

(3) Whether Federal, State, and local emergency preparedness personnel, emergency response personnel, and medical personnel are adequately trained and equipped to promptly respond to accidents along specific transportation routes for current, anticipated, or proposed hazardous chemical and radioactive material transport.

(4) The costs and time required to ensure that Federal, State, and local emergency preparedness personnel, emergency response personnel, and medical personnel are adequately trained and equipped to promptly respond to accidents along specific transportation routes for current, anticipated, or proposed hazardous chemical and radioactive material transport.

(5) The availability of, or requirements to establish, information collection and dissemination systems adequate to provide the public, in an accessible manner, with timely, complete, specific, and accurate information (including databases) concerning actual, proposed, or anticipated shipments by highway, railway, or waterway of hazardous chemicals and radioactive materials, including accidents involving the transportation of such chemicals and materials by those means.

(d) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.**—The study under subsection (b) shall be completed not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) **REPORT.**—Upon completion of the study under subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study.

SEC. 351. (a) Of the funds appropriated by title I for the Federal Railroad Administration under the heading “RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT”, up to \$750,000 may be expended to pay 25 percent of the total cost of a comprehensive study to assess existing problems in the freight and passenger rail infrastructure in the vicinity of Baltimore, Maryland, that the Secretary of Transportation shall carry out through the Federal Railroad Administration in cooperation with, and with a total amount of equal funding contributed by, Norfolk-Southern Corporation, CSX Corporation, and the State of Maryland.

(b)(1) The study shall include an analysis of the condition, track, and clearance limitations and efficiency of the existing tunnels, bridges, and other railroad facilities owned or operated by CSX Corporation, Amtrak, and Norfolk-Southern Corporation in the Baltimore area.

(2) The study shall examine the benefits and costs of various alternatives for reducing congestion and improving safety and efficiency in the operations on the rail infrastructure in the vicinity of Baltimore, including such alternatives for improving operations as shared usage of track, and such alternatives for improving the rail infrastructure as possible improvements to existing tunnels, bridges, and other railroad facilities, or construction of new facilities.

(c) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of the study to Congress. The report shall include recommendations on the matters described in subsection (b)(2).

SEC. 352. PRIORITY HIGHWAY PROJECTS, GEORGIA. In selecting projects to carry out using funds apportioned under section 110 of title 23, United States Code, the State of Georgia shall give priority consideration to the following projects:

(1) Improving Johnson Ferry Road from the Chattahoochee River to Abernathy Road, including the bridge over the Chattahoochee River.

(2) Widening Abernathy Road from 2 to 4 lanes from Johnson Ferry Road to Roswell Road.

SEC. 353. SAFETY BELT USE LAW REQUIREMENTS. Section 355(a) of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (109 Stat. 624) is amended by striking “has achieved” and all

that follows and inserting the following: “has achieved a safety belt use rate of not less than 50 percent.”.

SEC. 354. STUDY OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the costs and benefits of constructing a third bridge across the Mississippi River in the Memphis, Tennessee, metropolitan area.

SEC. 355. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Section 345 of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 authorizes limited relief to drivers of certain types of commercial motor vehicles from certain restrictions on maximum driving time and on-duty time.

(2) Subsection (c) of that section requires the Secretary of Transportation to determine by rulemaking proceedings that the exemptions granted are not in the public interest and adversely affect the safety of commercial motor vehicles.

(3) Subsection (d) of that section requires the Secretary of Transportation to monitor the safety performance of drivers of commercial motor vehicles who are subject to an exemption under section 345 and report to Congress prior to the rulemaking proceedings.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Transportation should not take any action that would diminish or revoke any exemption in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act for drivers of vehicles under section 345 of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–59; 109 Stat. 613; 49 U.S.C. 31136 note) unless the requirements of subsections (c) and (d) of such section are satisfied.

SEC. 356. Section 41703 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **AIR CARGO VIA ALASKA.**—For purposes of subsection (c) of this section, cargo taken on or off any aircraft at a place in Alaska in the course of transportation of that cargo by one or more air carriers or foreign air carriers in either direction between any place in the United States and a place not in the United States shall not be deemed to have broken its international journey, be taken on in, or be destined for Alaska.”.

SEC. 357. Point Retreat Light Station, including all property under lease as of June 1, 2000, is transferred to the Alaska Lighthouse Association.

SEC. 358. PRIORITY HIGHWAY PROJECTS, MINNESOTA. In selecting projects to carry out using funds apportioned under section 110 of title 23, United States Code, the State of Minnesota shall give priority consideration to the following projects:

(1) The Southeast Main and Rail Relocation Project in Moorhead, Minnesota.

(2) Improving access to and from I–35 W at Lake Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

SEC. 359. NOISE BARRIERS, GEORGIA. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation shall approve the use of funds apportioned under paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, for construction of Type II noise barriers—

(1) at the locations identified in section 358 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (113 Stat. 1027); and

(2) on the west side of Interstate Route 285 from Henderson Mill Road to Chamblee Tucker Road in DeKalb County, Georgia.

SEC. 360. The Secretary is directed to give priority consideration to applications for airport improvement grants for the Addison Airport in Addison, Texas, Pearson Airpark in Vancouver, Washington, Mobile Regional Airport in Mobile, Alabama, Marks Airport in Mississippi, Madison Airport in Mississippi, and Birmingham International Airport in Birmingham, Alabama.

SEC. 361. Section 5117(b)(3) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105–178; 112 Stat. 449; 23 U.S.C. 502 note) is amended —

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (F), and (G), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph (C):

“(C) **FOLLOW-ON DEPLOYMENT.**—(i) After an intelligent transportation infrastructure system deployed in an initial deployment area pursuant to a contract entered into under the program under this paragraph has received system acceptance, the original contract that was competitively awarded by the Department of Transportation for the deployment of the system in that area shall be extended to provide for the system to be deployed in the follow-on deployment areas under the contract, using the same asset ownership, maintenance, fixed price contract, and revenue sharing model, and the same competitively selected consortium leader, as were used for the deployment in that initial deployment area under the program.

“(ii) If any one of the follow-on deployment areas does not commit, by July 1, 2002, to participate in the deployment of the system under the contract, then, upon application by any of the other follow-on deployment areas that have committed by that date to participate in the deployment of the system, the Secretary shall supplement the funds made available for any of the follow-on deployment areas submitting the applications by using for that purpose the funds not used for deployment of the system in the nonparticipating area. Costs paid out of funds provided in such a supplementation shall not be counted for the purpose of the limitation on maximum cost set forth in subparagraph (B).”.

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (D), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following new subparagraph (E):

“(E) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

“(i) The term ‘initial deployment area’ means a metropolitan area referred to in the second sentence of subparagraph (A).

“(ii) The term ‘follow-on deployment areas’ means the metropolitan areas of Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas/Ft. Worth, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Miami, New York/Northern New Jersey, Northern Kentucky/Cincinnati, Oklahoma City, Orlando, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Pittsburgh, Portland, Providence, Salt Lake, San Diego, San Francisco, St. Louis, Seattle, Tampa, and Washington, District of Columbia.”; and

(5) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraph (F)”.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002”.

PROVIDING FOR THE ELECTION OF ALFONSO E. LENHARDT AS SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 149) providing for the election of Alfonso E. Lenhardt as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, effective September 4, 2001.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, it is my honor to welcome Alfonso E. Lenhardt as Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate.

In 1789, when the office was first established, the challenges of the job

were quite different than they are today. The Sergeant at Arms was given the responsibility for keeping a majority of members together long enough to organize and begin the business of government.

Today, the job has grown, and so has the office. The Sergeant at Arms is now the chief protocol and law enforcement officer of the Senate, as well as the administrative manager for many Senate support services. The Sergeant at Arms oversees the largest staff and budget in the U.S. Senate.

That expanded role demands expanded skills—in both law-enforcement and management.

In every position he has held, Al Lenhardt has demonstrated those skills as well as a solemn commitment to public service.

Al retired from the United States Army in 1997 as a Major General after over 31 years of domestic and international experience in national security and law enforcement programs. As Commanding General at the U.S. Army Recruiting Command in Ft. Knox, KY, he managed and directed over 13,000 people in over 1,800 separate locations.

Before the recruiting command, Al served as the senior military police officer in the Army, overseeing all Army police operations and security matters worldwide and managing a budget of over \$300 million.

For the past four years, he has served as Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Council on Foundations, a non-profit membership association of foundations and corporate philanthropic organizations.

Al Lenhardt is a versatile senior executive with the stature, the management experience and the law enforcement portfolio to make an outstanding Senate Sergeant at Arms. While Al Lenhardt may not be readily known to you because he has no prior connection to me or to the Senate, I think my colleagues will be impressed with the experience, the ability and the character of the man.

In the 212 year history of the Senate, Al Lenhardt will become the 35th person to serve as Sergeant at Arms, and the first African American to hold this position.

But more importantly, Al is clearly of the highest caliber and qualifications. The Senate will benefit greatly from his service and leadership. We all look forward to working with him in the months and years ahead.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action for debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 149) was agreed to.

(The text of S. Res. 149 is printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1246

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on the Agriculture supplemental authorization bill occur at 9:30 on Friday, August 3, with the mandatory quorum waived; further, that Senators have until 10 a.m. to file second-degree amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BAUCUS and Mr. BYRD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1347 are located in today's RECORD under "Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Arkansas.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURE ASSISTANCE

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I am here on the floor out of a sense of frustration and I suppose a very deep sense of dedication, maybe because I am from a seventh-generation Arkansas farm family, maybe because I am a daughter of a farmer who I watched for many years toiling to ensure that he could provide a good upbringing, a good heritage to his family, working on that family farm.

Maybe it is because I have watched neighbors and family members who have had to give up a way of life and a profession, a piece of their heritage, because they were unsure of where their Government was going to be for them as family farmers. Or perhaps it is because they were inundated by so many things that were unpredictable, things they could not predict or control such as the weather or the economy or the fact that their Government could not make a decision as to whether the family farmer was important enough to support and to keep in business.

I am really here because, in the 11th hour, I still take my job very seriously. That job is to be here to fight hard, to do everything I can to support that American farmer and that farmer in Arkansas who has spent this entire year trying to put out a crop and wondering whether or not his or her Government was going to come through in the end with an emergency supplemental appropriation as we promised.

I am here to talk about agriculture and to talk about the rural economic crisis that we are on the verge of making even worse. Six years ago, Congress and the White House, the Republicans and the Democrats, stood toe to toe and dared each other to blink. Of course no one did, and all that happened is that the Federal Government shut down. FSA offices and other important Government offices around the country closed. Farmers could not get access to the services they needed. Sen-

iors could not access the services they needed. People all around the country were knocking on Government doors that would not open. But up here in Washington, instead of sitting down and figuring out how to get those doors open, politicians only pointed fingers at each other. They were more concerned about laying blame on each other than finding a solution.

Here we are again. Now we find ourselves at another impasse, this time on an emergency assistance package for farmers that is profoundly crucial to the economic well-being of our farmers and our rural economies, an emergency assistance package we have been talking about since February. In February we started talking about the dire situation our farmers were in, that rural America was in dire straits because we had not addressed their needs, whether it was in trade or whether it was in how Government was going to provide them what they needed in order to be competitive and maintain themselves in a competitive way in the global marketplace.

Whether we are talking about the delta region of Arkansas and Mississippi or the prairies of the Dakotas or anywhere else for that matter, our rural economies are in deep trouble.

I don't think there is a single person in this body who would dispute that. Our farmers are hurting, and they are hurting badly. But, of course, they are not the only ones who are hurting. All of the small town institutions, businesses, and local banks were up here to talk to us back in February about what we do in extending these loans to these critical people in our communities. Do we give them a loan knowing their cost of production is going to be enormous because of energy and because of fertilizer input? Do we extend that loan knowing the prices are in the tank on commodities and have remained there and probably will remain there?

It is also hurting the suppliers, the corner grocery stores on Main Street, and the car dealers. They are all hurting because their viability depends on the health of the farm economy.

Colleagues, this crisis is real, and we are on the verge of making it much, much worse. If we don't get an emergency assistance package passed this week, these farmers and these small towns—very real people, many of whom happen to be related to me and to you—and these rural economies will have run out of time.

I am frustrated. I am outraged that we have been sitting in this Chamber all week without being able to come to agreement on an emergency package that we all agree our farmers need. The House passed a \$5.5 billion emergency package, and they are saying, oh, just do what we did, and we can all go home. But that doesn't even meet the needs of the AMTA assistance payments that our farmers need to survive. The fact is, it doesn't even give them what they had prior to 1999.

Because of the Freedom to Farm Act, we have ratcheted down the payments