchange of motor vehicle driving records. The assessment may consider alternative unique motor vehicle driver identifiers that would facilitate accurate matching of drivers and their records.

(3) Sense of Congress.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation and technology assessment, together with any recommendations for appropriate administrative and legislative actions.

In section 339(c) of the Act, strike “amended—” and all that follows through “(2)” by and insert “amended by”.

In section 332(b) of the Act—

(1) in paragraph (43) after “East-West” insert “Intermodal”; (2) strike paragraph (58), relating to Oklahoma City—MAPS Link; (3) in paragraph (90)—

(A) strike “Commuter Rail”; (B) after “Northstar” insert “Corridor”; and (C) strike the parenthetical phrase and insert the following: “(Downtown, Minneapolis–Anoka County)”; (4) redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly; and (5) add at the end the following:

(B) after “Northstar” insert “Corridor”; (B) after “Penn” insert “Corridor”; (9) in item 120 strike “Stapleton, CO” and insert “Denver, CO–Stapleton”;

(b) in item 73—

(A) strike “1.750” the first place it appears and insert “2.250”; and (B) strike “1.750” the second place it appears and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 77—

(1) redesignate paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and (2) insert after paragraph (3) the following:

(a) the Secretary shall conduct a study to identify, examine, and evaluate current and future issues and policies related to government access to data produced by electronic systems for motor carrier regulatory enforcement. The entity shall have demonstrated knowledge about the motor carrier industry, motor carrier safety regulations, and the electronic information industry;

(b) Inspector General.—The Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall conduct a study to identify, examine, and evaluate current and future issues and policies related to government access to data produced by electronic systems for motor carrier regulatory enforcement. The entity shall have demonstrated knowledge about the motor carrier industry, motor carrier safety regulations, and the electronic information industry;

(b) in item 103—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 121 strike “Stapleton, CO” and insert “Denver, CO–Stapleton”;

(b) in item 126—

(1) in item 7 strike “0.000” and insert “0.200”; (2) in item 41 strike “0.000” and insert “1.000”; (3) in item 62 strike “0.000” and insert “0.300”; and (4) in item 65 strike “1.625” each place it appears and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 66 and insert the following:

(b) in item 78—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 86—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 96—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 103—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(b) in item 121 strike “Stapleton, CO” and insert “Denver, CO–Stapleton”;

(c) in item 126—

(1) in item 7 strike “0.000” and insert “0.200”; (2) in item 41 strike “0.000” and insert “1.000”; (3) in item 62 strike “0.000” and insert “0.300”; and (4) in item 65 strike “1.625” each place it appears and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 66 and insert the following:

(c) in item 78—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 86—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 96—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 103—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 121 strike “Stapleton, CO” and insert “Denver, CO–Stapleton”;

(c) in item 126—

(1) in item 7 strike “0.000” and insert “0.200”; (2) in item 41 strike “0.000” and insert “1.000”; (3) in item 62 strike “0.000” and insert “0.300”; and (4) in item 65 strike “1.625” each place it appears and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 66 and insert the following:

(c) in item 78—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 86—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 96—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 103—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 121 strike “Stapleton, CO” and insert “Denver, CO–Stapleton”;

(c) in item 126—

(1) in item 7 strike “0.000” and insert “0.200”; (2) in item 41 strike “0.000” and insert “1.000”; (3) in item 62 strike “0.000” and insert “0.300”; and (4) in item 65 strike “1.625” each place it appears and insert “1.250”;

(c) in item 66 and insert the following:

(d) in item 78—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(d) in item 86—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(d) in item 96—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”;

(d) in item 103—

(A) strike “1.000” and insert “1.250”; and (B) strike “0.000” and insert “1.250”;

(d) in item 121 strike “Stapleton, CO” and insert “Denver, CO–Stapleton”;
Strike paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 61(d) of the bill and insert the following:

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

(A) Methods, materials, and testing to improve the durability of surface transportation infrastructure facilities and extend the life of bridge structures, including new and innovative technologies to reduce life-cycle costs, and tests simulating seismic activity, vibration, and weather;

(2) by striking subparagraph (C),

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C), and

(4) by adding after subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, the following new subparagraphs:

(D) Research on the use of recycled materials, such as paper and plastic fiber reinforcement systems. 

(E) New innovative technologies to enhance and facilitate field construction and rehabilitation techniques for minimizing disruption during repair and maintenance of structures.

(F) Expansion of knowledge of implementing life-cycle cost assessment, including establishing the appropriate analysis period and discount rates, learning how to value and properly consider user costs, determining tradeoffs between reconstruction and rehabilitation, and estimating methodologies for balancing higher initial costs of new technologies and improved or advanced materials against lower maintenance costs.

(G) Estimates of useful life under various conditions for advanced materials of use in surface transportation. Such estimates shall be developed in conjunction with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and other appropriate organizations.

In section 61(e) of the bill, strike paragraphs (1) and (2) and insert the following:

(1) by striking subsections (c), (d), and (e) and inserting the following:

(c) STUDY OF FUTURE STRATEGIC HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

(1) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998, the Secretary shall make a grant to, or enter into a cooperative agreement or contract with, the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences (referred to in this subsection as the "Board") to conduct a study to determine the goals identified under subparagraph (A); the research agenda and projects, administrative structure, and fiscal needs for a new strategic highway research program to replace the program established under section 307(d) (as in effect on the date before the date of enactment of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998), or a similar effort.

(B) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Board shall consult with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and such other entities as the Board determines to be necessary to the conduct of the study.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after making a grant or entering into a cooperative agreement or contract under subsection (a), the Board shall submit a final report on the results of the study to the Secretary, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and:

(A) strategic plan or revision required under section 306 of title 5, United States Code;

(B) performance plan required under section 1115 of title 31, United States Code; and

(C) program performance report required under section 1116 of title 31, United States Code; and

with respect to surface transportation research and technology development.

(4) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.—In complying with sections 1115 and 1116 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall include—

(A) a summary of the results for the previous fiscal year of surface transportation research and technology development programs to which the Department of Transportation contributes, along with—
Mitchell to carry out activities related to surface transportation research and technology development. For carrying out this shall be derived from funds made available under section 127(a)(3)(F) of the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act of 1998.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5505 the following:

``5506. Surface transportation research planning.``

``5507. Surface transportation-environment cooperative research program.``

In section 652(b)(4) of the bill, insert `, and including the handicapped'' after `and motorcycles''.

In section 652(b)(7) of the bill, insert `at the end.``

(b) REPORTING.—The plan described in subsection (a) shall be transmitted and updated as part of the plan developed under section 5506 of title 49, United States Code. At the end of section 655(c) of the bill, add the following:

Such tests shall be designed for the collection of data to permit objective evaluation of the results of the tests and the derivation of cost-benefit information that is useful to others contemplating the deployment of similar systems.

In section 655(d) of the bill, strike `work shall incorporate human factors research findings'' and insert `work—``(1) shall incorporate human factors research, which may include research in the science of the driving process, to improve the operational efficiency and safety of intelligent transportation systems,``

``(2) may incorporate research on environmental, weather, and natural conditions that impact intelligent transportation systems, including the effects of cold climates, and``

``(3) may incorporate materials or magnetism research''.

Strike section 658 of the bill and redesignate section 659 as section 658. Conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly.

After section 802 of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 803. AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT.

Section 203 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1222) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (13) as paragraphs (5) through (12), respectively;

(3) by redesigning subparagraphs (C) through (F) of paragraph (7), as so redesignated, as subparagraphs (D) through (G), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7), as so redesignated, the following:

``(C) Lake Champlain (to the extent that such resources have hydrological, biological, physical, or geological characteristics and problems similar or related to those of the Great Lakes).``

Conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly.
Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Chairman, this is a manager's amendment, technical in nature. It has been cleared both on our side and with the minority. I rise in support of the committee amendment to H.R. 2400.

The Committee amendment contains issues worked out in cooperation with other committees that had jurisdictional claims over H.R. 2400—the Science Committee, the Resources Committee and the Commerce Committee. I am pleased that we were able to include several provisions that were worked out on a bipartisan basis with those committees.

I particularly want to thank Chairman YOUNG of the Resources Committee, Chairman BILEY of the Commerce Committee and Chairman SENENBRENNER of the Science Committee for their cooperation in expediting the consideration of BESTEA.

The amendment also contains several non-controversial issues and project description changes.

All provisions in the committee amendment have been worked out in a bipartisan manner and are acceptable to the Democratic members.

There are several Members who had urged that certain provisions be included that we were unable to work out in the short time available. We will continue to work with those Members to resolve their issues when we go to conference with the other body. I am including a full summary of the committee amendment for the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2400

TITLE I—HIGHWAYS

Provides that newly-designated nonattainment areas are eligible for CMAQ funding (but not part of the CMAQ formula).

Provides that the Secretary of the Interior develop a new formula for the distribution of Indian Reservation Road funds by fiscal year 2007.

Establishes a pilot program to allow Indian tribes to directly administer their Indian Reservation Road funds.

Adds transit vehicles signal prioritization projects to Federal share provisions under section 120(c) of title 23.

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

Makes clarifying amendment to section 125(d)(1) of the bill regarding provisions relating to cooperation of local officials in developing State transportation plan.

Clarifies that States can continue to divide or segment projects, in accordance with current regulations regarding division of segmenting of projects, in carrying out high priority projects designated by Congress.

Section 604 requires notice to Congress if the Department of Transportation reorganizes research programs or reorganizes programs authorized by Title 6 of BESTEA.

Section 605 contains a sense of Congress regarding the year 2000 computer problem.

Requires a study on future research requirements for highway pavement.

Establishes a surface transportation-environment cooperative research program. Makes some additional minor technical changes to the research title of BESTEA.

TITLE II—RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY PROGRAM

Amends National Sea Grant College Program Act relating to research funds for Lake Champlain. (Mr. OBERSTAR.)

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and PETRI, Ranking Member RAHALL, and all the Members of the Committee who worked with us to improve BESTEA and I urge adoption of the entire amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment number 2 printed in Part II of House Report 105-476.

AMENDMENT OFFERED by MR. DAVIS of ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part II, amendment numbered 2 offered by Mr. Davis of Illinois: (in section 330), strike "$42,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment which seeks to expand and improve the Access to J obs Grant program. This amendment would increase funding for this program by $300 million per year. The Access to J obs legislation assists welfare recipients and low-income individuals to commute from where they live to where

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment which seeks to expand and improve the Access to J obs Grant program. This amendment would increase funding for this program by $300 million per year. The Access to J obs legislation assists welfare recipients and low-income individuals to commute from where they live to where
jobs are located. This increase in money is designated to address the fact that in too many cases, in both urban and rural areas, welfare recipients and low-income individuals are isolated from the jobs they want and need.

Last year, we enacted legislation to move people from welfare to work. We imposed strict time limits and other restrictions that will result in the termination of benefits for an estimated 2 million people by the year 2002. One of the greatest obstacles many welfare recipients face in getting work is literally getting to the jobs.

Welfare recipients and low-income individuals often live, almost by definition, in impoverished communities devoid of job opportunities. Ninety-four percent of welfare recipients do not have cars, low wage earners often do not have cars. They are dependent on public transportation to get to areas with jobs. If the public transit is inadequate, welfare recipients face severe labor shortages because they cannot find enough workers looking for entry-level jobs. This amendment helps to ensure that welfare recipients who want jobs will not be denied because they do not have access to transportation to get to and from work.

Too many welfare recipients and low-income individuals are isolated from potential job opportunities because existing public transportation systems are inadequate or nonexistent. The Community Transportation Association of America has found that 40 percent of all rural communities have no public transportation whatsoever. When transit is present, it often does not connect public assistance recipients to jobs or on welfare to areas where times when many low-wage or entry-level jobs are performed. By filling the gaps in transit services, we can give people the chance to get to the jobs they seek.

For example, in Chicago an innovative Suburban Jobs Link program is doing just that. Buses carry workers from the cities to their jobs in neighboring suburbs. An increase in funding for this program would allow it to expand and help other communities. If only we have a program that can be successful in getting to a job and are able to work, then America wins and this program will have paid big dividends. Therefore, I urge its immediate adoption.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the last amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that in the course of the discussion of the rule of this bill, in the course, a lot of people came to the floor of the House of Representatives in the course of the last few weeks, as well, saying that the scope of this bill is too large, that an increase of over 40 percent in transportation funds over 6 years is a budget buster. And yet the amendment we are before that the bill is not large enough, and the hope of the gentleman in offering this amendment is that we add some additional hundred million dollars to the bill to meet a particular need, that despite the fact that we are facing an Access to Jobs pilot program in the bill, and in addition to this bill there is some $20 billion, $20 billion in formula funds for over 6 years that can be used for the needs of people who want to go from welfare to work and to meet their transportation needs.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have mass transit and many other transit operations of a particular nature already in existence around the United States. We are not going to pile on a lot of money that will ultimately be used for administration rather than help real people find real jobs. We are willing to experiment in this bill with a pilot program, but I think before we know what we are talking about we should not start throwing additional money at it.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I really want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for this amendment because I am from a very rural district that has 26 counties, 3 of which are among the highest welfare counties in the State of Missouri, and after numerous meetings with my welfare recipients the biggest stumbling block they have to getting a job is, like almost everywhere, the transportation, and they might have to drive an hour and a half, 2 hours to get to a job and have no means of transportation because we do not have the funds in Missouri, particularly in my district, to beef up our very minimal transportation systems. And certainly they are not present in use for that specific purpose.

So I just want to ask my colleagues to really think about this because if we truly want our welfare recipients to work, we do independent lives, then we really need to also put our money where our mouths are and help make a real job a reality for these folks. So I will happily support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE), a member of the committee.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, with the greatest personal respect for my colleagues from Illinois and Missouri, I oppose the gentleman from Illinois' amendment to increase funding for this program from the $42 million included in the bill to approximately $150 million per year.

While I agree that providing transportation for welfare recipients to get to jobs is critical, I question whether increasing the funding for the pilot program contained in this bill is the best approach to achieving this worthy result.

This pilot program promotes new and innovative approaches to providing transportation and makes funding available to nontraditional transit grant recipients in addition to public transit agencies. There is concern among some in the transit community that a new program that is large and prescriptive is not only unnecessary but would take flexibility and control away from transit agencies whose very mission it is to provide access to jobs.

There are also significant transportation resources for access to jobs activities under a number of federally funded social services programs already in place. These include the Department of Health and Human Services Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and the Department's Welfare to Work program comprising $3 billion over 2 years and the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Bridges to Work program.

Should the pilot program contained in this bill prove to be successful in conjunction with these many other programs of Federal agencies, we can then reevaluate whether to increase the funding in future transportation legislation. But I think at this moment it is premature to raise the funding level to the amount proposed in the amendment, and I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I arise today to strongly support the amendment by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. Petri). Mr. Chairman, today I had lunch with the CEO of United Airlines, Jerry Greenwald, who sits on the President's Welfare to Work Task Force. I want to commend United for employing 500 former welfare recipients with the goal of 2,000 by the year 2000. This is a success story.

But I told him what many of us already know, that the most serious barriers for former welfare workers entering the work force are, one, child care, and two, transportation. Through reverse commuter programs, transit vouchers and van pools many of these people can get to work.

Mr. Chairman, let us put our money where our mouth is and get welfare to work going. Increase this budget and support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. The other side is entitled to close debate on their amendment, so I just would proceed to conclude by saying that while I understand the gentleman's interest in this
program, we have included funds in this bill for this program.

A lot of Members have expressed concern in debate, and a lot of others who have looked at this bill, that we are already spending more than we feel is prudent. To increase spending beyond what the committee has asked for is something that I think is highly problematic.

I would think that this would be an interesting test to see whether Congress would like to stay within the parameters of this bill or feels that the committee sort of undershot and we should be spending even more than we have been asked for in this bill. I think it best to plan and see that we walk before we run. We do have $42 million in this bill plus $20 billion that is eligible if State and local transit authorities feel these needs are needs that need to be addressed. We do not need to add another $100 million dollars to a bill that is already quite generous in the transportation area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ‘no’ vote.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, just want to speak to the fact that the chairman does understand that this is an authorization, these are not contract authority dollars?

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, understanding is an authorization, but I yield the senior member of the committee from my State and others in the authorization committee, appropriation committee, which would have to actually appropriate money, saying that this was taking away from priorities that they felt were important. Now we are adding to their burden, I think.

But I would be interested to see how they vote on this amendment because if they really are concerned and consistent, they would receive a ‘no’ vote, not a ‘yes’ vote from those gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the excellent amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis).

The simple fact of the matter is that lack of transportation is frequently a barrier to employment whether one resides in an urban or rural environment. This amendment would raise the general fund authorization contained in the bill for the welfare to work program.

I know that from a rural perspective these programs hold great promise. In my home State of West Virginia, we have undertaken four welfare to work pilot programs already, including in Greenbrier and Wayne Counties which I have the honor of representing. This amendment is about access to jobs, access to training, access to a better life for many Americans, and I urge all Members to vote for it.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX).

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Davis amendment to BESTEA. This would further build upon the committee’s commitment to encouraging access to jobs and moving people from welfare to work.

I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment which enhances an already strong portion of the underlying bill. I was pleased to see the Senate also acted, through the efforts of the Senators from Pennsylvania, Illinois and New York, to include a strong commitment to moving people from welfare to work.

The gentleman from Illinois shows a great commitment and vision in offering his amendment as he recognizes the need for a national approach to this problem. Few people on welfare own cars and few can afford other transportation means to get to jobs and job training. I strongly urge support for the Davis amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Davis amendment. First of all, we must go to the appropriations. There are checks and balances. That is something we have to do. This is a general fund authorization.

Second of all, we have spoken in the last 4 years about welfare reform. It is time for us to put our money where our mouth is. The argument that this bill is a pilot program and cannot increase too quickly, forget about it. We have told people in 5 years they have to be off welfare, by the year 2002. We do not have that much time.

Let us have bipartisan agreement that we are going to jobs that exist. There are 2 million people out there that are going to be removed from welfare to work over the next 5 years, and only 6 percent of them have cars.

Now, what are you going to do about that? This amendment goes right to the heart of that situation. This is getting people to work. This is what we want, work, not welfare.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for offering this amendment and for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, last year we passed a welfare-to-work bill, knowing that that bill was not the sound bill it should be for those who are moving from welfare to work. This amendment that my friend has put on the floor is one that will help us to move this generation of welfare recipients to work.

One in 20 welfare recipients in this country own a car. That is a frightening statistic. When one considers that when we passed welfare reform we placed strict time limits on the welfare recipients, we can ill-afford to not pass this amendment. I urge all Members to pass the Davis amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) if he would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it comes down to this: Do we really want people to go off of welfare and on to workfare? As probably some Members know, some of us in the States got into that a little bit ahead of even the national level. (Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD)

Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, who contributes so much to the educational issues, and I thank the author of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis). It is something we have to do if we are going to get this job done. I think we all want very much to get this done, to get people to work.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) if he would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, who contributes so much to the educational issues, and I thank the author of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis). I introduced legislation earlier this year which incorporates this same concept, and I frankly would have put more money into this if we had been able to. But I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) and the gentleman of the minority side for supporting this.

Here is why this is such a good idea. If one out of every 300 families on welfare in America, one out of every 300, gets a job as a result of this program, that is an enormous result of being moved from where they live to where the jobs are, this pays for itself as a result of people leaving the welfare rolls and paying taxes.

In other words, the success level for this to be budget-neutral is very, very low. It is a great idea.

In my area, United Parcel Company is helping to do a similar thing, where
they are moving welfare recipients from Camden, New Jersey, to a UPS terminal at the Philadelphia airport. It works, the Davis amendment works, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes, the balance of my time, to the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Oberstar).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, this is a reality check amendment. If you voted for welfare reform, then look in the mirror and say, did I really mean it? Was I serious about that? If you were, then you really ought to be serious about providing the means for people to get from where they are to where the jobs are.

We made a start on it in this legislation which we passed in 1996 to the tune of $108 billion. I think it is well-crafted, I think it is a good initiative, but it is woefully inadequate in dollars to do the job that needs to be done.

A study of 42 large metropolitan areas found that communities with the longest job commute times had the highest rates of unemployment. In Cleveland, inner-city residents can reach only about 8 to 15 percent of entry level jobs in a reasonable time with current public transportation. There are many other similar examples.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize, this is a general fund authorization. It does not require offsets. It is under the cap and the budget hawks.

The Committee on Appropriations will decide among the many priorities that they have to contend with which of the funds will go to this program and which to other programs. It will not come out of contract authority dollars. It is reasonable and fair. It is far less than the Senate is providing in this legislation. Mr. Chairman, finally, I want to say in closing, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman Shuster) and I were there a year ago to look at their transportation, we saw their effective welfare-to-work program. It was a pilot, if you will. It was the spark of imagination for the program we have in this basic legislation.

But, fundamentally, I drew this idea from my daughter and I who works for Jubilee Jobs in Northeast-Northwest Washington, in the Adams Morgan area, who serves people in work who are coming out of the welfare shelters, who are coming out, dropouts from the welfare system, she cannot get them to their jobs because they cannot afford transportation. If you cannot match the person with the job through a means of transport, then you have failed.

Let us not fail. Let us pass this amendment.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this vital amendment that will enable thousands of people in my community to obtain access to employment opportunities they may otherwise be denied.

The additional $108 million that this amendment will provide for welfare-to-work programs is crucial if our nation is to ensure that our current prosperity benefits all people in America.

Back in my hometown of Chicago, less than 10 percent of welfare recipients own or have access to an automobile.

That's right less than 10 percent. At the same time, job growth in the Chicago metropolitan area is greatest in areas that are accessible only by public transportation. Obviously, this causes a significant obstacle to the people who need employment most.

A serious mismatch exists in Chicago and countless other urban areas in our nation between job growth and the location of low-income communities.

The lack of affordable housing in many growing suburbs ensures that low-income people, the people who would fill the myriad service jobs that are being created in new suburban strip malls and office parks, can't live where job creation is most dynamic.

So we must address this problem. We must take action to get people to where the jobs are.

Failure to do so means we are cutting off from jobs and financial security the very people who we have mandated to work under new welfare reform regulations.

So we cannot fail in this task and we cannot fail to pass this important amendment that is fundamental to building a fairer economy that includes all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. America can only work if we enable all our people access to jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question was taken; and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) was agreed to by the terms of the rule.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. Roukema) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. Roukema).

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, as has been submitted and printed, would end the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program under BESTEA.

The amendment reaffirms, and I want to be very clear about this, reaffirms our encouragement of affirmative action through expansion of the applicant pool and active recruitment, and I stress active recruitment, of qualified women and minorities.

At the same time, this amendment makes it clear that such encouragement and recruitment does not involve granting a preference or fulfilling a quota or a set-aside.

In other words, and I want my colleagues to understand this, in other words, we are reforming affirmative action as we know it today. That is, it should go back to its initial roots of nondiscrimination.

We are not suggesting that there is no discrimination. In other words, we are reforming affirmative action as we know it while protecting the civil rights of all people.

Now, the preference program, DBE as it is known, the preference program at the heart of this issue is a provision of BESTEA, and it states that, and we should be clear about this, because there is misinformation being spread around. It states that not less than 10 percent shall be expended with small businesses owned and controlled by
"socially and economically disadvantaged individuals."

This is a floor set by the Department of Transportation that must be met. If it is not met, then the administration can and does sanction.

There is also, "Not less than 10 percent of the amounts authorized shall be expended" to small businesses controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged. It is a clear quota.

At a hearing held recently this past year by a subcommittee on the J udiciary, Mr. Chairman, we heard that this preference resulted in many subcontractors being denied a transportation contract, despite having by far the lowest bid. To represent only one subcontractor, Malcolm Drilling, Inc., he testified that they were discriminated against merely because the general contractor did not use enough minority or women-owned subcontractors.

As a result, the contract was awarded to the next lowest bidder at a bid of $3 million more. This was just one relatively small contract. So the Federal dollars at work cost the taxpayers $3 million more in this specific case.

There are many other instances. I will not mention now, but I do want them to be included in the Record, a company in Wyoming to the tune of $345,000, and another one in Iowa and so on. These qualified under the 10 percent set-aside for disadvantaged businesses.

This is a waste, a clear waste, of taxpayer dollars. Competitive bidding is intended to save money. Not requiring at least a 10 percent set-aside has made the point of competitive bidding moot, if not some would say a joke.

Governments have been imposing quotas, preferences and set-asides in the goal of eliminating discrimination, but instead the actual real world has resulted in reverse discrimination.

Now the amendment explicitly reaffirms the original concept of our Affirmative Action Program that through vigorous and systematic outreach, recruitment and marketing efforts among qualified women and minorities, we would be reaching those who are out of the loop, so-to-speak. The amendment explicitly reaffirms and requires outreach programs.

The amendment also seeks to restore the color-blind principle to Federal law by prohibiting the Federal Government from granting any preference to any person based on whose qualifications were either race, color or national origin or sex-based.

When affirmative action, and this I thought was very interesting in doing my research for this amendment, going back to the Kennedy Administration's Executive order that established this principle in 1963. It was specifically applied through the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The purpose was promotion and assurance of equal opportunity without regard to race, creed, color or national origin, encouragement of positive measures towards equal opportunity for all qualified people, and expansion and strengthening of efforts to promote full equality of employment opportunity.

That, to me, is a reflection of exactly what we have here in my amendment. That was the original Kennedy initiative.

Before opponents of my amendment raise their voices, let me also add for clarity, here, that this legislation absolutely maintains this Nation's existing antidiscrimination laws. If it did not, I would not be proposing it here on the floor today. It maintains existing civil rights laws which are there as a remedy for individuals who are victims of discrimination. Further, it is consistent with civil rights laws that prohibit any discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I want Members to know that over time I have been a strong supporter of affirmative action. However, over the course of the years I have watched the implementation of affirmative action amount to the use of quotas, set-asides, preferences, and timetables based on sex and race. This is evidence, I believe, of the law of unintended consequences.

That is why we should be reforming comprehensively affirmative action. But we have been unable to get that to the floor, a total reform. Indeed, I had fervently hoped that by this time in our session the Committee on the Judiciary would have reported that. In the absence of an overall reform, I thought this was the best vehicle to bring the issue before the public. It is very precise in this bill, as I have outlined it.

I know, of course, that discrimination exists today in America. There is no denying it. But we cannot attack discrimination with a different style of discrimination. Discrimination, that is, the reverse discrimination that I see, is the consequence of these set-asides and quotas. Discrimination in the name of equal treatment is, in my opinion, an oxymoron.

Mr. Chairman, affirmative action did its job in its day, but the day it became more quotas than opportunity is the day that, in my opinion, it became part of the problem and not part of the solution.

Equal opportunity has always been at the core of the American spirit. It is time that we return to that core, and apply it equally for all people in our society, while protecting the civil rights of those who need continued protecting, and assure that the law is applied equally to all people.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment, and request the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).
The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program ensures that small businesses that are owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals will have a fair opportunity to compete for federally-funded construction and transportation contracts. Prior to enactment of the DBE program in 1982, minority-owned businesses participated in only about 2 percent of all contracts in the Federal-aid highway program. Following enactment of DBE, minority participation has risen to roughly 9 percent of all contracts.

Since 1987, women-owned businesses have also benefited greatly from the DBE program. According to Federal Highway Administration figures, contracts to women-owned businesses have increased from 2.6 percent in fiscal year 1996 to 6.7 percent in fiscal year 1999. Nevertheless, while women own one-third of all construction firms, they still only get 19 percent of business contracts.

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program has been instrumental in promoting equal opportunity for all citizens to fully participate in our national economy. Now is not the time to turn back this effort.

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHARLES CANADY), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA). The ideal of equality under the law for all Americans is an ideal supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people. That ideal is at the heart of the American experience. We all know that in our history as Americans we have not fully lived up to that ideal, but we also know that future generations of Americans will judge us by how well we ground the laws of the land on that fundamental principle.

The amendment now before this House is solidly based on the ideal of equality under the law. Like the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964, this amendment recognizes that each American has the right to be treated by our government not as a member of a particular race or gender group, but as an individual citizen, equal in the eyes of the law.

The amendment is based on the conviction that it is morally wrong for the United States government to give some Americans benefits because of their race or gender, while denying other Americans opportunities because they belong to the wrong groups.

Let us be clear about it, despite the denials that we hear, under the transportation program, that is exactly what is happening every day. Contracts and subcontracts are awarded based on the race or gender of the people who are receiving those contracts or subcontracts. That is an undeniable fact.

Race and gender preferences undermine true meritocracy. To some Americans, the system of preferences says, your government will deny you a job or some other opportunity because you are the wrong gender or ethnic background. To other Americans, the system of preferences says you have to compete as an equal, but will be measured by a lower standard than individuals of another gender or race.

Both messages are hurtful, both messages are demeaning, both messages are demoralizing, and both messages are contrary to the basic American principle of respect for the individual. We will never overcome discrimination by practicing discrimination. The way to mend affirmative action is by abandoning the divisive system of preferences based on race and gender, and reaffirming the original concept of affirmative action through vigorous and systematic outreach, recruitment, and marketing efforts.

Preferential policies are a dead end. As the Federal Government classifies, sorts, and divides Americans by their race and gender, it sends a powerful and perverse message to the American people that we should judge one another on the basis of race and gender. That is exactly the wrong message for us to be sending. That is a message which only reinforces prejudice and discrimination in our society.

President Clinton has quite rightly called on Americans to transform the problem of prejudice into the promise of unity. He has spoken of our primary allegiance to the values America stands for, calling for us to build one America.

The system of race and gender preferences stands as a massive impediment to a united America, in which all Americans are treated as individuals who are equal in the eyes of the law. Congress can demonstrate its allegiance to fundamental American values by adopting this amendment, and ending the use of race and gender preferences in the transportation program.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. I want the record to be clear. This is a proposal that has been worked out. It is the same language that is in the Senate bill. It was an agreement within the committee. Clearly, this is meant to be corrective action.

If it was true that we no longer needed to provide special treatment, then we would be the first person to want to give it up. All of my political career I have had to come to the forefront to try to defend and make opportunities; not to be better than anyone else, and certainly not to lower standards, but to make opportunities for those women and those minorities who do not get them without a program.

It is unconscionable that we should stand by and deny people who work hard, people that just do not look like white men, and defend their ability as Americans, as citizens, as persons who work just as hard, to get a simple opportunity.

This is a sad day to see that we still have people who are willing to deny people who work hard, who take on the same responsibility, are not asking for anything, they are only asking for an opportunity. I oppose this amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the bill provides in section 102, “Not less than 10 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under titles I, II, III, and VI of this Act shall be expended with small business concerns and owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.”

The underlying statute defines, at 15 U.S.C. 637, “The contractor shall assume that socially and economically disadvantaged individuals include black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, and other minorities.”

The bill sets aside a quota on the basis of race.

The facts are uncontroversial: race determines who gets contracts under this statute, and it is wrong. We cannot do good by doing bad. We cannot lift some people up on the basis of their race without putting other people down on the basis of their race. It is inherently unfair.

In the new biography of Jackie Robinson, there is a very touching quotation of a letter.

I quote: “Late in his career he wrote an eloquently spare letter to a white New Orleans journalist who had abused him in print: ‘I wish you could comprehend how unfair and un-American it is for the accident of birth to make such a difference to you.’”

Are there other ways of taking care of the fact that we do not start life equally? Of course there are. The amendment of the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) does that: Take a look at somebody’s actual effort to try to overcome the obstacles that they have been presented with; give a preference on the basis of someone who has never had a contract before, take account of the individual. But do not judge on the basis of their race.

How can we explain to somebody that it is fair that “You would have had had this contract, but your skin is the wrong color”?

Mr. Chairman, it was not that long ago that this issue was brought to the Supreme Court on the fundamental question of whether it was acceptable
for the units of government in our country to use race. In 1954 the Supreme Court said it was not. In Brown vs. The Board of Education, the Supreme Court reversed the horror of Plessy versus Ferguson, in which the Supreme Court said separate but equal was okay. And in striking down Plessy versus Ferguson, the Supreme Court of the United States said it is stigmatizing, it is inherently wrong, for the government to make distinctions on the basis of race.

Justice Douglas, nobody's right-wing conservative, himself put it this way in 1974: "There is no constitutional right for any race to be preferred. There is no superior person by constitutional standards. A * * * [person] * * * who is white is entitled to no advantage by reason of that fact; nor is he subject to any disability, no matter what his race or color. Whatever his race, he had a constitutional right to have his application considered on its individual merits in a racially neutral manner.

We face today to do what is right. But we cannot do right by doing wrong. We have other means provided in this amendment to help those who are disadvantaged, but let us today put an end to the use of race by government, let us never again look at someone and say, 'you have something that another may not because of the color of your skin.'"

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, shame on the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), my good friend and fellow law professor, for racializing this issue. Not once did the gentleman address the issue at hand, but instead he admonished me for having the nerve to support a bill which is necessary for women and men to have an equal opportunity to compete. This is the gentleman's approach to this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I also know there are serious constitutional questions involved whenever the government tries to guarantee outcomes, because that government action usually amounts to a quota and consequent legal challenges.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that when women are given an equal playing field we have proven that we can succeed. Women now employ more individuals than all the Fortune 500 companies in the world combined, and we want to be able to say we have achieved those successes because of our brains, not our gender.

Quotas have the perverse effect of undermining the creativity of minority businesses because people believe that they got that contract on some basis other than merit. For women, that would set our movement back.

The Roukema amendment clearly states that it is the policy of the United States to recruit qualified women and minorities into the applicant pool for transportation contracts. This approach will move us beyond discriminatory government-sanctioned preferences and discrimination in our society. We need a system of equality under the law, while continuing the original intent of affirmative action to reach out to those who are disadvantaged.

Mr. Chairman, my line is that I want my party and this Congress to embrace public policy that lets women know they are welcome, even encouraged, to enter and compete for business. My party and this Congress should be about expanding opportunities for women. Toward that end, I believe the gentlewoman from New Jersey has struck the proper balanced approach that is pro-woman, pro-minority opportunity, pro-affirmative action.

Nobody in this body can question the long and positive record of the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) on women's rights and opportunities. I urge my colleagues to support her balanced approach to affirmative action in the Roukema amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. POSHARD).

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and strongly urge my colleagues to vote against it. The gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) seeks to discontinue the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises program, which has the goal of providing at least 10 percent of transportation contracts to small businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

For almost 20 years, the DBE program has enjoyed great success and provided critical opportunities for women and minorities to compete for and perform Federal construction contracts. This is a good program and it deserves our continued support.

Mr. Chairman, although I dearly wish that it were not the case, the fact is that women and minority-owned firms remain underrepresented in the field of construction. The DBE program has been instrumental in increasing the percentage of contracts awarded to these firms which are participating more than ever in the construction and maintenance of our Nation's highways.

Now is not the time to dismantle the successful program which has helped so many and can continue to help even more.

The DBE program does not impose quotas or set-asides but relies instead on flexible targets and allows States and local governments to set their own goals based upon the particular circumstances of those markets. Ending this program would create turmoil in the firms which have relied upon it, resulting in failing businesses and thousands of jobs lost.
Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will recognize the critical role that the DBE program can continue to play in the promotion of equal opportunities for all business owners and join me in opposing the Roukema amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. Tauscher). I congratulate her for bringing to the floor such a useful way to improve ISTEA, our transportation bill, so that it promotes affirmative action and so that it outlaws discrimination.

First, let us focus on what this amendment really does. It would declare the policy of the Federal Government in favor of affirmative action. That means encouraging bidding by minority-owned and women-owned businesses, expanding the applicant pool, and encouraging contractors to do the same. That is what affirmative action is all about.

In 1964, in the other body, the Democratic floor manager of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Hubert Humphrey, told a critic of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, a critic of affirmative action, “If you can find anything in this legislation that would require people to hire on the basis of percentages or quotas, I will start eating the pages one after another.” He knew that quotas are the enemy of affirmative action.

Mr. Chairman, I heard a Member in defense of this discrimination provision say that it is a voluntary program, but the law says, as it is proposed to be passed on the floor, 10 percent. That is a quota. It has nothing to do with disadvantaged people. The definition of “disadvantaged” in the bill says if a company has 16 percent of one group after year after year, they are disadvantaged. As the Federal court said when it struck down a provision just like this as unconstitutional, under this standard the Sultan of Brunei could qualify.

Mr. Chairman, let us not cheat those who are really disadvantaged. Let us do something for them with affirmative action. Let us get rid of discrimination and let us make it illegal. Let us vote for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Bonior), the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, there is an unfortunate pattern that has developed here. We have had almost an impossible scenario of trying to get colleagues on this side of the aisle to support the minimum wage bill. Just a few minutes ago, sales of soft drinks have gone past the privileged few. Now the Roukema amendment, it is the general contractors’ amendment. The contractors and others are willing to accept the votes of women, Hispanic Americans, and African Americans in this Congress to pass this bill, but want to lock us out of the benefits. If this Congress cannot accept the simple goal of equality of opportunity for all Americans, what a sad day it will be.

As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about privilege, they are referring to the privilege that has been enjoyed by the majority for a long period of time with very few benefits to anyone in the minority. Let us promote participation, not prohibit it, by declaring this amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The Department of Transportation DBE program has provided over 20,000 firms with contracts worth over $2 billion in 1996 alone. As a result, women and minority businesses have been created, providing economic development in cities, rural areas and in communities desperately in need of hope and opportunity. This important program has provided opportunity for non-traditional fields like construction and deserves our support.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, I can tell my colleagues that this program is effective, competitive, and focused on outcomes. It uses competitive bidding that includes white males, minorities and women business owners competing for transportation contracts. This program enjoys bipartisan support in this body, including the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the subcommittee of jurisdiction.

Recently the other body overwhelmingly rejected a similar amendment to destroy this valuable and necessary program. This amendment threatens to undermine a bill that will help us meet the goal of rebuilding this Nation’s infrastructure and providing for our transportation needs.

Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues engage in rhetoric about empowerment and opportunity. Well, this amendment is all about opportunity and empowerment. By providing opportunity in the transportation bidding process, small local firms are creating jobs, teaching skills and reaching the tax base and helping communities literally rebuild themselves.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Fowler).

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roukema amendment. It is time to stop dividing our country along race and gender lines.
Initiatives like the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program harm our society, both by lowering standards and by leaving the beneficiaries of the program in doubt of their own ability. The DBE program reinforces negative stereotypes because it is based on the implicit assumption that members of certain groups cannot measure up to an objective standard and must be given special treatment in order to succeed.

Some contend that there are really no quotas or set-asides in Federal law. Well, I encourage anyone who believes that to read the bill. The language is an explicit 10 percent set-aside. The Roukema amendment eliminates the set-aside, but it does not prohibit the Federal Government from making affirmative efforts targeted at minorities and women to increase the size of the applicant pool for transportation contracts.

The Department of Transportation can still educate and mentor these firms in their effort to learn how to compete for contracts. In the end, though, all candidates must be judged by the same standard and requirements.

We all strongly support equal opportunity. We should create a level playing field, but we should never guarantee the final score.

I encourage my colleagues to prohibit discrimination and preferential treatment when awarding transportation contracts by supporting the Roukema amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to an amendment to eliminate the Department of Transportation's Disadvantage Business Enterprise program. The DBE program ensures that small business concerns which are owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals will have a fair opportunity to compete for federally-funded highway and transit contracts.

Much has happened since the Department's first efforts to bring fundamental fairness to contracting with federal transportation contracts. Currently, small and disadvantaged business participation in federally assisted highway construction contracting was at a mere 1.9 percent in 1978 and rose to 14.8 percent in 1996. The DBE program stood at a mere 1.9 percent in 1978 and rose to 14.8 percent in 1996.

In 1985 on the 4th day of this very month my Mayor Harold Washington, the Mayor of the great city of Chicago ordered city agencies to award 30 percent of their contracts to companies owned by minority group members and women. He had to threaten to impose financial penalties on contractors who try to avoid this minority goal. He suffered death threats and humiliation from contractors. However because of his actions minority businesses were able to break an inefficient, archaic system that favored a handful of contractors and prevented minorities and women from obtaining city business.

There is good reason for concern that without a federal program in place, minority participation will decline substantially. When DBE programs end, many prime contractors return to the same exclusionary practices that denied minorities and women the chance to compete for business before the DBE program was created and will completely destroy what Mayor Harold Washington and the city of Chicago worked for. Why must we continue to allow members of this Congress to hinder a person's opportunities and adversity and other such obstacles to achieving excellence.

Mr. Chairman, I am told truth is proper and beautiful in all times and in all places. Well now is the time, and the place. Let us be truthful to the all American business people and give them the right and responsibility to access the roads to prosperity. Vote no to the Roukema amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise with my colleagues and friends to oppose this amendment. This amendment is anti-small business. When I chaired the Michigan Small Business Committee in the House, we heard over and over again the concerns of small businesses about coming particularly into the field of transportation and competing with the large firms. The majority of small businesses today are being opened by women and minority firms. They are the opportunity not to be an example, not for a quota, but for the opportunity to get started in a multibillion-dollar business.

This is a transportation package that will provide jobs and billions of dollars in contracts. What we are asking, what the committee reported out was the opportunity to make sure that small and disadvantaged businesses have the opportunity to get started in this business. We are talking about those who do not have the record and relationships over years and years being able to be given a chance as a small business to get that first contract so then they can go on to get the second and the third and get bigger and bigger.

I urge a no vote on this amendment. It is anti-small business.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from a small businessman in New Jersey who indicates the discrimination he endured and was denied equal opportunity.

I also include for the RECORD the letter of Ward Connelly of the American Civil Rights Coalition in support of my amendment.


Hon. MARGE ROUKEMA, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROUKEMA: I urge you to please support congresswoman Roukema's amendment H.R. 2400, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) bill to eliminate provisions inserted by the Senate that contain racial preferences and set-asides. I would ask that you do everything in your power to ensure that this amendment is made in order. As you noted on ABC's "This Week" last September we should have competitive bidding in federal contracts, not quotas or set-asides. The Supreme Court agreed in the Adarand decision, ruling that programs granting racial preferences and set-asides are unconstitutional unless they can meet a specific and compelling state interest. Aside from being ineffective and discriminatory federal policies as a method of redressing past discrimination is counterproductive. Discrimination is wrong, no matter where it occurs. As public servants, we have an obligation to protect people's rights, whether it is through your authority as House Speaker or mine as a university representative.

Sincerely, WARD CONNERLY, Chairman.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.
yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we know exactly what will happen if this amendment is passed. Similar legislation was passed before and the result is always the same: opportunities for minorities and women disappear. For example, in Michigan, when they eliminated their program, minority businesses were totally shut out of billions of dollars of State contracting dollars.

Mr. Chairman, we do not live in a color-blind world. According to a study by the Department of Transportation, a white-owned construction firm will likely receive 50 times more bonding from a white-owned construction firm than a qualified minority or a qualified woman-owned business.

In addition, we know that minorities and women are discriminated against in access to capital and are still excluded from many business opportunities and social circles where many important business decisions take place.

The Roukema amendment turns back the clock and destroys the very viable, fair and constitutional DBE program. Minority and women-owned businesses are still underrepresented in the construction industry.

The Senate recognized the validity of the program when it defeated Senator McConnell's efforts to eliminate the program. The Roukema amendment will have a devastating effect on the opportunities for DBEs to participate in federally funded highway and transit projects. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Roukema amendment to eliminate the DBE included in BESTEA.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the debate on the House floor and I hear a lot of talk about free enterprise and free markets. I would like to point out that it was President Ronald Reagan that signed this bill into law. The fact of the matter is that if we look at the system we have in place today, what we have in place is very simple. We have socialism for white contractors and free enterprise for everybody else.

Let us look at the whole idea of what goes behind this. If we have got some idea that we want to have a poor black entrepreneur in Boston or California or, yes, New Jersey bid on one of these contracts, if we want a woman to feel that she can compete, how are they going to do it? We have an entire tax system that allows you to depreciate this bill in law. The fact of the matter is that employees are treated during the work and the taxes that they pay in order to be able to build our highway system.

So what we do is we pretend, by a lot of rhetoric, that if we take a program that has no quotas, that has no time- tables, that just says that if there is a qualified minority or a qualified woman that wants to bid on a contract, we ought to provide her or him or that individual with a competitive environment in order to get it. It has not lessened the quality of the workmanship of our highway program throughout the Nation. In fact, it has strengthened it.

What we are doing, make no mistake about it, is we are saying this is for white boys only. That is all this amendment is about. It is trying to say, we are going to put up with wall between minorities and the work and the taxes that they pay in order to be able to build our highway system.

Let us be honest with the system we have got. Let us encourage minorities and our women to go out and get competitive, get business contracts, start their own companies and employ the people of our country.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We are hearing a lot of things today about what is happening and what is not happening. One of the things that is important for us to understand is what affirmative action originally meant. If we go back to what President Kennedy said when he issued the original affirmative action executive order, it involved this provision. It said, "The contractor will take affirmative action to assure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin."

Without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin. That is the Senate's own recognition that is the principle of affirmative action as it was originally embodied in the policy of this land, and that is the policy of this amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

The Roukema amendment turns back the clock and destroys the very viable constitutional DBE program. I rise in vigorous opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I am rising today to speak against the Roukema Amendment that would abolish the Department of Transportation's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program. For almost two decades, the DOT's DBE Program has been providing equal opportunities for women and minorities competing for highway and transit contracts. By reaching out to women and minority-owned firms and fostering business relationships, the program has countered the effects of discrimination and good old boy networks which have been roadblocks to many legitimately competitive minority-owned businesses.

The fact remains that as a result of continued discrimination, women and minority-owned firms remain underrepresented in the construction field, even today. Now is not the time to discontinue DOT's equal opportunity program. It is still an essential tool in paving the road to equal opportunity for many so-called disadvantaged businesses. This program does not impose quotas or set-asides of any kind on those seeking to receive a government contract. It merely gives the government the ability to achieve a standard to measure in regards to women and minority participation in our vast federal economic apparatus.
Furthermore, the Adarand decision has put forth a clear groundwork of which affirmative action programmatic agendas genuinely produce diversity without unfairly harming others and which do not. The law is clear, affirmative action is neither illegal nor inappropriate. It is framed merely to achieve true multi-cultural and multi-gender diversity amongst those people this government chooses to do business with. The DBE program is about creating points of access and opportunity for those groups who would otherwise not have them. We have mended affirmative action needs of our changing world and its law, but we cannot end it. Opportunity is as essential to success in this world as air is in our lungs; give people a fair chance to maximize their potential. Vote down the Roukema Amendment. This amendment is bad for Texas and bad for Houston. This is not reverse discrimination.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, this highway bill will spend over $200 billion of taxpayers' money. The fact is that well over half of those taxpayers are women and minorities.

It is only a matter of basic fairness that groups comprising a majority of American should have a realistic chance to compete for 10 percent of the highway programs paid for by their tax dollars. It was that very fundamental issue of fairness that caused 58 Democrats and Republicans in the other body to vote “no” on this unfair amendment.

The DBE program is not a quota. I oppose quotas. But what is good for America and good for our highway program is that when we are spending billions of American taxpayer dollars we should at least make it a goal to not exclude women and minorities from these programs. That is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a few Members today talk about reverse discrimination in the highway business. Well, I have a suggestion for them: Go to a potluck. When it comes to competition every single person will contribute to that pot every year. So when it comes time to divide the money, every person will contribute their share to the pot. This pot reminds me of my grandmother’s sweet potato pie. We all contribute to that pot every year. So when it comes time, we should all get a piece. That includes women and minorities. Women and minorities should be getting part of the goods and services.

The DBE program is simply one tool to make sure that we are on a level playing field when it comes to competing. Vote “no” on this amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side, please?

The CHAIRMAN. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, and I will have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) has the right to close.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
they win these bids, these companies create jobs for disadvantaged citizens across our country, at the same time they are helping to build the highest-quality highways for our people. It is a grave mistake to think that we can do without it.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the Roukema Amendment and urge my colleague to vote against it.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MILLENDE-R McDonald).

Ms. MILLENDE-RMcDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California for yielding to me.

A distinguished Member of this House once wrote that “In politics we have no permanent friends, no permanent enemies, just permanent interests.” It gives me no great pleasure to rise in opposition to one of my Women Caucus colleagues, but I do have permanent interests, and that is the economically disadvantaged.

As the co-chair of the Women-owned Business of the Women’s Caucus, I hold a hearing the top of the year because women are complaining that, though we have mandated about 5 percent of the procurement contracts, they have only gotten 1.8 percent of the contracts.

This is what DBE is all about. It allows women and others, irrespective of their race, the opportunity to apply for contracts if they qualify. The DBE program is not a set-aside, it is not quotas, it is simply giving them an opportunity to qualify for contracts for those who are economically disadvantaged.

The disadvantaged business enterprise provisions of BESTEA are sound and were passed out by the full committee with bipartisan support. I join the Senate in saying “no” on the Roukema amendment and “yes” for moving an agenda for women-owned businesses.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. McINTOSH).

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. Roukema) for bringing this amendment to the floor, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Let us be very clear. The Supreme Court has stated that the current set-aside program is unconstitutional because the 14th amendment guarantee that all Americans will be treated equally regardless of race, color, or gender. By setting aside a certain number of contracts to be allocated on those bases, current law flies in the face of our constitutional mandate that all Americans be treated equal under the law.

Now, President Clinton has suggested that we need to mend, not end, affirmative action to bring it in compliance with the Supreme Court rulings and to bring it in compliance with our notions that has been since the founding of our country that every person is of equal dignity.

I think the Roukema amendment does exactly that. It removes the unconstitutional provision that sets up a quota and says that certain contracts will not be awarded based on merit, based on free competition, not based on color, not based on whether you are a woman, not a man. That is wrong and needs to be removed from law.

What her amendment does, which is absolutely necessary, is puts into place an effective affirmative action program that says we are going to reach out to disadvantaged contractors, reach out to minorities, reach out to women and make available to them every opportunity to compete on a free and equal basis.

I heartily encourage my fellow colleagues to vote for the Roukema amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, we have to recognize that there is still disparity out there. And if we do not recognize it, we will continue to fail.

For them to stand up there and talk in terms of being in favor of affirmative action, in favor of trying to do the right thing reminds me of the slave who basically said, you are better off in slavery because we will be able to take care of you. It is appalling in terms of the comments that I hear when I stand up here before my colleagues.

It is not a quota. We need to recognize the fact that there is preferential treatment that is occurring out there and that is discrimination that is happening, and we need to see how we can best respond to that. And this program is one of the programs that has been proven to make sure that the individuals have an opportunity to be able to participate.

My colleagues cannot tell me that women are having a fair deal out there, because they are not; and for my colleagues to stand up there and say that they are is contrary to what is actually happening. It is contrary to what the statistics will show and tell us. I would ask that my colleagues consider what has been done too.

To say that it is contrary to the Supreme Court decision, I would ask my colleagues to also consider the Adarand decision because this particular decision does not deal with this particular item, and it is a safe item, and we should continue to support it.

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

I am afraid the gentleman from Texas is the only one that I know who interprets the Adarand decision this way. Mr. Chairman, what is the balance of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. Each side has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) has the right to close.

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

I would simply say that I think our colleagues have been listening to this debate, but in no way are we denying affirmative action. We are really mending it and bringing it up to date because it has resulted in unintended consequences. And my amendment could protect in an overwhelming bipartisan as the civil rights and anti-discrimination elements of affirmative action and literally goes back to our original intention. As we know now, the courts are clearly coming to terms with this. And if we do not act upon it, the courts certainly will.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, we have an amazing fundamental ignorance that goes behind this amendment and particularly to people who have responded in debate tonight.

First of all, it is very obvious that they do not know that there are no quotas in this bill. There are no quotas in this bill. They feel that there are. They feel that there are set-asides. There are no set-asides in this bill, only goals. They do not understand, obviously, that this bill is not all for minorities and women. It is for disadvantaged. Anyone can be disadvantaged. Even some white males have been disadvantaged.

So this is a spurious argument that they are using here today. It is not even based on fact. If they are trying to bring to the floor a bill which one of our colleagues from Florida has been trying to tack onto everything that has come through this House, then do it. But this is no way to do it. They are doing it on a bill that is going to benefit a lot of people in this particular body.

So if that is what they are doing to try to kill the transportation bill, then kill it. But kill it in such a way that is noble and noteworthy and not cloaked behind something that is not true.

I say to each of my colleagues to vote against this bill. This is a terrible bill, and they know it. They have got one of their moderates to present it, but it is presented under the wrong title.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, despite an overwhelming bipartisan defeat in the Senate, unfortunately we have before us another attempt to gut a program that gives women and minorities the chance to compete for Federal highway dollars.

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise programs work. It puts women and minorities to work. It gives them the chance to compete in an industry that has traditionally shut them out.
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It is not a quota. It is not a set-aside. If it were, do we really think that Ronald Reagan's administration would have created this program? I think a no.

The highway bill offers so much to so many. It is wrong to turn back the clock on women and minority-owned businesses. Let us not put a tolleage on the road to opportunity for these aspiring entrepreneurs.

We can further refine this program. As this gentleman has said, mean it, do not end it. But this amendment goes too far. I urge a "no" vote and, frankly, a return to the kind of bipartisan spirit that has allowed us to begin to make some progress against the legacy of discrimination. This program should be reaffirmed and not eliminated.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to set the record straight. Nobody sought me out as a moderate, dirty word, moderate to do this amendment. I have been advocating this procedure far longer than a year. In opposition, the Senate proposal was not this proposal at all, the one that was defeated. It was a far more complicated one. It created a whole new program. It was not my amendment that was defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Speaker GINGRICH.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia, the Speaker of the House, is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I hope that everybody who is listening carefully to this debate has listened to our good friends over here, because they are now caught in an inherent contradiction. They say to us they are against quotas. Member after Member got up and said, "I am against quotas." They say to us there is nothing in this program that is a quota. They say to us, "We are against the government discriminating. They say there is nothing in the program that requires the government to discriminate."

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), for having the courage to stand up here and to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It says it is for affirmative action.

Affirmative action: "to expand the applicant pool for transportation contracts in order to increase competition; to encourage participation by businesses owned by women and minorities in bidding for transportation contracts."

Affirmative action: "to recruit qualified women and minorities into the applicant pool for transportation contracts."

And it goes on to say, an affirmative action: "to encourage transportation contractors to request businesses owned by women and minorities to bid for transportation contracts" and affirmative action: "to include qualified women and minorities into an applicant pool for transportation contracts."

But here is what it then goes on to say. It then says, but it cannot involve granting a preference. This is the nub of this thing. Should an American citizen be discriminated against? Should an American citizen be discriminated for by their own government? Should the Government of the United States use the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week.

Let me point out, in California, when this broke down, when Senator CAMPBELL at that time first got involved in this fight, it was because it was Asian women who were being discriminated against at law school and could not get in because the quota was filled. And it was Asian women who were being discriminated against, not white males, not the old boy network. They frankly were not studying enough. But Asian women.

So let us go ahead. What does the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibiition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

She says it is for affirmative action. And to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It was not my amendment that was defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Speaker GINGRICH.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that everybody who is listening carefully to this debate has listened to our good friends over here, because they are now caught in an inherent contradiction. They say to us they are against quotas. Member after Member got up and said, "I am against quotas." They say to us there is nothing in this program that is a quota. They say to us, "We are against the government discriminating. They say there is nothing in the program that requires the government to discriminate."

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), for having the courage to stand up here and to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It says it is for affirmative action. Affirmative action: "to expand the applicant pool for transportation contracts in order to increase competition; to encourage participation by businesses owned by women and minorities in bidding for transportation contracts."

Affirmative action: "to recruit qualified women and minorities into the applicant pool for transportation contracts."

And it goes on to say, an affirmative action: "to encourage transportation contractors to request businesses owned by women and minorities to bid for transportation contracts" and affirmative action: "to include qualified women and minorities into an applicant pool for transportation contracts."

But here is what it then goes on to say. It then says, but it cannot involve granting a preference. This is the nub of this thing. Should an American citizen be discriminated against? Should an American citizen be discriminated for by their own government? Should the Government of the United States use the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week.

Let me point out, in California, when this broke down, when Senator CAMPBELL at that time first got involved in this fight, it was because it was Asian women who were being discriminated against at law school and could not get in because the quota was filled. And it was Asian women who were being discriminated against, not white males, not the old boy network. They frankly were not studying enough. But Asian women.

So let us go ahead. What does the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

All right. What would the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

She says it is for affirmative action. And to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It was not my amendment that was defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Speaker GINGRICH.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia, the Speaker of the House, is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I hope that everybody who is listening carefully to this debate has listened to our good friends over here, because they are now caught in an inherent contradiction. They say to us they are against quotas. Member after Member got up and said, "I am against quotas." They say to us there is nothing in this program that is a quota. They say to us, "We are against the government discriminating. They say there is nothing in the program that requires the government to discriminate."

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), for having the courage to stand up here and to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It says it is for affirmative action.

Affirmative action: "to expand the applicant pool for transportation contracts in order to increase competition; to encourage participation by businesses owned by women and minorities in bidding for transportation contracts."

Affirmative action: "to recruit qualified women and minorities into the applicant pool for transportation contracts."

And it goes on to say, an affirmative action: "to encourage transportation contractors to request businesses owned by women and minorities to bid for transportation contracts" and affirmative action: "to include qualified women and minorities into an applicant pool for transportation contracts."

But here is what it then goes on to say. It then says, but it cannot involve granting a preference. This is the nub of this thing. Should an American citizen be discriminated against? Should an American citizen be discriminated for by their own government? Should the Government of the United States use the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week.

Let me point out, in California, when this broke down, when Senator CAMPBELL at that time first got involved in this fight, it was because it was Asian women who were being discriminated against at law school and could not get in because the quota was filled. And it was Asian women who were being discriminated against, not white males, not the old boy network. They frankly were not studying enough. But Asian women.

So let us go ahead. What does the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

All right. What would the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

She says it is for affirmative action. And to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It was not my amendment that was defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Speaker GINGRICH.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that everybody who is listening carefully to this debate has listened to our good friends over here, because they are now caught in an inherent contradiction. They say to us they are against quotas. Member after Member got up and said, "I am against quotas." They say to us there is nothing in this program that is a quota. They say to us, "We are against the government discriminating. They say there is nothing in the program that requires the government to discriminate."

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), for having the courage to stand up here and to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It says it is for affirmative action.

Affirmative action: "to expand the applicant pool for transportation contracts in order to increase competition; to encourage participation by businesses owned by women and minorities in bidding for transportation contracts."

Affirmative action: "to recruit qualified women and minorities into the applicant pool for transportation contracts."

And it goes on to say, an affirmative action: "to encourage transportation contractors to request businesses owned by women and minorities to bid for transportation contracts" and affirmative action: "to include qualified women and minorities into an applicant pool for transportation contracts."

But here is what it then goes on to say. It then says, but it cannot involve granting a preference. This is the nub of this thing. Should an American citizen be discriminated against? Should an American citizen be discriminated for by their own government? Should the Government of the United States use the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week.

Let me point out, in California, when this broke down, when Senator CAMPBELL at that time first got involved in this fight, it was because it was Asian women who were being discriminated against at law school and could not get in because the quota was filled. And it was Asian women who were being discriminated against, not white males, not the old boy network. They frankly were not studying enough. But Asian women.

So let us go ahead. What does the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

All right. What would the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) do? She says it is a "prohibition against discrimination or preference in the lowest competitive bidder, but you did not fit the preference this week."

She says it is for affirmative action. And to offer a very, very important amendment. Notice what it says. It was not my amendment that was defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Speaker GINGRICH.
The DBE program has worked wonderfully for the 6 years of ISTEA. The 10 percent goal is a national target. State and local recipients of DOT funds set their own goals for DOT participation and construction projects based on the employment of disadvantaged businesses in their markets. There is no absolute requirement that a particular goal be met.

In fact, it is very acceptable business practice to set goals. Goals are a standard tool of good management world-wide. But by prohibiting goals, the amendment prevents States and localities from measuring progress against discrimination. That is what this is all about—against the DBE program discrimination.

I have heard all sorts of conversation today from the advocates of this amendment about freedom, freedom to choose, freedom to move, mobility. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, rich and poor alike have the freedom to leap under a bridge. Only the poor wind up under the bridge. Do not stuff people under a bridge with this amendment.

Let us defeat this amendment. Let us stand up for what is good in America and give poor, minorities, women, an opportunity to bid on this great highway program, this $270 billion program of ours that moves America forward into the next century.

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

BESTEA is a terrific bill. I salute Chairman Shuster and his committee for the many hours of hard work they put in on this bill over the last year.

I thank the committee for including a very important provision which will exempt from federal DBE requirements any transit authorities that are under court order preventing them from complying with these requirements. This is a step in the right direction, but it doesn’t quite go far enough.

It is time to completely put an end to discrimination in the awarding of transportation contracts.

Mr. Chairman, race-based discrimination is wrong. And gender-based discrimination is wrong. And it is wrong regardless of whether the victim is male, female, black, or white.

The DBE program is a federally-mandated quota program that commands highway and transit contractors to discriminate based on race and gender.

A federal court in Texas recognized that this kind of discrimination is wrong when it ordered the city of Houston’s metro transit authority to cease awarding contracts based on race and gender.

Houston METRO complied with this court order, and as a result, it went 18 months without its $350 million federal funding.

The BESTEA bill prevents this kind of thing from happening again. It guarantees that transit agencies will not lose their funding when a court orders them not to discriminate. That’s great. I support that.

If we pass this amendment, we will take an even bigger step in rooting out discrimination. Getting rid of the DBE program will ensure that agencies continue to receive funding if they refuse to discriminate—even without a court order or federal funding.

I urge my colleagues to stamp out government-enforced discrimination. I urge them to vote yes on this amendment.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Roukema Amendment to the Building Efficient Surface Transportation and Equity Act to eliminate the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program. I strongly support the DBE Program which was first signed into law in 1982. The goal of the DBE Program is to eradicate the lingering effects of discrimination in the construction industry, and provide equal opportunities for minority and women-owned business to compete for federal highway and construction contracts.

Although the playing field is still far from level, we have made progress since the inception of the DBE Program. The percentage of women and minority-owned firms participating in the construction, highway, and construction industries has increased. By reaching out to minority and women-owned firms and forging business relationships, this program has been successful in countering the effects of “good old boys” net-work. Despite the success of the DBE Program, more remains to be done.

The DBE program is consistent with President Clinton’s “mend it, don’t end it” policy on affirmative action, and the Supreme Court’s Adarand decisions which allowed the use of affirmative action by the federal government to meet a “compelling government interest” to combat the “lingering effects of discrimination.”

I urge my colleagues to follow the lead of the House Authorizing Committee, which recommends that this program be continued. I urge you to follow the Senate’s lead, which voted overwhelmingly to retain it. And finally, I urge my colleagues to follow the lead of the two past Presidents and our current President, all of whom support this valuable program, to urge the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Roukema amendment. How ironic that the GOP—who recently led the effort that resulted in renaming Washington National Airport to the Ronald Reagan National Airport—now seeks to eliminate a vital program which President Reagan himself signed into law. The Department of Transportation’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program is about progress—an ideal our Republican colleagues often champion as one of their goals. It is not about quotas, set asides, unqualified businesses receiving preferential treatment, nor about violations of Supreme Court rulings.

The DBE program was created by Section 105 (f) of the Surface Transportation Act of 1982 (P.L. 97-424) in order to increase the share of qualified, “socially and economically disadvantaged” businesses in the transportation construction industry. Under the program, state Departments of Transportation and state and local mass transit agencies must establish a goal of awarding 10 percent of all funds spent on federal-aid highway projects to certified firms owned by “socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.” However, if a state agency or prime contractor is unable to find enough qualified subcontractors to reach the goal, they are allowed to apply for a waiver to lower the goal.

The Roukema amendment would gut DOT’s ability to address a problem that still plagues our nation: the paucity of minority and women-owned firms who receive transportation dollars. For those who naively believe that America has fully realized her dream of a color-blind society, a society in which there no longer exists a need to ensure an equitable playing field in the economic marketplace for disadvantaged persons, I submit that they are mistaken. Discrimination is alive and well and manifesting itself through the difficulties minorities and women continue to face in securing access to contracts and capital.

Consider that minorities make up 20 percent of the population, yet represent only 9 percent of all construction firms and 5 percent of all construction receipts. Women own one-third of all firms, but receive only 10 percent of the business receipts. White-owned construction firms receive 50 times more loan dollars than black-owned firms with identical equity. Without goals, women- and minority-owned businesses have been shut out of transportation construction projects. In 1989 in Michigan, within nine months of terminating the state DBE program, no minority businesses received contracts. Seven years later, in 1996, DBEs still had received no more than 1.1 percent of state highway contract dollars.

These disturbing statistics further underscore the reality that America has yet to reach the honorable state of a truly color-blind society, and that in order to ensure absolute parity in the contracting process, we must legislate fairly through programs such as the one before us today. Think about the following example: since the inclusion of women in the DBE program in 1987, women have enhanced their procurement dollars by approximately 175 percent. In FY 1994, the DBE program generated nearly $87 million in contracting opportunities for women-owned businesses. To further our goal of expanding opportunities, there is the creation of 62,000 new jobs. When racial/ethnic minority-owned firms are added, the DBE program in FY 94 generated $3.4 billion and
businesses in the field of construction grew by 62,000 new jobs in highway and transit under the DBE program, generating $1.4 billion of revenue, were awarded to women-owned businesses. Sixty-six percent of the HUD partnerships have been awarded to women-owned and minority-owned small and disadvantaged businesses in California. Women-owned businesses received less than 4 percent of the DBE dollars.

The Senate voted 58 to 37 to defeat an amendment to replace the DBE program. I urge the House to follow their bipartisan lead and pass this fair, effective and constitutional program.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on Amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) which will be taken immediately after this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 225, answering “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

AYES—194

Mr. Martinez and Mr. McDade changed their vote from "aye" to "no," Messrs. Dan Schaefer of Colorado, Young of Alaska, Snowbarger and Whitfield changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. Radanovich changed his vote from "present" to "no." So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS**

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EWING and Mr. FOLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 4 printed in part II of House Report 105-475.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GRAHAM**

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. Graham: (a) HIGHWAY PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.— (1) In section 102(b), strike all after the paragraph "$885,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2003." (2) In section 103(b), strike the "and" and all that follows after paragraph (7) and insert "and" after paragraph (6). (3) Strike sections 127(b) and 127(c) and redesignate sections of the bill accordingly. (b) TRANSIT PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.— In section 5309(b)(1) of title 49, strike all that follows after "shall not exceed $878,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $985,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and $885,000,000 for fiscal year 2003." (2) In section 302(a) strike "shall not exceed" through the end of subsection and insert "(1) $800,000,000 for fiscal year 1998; (2) $856,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and (3) $1,045,200,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2003." (3) Strike sections 332 and 333 and redesignate sections of the bill accordingly.
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Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT). Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of this amendment that would strike out all of the special projects in the current bill before this committee.

I want to say that I am opposed to the bill itself for three principal reasons: One, it is bad process; two, it is
bad precedent; and three, it is a bad product.

Let me speak about bad process first. I would ask the question, is it right that the campaign committee chairmen are consulted before the special road projects are given to Members who represent politically sensitive districts where they have tough races coming up in November?

Is it right to dangle millions of dollars in front of Members for no specific projects, just a blank check?

Is it fair to the States of Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Members an average of $253 million, versus $54 million if there is not a Member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure from one's State?

It is bad precedent because this bill exceeds the budget caps put in place last summer by $26 billion, that is with a capital B, billions of dollars. What happens when we use the budget caps as a way of defying the deficit? What is to raise spending in any other level? Are we going to say, no, we cannot do that because of the budget caps? We cannot do it if we pass this bill.

What happens when we begin building roads and structures to high fiscal insanity? We will raise taxes. It is bad precedent.

It is a bad product. What do I mean by that? Is it responsible to increase the total funding for infrastructure by 42 percent, which is what this bill does? The Balanced Budget Agreement, which we voted on, again, last summer, calls for a 20 percent increase in infrastructure funding. How much is enough?

What happens when the Senate does not agree with the offsets? What are we going to do then?

Do we really think a high-priority project is a transportation museum in Pennsylvania, an Appalachian Trans- portation Institute at Marshall University, or $500,000 for a train station? Are these really high-priority projects?

The chairman of this committee is a zealous advocate for roads. I appreciate that and respect him for it. But I believe he has crossed the center line. The House's own rules say it shall not be in order for any bill to contain any provision for any specific road.

The rule was never waived until 1982. Then, in 1982, it was waived: ten special projects in 1982, $386 million; in 1987, 152 for $1.3 billion; in 1991, 539 projects, for $1.3 billion; in 1991, 539 projects, for $6.2 billion; this year, 1,450 projects for $9.3 billion.

Support the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina to strike these projects.

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

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 of my minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), to control blocks of time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I feel support of the principle of Members of Congress being able to recommend to our committee specific projects, and our committee in turn being able to vet those projects and determine which are worthy. It is very important to emphasize that only 5 percent of the total funding in this bill is dedicated to high-priority congressional projects. That means, and let me be even more specific, 98 percent of the decisions being made as to where the highways and transit systems are being built will be made by the States: by governors and by the legislatures and the departments of transportation. Seventeen percent of the money raised must be made by the Secretary of Transportation.

The decisions to build highways and transit systems are not decisions made by angels up in heaven. These are decisions made in the political process. Governors decide where it is best to put highways. State legislators decide.

There is nothing wrong with Members of Congress, who are the ones that have to cast the tough votes to create the programs, having some say. To have a 5 percent say does not seem unreasonable.

In fact, I would point out that if indeed this amendment were to pass, and $18 billion less were to be available, then we would be violating the principle of spending gas tax dollars for improvements to infrastructure. We would be back in the same old game we were in previously, where the American people were being flim-flammed.

They were paying their gas taxes at the pump, but the money was building up in the Trust Fund, and this would increase the balance in the Trust Fund.

Conversely, if we strike the projects but do not strike the money, then there is no saving. We would be back keeping faith with the people in terms of saying that the money paid by the gas tax would be available to be spent, and that is all, only the revenue coming in of the gas tax; honesty in budgeting, that is all. Then we would be saying the money can be spent, but zero decisions would be made by Members of Congress, and all of the decisions would be made by those governors and legislators and the Secretary of Transportation.

I think it is not reasonable to believe that somehow there is a non-political, pure process back in the State Houses, as compared to the decisions that are made here. And I also believe the Members of Congress does not know what is important to his district, then I do not think he is going to be a Member of Congress very long.

Let me say, I do not agree with some of the projects that have been submitted. But that is not my decision to make. In fact, I would respectfully suggest it is a bit arrogant for someone to say that we know better what is important for Members' congressional districts than they do.

Indeed, we have a vetting process. The vetting process is a 14-point vetting process, which includes recommendation by the Secretary of Transportation in the State, which includes recommendation by the governors. Indeed, what I find so mystifying is my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), submitted four projects to us. I have the letter right here from him, saying that the South Carolina Route 72 project is vital and would provide additional traffic capacity resulting in safe and efficient roadways in three counties, a letter asking for the project.

And my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), signed a letter asking for projects. In fact, I do have a letter from the Governor of Oklahoma received just yesterday saying, "On behalf of all Oklahomans, I want to express our appreciation for the successful completion of the bill to do so much to restore Federal funding dollars and to move the vital Interstate 40 crosstown project forward."

That is the project which was requested by two members of the Oklahoma delegation who took this floor or took a press conference last week to attack our integrity, suggesting that we were offering projects in exchange for votes. At the time I challenged somebody to come forward and to name one Member of Congress to whom I said, I will give you a project in exchange for your vote, or conversely, threatened, you will not get a project if you do not vote for it. None has come forward? Why, because it never happened.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, this is also worth pointing out, that this was an open process, with 4 full days of hearing, 170 Members of Congress testifying in public, supported by hundreds of local mayors and officials from across the United States, pointing out the merits of these particular projects.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, speaking of angels and governors, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the Graham amendment. I believe that what we have here is a violation of the Balanced Budget Agreement. I think the committee, by the way, did a good job on this legislation. They just went too far.

They went about $26 billion too far, and that is money which we do not presently have.

About $18 billion of that can be found in these special demonstration projects.
projects. I disagree with the Chairman on this. I believe the special demonstration projects are wrong. I believe they are pork. I believe these decisions should be made by the States and by the officials who live in the States, who make the day-to-day decisions about where their highways should go.

Are these individuals angels? Let us get real. The last time I checked, governors and State legislatures are going to make those decisions about where their highways should go.

How are we going to pay for this? I ask Members to ask themselves that before they support this legislation. We are going to pay for it because education is going to suffer, defense is going to suffer, housing may suffer, the environment may suffer. Maybe we will not balance the budget. Alan Greenspan will tell us that interest rates will go up 2 percent if we do not get a balanced budget.

I think these are extraordinarily important issues. I hope before anybody here votes, whether they have demonstration projects or not, they will consider the enormity of what we are doing. This has just gone too far, and it is too bad, because an extraordinary amount of good work was done here.

However, the bottom line is, all of us should unite to support this amendment and take this $18 billion off the table.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALI), a ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and an architect of this legislation.

Mr. RAHALI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let us get some facts on the table. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) has laid out very well how funds for highways are apportioned under this bill. Eighty-eight percent would be distributed to the States by formula through apportionments, by going to States. Basically, this money goes to governors and not to State legislators. Seven percent would stay here in Washington for administration of the Federal Highway Administration.

Let us get it straight, only 5 percent, the remaining 5 percent of the highway funds in BESTEA, are for these projects that are deemed to be high-priority projects by Members of this body. That is the same as in the current law, ISTEA. The bottom line is that governors and State legislators get to spend 88 percent of the highway dollars, while House Members get to direct only 5 percent.

Yet some in the media, and I think perhaps the sponsors of this amendment, ought to look at these facts, instead of paying attention to those in the editorial pages in some of the national newspapers or those in the media who would portray this as pork and something evil. Let us look at the facts. They ignore the fact that 88 percent of the money is going directly to the State governors and State legislators for their disbursements.

Are these individuals angels? Let us get real. The last time I checked, governors were elected like we are elected, politicians. They have to run for election. I do not know of any governor that has been appointed from some holier-than-thou source to serve. So these guys are politicians. Get real.

I would submit to Members of this body, Democrat and Republican alike, know his or her district better than any State governor who has to make these decisions on a Statewide basis. If anybody in this body does not know his or her district better than the governor of their State, I doubt if they are going to be here very long.

These projects are worthwhile. They have been through a rigorous vetting process. They have answered a series of 14 tough questions that we instituted back when we started reauthorizing ISTEA. They have been part of the transportation plan of every State.

We have reviewed the requests. We have held public hearings. There has been nothing secretive about the process. I have nothing dishonest about the process. I believe the special demonstration projects are wrong. I believe the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds, just to say that Citizens Against Government Waste and the National Taxpayers Union support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I would like for the American public to know what was left on a voice mail in my office by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

"Matt, this is Darryl Wilson with the Surface Transportation Policy Project, a liberal group comprised of environmentalists, in line with the Conference of Mayors and League of Cities. The Surface Transportation Policy Project has endorsed this legislation, and they have said that these projects are worthwhile.

I would urge rejection of this amendment."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRAHAM) for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment, and I want to make the point that the people get this issue back home.


The answer is this bill breaks every promise we made when we got here. We came here and said we would not do business as usual, but this bill has us spending money the same way money used to be spent. It is pure and simple bribery.

Mr. Chairman, if we allow Members of Congress to control how the money is spent in this bill, why not allow Members of Congress to control how the money is spent in every bill? That is the kind of project where it is pork by definition because of the way the support was built.

The truth is these decisions need to be made on merit. They need to be based on the real need for these transportation projects. They should not be such that one State with a powerful committee chairman gets hundreds of millions of dollars more, even billions of dollars more than another State which has no Member on the committee. That is the way Washington used to work and under this bill, it is sadly the way this bill still works.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS).

Mr. INGLIS. South Carolina, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) for yielding me this time.
Mr. Chairman, this is probably the most embarrassing night that I have ever spent in this Congress, to realize that we came here to change things and we are not. We are participating in the big old trough that has characterized this place in the past, and it is a terrible embarrassment to be part of the new majority and to stand here and have to support this amendment that would take care of that trough that we are seeing.

Mr. Chairman, there are 31 States who will be cheated as a result of this bill and the demonstration projects in it. Not an opinion; it is a mathematical fact. If a Member is from South Carolina and votes for this bill, they are cheating the State of South Carolina. So it is for 30 other States. Unless Members happen to have the big dig going on in their State or are from Pennsylvania, they are being cheated in this bill.

 Demonstration projects cheat their State, and in return they are getting a press release. So they get a press release and their State gets cheated. That is a lousy deal for their State and it is a lousy deal for America. It is a lousy deal for America. That is why we claim to have come here to change things and we are not. I am embarrassed at what is before me, and I am embarrassed for this House. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and fix this lousy bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I too am very embarrassed for this House. We came here in the Class of 1994 in particular claiming that we were willing to stand for America and do anything to balance the budget and cut taxes. Tonight we are the people busting the budget. We are the people with the proposal billions of dollars higher than the United States Senate.

I am embarrassed at what is before us. I see media reports in Indiana of Members of Congress who are getting money that is going to be allocated to their county commissioners. That was not a carefully scrutinized thing. It is up to Members of Congress whether they support their demonstration projects or not. Any Member of Congress can have such a thing.

It was not a carefully scrutinized process. Everybody here, whether it was direct or indirect, knew that if they supported this bill they would have access to certain funds. We all advocated different projects at different times within the context of the balanced budget agreement but the budget busts the budget.

This is contrary to what we ran on. By the time we get done with this, the House and the Senate and the President, we are going to have spent the supposed surplus and undermined everything we claimed to have come here to do and I am embarrassed for this body tonight.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), listen up. You have used my name, and that is okay. You talked about a letter I wrote, and that is okay. Last year your committee called me and said there was $7 million for projects in my district. I submitted a list of projects after talking with the highway commissioner in the Third Congressional District, and I appreciated the $7 million.

Two weeks ago I got a call from your committee, unsolicited, that said I now have $15 million. I said no. You told me I had by 5 o’clock two weeks ago to take the money or lose it, and I said no. And the reason I said no is because the bill you put together spends $26 billion more than we can afford to spend.

What you are doing is, you are allowing this House to slip down a slippery slope because your committee wants to take more of the balanced budget pie for itself. And the next chairman and the next worthy cause is going to do that.

You are going to make us take it out of somebody else’s hide, because you have an amendment in this package that requires this bill to be offset. So we have to go to somebody else in this government and say, “Give us $26 billion because we overspent on highways, but we are not going to give a dime ourselves.”

Mr. Chairman, my amendment says give up the demonstration projects and we reduce the amount we have to offset by 69 percent. But we are not going to do that. We are going to go to other people and say, “Give it up. But not us, buddy.”

Mr. Chairman, we reduce spending by 8 percent if we do away with the demonstration projects. All of them are probably worthwhile. I am not up here and say that their project is not worthwhile. Let us assume all 1,467 of them are worthwhile. Look what has happened since the last time we met. Look how the number of projects has grown. Look how much money. We have tripled the number of demonstration projects and increased the spending by a third.

I am not here to shame anyone and say that their project is not worthwhile. I am here to say we cannot afford a lot of things they would like. But not us. Somebody in this government is going to pay for this bill, but it will not be us. We will not give one penny. We are going to take every penny we can get and put it in the ground, in the asphalt, and somebody else is going to have to give it up.

Mr. Chairman, that is what is wrong with this country. That is why we cannot lead. The gentleman has taken the balanced budget agreement and has made a mockery of it and we all should be ashamed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to observe that it is inappro- priate for a Member to address directly another Member, and that all remarks should be addressed to the Chair in proper debate.

Mr. Chairman, when all else fails, try the facts. The facts that are this committee went through a very appropriate process of asking all Members about projects that are priorities and important in their district, priorities that their State has not addressed. Point 8 of our 14-point questionnaire: ‘Is the project included in the metropolitan planning or State long-range plan or the State long-range plan? Is it scheduled for funding?’ And on through a very objective analysis of each project.

That is a fair way to do it. Who said that all wisdom resides in the State? A statement was made earlier in this debate, decisions should be made by the States, who know what the needs and priorities are in their State. Well, the States will have the choice to match the required 20 percent or not to match it. It is up to the States to start projects or not to start those projects. Those are decisions that are left to the States.

But let me tell my colleagues what kind of wisdom there is in State government. There was a stretch of highway in my district on which, over 15 years, 57 people have died. Where did that appear on the State priority list? Nowhere, until I got involved in it and brought them together, and now we are going to address long-term and immediate needs on Highway 8 and there are not going to be any more deaths if I have my way and if we have the funding that is in this legislation.

All of this talk about we are spending over the amount. Listen, we give up $9 billion of the Highway Trust Fund, taxes already paid by drivers in America who have been carrying for 30 years the burden of government on their back, and we give up the future interest, $13 billion dollars. We paid for it. The drivers of America paid for this bill, and over and over again, and now it is time to get their due and let us invest in America. We know what projects are good and important for our districts every bit as well as those governors do.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) printed in Part II of report 105-476.
It dismantles the budget structure that we built up so painstakingly over the last 15 years, which has brought us to a balanced budget, by taking transportation off budget, removing it from any stricture whatsoever.

To those who say there is not the time to do this process, this amendment provides an answer.

It extends the Surface Transportation Extension Act for another 2 months. This act was temporary in the first place. It runs out on May 1. I will have to be extended because it is highly unlikely that we will have a conference report by then and, in any event, States will not get any more budget authority under BESTEA than they will get under this because the levels for 1998 are the same.

What we are proposing here once again, Mr. Chairman, is budget discipline, the budget process that we built up over time. In the end, I am sure transportation will get more. They have demonstrated that Members from all parts of the country and all places of the spectrum support more spending. But we will do it in a regular order procedure, and we will do it in a process so we can determine exactly which priorities will have to be displaced to give transportation more.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am for spending more on highways and mass transit, but vastly for deciding how much more and which priorities we will pare back or preclude to make room for more spending on highways so that we can keep the budget in balance.

The purpose of this amendment is basic and simple. It is just to let this process work. What it calls for is regular order, nothing more. Let us pass a budget resolution. Let us go through the 302(B) allocation process. Let us identify $26 billion in offsets, or whatever the amount may be, and then let us come back to this floor and pass this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to offer this amendment because I am the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and this bill does not just skirt or evade the budget process, it is a frontal assault upon it. It violates the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997, which we only voted for a few months ago, and trumpeted by all of us who voted for it, by authorizing $40 billion more for contracting authority than the BBA provides and $26 billion in outlays over the next 5 years above and beyond the BBA.

Mr. Chairman, it radically departs from the appropriations process by letting the Appropriations Committee foreclose some $26 billion in offsets to pay for their increases. All of these offsets are outside their jurisdiction. It violates the Congressional Budget Act by being brought to the floor ahead of the budget resolution. It violates the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 by providing $9.3 billion in mandatory spending for demonstration projects without identifying $9.3 billion in offsets. And this amendment will delay any implementation of BESTEA until the last quarter of fiscal 1998 and will put out additional funds, get this, additional funds under the unfair Senate-imposed formula that was included in the short-term bill that the Transportation Conference provided.

Many more States will receive more apportionments and obligation authority than they would receive for the entire year under BESTEA. This will preclude full formula change for this year. Donor States will have to wait another year for the formula, the fair formula, which we have in this bill, to take, fully take effect. This will completely upset the minimum apportionment program and apportion more funds that are not subject to any equity adjustment.

Members' projects will not be able to begin. They will lose a whole season before these projects can be implemented. BESTEA simply spends the new gas tax revenues coming into the Highway Trust Fund over the next 6 years. That is what the people who pay these taxes expect. Rather than upset the budget process, in fact, it restores honesty and fairness to the budget process.

In sum, this amendment will wreak additional havoc with the States, virtually every State, but most particularly the Northern tier States. It is unfair and unnecessary.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First, I want to thank both the ranking member and chairman. They believe in what they are doing. We happen to disagree. But in every instance that I have dealt with them they have always been gentlemen. I just think they are wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I totally disagree with the arguments outlined by my chairman from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This amendment extends the temporary ISTEA for another 2 months. We anticipate that we will be able to pass a full bill before then. But what we are being asked to do in this legislation is to spend and allocate $217 billion without having the offsets to pay for the new money. I think that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

This is a good amendment. Let me use an analogy. Take a hot summer day and there is a picnic and there are sandwiches and potato chips and cookies there. And somebody comes along with ice tea, and it is 95 degrees out and that ice tea looks awfully good, and they fill your glass. That is abso-

utely wonderful. But then you make a mistake and they fill it too much, and it spills on the sandwiches and on the potato chips and the cookies, and it ruins them. That is what is happening here.

This amendment is wrong, badly incorrect, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.
This is good legislation. This is good ISTEA. To the extent that this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to their great credit, put together a formula and put together the numbers that we handled in the budget agreement, we have just done a wonderful job. But they went too far. They went too far by about $26 billion.

What this amendment is doing is saying let us wait for 2 months so we can see how much money we are really going to be able to spend on transportation, which we all agree should be done. We have heard all manner of examples all afternoon of how we should spend money on transportation. That is absolutely correct. But the bottom line is that the glass has flowed here and we have $26 billion too much in it.

I just spoke a moment ago on the demonstration projects. I think that is a poor public policy. Beyond that, we are looking at that additional $26 billion. Where is it going to come from? We are about to vote blindly for a piece of legislation in which we are not at all sure what the offsets are. Let me remind Members of the work that he does on that committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to their great credit, put together a formula and put together the numbers that we handled in the budget agreement, we have just done a wonderful job. And that is why we must proceed here forthwith without waited for any budget resolutions. It is no way to plan America’s future. It is no way to plan for the safety on our Nation’s highways.

If we are to delay the process and find come May 1, or a couple of weeks thereafter if we face a slippage that the States do not have the definitive schedule upon which to base the letting of contracts within their borders. So I would submit that while the chairman of the, the ranking member of our Committee on the Budget has noble goals in mind, this is perhaps a back-door effort used by some on the other side of the aisle to truly kill this bill.

I would urge defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 3 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has the right to close.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, this vote is not just about bridges and highways for them. It is a vote about priorities, a vote about fiscal discipline and a promise we made to America just last year. Unfortunately, highway construction seasonality does not necessarily allow themselves, because of the seasons through which they go, to follow our normal budget processes in Congress.

The other body decided to proceed full steam ahead with this legislation prior to consideration of their budget resolution. And I think our House leadership made the appropriate decision in consultation with our House budget chairman, to proceed forthwith with this legislation at this time. We are facing a May 1 deadline.

After May 1, the States will lose their ability to obligate spending authority and in many States much more, so in our Northern States and other States, this will truly wreak havoc in their transportation planning decisions.

Not only will it wreak havoc in the States, but there could very well be a problem with the FHWA here in Washington. There are staffing problems to consider. We do not want to face any type of a government shutdown at FHWA, which would truly be devastating to our road mapping processes and transportation decisions across this country.

There is no way to plan if the States are faced with a cutoff of obligatory authority come May 1. It is truly a drop-dead date. We do not have the luxury of trying to comply with the budget process or time frames that have been set up here in this Congress.

We are talking about spending what the American taxpayers and the American motorists in particular have already paid a tax and that is why we must proceed here forthwith without waited for any budget resolutions. It is no way to plan America’s future. It is no way to plan for the safety on our Nation’s highways.

If we are to delay the process and find come May 1, or a couple of weeks thereafter if we face a slippage that the States do not have the definitive schedule upon which to base the letting of contracts within their borders. So I would submit that while the chairman of the, the ranking member of our Committee on the Budget has noble goals in mind, this is perhaps a back-door effort used by some on the other side of the aisle to truly kill this bill.

I would urge defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 3 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has the right to close.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, this vote is not just about bridges and highways for them. It is a vote about priorities, a vote about fiscal discipline and a promise we made to America just last year. Unfortunately, as the majority leader put it the other day, the leadership of the House is more concerned about haste rather than substance.

As a result, we may unravel the first balanced budget in a generation. This is no way to write a budget. The cart is way before the horse. If we approve this bill we are going to have to make substantial cuts to the budget. Where do we get the $26 billion from; defense? From senior citizen housing, again, another day? From our kids health care?

From education or maybe our seaports or airports, as we did the other day.

Those of us on the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations already knew we were going to have to shave billions of dollars from the Federal budget just based on last year’s budget deal. Now we will have to find billions of dollars more to cut.

Mr. Chairman, it boils down for us today to a question of courage. Let us be responsible about spending. Let us set our budget priorities in the manner they should be set and let us show the American people we have the courage to live within our means.

Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. Chairman, I yield ½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), distinguished chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make several points. First of all, I have watched one-minutes sometimes and hear the spin people are trying to give to this Congress. Some Members are saying we are a do-nothing Congress. And then Members are stepping forward and saying we should do something.

We are trying to meet a major need of our country by passing this bill at an appropriate time, as asked by the national Governors who wanted us, if we possibly can, to get this done so that they can go forward with their construction season and plans this summer by May 1. If we had some assurances that the budgeteers would act in a reasonable and timely way, that is one thing. But knowing how these things work around here, they are not going to, I do not think.

We do not have any assurance that we will have a budget resolution passed and ready to guide Congress by May 1 or thereby. We will be lucky, last year I think it slipped into July or so. That means if we waited for this process, we are into September or October and Congress will be out.

This is saying we do not want to address the needs of the country. We do not want to deal with the donor State question in this Congress. That is what it is saying. They want to be a do-nothing Congress, not a do-something Congress. I think that is just plain wrong.

I have some suggestions for our budget friends as they say where we can find this money. We are giving up $9 billion, writing it off the debt of the United States. No scoring for that. We are lowered, by the budget resolution, the caps, by about $9 billion below what we are actually spending. That mistake could be corrected. That is not really an increase in spending, when we just continue in constant levels, yet they score us with cuts. We are giving up $14 billion of interest over the life of this bill. That is not being scored either.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).
offs. Let us pay some attention to the process that we are breaking here today.

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina offers a very appealing and even compelling, rational, thoughtful argument. It is a neatly constructed syllogism which I appreciate. The horse should be before the cart, in other plain terms, the horse being the budget.

We did that last year. We had the debate on the budget resolution. We had the Shuster-Oberstar amendment, which asked Members to make choices, to prioritize, to decide where they wanted to pin dollars on their values. We came within two votes of prevailing because we offered something that was very reasonable and very responsible. We had an across-the-board minuscule cut.

Everybody is going to have a little cut. Little bit less in taxes, little bit less in defense, little bit less on domestic discretionary. And we exempted the mandatory programs and the entitlements. And we should have won.

But I have to tell my colleagues what that means. Last year, you and I did not make the process that we are breaking here today.

Yesterday, we passed a $2.9 billion bill and the majority demanded offsets before it passed. Today, we add $26 billion to the deficit, with offsets unknown. We should have, my friends, the discipline to pass a budget prior to adding $26 billion in spending before the cap.

My colleagues, we have come a long way in balancing the budget. Let us not fail now. Let us show the discipline to say, yes, we want these things; yes, we want to invest in the infrastructure of America but let us do it in a way where we are going to pay for it before we do it. That 437 percent increase in the debt was because we did not answer that question first.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINE), who was my partner in trying to put forward a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. MINE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to briefly say that all of us support transportation. We think it is vital in our country; it is important; it is our infrastructure. At the same time, all of us are sensitive to the practical needs of the States.

I think the important thing to recognize is that the bill reported out of Committee does not increase the spending in 1998 above the budget agreement. We do not have to worry about ruining the States' ability to construct roads in 1998 or let contracts. That is not what is at issue here. That is a red herring.

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

We spent 11 years trying to get our country's financial house in order. We are so close. And now we are spending the surplus we do not even have. We gave the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure $20 billion above last year's agreement. We are giving them another $26 to $33 billion this year. We do not even have offsets.

For me, this is an amazing time. I salute my colleagues on the other side who have done this in a bipartisan way. But we spent 30 years having deficits in a bipartisan way. I thought we had ended that.

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

A 2-month short-term extension is terrible policy for our State transportation departments, for the people...
across America. This will destroy the construction season for many if not all of the States. There will be insufficient funding for the States to have certainty to proceed with projects. And, indeed, this will extend the unfair Senate-imposed delay which we are living with now. And most importantly in that regard, the donor States will have to wait another year for the formula changes to take place; and Member projects will be delayed for another year.

Now, my good friend on the other side said, “This is not money from heaven.” How true that is. This is not money from heaven. This is money from the gas tax paid by the American people at the pump, and we do not spend one penny more than the revenue coming in.

Defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). The amendment was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 6 printed in Part II of House Report 105-476.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Part II amendment No. 6 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. KASICH: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Transportation Empowerment Act.”

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the objective of the Federal highway program has been to facilitate the construction of a modern freeway system that promotes efficient interstate commerce by connecting all States;

(B) each State has the responsibility of providing an efficient transportation network for the residents of the State;

(C) each State has the means to build and operate a network of transportation systems, including highways, that best serves the needs of the State;

(D) States that are best capable of determining the needs of the State and acting on those needs;

(E) the Federal role in highway transportation in each State is best served by taxing fuels used in the States and then distributing the proceeds to the States based on the Federal Government’s perceptions of what is best for the States;

(F) the Federal Government has used the Federal gasoline tax revenues to force all States to take actions that are not necessarily appropriate for individual States;

(G) the Federal distribution, review, and enforcement process wastes billions of dollars on programs, and activities that the States would not otherwise undertake;

(H) Congress has expressed a strong interest in reducing the role of the Federal Government by allowing each State to manage its own affairs;

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(A) to return to the individual States maximum discretionary authority and fiscal responsibility for all elements of the national transportation systems that are not within the direct purview of the Federal Government;

(B) to preserve Federal responsibility for the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways;

(C) to preserve the responsibility of the Department of Transportation for—

(1) design, construction, and preservation of transportation facilities on Federal public lands;

(2) national programs of transportation research and development and transportation safety;

(3) and emergency assistance to the States in response to natural disasters;

(4) to eliminate to the maximum extent practicable Federal obstacles to the ability of each State to apply innovative solutions to the financing, design, construction, operation, and preservation of State and Federal transportation facilities;

(5) with respect to transportation activities carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector, to encourage—

(A) competition among States, local governments, and the private sector; and

(B) innovation, energy efficiency, private sector participation and activity.

SEC. 3. CONTINUATION OF FUNDING FOR CORE HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.

(1) FUNDING.—For the purpose of carrying out title 23, United States Code, the following sums are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund:

(B) INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM.—For each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(i) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that a State determines that funds made available under this title to the State for a purpose are in excess of the needs of the State for that purpose, the State may transfer the excess funds to, and use the excess funds for, any surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purpose in the State.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has transferred funds under paragraph (1) to a purpose that is not a surface transportation purpose as described in paragraph (1), the amount of the improperly transferred funds shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year that begins after the date of the determination.

(3) FEDERAL-ASSISTED SYSTEM.—Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “systems under the Interstate System and the National Highway System” and inserting “system is the Interstate System”.

(4) INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM.—

(A) FUNDING.—Section 204(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, for the Interstate maintenance program under section 119, 1 percent to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the remaining 99 percent apportioned as follows:

(ii) FOR each State with an average population density of 20 persons or fewer per square mile, and each State with a population of 1,500 persons or fewer and with a land area of 10,000 square miles or less, the greater of—

“(aa) a percentage share of apportionments equal to the percentage listed for the State in subclause (I) or

(bb) a share determined under clause (ii).

“(III) The percentage referred to in subclause (I)(aa) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEC. 4. PROJECTS AND ELIGIBILITY.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—For each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, for the Interstate maintenance program under section 119, 1 percent to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the remaining 99 percent apportioned as follows:

(i) FOR each State with an average population density of 20 persons or fewer per square mile, and each State with a population of 1,500 persons or fewer and with a land area of 10,000 square miles or less, the greater of—

“(aa) a percentage share of apportionments equal to the percentage listed for the State in subclause (I) or

(bb) a share determined under clause (ii).

“(III) The percentage referred to in subclause (I)(aa) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEC. 5. FUNDING FOR THE INDIAN RESERVATION BRIDGE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the Interstate maintenance program under section 119, 1 percent to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the remaining 99 percent apportioned as follows:

(ii) FOR each State with an average population density of 20 persons or fewer per square mile, and each State with a population of 1,500 persons or fewer and with a land area of 10,000 square miles or less, the greater of—

“(aa) a percentage share of apportionments equal to the percentage listed for the State in subclause (I) or

(bb) a share determined under clause (ii).

“(III) The percentage referred to in subclause (I)(aa) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEC. 6. FUNDING FOR THE INDIAN RESERVATION BRIDGE PROGRAM.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—For the Interstate and Indian reservation bridge program under section 119, 1 percent to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the remaining 99 percent apportioned as follows:

(i) FOR each State with an average population density of 20 persons or fewer per square mile, and each State with a population of 1,500 persons or fewer and with a land area of 10,000 square miles or less, the greater of—

“(aa) a percentage share of apportionments equal to the percentage listed for the State in subclause (I) or

(bb) a share determined under clause (ii).

“(III) The percentage referred to in subclause (I)(aa) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kansas...........................1.10
Kentucky..........................1.91
Louisiana.........................1.63
Maine..................................0.50
Maryland............................1.04
Massachusetts......................1.68
Michigan.............................3.34
Minnesota.........................1.56
Mississippi.......................1.23
Missouri..............................2.45
Montana...............................0.95
Nebraska............................0.73
Nevada..............................0.67
New Hampshire......................0.48
New Jersey.........................2.28
New Mexico.........................1.05
New York.............................4.27
North Carolina.......................2.83
North Dakota.......................0.63
Ohio.................................3.77
Oklahoma..............................1.55
Oregon...............................1.23
Pennsylvania.......................4.12
Puerto Rico.........................0.50
Rhode Island.........................0.55
South Carolina......................1.63
South Dakota.......................0.76
Tennessee............................2.30
Texas..................................7.21
Utah....................................0.71
Vermont...............................0.43
Virginia...............................2.61
Washington...........................1.75
West Virginia.......................0.76
Wisconsin.............................1.91
Wyoming..............................0.66.

(“(ii) For each State not described in clause (i), a share of the apportionments remaining is determined in accordance with the following formula: (I) ¼ in the ratio that the total rural lane miles in each State bears to the total rural lane miles in all States described in subclause (I); (II) ¼ in the ratio that the total urban vehicle miles traveled in each State bears to the total urban vehicle miles traveled in all States described in subclause (I); (III) ¼ in the ratio that the total urban lane miles in each State bears to the total urban lane miles in all States described in subclause (I); (IV) ¼ in the ratio that the total urban vehicle miles traveled in each State bears to the total urban vehicle miles traveled in all States described in subclause (I); (V) ¼ in the ratio that the total diesel fuel used in each State bears to the total diesel fuel used in all States described in subclause (I); (VI) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting "through fiscal year 1999 after thereafter." (B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 119(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended— (i) in paragraph (1), by striking "11" and inserting "For each of fiscal years 1991 through 1997, if"; and (ii) by paragraph (2)(B), by inserting "through fiscal year 1997 after thereafter.

5) INTERSTATE BRIDGE PROGRAM.—Section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended— (A) in subsection (d)— (i) by inserting "on the Federal-aid system as described in subsection (c)(3)" after "highway bridge" each place it appears; and (ii) by inserting "on the Federal-aid system as described in subsection (c)(3)" after "highway bridge" each place it appears; (B) in the second sentence of subsection (e)— (i) in paragraph (1), by adding "and" at the end; (ii) by paragraph (2), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a period; and (iii) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4); (C) in the first sentence of subsection (l), by inserting "on the Federal-aid system as described in subsection (c)(3)" after "any bridge"; (D) in subsection (m), by inserting "on the Federal-aid system as described in subsection (c)(3)" after "any bridge"; and (E) in the first sentence of subsection (n), by inserting "for each of fiscal years 1991 through 1997," after "of law".

4) NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS.—Section 311 of title 23, United States Code, is amended— (A) in the first sentence, by striking "under subsection 104 of this title" and inserting "to carry out this section"; and (B) by striking the second sentence.

7) TERMINATION OF MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Section 157 of title 23, United States Code, is amended— (A) in subsection (a)(4), by striking "fiscal year 1991 thereafter" and inserting "each of fiscal years 1992 through 1997"; and (B) in subsection (b), by striking "the fiscal years ending on or after September 30, 1983" and inserting "fiscal years 1983 through 1997."
each fiscal year after 1998 and before 2003, the Secretary shall transfer \$300,000,000 from the Highway Trust Fund to Infrastructure Special Assistance Fund.

(2) Long States from Infrastructure Special Assistance Fund.—

"(A) TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), for fiscal years 1999 through 2002, the amount in the Infrastructure Special Assistance Fund shall be available to States for transportation-related program expenditure.

"(ii) STATE SHARE.—

"(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), the Secretary shall apportion the amounts transferred under paragraph (2) among the States in proportion to the percentage of each State's share of the amount specified in paragraph (2) upon enactment of legislation providing 1 of the 2 funding mechanisms described in clause (ii). To the extent that the Secretary determines that the percentage of each State's share of the amount specified in paragraph (2) upon enactment of legislation providing 1 of the 2 funding mechanisms described in clause (ii) exceeds 15\%, the Secretary shall reduce the Percentage of the amount specified in paragraph (2) upon enactment of legislation providing 1 of the 2 funding mechanisms described in clause (ii) by the amount determined by the Secretary.

"(B) ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Infrastructure Special Assistance Fund, in addition to the amount specified in paragraph (2), shall be provided, as available, by appropriations Acts, to the States for any surface transportation-related program expenditure (mass transit and rail) purpose in such States, and the Secretary shall apportion such excess amounts among all States using the percentages determined under clause (ii)(I)(aa) for such States.

"(ii) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has used amounts under clause (i)(aa) for a purpose which is not a surface transportation purpose as described in clause (i), the improperly used amounts shall be deducted from any amount that the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year which begins after the date of the determination.

"(B) ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Infrastructure Special Assistance Fund, in addition to the amount specified in paragraph (2), shall be provided, as available, by appropriations Acts, to the States for any surface transportation-related program expenditure (mass transit and rail) purpose in such States, and the Secretary shall apportion such excess amounts among all States using the percentages determined under clause (ii)(I)(aa) for such States.

"(ii) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has used amounts under clause (i)(aa) for a purpose which is not a surface transportation purpose as described in clause (i), the improperly used amounts shall be deducted from any amount that the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year which begins after the date of the determination.

"(C) PROVIDE OTHER ASSISTANCE.—Other assistance referred to in subparagraph (A) and (B) includes any use of funds for the purpose of—

"(1) promote the continuity, quality, and safety of the Interstate System;

"(2) develop programs to promote and fund surface transportation safety initiatives and establish surface transportation safety standards for the participating States;

"(3) conduct long-term planning for surface transportation infrastructure in the participating States;

"(4) develop design and construction standards for infrastructure banks described in paragraph (3) to be used by the participating States, and

"(5) establish surface transportation infrastructure banks to promote regional or other multistate investment in infrastructure described in paragraph (3).

"(D) INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An infrastructure bank may—

"(A) make loans;

"(B) provide other assistance to public or private entities constructing, or proposing to construct, or initiate, surface transportation projects;

"(C) provide other assistance to public or private entities constructing, or proposing to construct or initiate, surface transportation projects;

"(D) INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An infrastructure bank may—

"(A) make loans;

"(B) provide other assistance to public or private entities constructing, or proposing to construct, or initiate, surface transportation projects;

"(C) provide other assistance to public or private entities constructing, or proposing to construct or initiate, surface transportation projects;

"(E) SUBORDINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The amount of any loan or other assistance described in subparagraph (C) to a public or private entity in an amount equal to all or part of the construction cost, capital cost, or initiation cost of a surface transportation project, and

"(F) SUBORDINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The amount of any loan or other assistance described in subparagraph (C) to a public or private entity in an amount equal to all or part of the construction cost, capital cost, or initiation cost of a surface transportation project.
(i) credit enhancement;  
(ii) a capital reserve for bond or debt instrument financing;  
(iii) bond or debt instrument financing issuance costs;  
(iv) bond or debt issuance financing insurance;  
(v) subsidization of interest rates;  
(vi) letters of credit;  
(vii) any credit instrument;  
(viii) bond or debt financing instrument security; and 
(ix) any other form of debt financing that relates to the qualifying surface transportation project.

(3) NO OBLIGATION OF UNITED STATES.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The establishment under this section of an infrastructure bank does not constitute a commitment, guarantee, or obligation on the part of the United States.
(B) STATEMENT ON INSTRUMENT.—Any security or debt financing instrument issued by an infrastructure bank shall expressly state that the security or instrument does not constitute a commitment, guarantee, or obligation on the part of the United States.
(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on October 1, 1998.

SEC. 7. FEDERAL-AID FACILITY PRIVATIZATION.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Executive agency shall—
(i) execute an agreement with a State or local government, or a private party,
(ii) subject to subsection (c), approve requests from State and local governments to privatize transportation infrastructure assets and sets or modify any condition relating to the original Federal program that funded the asset.
(b) CRITERIA.—The head of an Executive agency shall approve a request described in subsection (a) if—
(I) the State or local government demonstrates that a market mechanism, legally enforceable agreement, or regulatory mechanism will ensure that the transportation infrastructure asset will continue to be used for the general objectives of the original Federal program.

There are authorized to be appropriated—
(1)¢
(2) $988,000,000, of which—
(A) $304,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(B) $95,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(C) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.
(2) $889,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, of which—
(A) $212,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(B) $97,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(C) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.
(3) $916,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, of which—
(A) $119,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(B) $100,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(C) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.
(4) $941,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, of which—
(A) $27,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(B) $10,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(C) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out this chapter—
(1) $304,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(2) $95,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(3) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out this chapter—
(1) $304,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(2) $95,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(3) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out this chapter—
(1) $304,000,000 shall be used to carry out sections 5307 and 5309;
(2) $95,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 5311; and
(3) the amount remaining after allocation under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.
used at the discretion of the Secretary, including for capital expenditure under this chapter.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by this section takes effect on October 1, 1998.

SEC. 10. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report to Congress describing such technical and conforming amendments to titles 23, 42, and 49 of United States Code, and such technical and conforming amendments to other laws, as are necessary to bring those titles and these laws into conformity with the policy embodied in this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENT UPON CERTIFICATION OF DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.

(a) Purpose.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that—

(1) this Act will become effective only if the Director of the Office of Management and Budget certifies that this Act is deficit neutral;

(2) discretionary spending limits are reduced to capture the savings realized in devolving transportation functions to the State level; and

(3) the reduction made by this Act is not scored under pay-as-you-go and thereby inadverently trigger a sequester.

(b) Effective Date Contingency.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect only if—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the "Director") submits the report as required in subsection (c); and

(2) the report contains a certification by the Director that the reduction in discretionary outlays resulting from the enactment of this Act (assuming appropriation amounts described in paragraph (2)(B)) is at least as great as the sum of the net reduction in receipts and direct spending provided in this Act for each fiscal year through 2003;

(c) OMB Estimates and Report.—

(1) Rebuttal.—Not later than 7 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall—

(A) change in receipts and in direct spending resulting from the enactment of this Act for each fiscal year through 2003;

(B) estimate the net change in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in budget authority under this Act for each fiscal year through 2003;

(2) Determination, based on those estimates, whether the reduction in discretionary outlays resulting from the enactment of this Act (assuming appropriation amounts described in paragraph (2)(B)) is at least as great as the sum of the net reduction in receipts and direct spending provided in this Act for each fiscal year through 2003;

(d) submit to the Congress a report setting forth the estimates and determination.

(2) Applicable Assumptions and Guidelines.—

(A) Revenue and Direct Spending Estimates.—The revenue and direct spending estimates required under paragraph (1)(A) shall be predicated on the economic and technical assumptions and scoring guidelines that would be used for estimates made pursuant to section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

(B) Outlay Estimates.—The outlay estimates required under paragraph (1)(B) shall be determined by comparing the estimated amounts of discretionary outlays that would flow from the new budget authority authorized in this Act on the assumption that subsequent appropriation Acts will provide amounts consistent with this Act (and that obligations limited set forth in such appropriation Acts, if any, the corresponding amounts provided in this Act) and the corresponding amounts of discretionary outlays assumed in House Concurrent Resolution 84 (105th Congress and House Report 105-136.

(3) Conforming Adjustment to Discretionary Spending Limits.—Upon compliance with the requirements specified in subsection (b), the Director shall adjust the adjusted discretionary spending limits for each fiscal year under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kasich) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

Mr. Kasich. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Well, the thing I want to do is just point out to the House and to my colleagues on the floor tonight who may study government, I think it is very interesting and think even a cause for optimism to recognize the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Shuster) and I have been locked in a titanic struggle now for the course of the last several years; and I think what we can conclude from this is that it has been possible for two people to be able to take opposite positions based firmly on their own principles and yet at the same time to be able to maintain a good relationship and never to make the fight personal.

I hope that in some small way maybe down the road this debate will serve as somewhat of a model to those that engage at times on this floor in very heated debates based on very firmly held principles. So I think this is a very bright day for the House of Representatives from the standpoint of how, in fact, we conduct our debates. Let me start with this.

I call it the turn-back proposal. I do not want any other Members to do what they have to do. I introduce it to ask the States to turn back to the States.

What I wanted to propose today is what I believe will ultimately happen in this country. And I must tell my colleagues, I am disappointed that our Republicans who want to turn power, money, and influence back to people in local communities and to the States have not actually adopted this program, but rather try to look at it all from the national perspective.

Mr. Chairman, what I propose today is to take the money that we put in and to send it back, what we are suggesting is that we would repeal this whole Federal program; and we would essentially say to the States, they tax themselves at the pump, they pave their own roads, they make their own decisions, and they use their own regulatory authority to decide how they are going to do things.

In a nutshell, what we are suggesting is rather than the States tax themselves at the pump and send their money to Washington so that we can then send it back, what we are suggesting is they never send the money to Washington in the first place. Because we all know what happens when we try to send money to Washington, it never comes back the way we want, and it never comes back in the amount we want.

So what we are suggesting going into the next century is that they get to keep their money at home, they get to make their decisions based on what their transportation needs are, that the Federal Government will only have the responsibility for maintaining the interstate system and helping those States that are in trouble.

And how do they come out? At the end of the day, bingo, 32 States in America would benefit from this program; if they live in Texas, if they live in California, if they live in Florida, if they live in Ohio, they will get to tax themselves, keep their own money, and we will also not have these onerous Federal regulations that the State Department of Transportation argues costs as much as 30 percent on each project.

There would be six States that would break even. But that would not be true, because when we cut the Federal regulations, the States would be far ahead.
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Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Interestingly enough, while this would simply turn projects back to the States, ironically there is a greater need for us to have a coordinated, tied-together national transportation system than ever. Why? Because more people and more goods are moving interstate than ever before. I think it is important.

I think it is important to recognize that 64 percent of all truck traffic travels interstate now. I think it is important to recognize that earlier today, a great example, Oklahoma City, where two interstates intersect, 60 percent of the license plates are out of State license plates.

Indeed, there is a greater need to have this tied together than ever before. Our bill not only does that, but it also gives flexibilities to the States and the cities by saying that 50 percent of the funding in each category can be flexibly moved about to other categories.

Beyond that, understand, this amendment keeps the 43 cents here in Washington and does not spend it. So we are back to the same old game, the shell game of taxing the American people for gas taxes. It is keeping that money here and not spending it.

Beyond that, this amendment has not been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. This amendment exempts the pay-as-you-go provisions of the bill for which we criticized.

So for all of these reasons, it is very important that we reject this amendment. It is very important, also, to recognize that, of the money that comes to Washington now, only 1 percent stays down here at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.
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Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.

Indeed, I can tell you that, on the average, each State would have to pass the State gas tax increasing it by 15 cents a gallon. So what assurance do we have in Washington now, only 1 percent stays here down at the Department of Transportation for administrative purposes, 88 percent goes back to the States through the congressional projects, and only 1 percent stays in Washington.

Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.
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Further, State regulations, which in many cases are as onerous, if not more onerous, than Federal regulations, would obviously stay in place. Indeed, we have no assurance whatsoever that, if we turn this back to the States, the States would pass and increase their gas taxes.
Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Kolbe).

Mr. Kolbe.

Mr. Kolbe. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, everything that was just said makes a great deal of sense provided that we stipulate that the Federal Government is the low-cost provider, that the most efficient way to get the most roads, the most bridges, and the most transportation is to send the money to Washington first where the freight charges can be deducted or turn through the bureaucracy here and then shipped back to the States.

If we think that Washington is the best way to do it, getting the Washington bureaucracy involved is the most efficient way to do it, then, by all means, keep sending our gas taxes to Washington, D.C., even after the Interstate Highway Program was all finished, which it was in 1991.

If we think the Washington bureaucracy is the low-cost provider, then, by all means, vote for the status quo. If we think Washington knows best, send all our money back here. But if we want more transportation, more highways, more bridges, more infrastructure, more transit, then take the full dollar of gas tax and spend it at home.

This program guarantees us a full 90 percent of what we send to Washington. It is time to get 100 percent. That is what this amendment will do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer).

Mr. Blumenauer. Mr. Chairman, since the founding of this Republic, the Federal Government has been integrally involved with developing an infrastructure system: railroads, freeways, airports, ports, and inland waterways. And it has provided us a national system that has made this country great. But today, it is fraying at the edges.

This proposal, the turn-back proposal, I think is appropriately named, because just when we are on the verge of getting it right under the ISTEA formula, we would be turning back to States that have varied, highly restricted constitutional provisions on how they can spend the money. They would be turning their back on many of the environmental priorities, transit priorities, and the strong national system that we have for bicycles. We would be turning our back on many of these areas.

Onerous Federal regulations that the gentleman from Ohio refers to strikes me as somewhat humorous. I am not running for President, but I have been in 30 American communities over the last year talking about ISTEA and transportation. I tell my colleagues to a certainty, in community after community, it is balanced budget advocacy that enabled for the first time cities and regions to have a voice that were ignored by State transportation commissions in State after State.

This is not a vote for the future. It is a turning our back on the partnerships that can make America great.
level in the State of Ohio or any other State. I can point the gentleman to half a billion dollars of road projects within spitting distance of the State capital that we share in Columbus, Ohio. I can also point the gentleman to roads in my area of the State where for 26 years there have been promises made, where young people die every day and improvements never come.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman’s amendment takes the decision out of the hands of 435 Members of this House, who are elected by 600,000 people and gives it to 50 men and women across this country who are elected by millions. H.R. 2400, BESTEA, makes sure that local decision-making is preserved. Ohio receives $300 million more per year than it received under ISTEA. This bill is a good bill, and it needs to be passed.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCRALE).

Mr. MCRALE. Mr. Chairman I oppose the “turn your back” amendment. The Kasich amendment would lower the gasoline tax by virtually eliminating Federal support for our Nation’s highways.

Last week my wife Kathy bought a gallon of gasoline in my district for 99 cents. We may have among the cheaper gasoline in the Western World. Mr. Chairman, we do not need cheaper gas, we need better safer highways.

A few minutes ago my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) attacked the proposed redefinition of the industrial waterfront in Allentown, Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Oklahoma has never visited the site; I live 2 miles away. The gentleman from Oklahoma has never spoken to the low-income families who live in the area; I have many times.

The ISTEA funding in this bill will provide roads and access ramps to reclaim and restore a brownfield site located in one of Pennsylvania’s largest cities. There could be, I pledge to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) and others, there could be no more honorable investment of public funds.

What a meaningless victory if we do not preserve the budget but abandon our cities. What a callous misjudgment if we protect our wallets but abandon our people.

I urge a “no” vote on the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) one of my cosponsors.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the first question it seems like we should ask ourselves. How do we most efficiently and most effectively get bridges and roads repaired in this country? One problem with the money coming to Washington and then going back to the States is there is too many strings attached when it goes back to the States.

Gabriel Roth, in his book “Roads in a Market Economy,” estimates that the Federal regulations that go back with that money increase the cost of roads and bridges by 50 percent. Other road economists estimate that it is 40 percent. Talking about politics played, we use this money as blackmail. We say to States, “Unless you do things our way, we’re not going to give you the road money. Unless you do your environmental regulations our way, you don’t get your road money.”

If we want to get ahead of the politics, if we want to develop more efficient construction and utilization to build a road and bridge system in this country that is badly in need of repair, then let us let the money stay in the States in the first place instead of running it through the Washington bureaucracy.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I am just delighted that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the author of this amendment, was not in the Eisenhower Cabinet or in the Bureau of Roads, as it was kept in those days, because goodness knows we would never have had a Highway Trust Fund, we would have never had an interstate highway program; he would have just let the States do their thing and fumble as they have been doing. He would take us back to a time that none of us here could possibly imagine, a time when some States started roads, others did not, they built it up to a certain point and then it stopped. Bridges were started and then stopped.

If we follow the gentleman’s logic all the way through, we would have bridges that go halfway across a river because one State would want to build it but the other State would not or would run out of money, or we would have roads that go up to a State’s border and the other State would say, “Well, we don’t think we want to build a road there.”

I mean, he would have us in chaos, he would have us back in 14th century England when the rule was that the owner of a castle had to repair the road in front of their castle so that the carriages riding along would not be stuck in the potholes, and if they did, then they had to pull them out. He would set us back, not forward.

This is a vote for the past, not a vote for the future. This is a vote for a childlike lack of transportation in America, one that exists solely in the mind of its author but does not exist in reality.

If we are going to be a Nation, and if my colleagues believe in the Constitution that said that all spendable money of the Congress shall be to build post roads, that it shall have authority over interstate and foreign commerce, then it is our duty to promote interstate and foreign commerce, and the way to do it is through transportation, and we do that.

This legislation that we bring to the floor today continues the greatest movement of, mobility of people and goods, the greatest thrust for economic growth that this country or any country has undertaken. Our transportation network has given America the thrust to be a world power.

Let us not retreat to the past. Let us vote for the future, for BESTEA, and vote down the Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, a donor State is better off under Kasich. If my colleagues believe that States can do some things better than the Federal Government, vote for Kasich. If my colleagues want highways off budget, let us really take them off budget, keep the dollars at home and vote for Kasich.

There is or there should be a Federal role in the highway area, but this bill is so incredibly irresponsible. Forty-four percent over the last bill, $40 billion, none of the budget; it demonstrates this Congress has lost all manner of self-control on this issue and does not deserve to have its hands on the dollars in this bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said a moment ago, oh, this amendment is not scored. I could not help but laugh. Give me a break. This bill has been scored, and it is a $40 billion budgetbuster.

We are told 50 Governors support the bill. What Governor do we not see in this posture, with his hand out half the time? We had 40 of those Governors last year tell us to pass the same budget that now they are telling us to bust. That is ridiculous.

Last year when we passed the welfare reform bill we told people that there was no longer any need to keep Federal standards under how we took care of poor people. If that is the case, there is certainly no need to maintain Federal standards on congestion.

Vote for the Kasich amendment. It gets us out of the most irresponsible mess I have seen in this Congress in at least a week.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I would just like to make a few points.

The Kasich amendment, hearing some of the people describe it, sounds like a pretty good idea: Keep the money in the States where it is generated and where it can be spent most efficiently, instead of sending it out to Washington and having all sorts of red tape added and then sending it back so we do not get as much investment for our infrastructure as we pay for.

Is that what the Kasich amendment does? No, last time I checked, what with the Federal tax at 18.4 cents, how much does the Kasich amendment send back? 18.4 cents? No, 11 cents. What happens to the rest? Stays in
Washington, at least a lot of it, and is spent on other things.

So in my State, in Wisconsin, what is being said? This is saying we want to increase taxes at the State level because we will give them in Washington 11 cents to maintain the transportation investment in their infrastructure they will have to raise their gas taxes how much? 11 cents? No, 15 cents.

As my colleagues know, the Governors and a lot of experts watching what is happening in our national Federal system have been pointing out that people in Washington cut back on spending and it has to be picked up at the State and local level and higher taxes at the State and local level, and then we pat ourselves on the back for supposedly cutting burdens when all we are doing is shifting it to the State and local level.

The Governors have been criticized here on this floor, but I think they are elected too and are due our respect. They were out here just a few weeks ago pointing out that over the last 20 years the Federal percentage of investment in our transportation infrastructure have been gradually declining. We have been talking pretty big out here, but we have been transferring the budget responsibility, the need for raising the revenue to maintain our roads and bridges in the United States, from Washington back to the State and local units of government. This would radically accelerate that, and it would basically short-change every State in the United States by about 4 cents.

Please vote ‘no.’

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I would like to remind my colleagues that in the 1990s when the Federal highway program started it was recognized that it was an improper function of the Federal Government. Therefore the Congress back then, they were still recognizing that the Constitution had some effect as well as the President; they had to come up for a reason for the highway projects, so they did it under national defense.

Of course today we do not debate that issue, but in that light, but I think we see the results of doing something that was not proper. Today it is very expensive, it is very bureaucratic, and we have seen tonight in the debate how it has become politicized.

So we are looking for a fair way to build highways, a more efficient way to build highways, I think this is the answer. This is not going backwards, this is going forward. This would be the first time we could have a national highway system controlled in the States where it is supposed to be. The States would have more money, not less money. They would have less regulation, not more regulation.

This is much better than block grants. This is returning responsibility to the States. I compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Brookhaven, Mississippi (Mr. PARKER).

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich amendment. Tim Penny, I saw him yesterday, and Tim made a statement to me which I find fascinating. He said he felt he owed an apology to some of the liberal Democratic chairmen of Senate bills that they had written. He thought there was a lot of pork in them, and he found out that, no, that was not really right; that this particular bill that has been brought forth puts the rest of them to shame.

Now, if you think this bill is going to become law as it is, it is not. The Senate is not going to pass this bill, and I pray to God that the President of the United States vetoes it.

The interesting point is this: Can you imagine the depths that we have sunk to when we have to depend on the other body and the President of the United States to show fiscal responsibility? I predict that this vote will be one of the worst votes, if you vote for this bill, of any vote you have ever cast, if you are a conservative, a fiscal conservative and believe in fiscal responsibility. You will rue the day you voted for this.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just make it clear: What we want to do is keep 3 cents in Washington to maintain the current interstate system. If you come from Montana, where you are losing in this bill, we are going to keep a penny here to help you and the other heavy transit States. We are going to repeal the 4.3 cents enacted in 1993 that every Republican voted against, and we are going to get rid of the rest of the gas tax that the States levy their own roads and manage their own roads with their own regulations.

I do not think that we are going to have any halfway built bridges that are going to end in the middle of a river. I think they are smarter than that. I know this, they are not lot smarter at home than they are right here in Washington.

Vote for the Kasich amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we hear about turning back to the States, but all 50 State Governors support BESTEA, not the amendments in front of us. Indeed, I have a letter from Governor Whitman of New Jersey in which she says turn back what hurt our State’s ability to move people and goods throughout the Northeast corridor. That is the way it is across America. Why? Because more people are traveling interstate than ever before.

And do not be fooled by this pig in a poke. This does not turn back the 4.3 cents. This does not rescind the 4.3 cents. This amendment does nothing but keep the 4.3 cents, which amounts to $6.5 billion a year. Here in Washington, not to be spent on highways, but to be spent to mask and disguise the same old Ponzi scheme of using this money rather than building highways in America.

Indeed, my good friend from Ohio talks about the regulations here. Only 1 percent of the money stays in Washington for the Department of Transportation. But we Republicans control the Congress. If we want to change the regulations then let us go do it. And, indeed, we hope that we will control the White House a few years from now, and indeed it may well be the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who will be the next President of the United States. And if he is the next President of the United States, I will join with him in changing these regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will be postponed.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series of votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GRAHAM

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM); Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT); and Amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series of votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GRAHAM

The pending business is the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) 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.
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RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 337, answered “present” 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—79

Archer
Bakewell
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Boehner
Bonilla
Burr
Campbell
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Cole
Collins
Costello
Cox
Cubin
Deal
Deutch
DeVito
Dreier
Duncan
Dykema
Engel
Emerson
Ensign
Fallon
Fattah
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
Fazio
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Fazio
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Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BERMAN and Mr. STARK changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I take this moment to express my deep appreciation to the staff on the Democratic side, David Heynsfeld, Sante Esposito, Ken House, Rosalyn Millman.
Ward McCarragher, Jim Zola, Steve Dubois, and to Jack Schenendorf, staff director on the Republican side, for the splendid cooperation and the many hard hours of work that they have devoted to this legislation.

And to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Shuster), Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say that his 26 years of service in this body have been unflaggingly devoted to advancing the cause of transportation, its safety, mobility, and economic growth and its impact on America. Some of our colleagues serving in this body are fortunate enough to get an amendment adopted. A rare few get a bill enacted into law. But a rare trailblazer makes an impact on legislation that will outlive his service in this body.

Yours is that monumental service. The bill we are about to adopt by, I am confident, an overwhelming vote will be an everlasting tribute to the years of professional service you have given to the people of America and to the cause of transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is the engrossment and third amendment.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be returned to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A recorded vote was ordered to be taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 337, noes 80, 10, answered “present” 3, not voting 10, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES—337</th>
<th>[Roll No. 98]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie</td>
<td>Fawell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Filner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aderholt</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Fosella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armey</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Frank (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arseo</td>
<td>Frank (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baca</td>
<td>Fratlinghusen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldacci</td>
<td>Frost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td>Gallegly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Ganske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>Gejdenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becerra</td>
<td>Gehrke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>Gehring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>Gibbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilbray</td>
<td>Gilchrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Goin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blagoevich</td>
<td>Goode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billey</td>
<td>Goodlatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenauer</td>
<td>Goodling (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehlert</td>
<td>Granger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bono</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosko</td>
<td>Greenwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boswell</td>
<td>Gutierrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucher</td>
<td>Gurbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td>Hall (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (CA)</td>
<td>Hanlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (FL)</td>
<td>Harman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>Hastert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunning</td>
<td>Hastings (WA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Hefner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>Hensley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callahan</td>
<td>Hilderbrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Hinchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>Hinshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Hoyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capps</td>
<td>Hoyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnahan</td>
<td>Hostetler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Hulshof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyburn</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coble</td>
<td>Ickes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Jackson (IL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condit</td>
<td>Jackson-Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conyers</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooksey</td>
<td>Johnson (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello</td>
<td>Johnson (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Johnson, E. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Johnson, Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Karkazis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Kennedy (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danner</td>
<td>Kennedy (RI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (IL)</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Davis (VA) | Kelly 
| DeFazio | Kildee |
| DeGette | Kilpatrick |
| Delahunt | Kim |
| Delauro | King (NY) |
| Delaney | Kiezczak |
| DelBianco | Kline |
| Delancy | Knollenberg |
| D din | Kuncl |
| Dingell | Lautaro |
| Doggett | Lasto |
| Doolittle | Lazio |
| Doyley | Leach |
| Dreier | Levin |
| Duncan | Lewis (CA) |
| Dunn | Lewis (KY) |
| Ehlers | Linder |
| Ehrlich | Lipinski |
| Emerson | Livingston |
| Engel | Lobiondo |
| English | Lowey |
| Ensign | Loebsack |
| Eshoo | Luther |
| Etheridge | Maloney (CT) |
| Evans | Maloney (NY) |
| Everett | Manton |
| Ewing | Markey |
| Farr | Martinez (MI) |

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 337, noes 80, answered “present” 3, not voting 10, as follows:

Mascara | Matlow |
| McCarthy (MO) | McCarthy (NY) |
| McCollum | McDaniel |
| McDermed | McGovern |
| McKeal | McHugh |
| Mcintosh | McInnis |
| McIntyre | McGrady |
| McKinney | McNulty |
| Meek | MEP |
| Meek (FL) | Meek (NY) |
| Menendez | Metcalf |
| Miller | McMillan |
| Millender | McDonald |
| Pickering | Pickett |
| Piskory | Plossili |
| Paxon | Pastore |
| Paxson | Pezola |
| Pezola | Petersen (MN) |
| Petersen (PA) | Petri |
| Pickering | Pickett |
| Pitts | Pombo |
| Pocan | Price (NC) |
| Price (OH) | Pricey |
| Quinn | Rahall |
| Ramirez | Redmond |
| Regular | Reyes |
| Riggs | Riley |
| Rivers | Rodriguez |
| Roemisch | Rogers |
| Rogers | Rohman |
| Rohman | Roukema |
| Roukema | Royal-Allard |
| Dixon | Rush |
| Sanchez | Sandlin |
| Sanders | Sawyer |
| Saxton | Schaffer, Dan |
| Schlueter | Schumacher |
| Scott | Serrano |
| Shaw | Sherman |
| Sherman | Shumlin |
| Shuster | Sikorski |
| Skiel | Skeen |
| Skelton | Smaltz |
| Smallet | Smith (MI) |

NOT VOTING—10

Cannon | Payne |
| Gonzalez | Ranger |
| Jefferson | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Klug | Royce |

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote: Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for, with Mr. Yates against

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1998:

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2400, to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members
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