

be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The first objection is heard to the request by the Senator from Louisiana.

Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, on behalf of 43 Members of the Senate, I object based on substantive disagreements about this very broad-based bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, reclaiming the floor and my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I think it is really regrettable. The Senator from Vermont and I can talk about the substance. I will be happy to talk about the substance of his big bill. But the bottom line is that 43 Members of the Senate disagree with him about serious substantive issues.

Because there is major disagreement—almost half of the Senate, 43 Members of the Senate—he is going to block moving forward with 27 clinics to serve veterans around the country, about which there is no disagreement. On my bill, as amended, there is zero disagreement on the substance of that bill. Because he can't get his way fully on a bigger package, he is going to take the bat and take the ball, and home plate, first base, second, and third, and go home. I don't think this is the approach and spirit in which the American people want us to work. I think the American people want us to agree when we can agree. I think we should bend over to agree in those instances where we can agree and actually accomplish substantive, concrete things. We would be doing that by moving forward separately with these 27 important community-based clinics. And by the way, I think we would be creating a much better environment to continue to work on a compromised broader package.

I commend this approach again to my friend from Vermont. I think we should come together where we agree. I think we should accomplish what we can and continue to work on a broader package. But taking these 27 clinics hostage is not doing that, is not creating an atmosphere which is conducive to progress on a broader package, and is not properly serving the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I would remind my colleague from Louisiana that the vote on that bill was 56 to 41. This is a 15-vote plurality. There is another person who was not here who would have voted for us on that bill, so 57 votes. But because of a Republican request for a budget point of

order, we need 60 votes. So a strong majority of the Members in the Senate support this comprehensive legislation. We are three votes shy of passing it. I intend to reach out to the Senator from Louisiana and every other Senator to see whether we get these three votes so we can pass the most comprehensive veterans legislation brought to the floor of the Senate in many decades.

This is not a complicated issue. On Veterans Day and on Memorial Day, every Member of the Senate and House goes back to his or her district and tells veterans just how much they respect them and love them and so forth and so on. That is all fine and well. Speeches are important. But at the end of the day, serving our veterans means a lot more than giving speeches. It means voting for programs that will improve their lives.

I will not disagree with anybody who says veterans programs are often expensive. They are expensive. When somebody goes off to war and comes back without any legs, without any arms, losing their eyesight or their hearing or dealing with TBI—traumatic brain injury—or PTSD—post-traumatic stress disorder—or suffering from sexual assault, it is an expensive proposition to make those folks as well as we possibly can. But, as I said earlier, if we are not prepared to support the men and women who come back from war, don't send them off to war in the first place.

So I very much hope I will be successful in working on an agreement with the Senator from Louisiana and some of my other Republican colleagues so we can do what the veterans community wants us to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I spoke last night in anticipation of this all-night session that was going to take place. I was not surprised at the general topics that were covered. There are probably five all together that they were stated over and over. I would like to clarify a couple of things that probably are worthwhile this afternoon.

One is my good friend from California—this is a quote, we took it down—said:

When 97 to 98 percent of the scientists say something is real, they do not have anything pressing them to say that other than the truth. They do not have any other agenda. They don't work for oil companies. And I will tell you, as chairman of the environmental committee, every time the Republicans

chose a so-called expert on climate, we have tracked them down to special interest funding, those 3 percent. They know where their bread is buttered.

That is kind of an interesting and a timely statement to make because what they are not telling you—and I am talking about the Senator from California and the other Democrats—is that the hedge fund billionaire and climate activist Tom Steyer plans to spend \$100 million through his NextGen PAC. The NextGen PAC is his political action committee. He has made the statement that he is going to be spending \$100 million in the midterm elections of 2014 and is going to be looking very carefully to make sure that all of the Democrats go along with his activist agenda.

That was actually a statement that was made, that has been written up. It is all documented. I am going to submit for the RECORD at this point all of the newspaper articles, the Washington Post, the Washington Times, and others that talk about this climate activist Tom Steyer, who is going to be spending \$100 million in the next election.

What I would like to do is cover the points that were made. As I say, they were made over and over, different people saying them, the same talking points. I am sure Tom Steyer's people had the talking points well prepared and moveon.org and George Soros and Michael Moore and the Hollywood elites and that crowd all had their talking points to sound real good. I noticed that so many of them were reading those points and were not familiar with the issues.

But last night many of my colleagues pointed to weather as the reason for manmade climate change. Yet they failed to quote meteorologists in the speeches. Let me read just what the meteorologists are saying about climate change.

A recent study by George Mason University reported—that was over 400 TV meteorologists—they reported that 63 percent of the weathercasters believe that any global warming that occurs is the result of natural variations and not human activity. That is a significant 2-to-1 majority.

Another study by the American Meteorological Society last year found that of their members, nearly half did not believe in manmade global warming. Furthermore, the survey found that scientists who professed liberal political views were more likely to proclaim manmade climate change than the rest of their colleagues.

I think we can name names here. Certainly one of the more prominent names is Heidi Cullen. She was with the Weather Channel. She spent most of her time with a background of very liberal thinking, liberal agenda, talking about this until she is no longer there anymore. She is now with one of the groups, the very liberal groups.

This is a good one, a lifelong liberal Democrat. His name is Dr. Martin

Hertzberg. He is a retired Navy meteorologist with a Ph.D. in physical chemistry who also declared his dissent of warming fears in 2008. This is a quote from Dr. Martin Hertzberg:

As a scientist and life-long liberal Democrat, I find the constant regurgitation of the anecdotal, fear mongering clap-trap about human-caused global warming to be a disservice to science. The global warming alarmists don't even bother with data! All they have are half-baked computer models that are totally out of touch with reality and have already been proven to be false.

CNN, not exactly a bastion of conservatism, had yet another of its meteorologists dissent from global warming fears. His name is Chad Myers, a meteorologist for 22 years and certified by the American Meteorological Society, spoke out against anthropogenic climate change on CNN in December of 2008.

He said, "You know, to think that we could affect weather all that much is pretty arrogant."

Since they are talking about the weather, here are a few facts that are not mentioned on drought and hurricanes. Several of the people came to the floor during the evening to talk about increase in drought, the increase in hurricanes and all of that. According to NOAA, hurricanes have been in decline in the United States since the beginning of records in the 19th century. The worst decade for major—category 3, 4, 5—hurricanes was in the 1940s. Severe drought in 1934 covered 80 percent of the country. The current one, the drought we went through a year and a half ago was 25 percent of the country.

Then they talked about, last night, the icecaps are melting and all of that. My colleague Senator FEINSTEIN from California pointed to melting icecaps as proof of climate change. Yet reports on what is not melting show a different story. This past December a research expedition of climate scientists got stuck in deep ice in Antarctica. We all remember that. I remember talking about that and showing pictures on the floor when that took place. That was a bunch of people who were going up there to try to solidify their case on global warming. They were stuck in ice for weeks on end. It took a couple of weeks and a couple more icebreakers getting stuck before the research vessel was finally freed.

A paper published in the October Journal of Climate examines the trend of sea ice extent along the east Antarctic coast from 2000 to 2008 and finds a significant increase, average of 1.43. That is 1.5 percent a year of increase of ice in the Antarctic.

Greenland, the IPCC—now, keep in mind, I talked yesterday about the IPCC. That is the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In a minute, I will show how it was discredited. But in Greenland they said—they admitted that in 2001, to melt Greenland the ice sheet would require temperatures to rise by 5.5 degrees Celsius and remain for 1,000 years. The ice sheet is actually grow-

ing by 2 percent a year. That is what is going on right now on this very ice sheet. Everyone is concerned about Greenland. Yet it is actually growing, not decreasing.

In January 2010, Time magazine: Himalayan Melting: How a Climate Panel Got it Wrong: "Glaciergate" is a black eye for the IPCC and the climate-science community as a whole.

In December of 2008, Al Gore said—this is good. Al Gore said, "The entire—

That is a little over 5 years ago. Gore said, "The entire North polar icecap will disappear in 5 years." It is now 5 years and 1 month past the deadline, December of 2013, and the Arctic ice is actually doing pretty well. Last month, BBC reported that the Arctic icecap coverage is close to 50 percent more than in the corresponding period in 2012. So contrary to what Al Gore predicted, that it would be gone by now, it did not disappear.

I had a good quote there by Richard Lindzen talking about Gore. This is Richard Lindzen, one of the foremost authorities, scientific authorities on climate anywhere in the world. He is MIT. He has been quoted extensively. He said, talking about Gore:

To treat all changes as something to fear is bad enough. To do it in order to exploit that fear is much worse.

I mentioned last night that the New York Times designated Al Gore as perhaps the first environmental billionaire in the United States. He said the entire North polar icecap would disappear in 5 years. It has actually increased substantially.

Last night they talked about the IPCC is the gold standard of climate science. Senator WHITEHOUSE defended the credibility of the IPCC despite climatigate, saying last night:

So after all that, after six published reviews whose results confirmed that there was nothing wrong with the science as a result of these emails—

We are talking about climatigate now.

—for people to continue to come to the floor and suggest that the email chains revealed some flaw in the data or some flaw in the science, it's untrue. It's as simple as that. It's just not true.

But we know this is not the case. The emails are very clear that the scientists were manipulating the data to generate a result they wanted. This is what some of the emails disclose: One of the scientists said, and the emails disclosed, that the IPCC was systematically distorting facts, cooking the science of global warming to either cover up data that did not tell the story they wanted everyone to hear and exaggerating the impacts of the changing climate to help drive people—out of fear—into action.

Here are two examples. We have about 12 examples. I have read them all in the past on the floor of the Senate. But here are a couple of examples of how the IPCC was cooking the science. The IPCC claimed the Himalayan gla-

ciers would melt by 2035. Of course it is not true. Yet it was put into the IPCC's fourth assessment report.

The assessment report is a report the IPCC has that the media picks up and the public consumes. According to the Sunday Times, that is in the UK, this claim was based off of a brochure that was used by the World Wildlife Fund to promote global warming activism. They put it on a brochure after finding a paper from a little-known scientist in India.

That scientist was wrong. According to the Times, Himalayan glaciers are so thick and at such a high altitude that most glaciologists believe it would take several hundred years to melt them at the present rate. More alarming, from the East Anglia University's Climatic Research Unit, the CRU, disturbing evidence was revealed that the climatologists had been increasingly cooking the books. One leaked email from 1999—keep in mind, these are the guys who are giving the science to the IPCC.

I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding the real temps to each series for the last 20 years, i.e., from 1981 onwards, and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline.

In other words, they were falsifying the increase in the temperature. What he is saying is that he changed the numbers to show the warming is happening when it has not happened.

Another e-mail that was revealed in 2009:

The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment, and it is a travesty that we can't. Our observing system is inadequate.

Despite this, the IPCC has continued to say global warming is continuing to happen.

The media outcry from these email leaks was surprising because we did not hear as much about it in the United States as we did in the UK and other places. It seemed to be the mainstream press organizations that have been strong partners with the global warming activists, alarmists, that began to question their confidence in the whole premise.

Here are some quotes. Keep in mind these are from legitimate organizations, publications, major publications that are credible.

Christopher Booker of the UK, the Telegraph—one of the largest papers in the United Kingdom—said that what has happened with climate change is they are talking about falsifying the information to make the public believe this is actually happening. They said it is the "worst scientific scandal of our generation." That is very serious, I say to the Presiding Officer, the "worst scientific scandal of our generation."

Clive Crook of the Financial Times stated: "The closed mindedness of these supposed men of science . . . is surprising, even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering." That was from the Financial Times. We are all familiar with that publication.

A prominent IPCC physicist said: "Climatigate was a fraud on a scale I've never seen."

U.N. scientist Dr. Philip Lloyd said: "The result is NOT scientific."

Newsweek magazine said: "Once celebrated climate researchers feeling like the used-car salesman."

"Some of the IPCC's most quoted data and recommendations were taken straight out of unchecked activist brochures."

George Monbiot is a columnist for the Guardian. He was on the other side of this issue. He was upset because people were finding out the truth and said: "It is no use pretending that this isn't a major blow. The emails extracted by a hacker from the climatic unit at the University of East Anglia could scarcely be more damaging . . . I'm dismayed and deeply shaken by them . . . I was too trusting of some of those who provided the evidence I championed. I would have been a better journalist if I had investigated their claims more closely." He is one of the strongest supporters of global warming.

Last night we heard more and more, and now we get to the rest of the story, and that would be what is most important. I say this is the most important because many years ago—this would have been about 2002, when almost everyone believed the world was coming to an end and it was global warming that was causing it—they all talked about how it must be true. Frankly, I thought it was true at that time until we did some checking to find out what would it cost to regulate greenhouse gases. I mean, even if it were a legitimate problem that was destroying this country, what would it cost?

The first reports we got were from Charles Rivers and from the Wharton School. Some of their economists came up with it. The range is between \$300 to \$400 billion a year. This is based off of a regulatory threshold of 25,000 tons. This is very tough.

I have a good friend, Senator ED MARKEY, who was in the House with me for quite some time. We disagree on this issue, but the last bill that came up, the last legislation to force us to have a type of cap-and-trade, was based on capping these people who emit 25,000 tons or more. That is based off of the regulatory threshold of 25,000 tons. Only the largest facilities, such as oil refineries and powerplants, would have been affected. But doing by regulation what they cannot do by legislation, they have to do it under the Clean Air Act.

This is kind of under the weeds, but it is very important. I thought the bill was too costly for the American people. It would regulate those who emitted 25,000 tons or more, but the Clean Air Act would regulate those at 250 tons or more. That is every church, every school, every small shop would be covered, apartment buildings in America.

So when you stop and think about it, we have never been able to calculate. No one disagrees with the fact that if we did it through regulation, it would cost between \$300 to \$400 billion a year. For those people who are listening

right now, \$300 to \$400 billion a year may not mean too much. But every year I calculate, in my State of Oklahoma, how many people, families we have who file a federal tax return. Then I do the math. That would have meant \$3,000 to each family in the State of Oklahoma. So it is a big deal. That is what it would cost them.

While they are extremely costly, the agency is busy doing other things that also include other types of regulations. The ozone, for example, their regulation—and it hasn't gone through yet—all 77 of my counties in Oklahoma would be out of attainment. That would be 7,000 jobs lost in my State.

Utility MACT is something that has already been implemented. That is what put coal out of business—\$100 billion in cost, 1.65 million jobs.

Boiler MACT is already implemented also. Every manufacturing company has a boiler, and so they would regulate those boilers. The cost of that is \$63 billion, costing 800,000 jobs that were lost. That is already implemented.

The BLM fracking regulations would be about \$100,000 per well. On fracking, I can remember when hydraulic fracturing was something not many people knew much about. I did because the first hydraulic fracturing took place in my State of Oklahoma. It was 1948.

I remember when the last Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Lisa Jackson, made the statement when I asked her the question live on TV—I said: Is it causing groundwater contamination? She is the one who said there has never been a documented case of groundwater contamination by using hydraulic fracturing.

President Obama, in his effort and his war on fossil fuels, is trying to stop them. We have heard him say several times: Well, we have good, cheap, abundant, plentiful natural gas to take care of our energy needs in America. That part was true, but then the next thing he said was: We have to stop hydraulic fracturing. Without hydraulic fracturing, we can't get 1 cubic foot of gas.

What I have tried to do is let the public know the cumulative impact of all of these regulations. A lot of people think of regulations as only affecting large corporations. If someone talks to Tom Buchanan of the State of Oklahoma—he was recently elected president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau. If we ask him what the most critical thing is for the farmers in the State of Oklahoma, he will say the overregulation by the EPA. He said: Overregulation by the EPA is much more significant to the ag community in Oklahoma and across the country than anything in the farm bill.

So the cumulative impact of all of these regulations so far is about \$630 billion annually and about 9 million jobs lost.

I would only say that last night they had a good time talking about these things, and the same story was told

over and over using a slightly different slant on it.

But in terms of the cost, this is the reason that they have tried ever since the Kyoto Convention. The first bill was introduced in 2002 and several of them since then. They were never able to pass a bill through the House and the Senate on regulating greenhouse gases because cap and trade is so costly.

But what people have to realize—I know right now as I speak that there are a lot of people out there who really believe global warming is happening, really believe the world is going to come to an end, really believe we are going to have to do something about it, and so we start in the United States. So knowing that these people are out there—and there are even people in my State of Oklahoma who have bought into this—when Lisa Jackson, who at that time—she is not there anymore. She was Obama's pick and was the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. I asked her the question on the record, live on TV in one of our committee hearings—I said: Let's assume that we pass legislation and that we impose the cost of \$300 to \$400 billion on the American taxpayer. If that is the case and if they did that, would that have the effect of reducing greenhouse gases worldwide? Her answer: No, it wouldn't, because the problem isn't in the United States; the problem is in China and India and Mexico and other places.

Now, you could carry out that argument even further and say that those people who want to do away with emissions and have cap and trade in the United States—that could cause it to have actually more, not less, emissions of CO₂ because we would be chasing our manufacturing base to countries that didn't have any requirements. So if you really believe it, then still it isn't true.

I would end with one more quote. Dr. Richard Lindzen of MIT, whom we talked about 1 minute ago, was asked this question: Why is it that so many of the bureaucrats, the very liberals who want government to be controlled from Washington, want our lives to be controlled from Washington, why is it that they are so concerned with carbon regulations? Richard Lindzen's answer was this: "Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life."

It is unfortunate. There are a lot of people even in this body who believe we should have much more power in the Senate. I can assure you that the problems we are facing now are problems because of too much power being concentrated in Washington, DC.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHESAPEAKE BAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have taken to the floor many times to talk about the Chesapeake Bay—the largest estuary in the Northern Hemisphere, and declared a national treasure by not only President Obama but by several U.S. Presidents.

For the 17 million people who live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, it is part of their life. From the residents of Smith Island, which is the last inhabitable island in the Maryland part of the Chesapeake Bay, to those who enjoy fishing for rockfish in the bay, to its oysters, its crabs, the over 11,000 miles of shoreline created by the Chesapeake Bay, the 150 major rivers that feed into the Chesapeake Bay, and the \$1 trillion to the economy, the Chesapeake Bay is truly part of the life of those of us who are privileged to live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

I have spoken about this bay many times because it is being threatened. Over 30 years ago, Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware, along with the EPA and other partners, entered into a Chesapeake Bay agreement.

This has grown to six States, including the Presiding Officer's State of West Virginia, and other governmental entities in the private sector. The Chesapeake Bay agreement has been revisited over time, and the most recent effort to update this agreement was the draft submitted by the Obama administration on January 29 of this year. This draft agreement is what I wish to speak about with my colleagues.

The development of sound policies to restore the Chesapeake Bay has been a top priority of mine over the course of my career in Congress. I have been fortunate to have great partners in Congress representing the Bay States. Together we have worked to develop effective conservation and ecosystem restoration programs in the farm bill, the Water Resources Development Act, the Clean Water Act, and elsewhere in law supporting a variety of conservation and ecosystem approaches across different sectors.

The Army Corps, USDA, and EPA are not the only Federal agencies doing important Chesapeake Bay work. NOAA, USGS, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Park Service are also important Federal partners in the broader effort to restore the Bay.

President Obama's May 2009 Chesapeake Bay Executive order recognized both the national interest in restoring the Chesapeake Bay and improving Federal coordination of restoration efforts because of a wide-ranging involvement of different departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The coordination of seven jurisdictions, hundreds of local communities, seven cabinet-level Federal de-

partments, and stakeholders of all stripes have necessitated the development of the Chesapeake Bay agreement to affirm the conservation goals of everyone involved in this effort.

I wish to stress the importance of broad involvement of all stakeholders in the effort to restore the Chesapeake Bay. The populations living and working in the bay watershed must realize we are all in this together. The major stakeholders in regard to our conservation action include farmers. Farming is not only a way of life in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, it is a desirable activity within the Chesapeake Bay watershed for the future of the Chesapeake Bay. But there are certain challenges as a result of farming as it relates to nitrogen in the bay and in the sediments.

Developers. We are proud of the fact people want to live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. We have seen a major increase in population. But with that comes the challenge of storm runoff, and we have to do a better job of preventing storm runoff dumping pollution into the bay, and the municipalities which are responsible for the growth of populations have to deal with how they treat wastewater, and the wastewater treatment plants need to be updated so we can have the maximum results in removing the pollution which otherwise would end up threatening the future of the bay.

The Chesapeake Bay agreement outlines a fairly comprehensive approach to continuing efforts to restore the bay which is dependent upon all stakeholders doing their part. The draft agreement is a good outline, but there is room for improvement in the draft agreement as well. I hope that while the agreement is in this period of public comment, the final will be approved.

The Chesapeake Bay program partnership was formed in 1983, when the Governors of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, the chair of the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and the EPA signed the first Chesapeake Bay agreement. For more than 30 years these entities have remained committed to the goal of restoring the Chesapeake Bay. As the science has determined and the interest in Bay stewardship has broadened, this partnership has since expanded to become a basin-wide effort where all six States of the basin are now party to the agreement.

Working together to achieve the various goals of the agreement is what will help ensure the Chesapeake Bay we will leave for our children is healthier tomorrow than it is today. The agreement does acknowledge the partnership cannot address every goal in the agreement instantaneously. Certainly some goals may take longer to realize than others, but all the goals are achievable, and some I think should be even more ambitious. They are based upon best science. We think science needs to judge what we can do

as far as cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay.

The agreement wisely suggests action be taken in a strategic and cost-effective manner. We want to make sure this is doable. We understand the burdens which can be caused. We want to make sure this is layered in a way which achieves best science results but does it in the most cost-effective manner.

Of the principles laid out in the agreement, I wish to acknowledge the partnership's commitment to transparency and consensus building. We want all stakeholders involved in the process, and we want local involvement. We think local governments know how we can best achieve our results. The goals of the agreement deal with very sensitive issues such as natural land preservation, nutrient pollution reduction, and others.

The process must be fair and open. The strategic development process and achieving the agreement's conservation goals must be devised in an all-inclusive manner which is open to the public so that all are included in the process.

There is a great deal of skepticism in certain communities about the government's role and its actions to protect and restore the bay. I have heard that skepticism from certain constituencies. I have learned that having an open dialog with stakeholders, carefully explaining intentions, listening to concerns, and answering questions goes a long way toward building consensus and acceptance.

The agreement acknowledges the role the bay TMDL plays in achieving the water quality goals of the bay. A majority of the waters of the Chesapeake Bay are within the boundaries of the State of Maryland. Thousands of Maryland watermen make their living on the bay. The property value and tourism draw of communities up and down the Eastern and Western Shores of Maryland, not to mention the Marylanders who swim and fish in the bay, all depend upon a healthy bay.

But there is no degree of action Maryland can take on its own, no matter how drastic, which will improve the bay quality—not without the other five States and the District of Columbia in the watershed doing their part as well. The TMDL assures that all Bay States are coordinated in their efforts to improve bay water quality. The agreement acknowledges the importance of the TMDL.

The TMDL gives us a level playing field so we can make sure all stakeholders in all geographical areas are treated fairly in achieving the goals of reducing pollution in the bay. I support the fisheries goal of the agreement. Restoring the iconic Maryland blue crab in the bay is important for so many reasons. The agreement sets the goal of maintaining a population of 215 female adult crabs through 2025. Blue crabs are a vital part of the food chain throughout the bay's ecosystem and