

the program are well-recognized nationally; the program is being used as a template for a similar authorization for the Upper Mississippi river system. In addition to their uses to the Corps of Engineers in planning for dredging needs of the region and development of cost-effective alternatives to dredging, the tributary transport models are made available to local, state and federal partners involved in nonpoint source pollution control to help target their efforts to prevent erosion which results in sedimentation of harbors and channels. A total of approximately sixty Great Lakes tributaries qualify under the authorization guidelines, 25 of which are considered high priority based on their current dredging needs.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in each of fiscal 1998 and fiscal 1999 the Congress was able to provide \$500,000 for this project—funds which were spent to begin construction of models for six priority tributaries. Models of the Nemadji River, and Saginaw River have been completed, but lack of funding in fiscal 2000 has delayed completion of models of the Maumee River, Menominee River, Buffalo River, and Grand Calumet River. Plans to begin development of additional models for priority tributaries in Mill & Cascade Creeks, PA and Grand River, MI have also been delayed. With the first models just finishing completion, we are already seeing the benefits of the program. In the case of the Nemadji River model, the county government is starting to use the model to explore potential effects of changes to forestry practices in the Nemadji River watershed to reduce bank erosion and soil loss to Lake Superior. Preliminary analysis carried out on the Maumee model indicate that soil conservation can reduce future dredging and disposal costs.

We note that the House Committee has provided \$500,000 in fiscal 2001 funding for the modeling program and ask the distinguished ranking member to make funding for this program a high priority in conference with the House.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to thank our colleagues from the Great Lakes states for highlighting the importance of this program and its potential for long-term cost. And to the extent that resources are available, I will do my best to address the funding needs of this program in Conference.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the chairman for his consideration and congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for presenting the Senate with an Energy and Water Development appropriations bill which addresses so many of this nation's water resources infrastructure needs.

LOW LAKE LEVELS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from New Mexico and Chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. DOMENICI, if he is aware of a serious problem facing Ohio and the entire Great Lakes region. For

the last 2 years, water levels in the Great Lakes have been declining rapidly. This year, the water level fell below low water datum for the first time in nearly 35 years.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am aware of the extreme low water level problem and understand the difficulties that the Great Lakes region is facing as a result.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, dredging in Great Lakes harbors and navigation channels is authorized by reference to low water datum. During periods of extremely low water, like those today, lake levels drop below low water datum. These low water levels not only threaten to cripple Great Lakes industries that depend on waterborne transportation, but they also create a serious threat to the safety of the thousands of recreational and commercial boaters on the Lakes. Would my colleague from New Mexico agree that the Corps should ensure minimal operation depths consistent with the original authorized depths and current use of the channels and harbors when Great Lakes water levels are below the International Great Lakes Datum of 1985?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe that the corps should work toward this goal recognizing the constrained nature of the operation and maintenance budget recommended for fiscal year 2001 and existing traffic using the system.

GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANNING ASSISTANCE AND SEDIMENT REMEDIATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the Fiscal Year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations, we would like to bring to the attention of the distinguished chairman and ranking member the critical problem which the Great Lakes region faces in dealing with a legacy of sediment contamination.

In 1987, the International Joint Commission designated 43 Areas of Concern on the Great Lakes where human use of the aquatic resources is severely impaired. Of the 31 U.S. sites, none have been cleaned up to the point of de-listing in the 13 years which have passed since listing. In most cases, the remaining recalcitrant problem is sediments which are contaminated with persistent toxic substances.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, the Army Corps of Engineers plays a key role in addressing the contaminated sediments problem in the Great Lakes region. Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 authorized the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance to the Remedial Action Planning Committees for each of the Areas of Concern. This technical assistance is critical to developing a cost-effective and scientifically sound approach to cleanup. One of the largest obstacles to cleanup of contaminated sediments in the Great Lakes region is the lack of availability of alternative technologies for remediation of contaminated sediments. The

Water Resources Development Act of 1996 amended Section 401 allowing technical assistance funds to be used for the development and demonstration of promising new remediation technologies.

Since 1990, Congress has provided a total of just \$3.25 million for the Section 401 program. Funding has never exceeded \$500,000 in any fiscal year, a level far too low to support even a single technology demonstration while maintaining key technical assistance capabilities.

We note that the House Committee has provided \$600,000 in fiscal 2001 funding for the Section 401 Program. While we welcome the prospect of this increase, even at this level funding remains woefully short of the amount needed for this key component of our regional battle to address the problem of sediment contamination in the Great Lakes. We ask the distinguished chairman and ranking member to make funding for this program a high priority in conference with the House and within any additional funding which may become available.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to thank our colleagues from the Great Lakes States for highlighting the importance of this program. To the extent that resources are available, I will do my best to address the funding needs of this program in conference.

GLOBAL AIDS AND TUBERCULOSIS RELIEF ACT OF 2000

Mr. MOYNIHAN. On August 19, 2000, President Clinton signed into law bipartisan legislation that pledges more than \$400 million to fight AIDS and other infectious diseases in Africa and around the world.

There are few greater crises that face us today than the AIDS pandemic. Alarming statistics are reported from around the globe. In Africa, more than 13 million people have died from AIDS, and an estimated 24.5 million are infected with the human immunodeficiency virus HIV. More than 1 in 3 adults in Botswana are HIV-positive. Burma and Cambodia have recently had the sharpest increases in the rate of infection. In Haiti, more than 1 in 20 adults are infected.

The XIII International AIDS Conference in South Africa was defined by the fact that 90 percent of those infected with HIV do not have the means to pay for the drugs to treat it. The epidemic is fueled by poverty, poor health, illiteracy, malnutrition, and gender bias. These are the same problems that developing nations have struggled with for many years. But even more urgency becomes warranted as these factors contribute to the exponential growth of an epidemic.

According to AIDS expert Peter Godwin, an epidemic requires specific responses in three areas: long-term protection of vulnerable populations; short-term relief and rehabilitation of those in crisis; and the strengthening

of basic institutions against future shocks to come. Each of these responses comprises an infinite number of sub-components.

The Senate's passage of this bill is remarkable. But our work has just begun. According to the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS, Asia has reached a critical point in the development of the AIDS epidemic. Though India has a relatively low infection rate, it has more than four million cases and is now the nation with the largest number of HIV cases in the world. In Africa, the U.N. has predicted that half of all 15-year-olds in the African countries worst affected by AIDS will eventually die of the disease, even if the rates of infection drop substantially in the next few years. Sandra Thurman, the director of the Clinton administration's anti-AIDS effort, put it best: "We are at the beginning of a pandemic, not the middle, not the end."

On February 3, Mr. FEINGOLD and I introduced S. 2032, the Mother-to-Child HIV Prevention Act of 2000. This bill has been included in this assistance package and will authorize \$25 million to bolster intervention programs, which include voluntary counseling and testing, antiretroviral drugs, replacement feeding, and other strategies.

At the beginning of this year, a score of bills were introduced by my colleagues in this body. Some proposals were more ambitious than others. No single proposal would have been a complete solution. Neither is the relief package before us. But each was an approach that did not require waiting for a cure. And each could make a difference. I hope this momentum will not face—but instead, grow internationally and exponentially—and that we will not become fatigued by this most formidable challenge.

IN MEMORY OF SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to my esteemed colleague, Paul Coverdell. I join with my colleagues in expressing sadness at his passing. He was a tremendous leader in the Senate and an asset for Georgians and the rest of the country. His years of exemplary public service have included the military, the Peace Corps, the Georgia statehouse, and finally the U.S. Senate. Senator Coverdell was an effective leader and demonstrated many times his unifying influence in the Senate.

On a personal level, he was an unpretentious man who had a quiet sense of humor and good mind for details. He was instrumental in helping me make the transition from the U.S. House to the Senate a couple of years ago, and provided insight and advice in every-

thing from how to set up a Senate office to how to make time for my family. There is not a day that goes by that his influence in my Senate career has not been felt.

Paul was a friend and a model statesman. He spent a lifetime of service to his country. I will miss him dearly. I extend my prayers to his wife, Nancy, and the rest of his family.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORT

SENATE REPORT NO. 106-373

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 106-373 was filed, the Congressional Budget Office report was not available. I ask unanimous consent that the report which is now available be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE—SEPTEMBER 1, 2000

S. 1612—Missouri River Basin, Middle Loup Division Facilities Conveyance Act

As reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on August 25, 2000

SUMMARY

S. 1612 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain facilities, lands, and rights to the Farwell Irrigation District, the Sargent Irrigation District, and the Loup Basin Reclamation District, in the state of Nebraska. Under the bill, these districts would pay the federal government about \$2.8 million for the Sherman Reservoir, Milburn Diversion Dam, Arcadia Diversion Dam, related canals and lands, and other associated rights and interests currently owned by the United States.

Based on information from the Bureau of Reclamation, CBO estimates that enacting S. 1612 would result in net receipts of about \$1.3 million over 2001–2005 period; \$2.8 million in asset sale receipts, offset by \$1.5 million of forgone offsetting receipts over that period.

Because enacting S. 1612 would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates a net pay-as-you-go cost of \$1.5 million over the 2001–2005 period, reflecting the forgone offsetting receipts. The asset sale receipts would not count for pay-as-you-go purposes because the sales of assets under S. 1612 would result in a net financial cost (on a present value basis) to the federal government.

CBO estimates that implementing this bill would have no net effect on discretionary spending in 2001, but would result in a very small decrease in discretionary spending each year thereafter.

S. 1612 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). The conveyance provided for in this bill would be voluntary on the part of the districts, and all costs incurred by them as a result of the conveyance also would be voluntary.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 1612 is shown in the following table. The costs of

this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars				
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING					
Asset Sale Receipts:					
Estimated Budget Authority	-2.8	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	-2.8	0	0	0	0
Forgone Offsetting Receipts:					
Estimated Budget Authority	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Estimated Outlays	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Net Changes:					
Estimated Budget Authority	-2.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Estimated Outlays	-2.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For the estimate, CBO assumes that S. 1612 will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2001. We expect that the project would be conveyed to the districts in fiscal year 2001. The bill would require the water districts to pay about \$2.8 million for the facilities that would be conveyed.

Currently, those districts have fixed repayment and water service contracts with the Bureau. Those contracts result in payments of about \$300,000 a year through 2016 and about \$130,000 a year over the remaining life of the contract (through 2042). Once the assets are conveyed to the districts, those repayments would no longer occur, and would result in a loss of offsetting receipts to the federal government. In addition, customers of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) are scheduled to pay a total of \$29 million to the government over the 2036–2042 period to assist with the repayment of the cost of these facilities. Enactment of S. 1612 would lead to a loss of these receipts as well.

S. 1612 would direct the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) to transfer \$2.6 million of receipts from the sale of electricity at the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin project to the reclamation fund at the time of the transfer or as soon as certain conditions are met. That intergovernmental payment would represent the net present value of \$29 million in payments that WAPA customers owe to the government under current law over the 2036–2042 period. The bill specifies that WAPA shall not increase the electricity rates to offset this payment; consequently, this provision would have no budgetary effect.

Based on information from the Bureau of Reclamation, CBO estimates that the agency currently spends less than \$60,000 each year for expenses related to the projects to be conveyed under S. 1612. After the projects are conveyed, these expenses would no longer be incurred, resulting in a small savings to the government. However, in the year of the conveyance, CBO expects that the bureau would spend about the same amount to administer the conveyance, resulting in not change in discretionary spending in 2001.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. Enactment of S. 1612 would result in the loss of offsetting receipts of \$0.3 million annually over the 2001–2010 period, and additional amounts later. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the succeeding four years are counted.