

Moreover, HEB has always had a practice of reaching out to the community. Never just a policy, but always a tradition, the practice of helping those in need has only become stronger under the leadership of Charles Butt. Time and time again, he has been there to help communities in need. When flood-waters ravaged the small city of Del Rio, Texas in August, HEB was there. Within hours of this tragedy, HEB tankers carrying 5,500 gallons of water were stationed at the Del Rio stores around the clock, and construction experts with the company were on site helping this city to rebuild. Charles Butt personally was on the scene to assist in whatever way he could.

The spirit of HEB can be seen not only in times of crises, but in everyday programs that reflect the company's desire to feed the hungry. HEB has revolutionized the food banking efforts with its support of twenty food banks—eighteen in Texas and two in Mexico. Since 1983 HEB supported food banks have shared more than 150 million pounds of donated food and merchandise with some 6,000 organizations. The list of charitable works goes on and on.

Again, I want to say how delighted I am that Charles C. Butt has been selected to receive this recognition. He is a man who represents the best in our country—a personal devotion to service, a professional commitment to excellence, and a visionary grasp of the opportunities open to all Americans.

Thank you for all your contributions, and I am glad to have this opportunity to add my accolades to this well-deserved honor. Congratulations, Mr. Border Texan!

THE GIFT OF LIFE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL ACT OF 1999

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are proud to introduce the "Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of 1999." This legislation creates a commemorative medal to honor organ donors and their survivors.

There is a serious shortage of available and suitable organ donors. Over 50,000 people are currently waiting for an organ transplant. Because of low donor rates, over 4,000 people die each year for lack of a suitable organ. Some patients also wait significantly longer for a transplant depending on where they live. In some parts of the country, the typical wait for an organ transplant is close to 100 days. In other parts of the country, the wait is closer to 1,000 days. We need to use every possible option to increase the number of donated organs for all Americans. The Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act draws attention to this life-saving issue, and sends a clear message that donating one's organs is a self-less act that should receive the profound respect of the Nation.

The legislation allows the Health and Human Service's Organ Procurement Organization (OPO) and the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network to establish a non-profit fund to design, produce, and distribute the medals. Funding would come solely from charitable donations. The donor or family member would have the option of receiving

the Congressional Gift of Life Medal. Families would also request that a Member of Congress, state or local official, or community leader award the medal to the donor or donor's survivors.

According to the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS), an average of 5300 donations per year were made between 1994 and 1996. Research points to a clear need for incentive programs and public education on organ donation. These efforts can increase the number of organ donations by more than 80 percent.

Physicians can now transplant kidneys, lungs, pancreas, liver, and heart with considerable success. The demand for organs will continue to grow with the improvement of medical technologies. Without expanded efforts to increase the supply of organ donation, the supply of suitable organs will continue to lag behind the need.

This is a non-controversial, non-partisan legislation to increase organ donation. I ask that our colleagues help bring an end to transplant waiting lists and recognize the enormous faith and courage displayed by organ donors and their families.

A copy of the legislation follows.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL

The Secretary of the Treasury shall design and strike a bronze medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, to commemorate organ donors and their families.

SEC. 3 ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any organ donor, or the family of any organ donor, shall be eligible for a medal described in section 2.

(b) DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall direct the entity holding the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (hereafter in this Act referred to as "OPTN") to contract to—

(1) establish an application procedure requiring the relevant organ procurement organization, as described in section 371(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 273(b)(1)), through which an individual or their family made an organ donation, to submit to the OPTN contractor documentation supporting the eligibility of that individual or their family to receive a medal described in section 2; and

(2) determine, through the documentation provided, and, if necessary, independent investigation, whether the individual or family is eligible to receive a medal described in section 2.

SEC. 4 PRESENTATION.

(a) DELIVERY TO THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver medals struck pursuant to this Act to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(b) DELIVERY TO ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall direct the OPTN contractor to arrange for the presentation to the relevant organ procurement organization all medals struck pursuant to this Act to individuals or families that, in accordance with section 3, the OPTN contractor has determined to be eligible to receive medals under this Act.

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), only 1 medal may be presented to a family under subsection (b). Such medal shall be presented to the donating family member, or in the case of a deceased donor, the family member who signed the consent form authorizing, or who otherwise authorized, the donation of the organ involved.

(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a family in which more than 1 member is an organ donor, the OPTN contractor may present an additional medal to each such organ donor or their family.

SEC. 5. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services or the OPTN contractor may provide duplicates of the medal described in section 2 to any recipient of a medal under section 4(b), under such regulations as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may issue.

(b) LIMITATION.—The price of a duplicate medal shall be sufficient to cover the cost of such duplicates.

SEC. 6. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of section 5111 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 7. GENERAL WAIVER OR PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS.

No provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods or services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. SOLICITATION OF DONATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may enter into an agreement with the OPTN contractor to collect funds to offset expenditures relating to the issuance of medals authorized under this Act.

(b) PAYMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), all funds received by the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network under subsection (a) shall be promptly paid by the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) LIMITATION.—Not more than 5 percent of the any funds received under subsection (a) shall be used to pay administrative costs incurred by the OPTN contractor as a result of an agreement established under this section.

(c) NUMISMATIC PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) all amounts received by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b)(1) shall be deposited in the Numismatic Public Enterprise Fund, as described in section 5134 of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury shall charge such fund with all expenditures relating to the issuance of medals authorized under this Act.

(d) START-UP COSTS.—A 1-time amount not to exceed \$55,000 shall be provided to the OPTN contractor to cover initial start-up costs. The amount will be paid back in full within 3 years of the date of the enactment of this Act from funds received under subsection (a).

(e) NO NET COST TO THE GOVERNMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of medals authorized under section 2 results in no net cost to the Government.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "organ" means the human kidney, liver, heart, lung, pancreas, and any other human organ (other than corneas and eyes) specified by regulation of the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the OPTN contractor; and

(2) the term "Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network" means the Organ

Procurement and Transplantation Network established under section 372 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274).

SEC. 10. SUNSET PROVISION.

This Act shall be effective during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE SPRAWLING OF AMERICA

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1999

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, people from across the nation are talking about ways they can make their communities more livable. Improving livability means better schools, safer neighborhoods, affordable housing and more choices in transportation. Improving livability also means preserving what makes each community unique, be it the farmlands in Oregon or the desert in Arizona. It is my pleasure to share with my colleagues the comments of Richard Moe, the president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, on this important and timely topic.

THE SPRAWLING OF AMERICA: FEDERAL POLICY IS PART OF THE PROBLEM; CAN IT BE PART OF THE SOLUTION?

(An address by Richard Moe, president, National Trust for Historic Preservation at the National Press Club in Washington, DC on January 22, 1999)

America today is engaged in a great national debate. It's a debate about sprawl. The central question in the debate is this: Will we continue to allow haphazard growth to consume more countryside in ways that drain the vitality out of our cities while eroding the quality of life virtually everywhere? Or will we choose instead to use our land more sensibly and to revitalize our older neighborhoods and downtowns, thereby enhancing the quality of life for everyone?

The debate touches every aspect of our lives—the quality of the natural and built environments, how we feel about the places where we live and work and play, how much time we have for our family and civil life, how rooted we are in our communities. I believe that this debate will frame one of the most important political issues of the first decade of the 21st century. Ultimately, its outcome will determine whether the American dream will become a reality for future generations.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation, which I am privileged to serve, works to revitalize America's communities by preserving our heritage—the buildings, neighborhoods, downtowns and landscapes that link us with our past and define us as Americans. Our mission is summed up in a short phrase: "Protecting the Irreplaceable." Sprawl destroys the irreplaceable, which is why the National Trust is concerned about sprawl—and why I want to address the subject today.

Preservation is in the business of saving special places and the quality of life they support, and sprawl destroys both. It devours historic landscapes. It makes the strip malls and subdivisions on the edge of Washington look like those on the edge of Albuquerque or Birmingham or any other American city. It drains the life out of older communities, stops their economic pulse and often puts them in intensive care—or sometimes even the morgue.

Sprawl reminds me of Justice Stewart's remark about pornography: It's hard to define,

but you know it when you see it. In simple terms, sprawl is the poorly planned, low-density, auto-oriented development that spreads out from the edges of communities. But it is best defined by the way it affects us in our daily lives.

Winston Churchill said, "We shape our buildings, and then our buildings shape us." The same holds true for communities: The way we shape them has a huge impact on the way we feel, the way we interact with one another, the way we live. By harming our communities, sprawl touches us all—and one way or another, we all pay for it.

We pay in open space and farmland lost. Since 1950, the State of Pennsylvania has lost more than 4 million acres of farmland; that's an area larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. Metropolitan Phoenix now covers an area the size of Delaware. It's estimated that over the next 45 years, sprawl in the Central Valley of California will affect more than 3.6 million acres of America's most productive farmland.

We pay in time lost. A study last year reported that each of us here in Washington spends about 59 hours a year—the equivalent of a week and a half of work—stuck in traffic. The price tag for time and fuel wasted is roughly \$860 annually for every man, woman and child in the Washington area. In Los Angeles, the average speed on the freeway is expected to drop to 11 miles per hour by 2010. A new term "road rage" has been coined to describe drivers' frustration over traffic.

We pay in higher taxes. Over the decades, we've handed over our tax dollars to pay for infrastructure and services—things like police and fire protection, water and sewer lines, schools and streetlights—in our communities. Now we're being asked to pay higher taxes to duplicate those services in sprawling new developments, while the infrastructure we've already paid for lies abandoned or underused in our older city center and suburbs. Even worse, local governments use our tax dollars to offer incentives and write-offs to sprawl developers—in effect, rewarding them for consuming our landscape and weakening our older communities.

Finally, we pay in the steady erosion of our quality of life. Inner cities have become enclaves of poverty. Long, frustrating commutes leave us less time with our families. Tranquil neighborhoods are destroyed by road-widening. Historic landmarks get demolished and carted off to the landfill. Everyplace winds up looking more and more like Noplace. These signs point to an inescapable fact: Sprawl and its byproducts represent the number-one threat to community livability in America today. And in a competitive global marketplace, livability is the factor that will determine which communities thrive and which ones wither. Nobel Prize-winning economist Robert Solow puts it this way: "Livability is not some middle-class luxury. It is an economic imperative."

Sprawl is finally getting the attention it deserves. It was the subject of major initiatives announced by the President and the Vice President in recent back-to-back speeches. Bipartisan caucuses focusing on smart growth and community livability have been formed in both the House and Senate. Governors across the political spectrum have announced programs to control sprawl and encourage smart growth. The Urban Land Institute, the American Institute of Architects, the National Governors Association, and foundations and nonprofit organizations of every stripe hold seminars and workshops on sprawl. Last November, voters from Cape Cod to California overwhelmingly approved some 200 ballot initiatives related to growth management and urban revitalization.

All this attention is welcome. Sprawl is a national problem, and it needs a national de-

bate. But the debate shouldn't focus on finding a national solution, because there isn't one. There are two essential elements in any effective program to combat sprawl: sensible land-use planning and the revitalization of existing communities. These are issues traditionally and best handled at the state and local levels—and that, in the end, is where the fight against sprawl will be won or lost. But—and here's the main point I want to make today—the federal government also has a crucial role to play in the process.

There are obviously many factors such as crime, drugs and bad schools and public services that have helped propel the exodus of people and jobs from our central cities, but that exodus has been greatly facilitated—even accelerated—by the effects of federal policies. Sometimes these effects have been intended and sometimes they have been inadvertent, but in most cases they have been profound. Because the federal government has contributed so heavily to the problem, it has a clear duty to help find solutions.

It can—and should—do so in four ways:

First, it should correct policies that encourage or reward sprawl.

Sprawl-friendly policies and practices exist in almost every federal agency. I'll mention only a few examples.

Nearly 17 million people work directly or indirectly for the federal government. With a workforce that size, decisions about where the government locates its offices can have a huge impact on a community's economic health. A 1996 Executive Order directs federal agencies to give first consideration to locating their facilities in downtown historic districts instead of out on the suburban fringe—but two years after it was issued, compliance is spotty. Right now, for example, in the small, economically depressed town of Glasgow, Montana, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is putting its county office in a new building that will be constructed in pastureland on the edge of town. A suitable downtown building was available, but USDA rejected it because the parking lot is a block away instead of right next door.

Relocating post offices to suburban sites can also deal a body blow to a small-town Main Street—and put historic buildings at risk as well. Because post offices serve an important role in the social and business life of many towns, the U.S. Postal Service needs to give communities more say in where these essential facilities are to be located.

The federal tax code, in all its complexity, is heavily tilted toward new development and the consumption of open space. It needs to put at least as much emphasis on promoting opportunities for revitalization and stabilization of older communities. It needs to provide incentives—which are currently lacking—for middle-class and moderate-income households to become urban homeowners.

Federal water and sewer grants were originally intended as a means of providing clean water and safe waste-treatment facilities in rural areas. In practice, however, the ready availability of this funding virtually invites development further and further into countryside.

The list goes on and on, but the biggest offender of all is federal transportation policy, which can be summed up in a short phrase: "feed the car, starve the alternative." As Jessica Mathews wrote a while ago in the Washington Post, "Americans are not irrationally car-crazed. We seem wedded to the automobile because policy after . . . policy . . . encourages us to be." Transportation officials generally try to "solve" problems by building more roads—an approach which is often like trying to cure obesity by loosening your belt.

People need transportation choices and communities need balanced transportation