

among LGAC members from all jurisdictions at our most recent meeting, held right here in this building. And I want to take this opportunity to thank Congressman Gilchrest and his staff for engaging in substantive dialogue with LGAC members about this legislation.

Local governments throughout the watershed are currently spending millions of local citizenry dollars to do our part in cleaning up the Bay. However, there needs to be a greater emphasis on developing mechanisms to capture those substantial implementation efforts by local governments and others which are not funded through state or federal Chesapeake Bay funds. For instance, the Commonwealth of Virginia still does not have an effective mechanism to track urban nonpoint source Best Management stormwater facilities. This could be accomplished through a direction to the Chesapeake Bay Program Office and the states to develop an enhanced tracking and reporting system. I understand that the states may already be working on such a system, but to facilitate reporting by implementing entities, I would recommend that this system be web-based and simple to use.

I'm sure it is no surprise to you that the biggest help we could use is additional federal and state funding. The "Cost of a Clean Bay" report prepared by the Chesapeake Bay Commission estimated that more than half of the cost for meeting C2K nutrient and sediment reduction goals would be borne by local governments. In some of the most expensive programmatic areas, such as stormwater management and urban nonpoint source pollution control, the local government share is closer to 100% since there are virtually no federal or state funds to help address the problem. While, sadly, the thoughtful recommendations of the Chesapeake Bay Blue Ribbon Finance Panel seem to have faded from memory, the needs that were identified there have not. It is critical that the federal and state governments in the watershed assume a major role in providing financial assistance for implementation at the local level.

On the issue of funding, I also need to mention my concern with deep cuts being proposed to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). While local governments and our State partners are working to increase funding for clean water programs, the federal SRF is being targeted for cuts totaling \$199.2 million. Many local governments, especially in rural areas, in the Bay watershed depend on this federal funding to pay for high priority water pollution control projects, and the proposed budget cuts are exactly the opposite of what's needed to achieve our goal of a clean and healthy Bay.

But funding alone isn't enough. We also need our state and federal partners to work cooperatively with local governments on a watershed basis to:

1. Clearly articulate measurable goals for local governments to achieve and couple these with appropriate levels of funding support. I support the requirement for measurable goals for local governments under the Local Government Involvement section, with the provisions that this be woven into a realistic implementation plan that includes equitable levels of funding support. To guarantee success of the Tributary Strategies, it is critical to have a detailed plan for implementation that explains who, what, when, where, why, and how.

2. Increase the level of support for the Small Watershed Grants Program to the proposed authorized amount of \$10 million. While far short of the estimated funding necessary to achieve the C2K goals, the Small Watershed Grants are perhaps the most ef-

fective mechanism for engaging local governments in the common effort to achieve water quality and habitat goals. The current funding level of \$2 million translates into just \$1,212 for each of the 1,650 local governments in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. In addition, I recommend increasing the cap on individual small watershed grants to as much as one million dollars, a substantial increase over the present \$50,000 limit. Let me give you an example: in Fairfax County, we often do not apply for small watershed grants because the staff time involved in preparing the grant application actually costs more than the grant itself. The current \$50,000 cap effectively eliminates larger jurisdictions from participating in the Small Watershed Grants Program. In addition to the review and prioritization of grant proposals by the Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee, there also should be a mechanism for prioritizing grants within watersheds or metropolitan areas to ensure that grants address priority local or tributary-specific issues. A good example of a priority might be the ongoing efforts to restore the Anacostia River which flows into the Potomac River just a few blocks from here.

3. Establish a "Measurable Goals" provision for Soil Conservation Districts comparable to the provision for local governments. As the level of accountability and responsibility for local governments is increased, equity suggests that there be a comparable provision for "Measurable Goals" for the agricultural sector. A logical geographic unit would be the soil conservation district. As above, implementation should be coupled with equitable levels of funding support.

4. Enhance the Tributary Strategies and Implementation Plans to explicitly address nutrient and sediment "Cap Management" as growth continues. Cap management is clearly required by the Chesapeake 2000 Agreement, and the population of the watershed is projected to increase by upwards of 2 million between now and 2030. If not explicitly addressed at the State level in Tributary Strategies and related implementation plans, there is a very real risk of losing ground, literally, as new development occurs.

5. A one-size-fits-all approach to local government coordination and C2K Agreement implementation will not work. Outreach and implementation must be tailored to the abilities of large and small jurisdictions to undertake those efforts. Differences in local government access to technology must be considered during the development of communications strategies. A strong, structured technical assistance program to local governments is needed, especially in smaller, more rural jurisdictions that lack staff expertise in stormwater management and watershed protection. In many localities, watershed management still is not reflected in land use planning. As a result, development patterns and practices ignore the many values that riparian buffers, protected floodplains and protected natural resource lands offer for water quality, water supply, and wildlife habitat. More importantly, as a local elected official, I know that local government officials need to understand the local benefits that would result from changes in land use policies. Otherwise, they won't be persuaded to defend these changes before their constituencies.

6. We are concerned about the proposed language that requires tributary strategy goals or BMPs to be included in NPDES permits, both point and nonpoint source, or MS4 permits. In Virginia, nonpoint source pollution standards should not be written into MS4 permits because, as mentioned earlier in my testimony, the Commonwealth does

not yet have an effective mechanism to track urban nonpoint sources.

Each of these areas is of strong interest to LGAC. With appropriate staff and requisite resources, I can envision an activist role for LGAC, as the Tributary Strategies are turned in to action plans, including:

Developing goals at the local level and helping to ensure that localities live up to their responsibilities;

Partnering with state and local agencies to achieve an equitable allocation of funding;

Reaching out to other sectors, especially agriculture and private industry. We need to open or continue dialogue with all our partners in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. We are all in this together: from those who labor under the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol dome to the Pennsylvania farmer, the Maryland waterman, the Virginia technology worker, the long-time resident, and the new Americans. Finger-pointing won't clean up the Bay; working together just might.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for the opportunity to appear here today and for your leadership in helping to keep the Bay restoration effort moving forward. We are looking forward to working with you, other members of Congress, and our State and federal partners to achieve our shared goals of a restored Chesapeake Bay watershed.

COVER THE UNINSURED WEEK
HIGHLIGHTS NATIONAL PROBLEM

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2006

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the nearly 46 million Americans who lack health insurance, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. Cover the Uninsured Week (May 1–7, 2006) aims to raise awareness of this National problem and the will to solve it.

One in seven Americans, including more than 8 million children, does not have even basic healthcare coverage. Each day, these men and women hope they do not become sick or are not injured. Parents hope their children remain healthy. As healthcare costs continue to rise, it becomes more difficult for many families to continue healthcare coverage.

During the week of May 1–7, events will be held at hospitals, medical centers, community centers, on campuses and in place of worship worldwide. Volunteers will help to enroll uninsured adults and children in public programs that provide low-cost and free coverage to those who are eligible. Information about local help available will be distributed as well.

Ensuring Americans have access to adequate medical care should be a priority for all of us. Cover the Uninsured Week gives all of us the opportunity to say that we care—and we want this issue to be a national priority.

THE REMARKABLE LEGACY OF
U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL KOFI
ANNAN

TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2006

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reflect on the distinguished legacy of United Nations

Secretary General Kofi Annan, a great friend of this Congress and of the American people, and a dear friend of our family.

Kofi Annan began his service as Secretary General in January 1997, and his second five-year term will be completed in December of this year. Although he is the seventh individual to serve as Secretary General in the history of the United Nations, he is the first individual to be selected for this position from the ranks of U.N. staff.

As the Secretary General completes his work in New York, Mr. Speaker, the world's luminaries will weigh in and a consensus will quickly emerge that Kofi Annan is the United Nations' greatest secretary general. Because Kofi and his wife Nanne are dear personal friends of my wife, Annette, and me, I want to be the first to reflect on the remarkable term of this outstanding international civil servant.

Mr. Speaker, in looking back on the decade that Kofi Annan has shaped the United Nations, it is clear that his term has been sustained by a powerful vision—his belief that this complicated world body could become something much more than a Cold War relic useful only for convening meetings and servicing international conferences.

Since Secretary General Annan's first day on the job, he has been driven by the conviction that the United Nations must undergo what he has called a "strategic refit" to help the organization reach its full potential in the 21st century, to better serve the pressing needs of mankind that individual states are unable or unwilling to meet.

Every day for the last decade, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary General has worked tirelessly, against impossible odds, to convince 191 sovereign states to let him reshape the organization in line with his vision. This has been no small task, given that each one of these 191 states—democracies, monarchies, military juntas, and brutal dictatorships—is jealous of its own sovereign rights.

As we enter the closing months of Kofi Annan's term at the helm of the most important and most unruly international organization, we can say with absolute confidence that—against all odds—he has succeeded in this project.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most profound measure of Kofi's success was the groundbreaking consensus agreement he led the United Nations to adopt last September at an historic summit of more than 100 heads of state. This agreement consisted of a binding pledge by all U.N. member states to recognize a collective "responsibility to protect" individuals threatened with genocide, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity, a responsibility that supercedes the sovereignty of any individual state.

Kofi Annan's inspiration for his effort to reshape the fundamental principles underlying the United Nations grew out of his profound sadness in the tragic failure of the global community to protect its most vulnerable citizens in Srebrenica, Bosnia, and in Rwanda.

Mr. Speaker, during the decade between the latter of these two tragedies and that World Summit pledge last September, Secretary General Annan, has focused U.N. activities on three goals: preventing conflict, promoting democracies, and eradicating poverty. He has done this methodically and with steely determination, step by step, surmounting numerous pitfalls and hurdles along the way.

Despite inheriting a United Nations beset with a sclerotic bureaucracy and severely limited resources, Kofi Annan's achievement in mobilizing the world body to start to close what he has called "the chasm between [those who are] rich and poor, free and fettered, privileged and humiliated." This effort has been breathtaking in scope and scale.

In the past nine years under Secretary General Annan's watch, Mr. Speaker, the number of civilian soldiers deployed on U.N. peacekeeping missions has increased from 20,000 to 80,000, bringing hope and a measure of stability to damaged lives in places like Liberia, Burundi, Haiti, the Ivory Coast, and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

U.N. capacity to move beyond simply keeping the peace to helping shell-shocked societies recover and prosper has also been greatly enhanced under Kofi Annan's leadership. His most notable accomplishment in this process was to establish a U.N. Peacebuilding Commission during that World Summit last September.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary General's efforts to build U.N. capacity to promote democracy have also enjoyed remarkable success. During his tenure the Secretariat's Political Office has helped conduct more than 100 successful elections, including those in Iraq and Afghanistan. The people involved in this enterprise have also helped achieve democratic openings in places previously thought to be beyond democracy's reach, such as Georgia, Ukraine, Sierra Leone and Lebanon.

Secretary General Annan's moral leadership has also inspired the U.N.'s member states to remake a wholly dysfunctional U.N. Human Rights Commission by replacing it with a Human Rights Council that for the first time in the history of the United Nations will require countries to meet human rights qualifications to gain membership. This change will forever shatter the pernicious myth that had long operated in Geneva, that a pathological dictatorship like Sudan somehow occupied the same moral high ground as Sweden in enforcing agreed human rights standards.

The Secretary General has also created a new architecture to attack poverty and chronic disease by committing states to tangible Millennium Development Goals, and by creating a Global Compact committing corporations to pledges to upgrade environmental, labor and human rights conditions. This will serve to bring the benefits of globalization to more people worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to be the first person to nominate Kofi Annan for the Nobel Peace Prize. When the distinguished Secretary General accepted that prize in October 2001, he explained why he is so committed to ensuring that the United Nations can live up to its responsibility to protect each and every vulnerable human being.

As he most eloquently phrased it on the stage in Stockholm, "What begins with the failure to uphold the dignity of one life, all too often ends with a calamity for entire nations." And "a genocide begins with the killing of one man—not for what he has done, but because of who he is."

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to overstate the contribution that United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan has made to advancing human dignity, peace and stability in the world. I invite my colleagues to join me in saluting Kofi Annan, the finest Secretary General ever to have served at the helm of the United Nations.

HURRICANE KATRINA STATEMENT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2006

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 2006, I prepared the following opening statement for the Committee on Government Reform's hearing, "Sifting Through Katrina's Legal Debris: Contracting in the Eye of the Storm".

Thank you, Chairman DAVIS, for holding this important oversight hearing to examine federal contracting for Hurricane Katrina relief. I appreciate that you have kept your promise to hold a series of hearings on the subject of Hurricane Katrina as you said you would in September of last year. I am grateful for your leadership in this regard.

Since this Administration has come into office, we have witnessed multiple federal contracting sprees, which have all been reckless and wasteful. After 9/11, and the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security, a variety of security functions were contracted out to private companies. The Iraq war and reconstruction brought the next round of federal contracts, and finally, after Hurricane Katrina, several contracts were administered to aid in relief and reconstruction.

Contracts awarded have consistently been cost-plus and no bid contracts, have lacked oversight and transparency, and have led to costly waste, fraud and abuse.

Despite the waste, fraud and abuse, which have been well documented by government oversight bodies, including this Committee, the federal government has refused to learn its lesson and change its contracting practices. The contracts handed out for Katrina relief and reconstruction were just as flawed as those for Homeland Security functions and Iraq reconstruction.

Halliburton, for example, which has been the target of investigations for robbing the American taxpayer blind in its Iraq contracts, was one of the first companies awarded no bid contracts after Katrina hit the Gulf Coast, to repair 3 different Navy facilities in Mississippi.

Furthermore, measures put forward immediately following Hurricane Katrina to help ensure proper contracting, such as Ranking Member Waxman's bill, the "Hurricane Katrina Accountability and Clean Contracting Act," were disregarded.

Now, eight months later—eight months too late—we are here in this Committee examining what went wrong. Our government should have known better.

Today's hearing will reveal how FEMA, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other federal agencies entered into at least eight major contracts, worth over \$5.6 billion, that have resulted in significant waste, fraud and abuse.

We will also hear some familiar testimony: how full and open competition has been the exception, not the rule, in awarding Katrina contracts; how lack of contract management and oversight were missing in Katrina contracts; and how these flawed contracting procedures lead to significant cost or performance problems in nearly every major contract related to Hurricane Katrina.

Far too much taxpayer money has been squandered on important jobs that aren't getting done. I look forward to the testimonials