

they see him, as we do here in the Senate, as a man of great stature and wisdom.

I thank JOHN for his service and for his friendship, and Marcelle and I join all Members of the Senate in wishing JOHN and Jeanne all the best in their future endeavors.

CHUCK HAGEL

Madam President, I rise to acknowledge the work and commitment of a colleague whom I have had the pleasure of serving with for the last 12 years here in the U.S. Senate. Senator CHUCK HAGEL joined the Senate in 1997 after an already successful career in business and public service, both in his home State of Nebraska and here in Washington, DC.

While in the Senate, CHUCK has been a strong independent voice for all Nebraskans and citizens of this country. He is not afraid to share what is on his mind and he is certainly not afraid to reach across the aisle to work with all Senators. In one of his first acts of bipartisanship, Senator HAGEL joined me as a cosponsor of the Landmine Elimination Act of 1997. I worked with CHUCK, who was himself injured by landmines while in Vietnam, to ban new deployments of antipersonnel landmines.

Senator HAGEL has demonstrated an incredible alacrity on defense and foreign policy issues. While it was not popular within his own party, he made the difficult decision to support a timeline for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. This is just one example of many stances he has taken in Washington that demonstrates how CHUCK HAGEL was an independent voice that Nebraska is proud to call their own.

I am also pleased to know CHUCK and Lilibet as wonderful travel partners. The last trip we took together, in May 2007, was to the Middle East to assess regional conflicts in Jordan, Lebanon, Israel and the West Bank. Trips like these provide the opportunity to get to know Senators and their spouses beyond the day-to-day encounters in Washington and I cherish the time we had to together.

I am pleased to call CHUCK a friend and voice of reason in the U.S. Senate. I will miss him as both a friend and colleague. Marcelle and I and wish him and Lilibet well in whatever way he will next serve Nebraska and our Nation.

PETE DOMENICI

Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to the senior Senator from New Mexico, a dedicated public servant, a respected lawmaker and a man I am proud to call my colleague, PETE DOMENICI.

From his first days in the Senate in the 93rd Congress, to now 35 years later, Senator DOMENICI has earned a reputation as a powerful champion for New Mexico. While he and I have not agreed on some issues, I have never questioned his commitment to do what he believed was right for this country and the State of New Mexico. However,

I might question which of our Italian grandmothers made a better meatball, but then again I wouldn't want a fight to break out here on the Senate floor.

Senator DOMENICI has too many accomplishments to list here today. Senator DOMENICI has had a long and distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. However what stands out most to me is his unending drive to enact Mental Health Parity legislation which he worked on so closely with our late colleague Paul Wellstone. I believe it was a fitting tribute to enact this legislation in the closing days of the 110th Congress.

I know it can sound repetitive when people hear Senators make remarks such as these about our colleagues as they are leaving the Senate. But I think it is important for the public to know that despite all the squabbling that goes on in Washington, there is the deep respect, affection, and caring that goes on among the Members of this body. After an incredible 35 years of service New Mexico and the whole United States are grateful, and I consider myself fortunate to have served 33 years with PETE DOMENICI in the U.S. Senate. Marcelle and I wish PETE and Nancy the best.

GORDON SMITH

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam President, when the Founders envisioned this Senate, I believe they hoped it would be a place where strong opinions, established life skills and varied experience would come together to serve the nation. Senator GORDON SMITH of Oregon has matched that standard and the whole nation has benefited.

I have always been encouraged and inspired by Senator SMITH's forward-looking mind and his energetic advocacy of a better life for all Americans. He has fought for better schools for our children. He confronted the reality of America's "drop-out culture" and fought for individualized attention for at-risk kids.

We have worked together to ensure that the Medicaid Program fulfills its promise to America's less fortunate, and to extend the excellent quality of American health care to a broader and broader share of the population.

It has been an honor to work with GORDON SMITH on the Aging Committee in particular. His tireless advocacy to ensure that our seniors are afforded the dignity and respect they deserve has been an inspiration.

GORDON SMITH has also been a strong voice for Oregonians on the environment and the natural treasures in their State. And he turned personal tragedy into a nationwide effort to prevent suicide.

On issue after issue, GORDON SMITH has demonstrated a boundless enthusiasm for the process of reform, and a confidence that we can always make government programs more responsive, more relevant and more effective for the American people.

Like the modern day Oregon pioneers he represents, GORDON SMITH has al-

ways demonstrated both a fierce independence and a strong belief that there is a better way—if we dream big, work hard and stick together, there is no problem too big for America.

In "Mr. SMITH Goes to Washington," Hollywood memorialized the commonsense man, of impeccable character, as the ideal Senator. GORDON SMITH would have fit the part perfectly. I will dearly miss his integrity, his enthusiasm, and his friendship in this place. But I am excited for what the next chapter of his leadership will mean to Oregon and this country. I hope we can all bring more of his can-do spirit and positive energy to the urgent challenges we face in the days ahead.

#### TRIBUTE TO TUCKER SHUMACK

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Tucker Shumack's dedicated service to the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship over the past 3 years. An integral part of the committee staff, Tucker always performed his duties with the livelihood and success of small business owners in mind.

Tucker began his Capitol Hill service in the office of Senator Paul Coverdell from his home State of Georgia. After attending law school, Tucker returned to Washington to work for the Congressman, and later Senator Johnny Isakson, also from Georgia. When he came to the Small Business Committee in the fall of 2005, Tucker was well-grounded in the ways of Capitol Hill. From day 1, Tucker was proactive in efforts to mitigate the often unfair tax structure that small business owners face. Tucker's insights on these subjects have proven immensely critical to me over the years.

Tucker has had many legislative successes helping me forge commonsense bills that appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle. Just last year, Tucker was invaluable in helping me develop provisions to extend the Work opportunity tax credit, to expand small business expensing and enhance the refundable child tax credit. These vital extensions give more people a chance at gainful employment and allow thousands of small businesses to succeed and thrive.

Whether it was extending the new markets tax credit, advocating for a fairer and simpler Tax Code, or confronting the mess known as the alternative minimum tax, Tucker consistently brought colleagues together to find reasonable and sound solutions to the myriad tax problems facing Americans. His ability to forge lasting relationships has made him a key player on Capitol Hill, and his diligence and perseverance have made him a trustworthy ally. My legislative priorities have been well served because of Tucker's talents and expertise.

Always the Southern gentleman, Tucker is easy to get along with because of his charm, grace, and wit—the latter of which Tucker is most famous

for. His ability to make others laugh cannot be overstated! He has certainly had a lasting impact on those with whom he has worked over the years, and his cordial demeanor and welcoming smile will be missed in the Halls of the Capitol complex.

On a personal note, Tucker and his wife Kristine recently welcomed their first child, Tucker, Jr., into the world in August. I am sure that Tucker will be a great father, and look forward to hearing about the Shumack family's adventures throughout the years.

Tucker's departure from the Small Business Committee is a true loss. I owe Tucker a debt of gratitude for his phenomenal work on behalf of the American people. I am confident that he will quickly become a well-liked and respected member of his new office. I speak for my entire staff when I wish Tucker well in his new job, and in all his future endeavors.

#### GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE ANALYSIS

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, earlier this summer, when gasoline prices were topping \$4 a gallon, I asked the GAO to analyze potential savings from the establishment of a national speed limit. I did not prescribe what that speed limit should be, merely asked the GAO to conduct an analysis at which speeds vehicles were most fuel efficient and make a determination as to whether a national speed limit would have positive impacts on the conservation of gasoline.

My interest in this approach to gas conservation was spurred by a desire for a measure that would provide immediate relief to the overstretched budgets of households across America. I was also dusting off a solution used in the past, specifically, the number of barrels of oil saved when a national speed limit was imposed in 1974 in response to the Arab oil embargo.

Last week, I was pleased to meet with the GAO and hear their findings on the relationship between vehicular speed and fuel economy as well as how reducing the speed limit might affect fuel use and perhaps cost.

While the days of my service in the U.S. Senate are numbered, it is my hope that these findings by the GAO can serve as a useful tool to my colleagues who will return in the next Congress, as I know the interlinked issues of energy, transportation, and climate change are going to remain the focus of much debate and policy making in the coming years.

Mr. President, I thank the GAO for its work, and I ask unanimous consent that GAO analysis be printed in the RECORD.

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

*Energy Efficiency: Potential Fuel Savings Generated by a National Speed Limit Would Be Influenced by Many Other Factors*

In response to Senator Warner's interest in obtaining information on the possibility of

using a national speed limit to reduce fuel consumption, the Government Accountability Office reviewed existing literature and consulted knowledgeable stakeholders on the following:

What is the relationship between speed and the fuel economy of vehicles?

How might reducing the speed limit affect fuel use?

Due to a limited time frame of two months to complete the work, to address these objectives, we limited our analyses to light-duty vehicles, such as cars, sport utility vehicles, and pickup trucks and relied on the expertise of GAO and knowledgeable stakeholders to identify the most relevant economic and transportation literature. We provided a draft to the three agencies whose officials we consulted for our analyses—the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of Energy (DOE), and the Department of Transportation (DOT)—and incorporated relevant technical comments. We did not examine other aspects of implementing a national speed limit, such as potential safety impacts. In summary, we found the following.

*According to Literature and Stakeholders, Reducing a Vehicle's Speed Can Potentially Increase Its Fuel Economy, Depending on the Vehicle's Characteristics*

For a vehicle traveling at high speed, reducing its speed increases fuel economy. In general, at speeds over approximately 35 to 45 mph, if a vehicle reduces its speed by 5 mph, its fuel economy can increase by about 5 to 10 percent, because air resistance, or drag, increases exponentially as a vehicle goes faster. Conversely, air resistance diminishes more rapidly as a vehicle slows down, thus increasing its fuel economy.

According to existing literature and knowledgeable stakeholders, there is no single speed that optimizes fuel economy for all vehicles. Optimal speed for fuel economy for individual vehicles ranges widely, but is generally between 30 and 60 mph, depending on a vehicle's characteristics. For example, according to the most recent published data—a 1997 study by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, commissioned by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), that examined fuel economy at different speeds for nine automobiles and light trucks from model years 1988 through 1997—the optimal fuel economy for a 1994 Jeep Grand Cherokee, a sport-utility vehicle, would be about 26 miles per gallon at a steady 40 mph. In contrast, in a 2008 internal study by the Argonne National Laboratory for the Department of Energy (DOE), examining four vehicles, the optimal fuel economy for a 2005 Toyota Echo, a subcompact car, is about 69 miles per gallon, achieved when traveling at a steady 30 mph.

However, a vehicle's fuel economy also depends on other factors besides air resistance. Factors that enhance fuel economy include engine efficiency enhancements (e.g., fuel injection), electronic and computer controls, more efficient transmissions, and hybrid technology. However, other factors, such as increased vehicle weight, decrease fuel economy.

In general, over the last 2 decades, fuel economy gains resulting from advances in automotive technologies have largely been offset by increases in vehicle weight, performance, and accessory loads. Specifically, vehicles are heavier than in the past, because they are larger and include more technologies. For example, average vehicle weight has increased from 3,220 pounds in 1987 to 4,117 in 2008, according to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In addition, trends show that recent vehicles, on average, have bigger, more powerful engines that yield better performance—i.e., accelera-

tion and greater speed—at the expense of fuel economy. For example, according to the same EPA report, average horsepower has increased from 118 to 222 over the same period. Further, increased accessory loads, such as air conditioning and electronics, have also reduced fuel economy. According to EPA, from 1987 through 2004, on a fleetwide basis, technology innovation was utilized exclusively to support market-driven attributes other than fuel economy, such as performance. Beginning in 2005, however, according to EPA's analysis of fuel economy trends, technology has been used to increase both performance and fuel economy, while keeping vehicle weight relatively constant.

*According to Literature and Stakeholders, a Reduced Speed Limit Is Only One of Many Factors That Could Affect Total Fuel Use*

Lowering speed limits can potentially reduce total fuel consumption. According to literature we reviewed examining the impact of the national speed limit enacted in 1974, the estimated fuel savings resulting from the 55 mph national speed limit ranged from 0.2 to 3 percent of annual gasoline consumption. According to DOE's 2008 estimate, a national speed limit of 55 mph could yield possible savings of 175,000 to 275,000 barrels of oil per day. This range is consistent with estimates of the impact of the past national speed limit. According to the Energy Information Administration, total U.S. consumption of petroleum for 2007 was about 21 million barrels of oil per day.

However, other factors, including drivers' compliance with a reduced speed limit, would affect the actual impact of a lower speed limit on the amount of fuel savings. Reducing the speed limit does not necessarily mean that drivers will comply. In fact, in 1975, under the previous national speed limit, about half of the states reported more drivers exceeding the national speed limit of 55 mph than complying with it. States may vary in their ability to enforce the reduced speed limit, in part due to cost and limited resources, affecting driver compliance. Moreover, a national speed limit would not affect many of the miles driven in the United States, such as those in urban areas, where most vehicles are already traveling at lower speeds due to lower speed limits or congestion. According to FHWA, fewer than one quarter of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the United States would likely be directly affected by a changed speed limit. In addition, congestion forces some vehicles to travel slowly, no matter what the speed limit, meaning a reduction would have little or no impact on fuel consumed on congested roads.

Other external conditions also affect fuel economy, such as road conditions, including whether a road is steep or flat, and weather conditions, including wind speed and direction. Finally, other aspects of driver behavior may also affect fuel consumption. For example, driver behavior may be affected by fuel prices. Higher prices may cause people to drive less or purchase more fuel-efficient vehicles. Similarly, driving at a consistent speed can reduce fuel consumption. In contrast, aggressive driving such as accelerating or stopping quickly can increase fuel consumption. In addition, proper vehicle maintenance—including regularly changing automobile fluids and filters and properly inflating tires—improves fuel economy.

The speed limit is only one tool among many for potentially conserving fuel. Certain realities such as congestion on our nation's roads, how people drive and maintain their vehicles, and emerging technologies are other potential considerations as the nation looks for options to conserve fuel.