

ANSWERING THE CALL IN THE
WAKE OF GULF'S FUEL DEPOT
EXPLOSION IN PUERTO RICO

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise to thank President Barack Obama for his steadfastness in dealing with the state of emergency in my beloved Puerto Rico. An explosion at the fuel storage complex in Cataño ignited a fire on Friday, October 23rd, that burned for two days, spewing thick, toxic smoke across the Caribbean region and forcing hundreds of people on the island to evacuate their homes. The fire affected 21 of the fuel depot's 40 tanks. The damages are now estimated at \$6.4 million.

In a press statement issued by the office of the President's Press Secretary, President Obama swiftly declared that an emergency exists in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Furthermore, the President ordered federal aid to supplement Governor Fortuno's funds and other local response efforts in the area struck by explosions and fire.

The President's action authorizes the Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency to coordinate all disaster relief efforts. The purpose of this swift action is to alleviate the hardship and suffering caused by the emergency on the locals, and to provide appropriate assistance for required emergency measures, authorized under Title V of the Stafford Act. This will save lives, protect property and public health and safety, and lessen or avert the threat of a catastrophe in the municipalities of Bayamón, Cataño, Guaynabo, San Juan, and Toa Baja.

Although it's true that we can't personally drive those fire engines and we can't personally distribute aid, there are still lots of other ways in which we can all help. I, and my fellow colleagues here in Congress, can make sure that our government does not stray from its initial commitments and that bureaucratic red tape does not impede any relief efforts to the affected area. We can also appeal to constituents in our own home districts to give to the local charities that are involved in this effort, like the Red Cross or Catholic Charities.

We must never forget that our country's strength lies not just in the size of our military, but also in the depth of our compassion. Any effort will go a long way in relieving the suffering that continues to be felt by our fellow citizens and Commonwealth neighbors to the south.

PUTTING THE PRICE OF GOING
GREEN IN CONTEXT

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight an article by Dr. Kurt House entitled, "Putting the Price of Going Green in Context." The following column was coauthored by Benjamin Urquhart, a research associate at Harvard University's Center for the Environment, and Mark Winkler, a Ph.D. stu-

dent at Harvard's School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

Over time, the global energy infrastructure must change because the continued combustion of fossil fuels is altering Earth's climate in potentially dangerous ways and because the large wealth transfer from mostly democratic oil-importing countries to mostly autocratic oil-exporting countries is propping up repressive regimes worldwide. So, we know that the world's energy infrastructure must change. But, the interesting questions are: how big an investment are we willing to make to bring about that change and how fast are we willing to make that investment?

Many groups have tried to answer these questions. In the last year alone former Vice President Al Gore, Google, oilman T. Boone Pickens, Greenpeace, and the International Energy Agency all have published hypothetical scenarios for how the United States could transform its energy infrastructure over the next two decades. Gore's "Repower America" calls for generating 100-percent renewable electricity by 2020. Google's "Clean Energy 2030" would eliminate coal- and oil-burning power plants by 2030, while retaining natural gas power plants to maintain grid stability. Greenpeace is strongly anti-nuclear, while Pickens promotes wind power and natural gas as alternatives to foreign oil.

The quantity of new electricity-generating capacity proposed in the Gore and Google plans has led to criticism that they are unrealistically expensive. We try to place such commentary in a more quantitative context by comparing the industrial and financial commitments necessary to achieve the Google and Gore plans to two large-scale, government-led efforts from the twentieth century—the industrial buildup that accompanied World War II and the construction of the Interstate Highway System. These massive projects serve as tangible benchmarks for the magnitude of financial commitment and public support that will be required to rebuild the U.S. power sector.

Let's start with a bit of history: The U.S. industrial commitment to World War II was staggering. At its peak, the war occupied almost 40 percent of the nation's total economic capacity, and it required massive quantities of raw materials—at least 100 megatons of steel to build among other things more than 80,000 tanks, 250,000 planes and helicopters, and 15 million tons of munitions. The inflation adjusted annual cost of the war effort averaged close to \$700 billion between 1943 and 1945, while the total cost of the war effort topped \$2.5 trillion (in 2006 dollars).

In comparison, constructing the Interstate Highway System demanded a less intensive effort—but one of far longer duration. With the majority of its 47,000 miles covered by 11 inch-thick concrete—and weighing an impressive 700 megatons—it remains the largest public works project in U.S. history. During its peak years of construction, from 1970 to 1980, 17 megatons of concrete were used annually to create 1,100 miles of roadway a year, at a real annual expense of almost \$11 billion, or about 0.3 percent of the nation's annual economic output over that time. The project—from its start in 1956 until its symbolic completion in 1995—cost the nation close to \$350 billion (again, in 2006 dollars).

How do current energy transformation plans compare to these massive governmental efforts?

To determine the answer, we calculated the overnight capital cost—the cost of a project without interest payments, as if it were finished in one night—as well as the requirements in steel and concrete for the Gore and Google plans. We also calculated

expenditures for the U.S. Energy Information Agency's (EIA) Annual Energy Outlook, the traditional policy-neutral, business-as-usual scenario. We then compared the total and annual expenditures of capital, steel, and concrete using World War II as a baseline for capital and steel consumption, and the highway project as a baseline for concrete consumption. (Note: Although the cost of steel and concrete also are included in the total capital numbers, we wanted straight comparisons for the total mass of steel and concrete to complement the more traditional capital comparisons.)

The results are summarized in two charts we have generated. The first chart shows that achieving Gore's vision of removing fossil fuels from electricity production by 2020 will require 50 percent of the capital and 60 percent of the steel required to wage World War II as well as 25 percent of the concrete that was used to construct the Interstate Highway System. (Google's requirements are a bit higher because its forecast assumes a higher U.S. growth rate for electricity consumption.) The other chart shows that the annual expenditures required to achieve the Gore and Google plans would require 60 and 90 percent, respectively, of the concrete used annually for the highway system and about 20 percent of the steel consumed annually during the peak of war spending.

Take a moment to consider these numbers. Achieving either plan would require both an annual investment of concrete equal to the amount used to build the Interstate Highway System and an annual steel investment equal to one-quarter of that required to defeat the Axis powers. This is a massive industrial investment! Furthermore, these are only the steel and concrete requirements; the quantity of photovoltaic panels, for example, required to achieve the Gore or Google plan would be 28 and 74 times current global production, respectively.

The material requirements to achieve the Gore plan are significantly lower than those required to achieve the Google plan primarily due to their radically different estimates for the growth in electricity production. Google estimates that U.S. electricity production will grow by 4 percent to roughly 1,024 gigawatts by 2020, which essentially matches the EIA's forecast. The Gore plan, on the other hand, assumes that U.S. electricity production will decrease by a staggering 27 percent! That decrease—Gore claims—will result from huge increases in energy efficiency, but the EIA forecast already includes significant efficiency improvements.

We should note that the energy plans would last longer than World War II, making the annual rate of spending about 15 percent of the peak annual war expenses (\$100 billion—\$124 billion versus \$800 billion per year). Also, because the U.S. economy is about six times larger today than it was in the 1940s, these costs represent a much smaller fraction of the country's total economic output (about 1 percent of gross domestic product). Put another way, the economic demands of the war effort were equivalent to diverting two days of every worker's five-day work week, the energy plans—over their lifespans—would demand only about 24 minutes from every worker's week.

Although each plan has other aspects that merit critical analysis (e.g., estimated capacity factors, load growth rates, and balance of peak and base-load power) our analysis yields an interesting conclusion regarding the required financial and industrial investments. Specifically, we have identified two precedents for large-scale, governmental projects with industrial and financial investments that exceed the total requirements of both the Gore and Google plans. When measured against historical extremes, the cost

and physical requirements of these ambitious energy plans are within the country's reach.

That doesn't mean they'll be cheap. After all, fighting World War II was incredibly expensive—the modern economic equivalent would be passing a \$700 billion stimulus package every eight weeks for the next three years. Furthermore, defeating the fascist powers was of utmost importance as those powers represented a material and immediate threat to every living person in the free world. Although we strongly believe that the world's energy infrastructure must change, we don't believe that either climate change or energy-driven trade imbalances are remotely as scary today as Hitler was in 1941; and thus, while we could rebuild the energy system as we rebuilt industry for the war effort, the impetus to do so is far smaller today than in was in the 1940s.

Rather than waging war, rebuilding our energy infrastructure according to these plans would be more like keeping the peace: Consider that were the government doing all of this spending, it would require an annual budget of about one-third the average peacetime budget of the Defense Department. When we recall that Defense employs more than 3 million people, includes a massive research, design, and procurement system, and maintains a system of facilities worldwide, we get a sense of the magnitude of these proposed energy plans.

Another important fact to consider is that neither the Gore plan nor the Google plan assumes that the government will pay for everything transforming the U.S. power sector entails. Rather, both groups believe—admirably, in our opinion—in the endless capabilities of the American entrepreneur. In other words, these plans are betting that free enterprise will spring into action with the necessary capital. (With one proviso: Said entrepreneurs are given the proper policy incentives such as a stiff price on carbon emissions.) While we also believe in the power of individual initiative coupled with enlightened policy, we are cognizant of the fact that both World War II and the Interstate Highway System were entirely funded by U.S. taxpayers. So taking on an industrial transformation similar in scope to either the war effort or the highway system with mostly private capital is—to put it modestly—a challenging proposition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, on October 26, 2009, I was unavoidably unable to cast my votes for rollcall 814 and rollcall 815. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

RECOGNIZING MR. RICHARD REUSS

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Richard Reuss of Glenview, Illinois, who recently retired after thirty years as an Advisor to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission. Mr. Reuss and I share a passion for

the Great Lakes and I thank him for his tireless work over the past three decades to protect and improve the fishery.

Mr. Reuss represented the public-at-large on the Commission's Committee of Advisors since he was first nominated to serve in 1980 by Governor James Thompson. The Committee is charged with advising the Commission about all matters relating to fish stocks shared by Canada and the United States, as well as providing an avenue for citizens to be heard on issues that matter to them. Mr. Reuss's responsibility was to consider ways in which all citizens could benefit from protecting and restoring the Great Lakes and then to provide the best advice possible to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission about how the Commission could better achieve its objectives.

As an Advisor, Mr. Reuss was a consistent and strong advocate for the Great Lakes. He stayed in regular contact with boaters, fishers, and elected officials, was constantly up to date on Great Lakes issues, and worked tirelessly to keep the Commission and others informed. For years, he volunteered his time to help educate fishers and citizens about the Great Lakes, the sea lamprey problem, and ways in which we could all work together to improve the resource. He was particularly outspoken about the need for effective invasive species measures, whether they be measures to control sea lampreys, to prevent Asian carp, or to address the ballast water vector. In 2004, the commission honored Mr. Reuss with the C.D. "Buzz" Besadny Award for Fostering Great Lakes Partnerships, the Commission's highest recognition.

For the first time in its 50-year history, the Commission has created the position of Advisor Emeritus and has asked Mr. Reuss to serve in that capacity. So, while Mr. Reuss is formally retiring from the Committee of Advisors, the Commission and the Great Lakes commission will not lose his invaluable service.

I am proud to honor Mr. Richard Reuss as he retires from the Great Lakes Fishery Commission's Committee of Advisors and I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his remarkable service to the Great Lakes.

HEALTH CARE

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, there are still at least three very different versions of a massive health care package being discussed in the House of Representatives. There is no firm agreement on whether we will have a "public option" or what form it might take. And yet we are being told that this plan MUST be passed before Thanksgiving.

Rushing this package to a vote is a huge mistake. It is dangerous to the futures of all of our constituents. This year our federal deficit has surpassed \$1.4 trillion. And yet, the Democrat majority wants to expand government in this healthcare bill, adding hundreds of billions more to our deficit.

The work on this bill is being done out of sight of every member except the select few chosen by the majority leadership. Americans deserve transparency in this process, not Chicago-style strong arm tactics.

That is why I have introduced a resolution calling for the final language, of the healthcare package to be available for 30 days before it comes to the floor for a vote.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF U.S. ARMY RESERVE CAPTAIN BENJAMIN A. SKLAVER

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life and mourn together with his family the death of an American hero, CPT Benjamin A. Sklaver of Hamden, Connecticut.

A captain the 422nd Civil Affairs Battalion, 3rd Infantry Division serving his second tour of duty, Benjamin Sklaver was killed in an ambush on Friday, October 2, while on patrol in Afghanistan. Struck down at the age of 32, he leaves behind a legacy of humanitarian works and honorable deeds that would do any man or woman proud.

Captain Sklaver was, as his friend Jake Herrie deemed him, "a combatant of peace," and his career of good works took him from Malawi to Djibouti and from Uganda to Central Asia. He served as a crisis relief specialist, helping people all around the world get back on their feet after hard times. Compelled to national service by his patriotism and to humanitarian action by his Jewish faith, Sklaver was at once a proud soldier and a humble man of peace. Along with his firearm and ammunition, he carried schoolbooks and drinking water. He constructed not only forts and bunkers, but roads, schools, and dormitories. He brought not war and destruction in his wake, but infrastructure and peace.

Before serving in Afghanistan as an army reservist, Sklaver—a graduate of Tufts University as well as its Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy—had worked for FEMA in New York and the CDC as an international emergency and refugee health analyst. And he was the co-founder of and director of ClearWater Initiative, an organization which aspired to provide clean drinking water to refugees displaced by an international emergency.

In the past two years, Sklaver's leadership at ClearWater had managed to provide over 6,500 people in Uganda with clean drinking wells. To the thousands of lives he changed in Uganda, Sklaver was known as "Moses Ben." But to his grieving family—his parents, Gary and Laura; his siblings, Anna and Samuel; his fiancée, Beth; her son, Danny; and her parents, Barbara and Jimmy Segaloff—he was simply Ben, a warm, kind, and generous young man with so much life ahead of him, taken from us all too early.

Connecticut mourns, and America mourns, this family's loss.

REMEMBERING HORACE

D'ANGELO, JR.

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in remembering the life and work of Horace