

success of the National Diabetes Prevention Program to Medicare. Nearly 26 million American adults have diabetes, and if this disturbing trend doesn't stop, over half of the adult population will either have Type 2 diabetes or its precursor, "prediabetes," by 2020.

Sadly, my home State of West Virginia has one of the highest diabetes rates in the Nation. In 2009, approximately 174,000 adults, which is 11 percent of West Virginia adults, had diabetes. According to Centers for Disease Control estimates, as many as 50 percent of the nearly 380,000 people with Medicare in West Virginia may be at risk of developing this serious, but preventable, illness. If current trends continue, one in three children born in West Virginia after the year 2000 will develop diabetes within his or her lifetime and people with diabetes risk developing terrible complications down the road, including heart disease, stroke, blindness, and amputations.

Diabetes is also one of the main cost drivers in our health care system. The direct economic burden of diabetes was \$116 billion for medical expenses and indirect costs totaled \$58 billion due to disability, work loss, or premature death in 2007. The costs associated with this preventable disease for Medicare beneficiaries are expected to grow to \$2 trillion over the 2011 to 2020 period.

We simply cannot stand idly by in the face of such overwhelming statistics—and fortunately, there is a way to prevent Type 2 diabetes. The National Diabetes Prevention Program, NDPP, is an innovative approach that has demonstrated its effects in preventing the onset of Type 2 diabetes. The NDPP is a proven, community-based intervention that focuses on changing lifestyle behaviors of prediabetic overweight or obese adults through activities that improve dietary choices and increase physical activity in a group setting. In a large-scale clinical trial that has been replicated in community settings, NDPP successfully reduced the onset of diabetes by 58 percent overall and 71 percent in adults over 60.

Because of the impressive success of the National Diabetes Prevention Program, I believe our seniors should have access to its benefits. The Medicare Diabetes Prevention Act of 2012 will help seniors prevent Type 2 diabetes by allowing Medicare to provide the National Diabetes Prevention Program through community settings like the YMCA, local health departments, or even the local church, reaching people with Medicare wherever they live. In the past, physicians have had few tools for their patients who are found to be at risk of diabetes. Under this bill, if a senior is found at risk for diabetes, for example, through their annual wellness visit, their doctor will be able to refer them to an NDPP program in their area.

Unlike Medicare, which needs a Federal legislative change to cover this program, State Medicaid programs already have the authority to pay for

this innovative initiative, and it is my hope that more states will do so. By 2020, Medicaid is expected to cover 13 million people with diabetes and about 9 million people who may have pre-diabetes, and states will spend an estimated \$83 billion on individuals with diabetes or pre-diabetes. The National Diabetes Prevention program presents an opportunity for States to reduce the incidence of diabetes among individuals enrolled in their Medicaid programs, an especially strategic investment when combined with the expansion of the Medicaid program under health reform.

The coverage of proven solutions under Medicare is nothing new. Yet, rather than providing a traditional drug or procedure, NDPP allows at-risk individuals to change their lifestyles through a community intervention. Implementing NDPP is a unique response to the alarming and escalating rates of diabetes. This public health solution has demonstrated tangible results that can enable our country to prevent diabetes, while reducing health care costs. The NDPP is a strategic and cost-effective intervention that costs less than \$500 per person to deliver, compared to the estimated \$15,000 per year spent on each Medicare beneficiary with diabetes. According to the Urban Institute, implementing the NDPP nationally could save \$191 billion over the next 10 years, with 75 percent of the savings, \$142.9 billion, going to the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Better yet, the National Diabetes Prevention Program is a job creator, bringing diabetes trainers to more communities nationwide to provide the program. West Virginia has already received funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through a Community Transformation Grant that will allow the State to train at least 100 community health workers to help disseminate the Diabetes Prevention Program in the State over the next 5 years.

The Medicare Diabetes Prevention Act has been endorsed by the American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, American Public Health Association, National Association of Chronic Disease Directors, National Association of State Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs, National Council on Aging, Novo Nordisk, Trust for America's Health, the YMCA of the USA, and State YMCA affiliates in over 45 States. With so many Americans at risk for developing diabetes and its potentially severe complications, today is the right time for Medicare to extend the proven National Diabetes Prevention Program as a covered benefit to seniors.

I urge my colleagues to support this timely and important piece of legislation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

S. 3464. A bill to amend the Mni Wiconi Project Act of 1988 to facilitate

completion of the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I introduced legislation to facilitate completion of the Mni Wiconi Rural Water System. The Mni Wiconi Project provides quality drinking water to three Indian Reservations and a non-tribal rural water system in western South Dakota that have historically faced insufficient and, in too many cases, unsafe drinking water.

I have been involved with this project for the entirety of my 25 year congressional career, including sponsoring authorizing legislation that was ultimately enacted in 1988. In authorizing the project, Congress found that the United States has a trust responsibility to ensure that adequate and safe water supplies are available to meet the economic, environmental, water supply, and public health needs of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, Rosebud Indian Reservation, and Lower Brule Indian Reservation. With treated drinking water from the Missouri River now reaching most of the three reservations, as well as the 7 county area of the West River/Lyman-Jones Rural Water System, we are very close to completing this critically important project.

Unfortunately, appropriations have failed to keep pace with projected timelines, and additional costs have cut into construction funding. Accordingly, the project requires an increase in the cost ceiling and extension of its authorization in order to be completed and serve the design population. Without an adjustment to the cost ceiling, some portions of the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System and Rosebud Sioux Rural Water System will remain incomplete. The legislation I have introduced today addresses this shortfall and other important aspects of the project. The legislation also directs other Federal agencies that support rural water development to assist the Bureau of Reclamation in improving and repairing existing community water systems that are important components of the project.

Our Federal responsibility to address the tremendous need for adequate and safe drinking water supplies on the Pine Ridge, Rosebud and Lower Brule Indian Reservations remains as important today as it was 25 years ago. I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this modest but important legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 534—CONGRATULATING THE NAVY DENTAL CORPS ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANCHIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 534

Whereas on August 22, 1912, Congress passed an Act recognizing Navy dentistry as a distinct branch among naval medical professions;

Whereas throughout history, the Navy Dental Corps has supported the Navy by sustaining sailor and marine readiness and providing routine and emergency dental care, ashore and afloat, in peace and in war;

Whereas the Navy Dental Corps works continuously to improve the health of sailors, marines, and their families by supporting individual and community prevention initiatives, good oral hygiene practices, and treatment;

Whereas the Navy Dental Corps endeavors to improve oral health worldwide by participating in the spectrum of military combat, peacekeeping, and humanitarian operations and exercises;

Whereas the Navy Dental Corps, in collaboration with national and international dental organizations, promotes dental professionalism and quality of care;

Whereas the Navy Dental Corps supports the mission of the Federal dental research program and endorses improved dental technologies and therapies through research and adherence to sound scientific principles; and

Whereas the Navy Dental Corps recognizes the importance of continuing professional dental education, requiring and supporting specialty dental education and postgraduate residencies and fellowships for its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Navy Dental Corps on its 100th anniversary;

(2) commends the Navy Dental Corps for working to sustain the dental readiness and the oral health of a superb fighting force; and

(3) recognizes the thousands of dentists who have served in the Navy Dental Corps over the last 100 years, providing dental care to millions of members of the Armed Forces and their families.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2665. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, to enhance the security and resiliency of the cyber and communications infrastructure of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2666. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2667. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2668. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2669. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2670. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2671. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2672. Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts submitted an amendment intended to be pro-

posed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2673. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2674. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2675. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2645 submitted by Mr. BINGAMAN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2676. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2677. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2678. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2679. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2680. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2681. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2682. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2683. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2684. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KYL, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COATS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. JOHANNES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2685. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2686. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2687. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2688. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2689. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2690. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2691. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2692. Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COATS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2693. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2694. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2695. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2696. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COATS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2697. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2698. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2699. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2700. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2701. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2702. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2703. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2704. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2705. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2706. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2707. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3414, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2708. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her