

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe it is in the national interest for the federal government to assist local communities to identify ways to protect the mountain backdrop in this part of Colorado. The backdrop beckoned settlers westward and presented an imposing impediment to their forward progress that suggested similar challenges ahead. This first exposure to the harshness and humbling majesty of the Rocky Mountain West helped define a region. The pioneers' independent spirit and respect for nature still lives with us to this day. We need to work to preserve it by protecting the mountain backdrop as a cultural and natural heritage for ourselves and generations to come. God may forgive us for our failure to do so, but our children won't.

For the information of our colleagues, I am attaching a fact sheet about this bill.

COLORADO NORTHERN FRONT RANGE MOUNTAIN BACKDROP PROTECTION STUDY ACT

Generally: The bill would help local communities preserve the Front Range Mountain Backdrop in the northern sections of the Denver-metro area in a region generally west of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology site.

Front Range Mountain Backdrop: The backdrop consists of the mountainous foothills, the Continental Divide and the peaks in between that create the striking visual backdrop of the Denver-metro area and throughout Colorado. Development in the Denver-metro area is encroaching in the Front Range backdrop area, and thus adversely affecting the esthetic, wildlife, open space and recreational qualities of this geographic feature. Now is the time to shape the future of this part of the Front Range. There is a real but fleeting opportunity to protect both protect Rocky Flats—a "crown jewel" of open space and wildlife habitat—and to assist local communities to protect the scenic, wildlife, and other values of the mountain backdrop.

WHAT THE BILL DOES:

Study and Report: The bill requires the Forest Service to study the ownership patterns of the lands comprising the Front Range Mountain Backdrop in a region generally west of Rocky Flats, identify areas that are open and may be at risk of development, and recommend to Congress how these lands might be protected and how the federal government could help local communities and residents to achieve that goal.

Lands Covered: The bill identifies the lands in southern Boulder, northern Jefferson and eastern Gilpin Counties in the Second Congressional District; specifically, an area west of Rocky Flats and west of Highway 93, south of Boulder Canyon, east of the Peak-to-Peak Highway, and north of the Golden Gate Canyon State Park road.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD NOT DO:

Affect Local Planning: The bill is designed to complement existing local efforts to preserve open lands in this region west of Rocky Flats. It will not take the place of—nor disrupt—these existing local efforts.

Affect Private Property Rights: The bill merely authorizes a study. It will not affect any existing private property rights.

Affect the Cleanup of Rocky Flats: The bill would not affect the ongoing cleanup and closure of Rocky Flats nor detract from funding for that effort, and will not affect existing efforts to preserve the options for wildlife and open space protection of Rocky Flats itself.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOILERMAKERS LOCAL 363

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 100th Anniversary of Boilermakers Local 363.

The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers was born on September 1, 1893. On that day, at a meeting in Chicago, representatives from the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, which had been organized on October 1, 1880, and the National Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, which had been formed in Atlanta in May of 1888, resolved to consolidate their organizations. It was further agreed that the new organization, to be known as the Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders of America, would make its Headquarters in Kansas City, Kansas. Two and a half years later, on June 9, 1896, the Brotherhood affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

In subsequent years, the Brotherhood continued to grow, and in 1902, the Helpers division was formed. Because helpers were barred from sitting in the lodge room with mechanics, this new division had its own local unions and was entirely separate from the Boiler Makers. This would change a decade later when the Helpers Division would be consolidated with the Mechanics Division.

In March 1906, at a special Convention in Kansas City, the name of the Union was changed to the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America in order to incorporate the newest division. Also at this time, the term "Boiler Makers" was condensed into one word, "Boilermakers."

The Boilermakers affiliated with the National Building Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor in February 1931. At the turn of the century, total membership stood at about 8,500, but by 1944, due in part to dramatic increases in the shipbuilding, railroad, and fabrication shop industries during World War II, the Boilermakers numbered over 350,000. In 1954, the Boilermakers merged their organization with the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers. The International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths had been organized in 1889 and added Helpers to both their membership and their name in 1901. A 1919 merger with the Brotherhood of Drop Forgers created the Union that, on June 29, 1953, merged with the Boilermakers to create the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers. A year later, a new International seal was adopted to include all crafts.

On October 1, 1954, the Boilermaker National Health and Welfare Fund was established, on November 9, 1959, the Boilermakers National Joint Apprenticeship Fund began, and the Boilermaker-Blacksmith National Pension Trust became effective October 1, 1960. Delegates to the 1977 Convention voted to establish a Construction Division at International Headquarters for the purpose of

servicing those members with employment in, or related to, the construction industry.

On March 15, 1984, the delegates to the Special Merger Convention of the United Cement, Lime, Gypsum and Allied Workers International Union voted to merge with the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers. The merger of the CLGAW, formed in 1936, and its ten thousand members who dominate the building products and supplies industry, and the Boilermakers forged an organization with a greater ability to provide services to its members.

On October 1, 1994, a merger was consummated with the Stove, Furnace and Allied Appliance Workers International Union—a skilled trade union that was organized in 1891. The Stove Workers, with 5,800 members, became a Division of the International Brotherhood known as the Stove, Furnace, Energy and Allied Appliance Workers Division. The word energy was inserted to give special recognition to the coal miners within that Division. The Division had its members employed primarily in the manufacturing of stoves and various types of appliances.

During the same period, merger talks were also being carried out with an independent union known as the Western Energy Workers. This one-local union, formed in 1978 with members employed in the coal strip pits, signed a merger agreement with the Boilermakers effective December 1, 1994.

In October 1996, a merger agreement was made with the Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers and Allied Workers International Union. This union was also an old line, skill trade union that was organized in 1892. This merger brought 4,000 new members to the Brotherhood. These members are employed primarily in plating and polishing shops within the United States and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the past, present and future members of the Boilermakers International Union, Local 363 on the occasion of their 100th Anniversary.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FOR TEA 21 REAUTHORIZATION

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Representative BILL LIPINSKI, the Ranking Democratic Member of the Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines, Representative DON YOUNG, the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and Representative JIM OBERSTAR, the Committee's Ranking Democratic Member, I would like to outline the Subcommittee's procedure for identifying items of concern to Members as we take up the reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). This legislation authorized \$218 billion for our Nation's highway, transit, motor carrier, highway safety and research programs for 6 years and is due to expire on September 30, 2003.

The importance of the surface transportation systems to our Nation's economic health cannot be overstated. Highway and transit investments stimulate economic activity. These investments increase productivity by decreasing time spent on the road, encouraging new economic development, and increasing property values. Transportation investment generates a 6-to-1 net return on investment. The linchpin of economic vitality is free movement of people and goods. In the U.S., more than 75 percent of the Nation's freight moves on highways—an annual value to the economy of more than \$5 trillion. And, for every \$1 billion in federal highway and transit spending, more than 42,000 jobs are created or sustained.

Despite the gains of TEA 21, transportation investment has fallen short of what is needed. The Department of Transportation estimates that the cost to improve highway and transit conditions to optimal levels would require more than doubling our current combined federal program size to \$74 billion per year. Meeting these needs will require a variety of strategies, including better use of existing systems, application of advanced technology, innovative financing, and public-private partnerships. It is our goal to develop a bill that increases transportation investment to improve and maintain this world-class system.

Reauthorization is the top priority of the Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines. In the second session of the 107th Congress, the Subcommittee held a series of 17 TEA 21 oversight hearings and received testimony from 140 witnesses. The hearings gave many interested Members, the Administration and affected groups the opportunity to testify and present their views. We would be happy to make copies of these hearing transcripts available to any interested Members.

We anticipate that the bipartisan legislation we develop this year will be based largely on the information obtained at last year's extensive programmatic hearings. As we begin the process this year, we would like to encourage Members to inform the Subcommittee about any policy initiatives that they want the Subcommittee to consider in the reauthorization of TEA 21. Members having such specific policy requests should inform the Subcommittee in writing no later than March 14, 2003.

Many Members have already contacted the Subcommittee to inquire about, or to request, specific funding for critical transportation needs in their districts. On January 8, 2003, Transportation Committee Chairman DON YOUNG and Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR sent a Dear Colleague that included a 21-question evaluation form for consideration of projects of importance to members. This form is reprinted in its entirety below. All project requests should be submitted no later than March 14, 2003. (Please note that this is a 2-week extension beyond the original deadline of February 28th.) Such submissions should be transmitted to us via the intranet website, <http://ushrtrans.house.gov>, and in writing, attached to a signed letter on the letterhead of the sponsoring Member.

We will also be holding a series of Subcommittee hearings in March and April, at which time Members and local officials will have an opportunity to testify on behalf of those requests. While these hearings are intended to give Members an opportunity to present information about specific project needs and policy requests, it is not necessary for Members to testify.

We look forward to working with all Members of the House as we prepare this important legislation that will set the course for our nation's surface transportation programs.

TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND PIPELINES

1. Name and Congressional District of the primary Member of Congress sponsoring the project.

2. Other Members supporting the project.

3. If the project is a highway project, identify the State or other qualified recipient responsible for carrying out the project.

4. If the project is a transit project, please identify the project sponsor (must be an eligible recipient of Federal transit funds).

5. Please categorize the project. (Check one)

Highway or bridge

Transit rail new start

Bus, bus equipment, or bus facility

Intermodal facility (passenger)

Intermodal facility (freight)

Bicycle and Pedestrian

Other (please identify)

6. Is the project eligible for the use of Federal-aid highway or transit funds under Title 23 or Title 49 of the United States Code?

7. If the project is a highway or bridge project, is it on the National Highway System?

8. Briefly describe the total project.

a. Is it part of a larger system of projects?

b. What is the total estimated cost of the project?

9. Please identify the specific segment for which project funding is being sought, including terminus points.

10. What dollar amount are you requesting in the authorization for this project or segment of a project?

11. Project Schedule:

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

b. What is the current stage of development of the project? (If the project is a transit new start, please specify whether the project is in alternative analysis, preliminary engineering, final design, has been issued a record of decision, under environmental review, or already has a current full funding grant agreement.)

c. Will the requested funding for the project be obligated within the next six years?

12. Project Plan:

a. Is the project part of the State's long-range plan?

b. Is the project included in the metropolitan and/or State Transportation Improvement Program(s)?

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

14. Does the project have national or regional significance? Describe.

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

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

17. Has the project already received funding through the State's federal-aid highway or transit formula apportionments or from other Federal, State, local, or private funds? If yes, how much and from what source?

18. Has the project received funding in a previous authorization act?

19. If the project has received funding in a previous authorization act, please cite the act(s) and amount(s) authorized.

20. Has the project received funding in a previous appropriations act?

21. If the project has received funding in a previous appropriations act, please cite the act(s) and amount(s) appropriated.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 18 and 19 on February 5th, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

INTRODUCTION OF THE URBAN SPRAWL AND SMART GROWTH STUDY ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the "Urban Sprawl and Smart Growth Study Act." This bill, similar to one I introduced in the 107th Congress, is designed to shine a bright light on the influence of federal actions on urban sprawl and assure that federal agencies consider how their actions may add to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, communities in Colorado and throughout the country are struggling to preserve their special charter and quality of life in the face of burgeoning populations. Especially in the West and South, extreme population growth has resulted in the continual build-out of cities and the loss of surrounding farmland and open space. In my state, this growth is also spreading along interstate highways into the mountain valleys and forested regions. The resulting sprawl is creating congested highways, more air pollution, overtaxed city services, and crowded schools and shopping centers.

According to the recent census, Colorado is one of the most rapidly growing states. Between 1990 and 2000, the population growth in the United States was 13.1 percent. During the same period, Colorado's growth was 30.6 percent! And in many of our counties, the rate was even higher. What does this mean?

The City of Broomfield has grown so much that it has now become its own county. Traffic is so heavy in the area that Congress appropriated \$1 million to study a new interchange at the intersection of U.S. 36 and Highway 287.

The cities of Fort Collins, Loveland, and Greeley are growing so fast, it's becoming difficult to tell where one ends and the other begins. These three cities are likely to become one in the next 10 years.

The south Denver portion of Interstate 25 near the Tech Center not only services the many offices in that area, but metro area sprawl has added more houses and towns on that end of Denver. Traffic is always bad there, no matter what time of day, and rush hour starts earlier and last longer now too.

Citizens in Colorado are asking their leaders to address the symptoms of sprawl and to