

Calendar No. 424

107TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
107-165

PORTS-TO-PLAINS CORRIDOR IN TEXAS, OKLAHOMA, COLORADO, AND NEW MEXICO

JUNE 19, 2002.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JEFFORDS, from the Committee on Environment and Public
Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[to accompany S. 1646]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which was referred a bill (S. 1646), to identify certain routes in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and New Mexico as part of the Ports-to-Plains Corridor, a high priority corridor on the National Highway System, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment, and recommends that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT AND BACKGROUND

In the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 105-178), Congress designated the Ports-to-Plains High Priority Corridor “from the Mexican Border via I-27 to Denver, Colorado” (112 STAT. 191). In 2000, Congress designated the southern portion of the route from Laredo to Dumas, Texas, in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY2001 (H. Rep. 106-1033, P.L. 106-554, 114 STAT. 2763A-201). However, Congress left unspecified the route north of Dumas, TX. The accompanying report language directed the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to submit to Congress a route designation if Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado and New Mexico did not reach a “unified consensus” by September 30, 2001. In July of 2001, the four States agreed to support designating the northern segment of the Ports-to-Plains corridor from Dumas, TX, along U.S. Highway 287 through Boise City, OK, to Limon, CO, and then along Interstate

70 to Denver, CO. The representatives also agreed to include in Ports-to-Plains the route from Dumas, TX, along U.S. Highway 87 through Clayton, NM, to Raton. This bill affirms and codifies the route that the four States recommended by consensus.

OBJECTIVES OF THE LEGISLATION

This bill seeks to complete the designation of the northern segment of the Ports-to-Plains Corridor as directed by the report language of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Identification of Ports-to-Plains High Priority Corridor Routes

This section identifies the Ports-to-Plains high priority corridor routes as follows: The four States agreed to support designating the northern segment of the Ports-to-Plains corridor from Dumas, Texas, along U.S. Highway 287 through Boise City, OK, to Limon, CO, and then along Interstate 70 to Denver. The representatives also agreed to include in Ports-to-Plains the route from Dumas, TX, along U.S. Highway 87 through Clayton, NM, to Raton.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), Congress designated the Ports-to-Plains High Priority Corridor “from the Mexican Border via I-27 to Denver, Colorado” (112 STAT. 191). In 2000, Congress designated the southern portion of the route from Laredo to Dumas, TX, in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (H. Rep. 106-1033, P.L. 106-554, 114 STAT. 2763A-201). Senators Bingaman and Domenici introduced S. 1646 on November 7, 2001. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works reported the bill favorably without amendment by voice vote on April 25, 2002.

REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT

In compliance with section 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the committee makes evaluation of the regulatory impact of the reported bill.

The bill does not create any additional regulatory burdens, nor will it cause any adverse impact on the personal privacy of individuals.

MANDATES ASSESSMENT

In compliance with the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4), the committee finds that S. 1646 would impose no unfunded mandates on State, local, or tribal governments.

Section 403 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act requires that a statement of the cost of the reported bill, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, be included in the report. That statement follows:

COST OF LEGISLATION

Section 403 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act requires that a statement of the cost of the reported bill, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, be included in the report. That statement follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2002.

Hon. JAMES M. JEFFORDS, *Chairman,*
Committee on Environment and Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1646, a bill to identify certain routes in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and New Mexico as part of the Ports-to-Plains Corridor, a high priority corridor on the National Highway System.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Rachel Milberg, who can be reached at 226-2860

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 1646, A bill to identify certain routes in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and New Mexico as part of the Ports-to-Plains Corridor, a high-priority corridor on the National Highway System, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on April 25, 2002

Current law identifies certain roadways as high-priority corridors, and States are authorized to spend a portion of their grants from the Federal-Aid Highway program on the construction of those corridors. S. 1646 would clarify the description of the Ports-to-Plains Corridor, a group of roadway identified as a high-priority corridor under current law.

S. 1646 would not authorize additional spending on the Ports-to-Plains corridor, and CBO estimates that implementing the bill would not have a significant impact on the Federal budget. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

S. 1646 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Rachel Milberg, who can be reached at 226-2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with section 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows: Existing law proposed to be omitted is en-

closed in **[black brackets]**, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman:

**INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY
ACT OF 1991**

[Public Law 102-240; December 18, 1991]

[As Amended Through Public Law 107-136, Jan. 24, 2002]

AN ACT To develop a national intermodal surface transportation system, to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

* * * * *

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991”.

* * * * *

SEC. 1105. HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

* * * * *

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.—The following are high priority corridors on the National Highway System:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

[(38) The] (38)(A) The Ports-to-Plains Corridor from Laredo, Texas, via I-27 to Denver, Colorado, shall include:

[(A)] (i) In the State of Texas the Ports-to-Plains Corridor shall generally follow—

[(i)] (I) I-35 from Laredo to United States Route 83 at Exit 18;

[(ii)] (II) United States Route 83 from Exit 18 to Carrizo Springs;

[(iii)] (III) United States Route 277 from Carrizo Springs to San Angelo;

[(iv)] (IV) United States Route 87 from San Angelo to Sterling City;

[(v)] (V) From Sterling City to Lamesa, the Corridor shall follow United States Route 87 and, the Corridor shall also follow Texas Route 158 from Sterling City to I-20, then via I-20 West to Texas Route 349 and, Texas Route 349 from Midland to Lamesa;

[(vi)] (VI) United States Route 87 from Lamesa to Lubbock;

[(vii)] (VII) I-27 from Lubbock to Amarillo; **[and]**

[(viii)] (VIII) United States Route 287 from Amarillo to Dumas~~].~~ **and**

(IX) United States Route 287 from Dumas to the border between the States of Texas and Oklahoma, and

also United States Route 87 from Dumas to the border between the States of Texas and New Mexico.

【(B) The corridor designation contained in paragraph

(A)】

(B) The corridor designation contained in subclauses (I) through (VIII) of subparagraph (A)(i) shall take effect only if the Texas Transportation Commission has not designated the Ports-to-Plains Corridor in Texas by June 30, 2001.

(ii) In the State of Oklahoma, the Ports-to-Plains Corridor shall generally follow United States Route 287 from the border between the States of Texas and Oklahoma to the border between the States of Oklahoma and Colorado.

(iii) In the State of Colorado, the Ports-to-Plains Corridor shall generally follow—

(I) United States Route 287 from the border between the States of Oklahoma and Colorado to Limon; and

(II) Interstate Route 70 from Limon to Denver.

(iv) In the State of New Mexico, the Ports-to-Plains Corridor shall generally follow United States Route 87 from the border between the States of Texas and New Mexico to Raton.”; and

* * * * *

