Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, tomorrow, March 29, 2001, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority will celebrate the 25th Anniversary of passenger service on the Metro-rail system. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate WMATA on this important occasion and to recognize the extraordinary contribution Metro has made to this region and to our Nation.

For the past quarter century, the Washington Metro system has served as a shining example of a public investment in the Washington Metropolitan area’s future. It provides a unified and coordinated transportation system for the region, enhances mobility for the millions of residents, visitors and the federal workforce in the region, promotes orderly growth and development of the region, enhances our environment, and preserves the beauty and dignity of our Nation’s Capital. It is also an example of an unparalleled partnership that spans every level of government from city to state to federal.

Since passenger service first began in 1976, Metrorail has grown from a 4.6 mile, five station, 22,000 passenger service to a comprehensive 103-mile, 83 station, and 600,000 passenger system serving the entire metropolitan region, and with even more service and stations on a fast track toward completion. Today, the Metro system is the second busiest rapid transit operation in the country, carrying nearly one-fifth of the region’s daily commuters traveling to the metropolitan core and taking more than a million passengers a day on the region’s subway system.

Metro is carrying about 600,000 passengers a day in its existing rail lines, stepping in to fill gaps. The rail lines don’t reach where most people wanted to move to their places of employment, and invest in neighborhoods and local business districts. These are among the things that contribute to the livability and I join in celebrating this special occasion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 2001]

REGION’S SUBWAY SYSTEM BEGINS TO SHOW ITS AGE

(By Lyndsey Layton)

As Washington’s Metro trains hummed to life 25 years ago, most people didn’t know what to expect. It was, after all, among the first U.S. subway systems built from scratch, rather than cobbled together from several existing railroads, as in New York and Boston.

But from its opening on March 27, 1976, Metro was a new American monument. Embarrassed locals and tourists, it became a $9.4 billion model for moving people swiftly between suburbs and the city. Riders have lately flocked to Metro faster than it can buy rail cars, 25 years before a fortune never anticipated by its designers.

The Metro would provide to be far more than a people mover. It shaped the region in dramatic ways, turning the village of Bethesda into a small city, revising sagging Clarendon, pumping new life into downtown by creating mass transit access that eventually lured the MCI Center and its professional sports teams to Gallery Place.

The Metro system has become—among many other things—a unified, a matcher maker, a land developer, an economic power and a community planner. But while Metro fulfilled some dreams, it failed on others. The rail lines don’t reach where most people wanted to move to their places of employment, and to public facilities freely; and invest in neighborhoods and local business districts. These are among the things that contribute to the livability of our communities and enrich the lives of our citizens. I submit that the Metro system and the regional cooperation which it has helped foster has helped make this region a community in which we can all be proud.

This week’s celebration is a tribute to everyone involved in the continuing intergovernmental effort to provide mass transit to the people of the Washington Metropolitan area—those local, State and federal officials who had the vision to begin this project 25 years ago and who have worked so steadfastly over the years to support the system. This foresight has been well rewarded and I join in celebrating this special occasion.

Moving People

Alan Sussman studies Torah on the Red Line. Frank Lloyd took his twin girls for all-day rides as a cheap diversion. Oren Hirsch, 14, always tries to claim the seat directly behind the operator so he can peer through the smoked glass window and watch the controls and the track bed rushing under the train.

Metro is carrying about 600,000 passengers a day on its trains and 500,000 on buses, making it the nation’s second-busiest transit system behind New York’s.

That’s a ranking that none of the original planners dreamed of when they designing the system in the late 1960s. “I’m a believer, and it has even outstripped my expectations,” said Cleatus Barnett, 73, who was appointed to the Metro board of directors in 1971 and is the longest continuously serving member.

The subway takes more than 270,000 cars off the road each day, Metro officials say. Those cars would have used more than 12 million gallons of gasoline and created 30 additional highway lanes and 1,800 acres of parking.

Mary Margaret Whipple, a state senator from Arlington and a past member of the Metro board, puts it this way, “One hundred thousand people a day go underneath Arlington on the Metro system instead of through Arlington in their cars.”

As highway traffic gets worse, subway ridership has soared. Ridership records are shattered regularly, which is a key part to a robust economy, strong tourism, a new transit subsidy extended to federal workers and fares that haven’t increased since 1995.

AN EARLY VISION

The architect, Harry M. Weese, had been sent on a tour of European subways with instructions to combine the world’s best designs into a new American monorail. Weese dreamed big, and a legion of engineers followed his concept to launch a transit system that would eventually cost $9.4 billion and stretch 103 miles across two rivers, two states and the District.

With their cobbled concrete arches and fluted mezzanines lighted dramatically from below, the stations were celebrated by everyone from architecture critics to construction workers.

DESIGN PROBLEMS

But planners can see only so far into the future. What they failed to recognize as a service area—the edge cities outside the orbit of downtown Washington—has left Metro with the challenge of trying to be useful to people who don’t live or work where the subway lines run.
The plotted a hub-and-spoke pattern of five lines stretching from the suburban to the center of the District, to ferry federal workers from homes to offices. But development patterns have since changed, creating suburban communities and office centers far from the subway lines in upper Montgomery, Howard, Southern Maryland, western Fairfax, Loudoun and Prince William counties. Those patterns are going to intensify. In another 25 years, two-thirds of all daily trips in the region will be from suburb to suburb, according to the region’s Transportation Planning Board. Transit advocates have been lobbying for several years for a Purple Line to connect Bethesda in Montgomery County with New Carrollton in Prince George’s County. Advocates say the Purple Line is the best bet for a fast connection between the counties, since the proposed intercounty connector linking I-270 and I-66 has been sited.

Metro planners are also looking at ways to connect Prince George’s County with Alexandria running rail over the new Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Metro has started several new suberb-to-suburb bus routes, though it acknowledges buses are a rapid, reliable service.

**CHANGING COMMUNITIES**

The original 103-mile metro system was finished in January, when the final five stations opened on the Green Line in the District and Prince George’s. While Metro is primarily a people mover, it also can change the look and feel of a community, for better or worse. Even in neighborhoods that waited many years for Metro service, people have mixed feelings about living on the subway line.

“The more accessible transportation is, the more likely developers are going to come into your neighborhood and price you out,” said Brenda Richardson, a consultant who runs her firm, Women Like Us, from the renter’s home five blocks from the new Congress Heights Station. “People here are worried about being displaced. We feel like we stayed here when things were awful, and now that the community is a prime place for development, we’re going to be boot ed out.... Gentrification to a lot of white folks means the white folks are coming.”

Communities like Arlington and Bethesda either require affordable housing near Metro stations or offer incentives to developers who set aside a portion of a project to affordable housing.

Richardson wants a similar protection in the District. “I don’t like the idea that Metro can destabilize communities,” she said. “There needs to be some sort of policy that is set so that when Metro comes into neighborhoods, developers are not at liberty to push out longtime residents, seniors and renters.”

Exactly how Metro changes a community has plenty to do with the decisions made by the community’s own planners and leaders. Metro is the reason some places, like Bethesda or the stretch between Rosslyn and Ballston in Arlington, have seen thriving “urban” growth; and now that the community is a prime place for development, developers are lining up around the stations while other spots, such as Rhode Island Avenue in the District or Addison Road in Prince George’s have stations that are relatively isolated and undeveloped.

**ARLINGTON’S MODEL**

Arlington County is widely seen as the gold standard for molding growth around Metro. Along the five-station corridor from Roslyn to Ballston, which opened in 1979, Arlington leveraged the subway stations to attract jobs, housing and commercial development.

“Nothing is more success story,” said Stewart Mader, of the Coalition for Smarter Growth.

The story starts with Arlington leaders, who recognized early on that Metro could be a powerful tool to revitalize the sagging median of I-66, and convinced Arlington tax-payers it would be worthwhile to pay extra to burrow the subway underground and pull out the road.

They worked with residents to establish a plan for the development they wanted and wrote zoning laws to make it happen. The plan was high-density, high-rise office, retail and residential space next to the stations, with a gradual tapering in height so that single-family homes wound untouched just two or three blocks away.

The streets around the stations welcome pedestrians, not cars. There is no Metro parking. "We were willing to go through a major community transformation in order to maximize the value of this transit system,” Whipple said. “The feeling was that people could live and work near transit, and it should have a beneficial effect. And it has. We simply don’t have the kinds of traffic problems that exist elsewhere.”

With offices, shops and housing near Metro, the station becomes as much a destination as origin. Trains are full coming and going. That’s not the case for most suburban Metro stations. “Most of the trains leave most of the stations most of the time essentially empty,” said Ed Ris e, a Vienna-based consultant who has closely studied the link between urban development and public transit. “The situation is the opposite. In many cases, it’s crowded and uncomfortable. But going in at midday and out in the morning, there are huge amounts of unused capacity. Looking ahead to the year 2025, we need to much more efficiently use that capacity.”

**OTHER APPROACHES**

Fairfax County, meanwhile, largely squashed attempts to develop commercial and retail property around its Orange Line Metro stations. Ris e worked on five different projects to develop land around the Vienna Metro station—they all failed to win approval.

County supervisors said they recognize that some development may be healthy at some stations and have approved a new zoning category that allows higher-density projects near Metro. But Ris e said the county is far from ready to embrace “transit villages.”

If you want the transit-related development at Vienna or any of those stations, it’s a long, arduous process,” he said. “There are vocal people who want to drive to the station, and the large group wants others to drive to the station so they can keep driving. And the third group lives near the station and doesn’t want anything built there.”

By contrast, Prince George’s County has struggled to lure developers to its Metro stations. Most of its stations are hard to reach by foot and are surrounded by large parking lots or garages.

“Prince George’s took a $10 billion investment and put it on the shelf,” Schwartz said. “The contract is, may be, 30 years.”

Prince George’s planners forecast little additional development 25 years from now. While some projects are underway, the county is far from ready to build a transit-oriented development.

Metro was one of the first transit agencies in the country to sell or lease land it owns near stations. To date, Metro has approved about 40 such projects, of which 27 have been built and generate about $6 million in annual revenue for the agency. Metro has identified about 400 additional acres it wants to develop.

**ROADS AND RAILS**

Critics, such as the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, say Metro could be more aggressive in developing projects around its stations and use all too much land to serve the Capital Beltway and surrounding roads. The environmental group says Metro should instead develop shops, offices and restaurants so people would ride the transit system as well as from it, thus reviving the community. But Metro General Manager Richard A. White said the system has historically stayed out of local affairs.

Meanwhile, the road network carries the load that Metro can’t. The high-tech corridor of Northern Virginia, the biotech community in Montgomery County and the Navy’s expanding air station in Southern Maryland are fed by congested highways or the overwhelmed Capital Beltway.

While 40 percent of the region rides mass transit into the core of Washington, the remaining 60 percent travel by automobile. And when you consider the total number of daily trips taken throughout the Washington region—including outer suburbs far from Metro—the percentage carried by transit drops to about 5 percent.

There’s just a limited number of people who can use it,” said Bob Chase, of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance. “If you live in Ballston and work in Farragut Square, fine. But that’s not a lot of people.”

Still, the subway has a strong public image. In a recent poll of riders and non-riders conducted by Metro, 69 percent said they felt positively or very positively about Metro.

Most people are for mass transit because they believe everyone else can use it,” Chase said. “They’re driving down the road and they’re thinking, ‘Gee, if we only had transit, everyone else would ride it and get out of my way.’”

Even as they celebrated the completion of the original system, Metro officials were working on three new projects—extending the Blue Line to Largo in Prince George’s, building a New York Avenue station on the Red Line and extending rail to Dulles International Airport, with stops in Tysons Corner and Washington Dulles.

As Metro starts digging the rail bed for the new century, some say it should correct its mistakes.

“If they just run [rail to Dulles] out the highway median and don’t focus on development at the stations, it will be a wasted investment,” Schwartz said.

I hope they won’t pull the rail to Dulles off the Dulles Toll Road and route it into the heart of the suburbs, it should make the
most of the stations along the highway. Risse, Schwartz said. They went stations of the new millennium to be built on plat-
forms over the highway that would also sup-
port stores, offices and housing—all of it ris-
ing into a roadway.

"While there is record ridership and we are
doing a good job, it’s like having a Class C
basketball team beating all its opponents
and saying that’s good enough," Risse said.

"But there’s Class B and Class A and Class
AA. There’s no reason this transit system
can’t be Class AA.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF RED
TAPE REDUCTION ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, five years
ago today the Congress, without dis-
sent in the Senate, took a historic step
in reigning in the federal government’s
regulatory machine and protecting the
interest of small businesses. My Red
Tape Reduction Act, what others call
the SBREFA panel process has had a very
positive impact on small businesses before their regu-
lations are proposed. This gives these
agencies the unique opportunity to
learn up front what the problems with
their regulation may be, and to correct
these problems when it will cause the
least difficulty. This has resulted in
significant changes being made, and in
one case, changing a policy because they recognized that the indus-
ytry could deal with the issue more ef-
fectively on their own.

Experience with this panel process had
proven to be an unequivocal suc-
cess. The former chief counsel for advo-
cacy of the Small Business Administra-
tion stated that, "Unquestionably, the
SBREFA panel process has had a very
salutary impact on the regulatory de-
liberations of OSHA and EPA, result-
ing in major changes to draft regula-
tions. What is important to note is
that these changes were accomplished
without sacrificing the agencies public
policy objectives."

Another provision of the Red Tape
Reduction Act that was just exercised,
was the Congressional Review Act, which
gave Congress the ability to in-
validate those regulations determined
to be truly egregious and beyond re-
pair. Thankfully, we had this measure
available as a last resort to dispose of
the Clinton OSHA ergonomics regula-
tion, which was a monument to regu-
latory excess and failure to appreciate
the impact on small businesses.

Finally, one other provision of the
Red Tape Reduction Act is just now
being tested. The Red Tape Reduc-
tion Act corrected the Regulatory
Flexibility Act’s lack of enforcement
by giving interested parties the oppor-
tunity to bring a legal challenge when
they believed that an agency is in non-
compliance. Litigation is now moving
through the courts that takes advan-
tage of this provision and will hold
agencies accountable for their actions.

While the Red Tape Reduction Act
has been a resounding success, is it clear
that more needs to be done. Too
many agencies are still trying to evade
the requirements to conduct regu-
latory flexibility analyses that will
identify the small business impacts of
their regulations. We now realize that
computers should be required to con-
duct small business review panels so
that their regulations will impose the
least amount of burden while still
achieving the mission of the agency.

These and shall be ad-
ressed in future legislation that I will
introduce. For now, let us all appre-
ciate and celebrate the benefits that
the Red Tape Reduction Act brought
to both the agencies and small businesses.

WORK OPPORTUNITY
IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, it is
with great pleasure that I join my col-
league and friend, Senator JEFFORDS,
to introduce S. 626, the Work Opportunity
Improvement Act of 2001. This legisla-
tion would permanently extend the
Work Opportunity Tax Credit, WOTC,
and the Welfare-to-Work, W-T-W, tax
credit. The measure would also modify
WOTC’s eligibility criteria to help
those receiving food stamps qualify for
the credit.

Since the past 5 years these tax cred-
its have played an integral part in
helping a million and a half of Amer-
ica’s working poor transition into the
work force. WOTC was enacted in Sep-
tember of 1996, and W-T-W a year later,
in order to provide employers with the
financial resources they would need to
recruit, hire, and retain individuals
who have significant barriers to work.
Traditionally, employers have been re-
sistant to hiring those coming off the
welfare rolls not only because they
tended to be less educated and have lit-
tle work place experience, but also be-
cause welfare dependency fosters self
esteem problems which need to be sur-
mounted. But these hiring tax incen-
tives have proven to be successful in
encouraging employers to change their hiring prac-
tices.

A vibrant public-private partnership
has developed over the past 5 years
whereby government has provided the
incentives and programs with fiscal support required to induce employers
to participate. Employers have re-
responded by changing their hiring prac-
tices. Many employers have established
outreach and recruitment programs to
target eligible individuals. States have
made these programs more employer-
friendly by continually improving the
way they are administered. But time
and again, we hear from both employ-
ers and the State job services, which
administer the programs, that the con-
tinued uncertainty surrounding short-
term extensions impedes expanded partic-
tipation and improvements in pro-
gram administration. A permanent ex-
tension would induce many of the em-
ployers now participating to expand
their recruitment efforts and encour-
age the States to commit more time
and effort to perfecting their admin-
istration of the program. This in turn
would mean that even more individuals
would be helped to transition from wel-
fare dependency to work. Precisely be-
cause these programs have proven to be
such successes over the past 5 years
that we believe they should be made
permanent.

In addition to making the WOTC and
W-T-W programs permanent, our legis-
lation would improve the WOTC pro-
gram by increasing the age ceiling in
the food stamp category from age 21 to
age 51. This would greatly improve the
job prospects for many absentee fa-
thers and other vulnerable males who
are less likely to qualify under other
categories. Making absentee fathers el-
igible for the WOTC credits would pro-
vide employers with the incentive to
hire them and in so doing provide them
with a sense of personal responsi-
ability and community involvement
that are essential first steps to their
assuming their responsibility as par-
ents.

We urge our colleagues to join us in
consponsoring this important legislation
that permanently extend the Work Op-
portunity Tax Credit and Welfare-to-
Work tax credit programs.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the
close of business yesterday, Wednes-
day, March 28, 2001, the Federal debt
stood at $5,734,570,704,080.99, Five tril-
lion, seven hundred thirty-four billion,
seven hundred seventy million, seven
billion, eighty dollars and ninety-nine
cents.

One year ago, March 28, 2000, the
Federal debt stood at $5,733,742,000,000.
Five trillion, seven hundred thirty-four billion,
five hundred seventy million, seven
billion, eighty dollars and ninety-nine

Five years ago, March 28, 1996, the
Federal debt stood at $5,071,792,000,000.
Five trillion, seventy-one billion, seven
billion, ninety-two million.