



To: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife Republican Members
From: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife Republican Staff; Kiel Weaver (Kiel.Weaver@mail.house.gov), Annick Miller (Annick.Miller@mail.house.gov), and Rob MacGregor (Robert.MacGregor@mail.house.gov)
Date: January 17, 2022
Subject: Legislative Hearing on H.R. 1546, H.R. 3540, H.R. 4057, H.R. 4092, H.R. 4677, H.R. 4716, H.R. 5973, H.R. 6023, and H.Res. 641

On **Thursday, January 20, 2022, at 10:00 a.m. EST, via Cisco Webex**, the Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife will hold a remote legislative hearing on eight bills and one House Resolution.

Member offices are requested to notify Annick Miller no later than Wednesday, January 19, at 4:30 p.m. EST, if their Member intends to participate in person in the hearing room or remotely from his/her laptop from another location. Submissions for the hearing record must be submitted through the Committee's electronic repository at HNRCDocs@mail.house.gov. Please contact David DeMarco (David.DeMarco@mail.house.gov) or Everett Winnick (EverettWinnick@mail.house.gov) should any technical difficulties arise.

I. KEY MESSAGES

- Many of the Democrat's bills would reauthorize programs that may be viewed as duplicative of existing programs and costly. The bills provide for little oversight of administrative overhead costs, which bloat the size of the federal government, and of whether additional funding is necessary and will be well-spent.
- H.R. 4716 would potentially eliminate necessary trapping activities of predator and invasive species within national wildlife refuges, which are longstanding scientific management activities used by both the federal government and State fish and wildlife agencies.
- A Republican bill, H.R. 1546, aims to modernize federal wildlife trafficking curtailment efforts and address wildlife trafficking on the internet.

II. WITNESSES

Panel I – Members

- **Representative Jim Costa**, California, 16th Congressional District [*H.R. 6023*]
- **Representative Debbie Dingell**, Michigan, 12th Congressional District [*H.R. 5973*]
- **Representative Alan Lowenthal**, California, 47th Congressional District [*H.R. 4057*]
- **Representative Paul Tonko**, New York, 20th Congressional District [*H.R. 4677*]
- **Representative John Sarbanes**, Maryland, 3rd Congressional District [*H.R. 3540*]
- **Representative Dan Newhouse**, Washington, 4th Congressional District [*H. Res. 641*]
- **Representative Earl “Buddy” Carter**, Georgia, 1st Congressional District [*H.R. 1546*]
- **Representative Jerrold Nadler**, New York, 10th Congressional District [*H.R. 4716*]

Panel II – Federal

- **Mr. Stephen Guertin**, Deputy Director for Program Management and Policy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.

Panel III – Stakeholders

- **Republican Witness TBD**
- **Ms. Kira Davis**, Program Director, Conservation Resource Alliance, Traverse City, MI [*testifying on H.R. 4092 and H.R. 5973*]
- **Dr. Allison Colden**, Maryland Senior Fisheries Scientist, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Annapolis, MD [*testifying on H.R. 3540 and H.R. 4092*]
- **Mr. Andy Bicking**, Director of Government Relations and Public Policy, Scenic Hudson, Kingston, NY [*testifying on H.R. 4677*]

III. BACKGROUND

[H.R.1546](#) (Rep. Buddy Carter, R-GA), Combating Online Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2021

In July 2013, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13648, which established a Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking (Task Force) co-chaired by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney General.¹ Within the House Natural Resources Committee’s jurisdiction, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), through the Office of Law Enforcement (OLE), investigates wildlife crimes, enforces wildlife laws, regulates wildlife trade and works in partnership with international, state, and tribal counterparts to conserve wildlife resources.

The Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-231) codified the Task Force and directed the Secretary of State to submit to the House and Senate Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees an annual report that includes updates on the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking and identifies countries with significant levels of wildlife trafficking. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the reporting requirements would cost the federal government a total of \$1 million over a five fiscal year period.² The law

¹ [Executive Order -- Combating Wildlife Trafficking](#)

² <https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/114th-congress-2015-2016/costestimate/hr2494.pdf>



included a sunset provision which terminated the statutory authority of the Task Force on October 7, 2021.

H.R. 1546 would reauthorize the Task Force through October 7, 2026. In addition, the bill would require the Task Force to develop recommendations and establish a working group to address wildlife trafficking on the internet. The recommendations must be included in the annual report to Congress. The Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development are also required to develop a strategy for engaging with internet and social media companies to address wildlife trafficking on their platforms.

H.R. 1546 has also been referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The bill has one cosponsor, Rep. John Garamendi (D-CA). A previous version of this bill was introduced last Congress but did not receive a hearing in the Water, Oceans and Wildlife Subcommittee.

H.R. 3540 (Rep. John Sarbanes, D-MD), Chesapeake Bay Science, Education, and Ecosystem Enhancement Act of 2021

The Chesapeake Bay is the nation's largest estuary. The 64,000-square-mile watershed covers parts of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New York, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.³

H.R. 3540 would reauthorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Chesapeake Bay Office (CBO), which was created by statute in 1992.⁴ Specifically, the bill would authorize funding for the CBO through Fiscal Year (FY) 2025, authorizing \$17 million in FY 2022, \$20.7 million in FY 2023, \$22.57 million in FY 2024, and \$24.627 million in FY 2025. In addition, the bill would allow the CBO to collaborate with universities, nonprofits, and other stakeholders to promote integrated coastal observations and information sharing. It would also authorize the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Education and Training program, which awards educational grants related to Bay restoration.

A representative from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation will testify in support of the bill, which has sixteen cosponsors, including one Republican (Rep. Rob Wittman, R-VA). A previous version of this bill was introduced last Congress but did not receive a hearing in the Water, Wildlife and Oceans Subcommittee.

H.R. 4057 (Rep. Alan Lowenthal, D-CA), Albatross and Petrel Conservation Act

Albatrosses are very large oceanic birds that are mainly found in southern oceans. Petrels are medium-sized, long-winged seabirds that fly far from land.⁵ The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP or "Agreement") is a multilateral agreement which seeks to conserve listed albatrosses and petrels by coordinating international activity to mitigate known threats to their populations. The development of the Agreement began in 1999, was first opened

³ [Chesapeake Bay Facts](#)

⁴ Section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (15 U.S.C. 1511d)

⁵ Britannica, Albatross and Petrels, <https://www.britannica.com/animal/petrel>

for signature in 2001, and entered into force in 2004.⁶ ACAP currently covers all 22 of the world's species of albatrosses, all 7 species of petrels, and 2 species of shearwaters.^{7 8} The black footed albatross, short tailed albatross and laysan albatross along with the pink footed shearwater are the only species in the agreement that are found near the mainland U.S. off the Pacific Coast. Notably, none of those four species are currently listed as endangered or critically endangered on the International Union for Conservation and Nature (IUCN) Red List and the short-tailed albatross, which has the lowest population of the four birds at 1,734, is already listed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act.⁹ There are currently 13 countries who have joined ACAP. While the United States is not one of them, it has been participating as an observer.¹⁰

Because ACAP is a multilateral agreement, U.S. participation must be ratified by the U.S. Senate. On September 26, 2008, the Department of State transmitted the agreement to the Senate for consideration.¹¹ The Senate has not acted, although bills authorizing federal agencies to implement many aspects of the Agreement have been introduced in the House in the last three Congresses.¹²

One of the main threats to species of albatrosses and petrels is longline and trawl fishing. However, these issues have largely been ameliorated in the U.S. In 2013, the Pacific Fisheries Management Council adopted seabird bycatch mitigation recommendations that have resulted in Pacific fishing operations rarely catching short-tailed albatross.¹³

Title I of H.R. 4057 would authorize Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce to re-establish albatrosses and petrels within the species' range and eradicate invasive and non-native species that have an adverse effect on them. Title I also would allow the Secretary of the Interior to protect breeding sites through land acquisition and the Secretary of Commerce to undertake conservation measures in marine habitats to ensure the sustainability of marine resources that provide food to the covered species (including measures to minimize the bycatch of albatrosses and petrels over relevant fisheries).

Title II would make it illegal to take any covered albatross or petrel without a permit. The bill defines take as "harmfully interfere with, harass, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, destroy, possess, or collect." For incidental take, the Interior Secretary would be required to authorize permits, but the permits must be limited in area and duration and they must not

⁶ Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, About ACAP, <https://www.acap.aq/resources/about-acap>

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Albatross and Petrel Species to which the Agreement applies, <https://www.acap.aq/acap-species/307-acap-species-list/file>

⁹ FWS-Listed U.S. Species by Taxonomic Group – Birds, <https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/species-listings-by-tax-group?statusCategory=Listed&groupName=Birds>

¹⁰ Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, Parties to the ACAP, <https://www.acap.aq/resources/parties-to-acap>

¹¹ <https://www.state.gov/e/oes/ocns/opa/biodiversity/seabirds/>

¹² H.R. 1305 (116th Cong.), H.R. 5763 (115th Cong.), and H.R. 4480 (114th Cong.)

¹³ THOMAS P. GOOD ET AL., NAT'L MARINE FISHERIES SERV, *OBSERVED AND ESTIMATED BY-CATCH OF SHORT-TAILED ALBATROSS IN U.S. WEST COAST GROUND FISH FISHERIES 2014–2015* (2017), https://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/F5a_NMFS_Rpt6_ElectricOnly_STAL_bycatch_report_2017_Apr2017BB.pdf

authorize an activity otherwise prohibited by any other statute or regulation. The bill provides an exemption for military activities, coast guard activities, and for lawful fishing activities so long as they are carried out in accordance with applicable measures to minimize bycatch.

Title III creates penalties for offenders and specifies enforcement responsibilities.

Title IV would require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce to designate an office or program at the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service, respectively, in order to carry out ACAP. The offices would be responsible for designating a U.S. representative to monitor activities of the agreement. They must also submit a report to Congress on conservation activities and the implementation of the ACAP within one year and every four years after.

Title V would authorize the Secretaries to work with other countries and provide other countries and international organizations financial support to improve the conservation status of the covered species.

Title VI would amend Section 610(e) the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act by changing the definition of “protected living marine resource” to include seabirds.¹⁴

Title VII would provide the Secretaries with the ability to craft regulations to implement the bill as well as ACAP.

A previous version of this bill was introduced last Congress and received a hearing which can be viewed [here](#). In the 116th Congress, the House Natural Resources Committee passed the previous version by a partisan vote of 21 to 12.¹⁵ In the dissenting views, Rep. Tom McClintock (R-CA) noted that the legislation “puts the cart before the horse” by implementing an agreement that the U.S. has not yet agreed to and is largely unnecessary because if the Senate chose to make the U.S. a signatory, the agencies tasked with implementing it already have the authority to do so under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.¹⁶ The bill currently has 24 cosponsors, including 1 Republican.

H.R. 4092 (Rep. Jared Huffman, D-CA), Coastal Habitat Conservation Act of 2021

The bill would authorize the USFWS’s Coastal Program (Program), which is a voluntary, partnership-based program created administratively in 1984 to provide technical and financial assistance for habitat conservation in coastal watersheds. Specifically, the bill would authorize the Program through FY 2026, authorizing funding at \$20 million for FY 2022, \$21.5 million for FY 2023, \$22.5 for FY 2024, \$23.75 million for FY 2025, and \$25 million for FY 2026. On average, the Program has been appropriated about \$13 million annually since FY 2013.¹⁷ In its FY 2022 budget justifications, the USFWS stated that it intends to use the Coastal Program to contribute to the 30x30 initiative.¹⁸ The Biden administration’s 30x30 effort, now called the

¹⁴ 16 U.S.C. 1826k(e)

¹⁵ <https://www.congress.gov/116/crpt/hrpt249/CRPT-116hrpt249.pdf>

¹⁶ *Id.*, 15-16.

¹⁷ [FY2022 Fish and Wildlife Service Budget Justifications, at HC-5.](#)

¹⁸ [FY2022 Fish and Wildlife Service Budget Justifications, at HC-5.](#)

“America the Beautiful” initiative, is a proposal that would put 30 percent of U.S. lands and waters under conservation and preservation status by 2030.¹⁹ Details on exactly how the Biden administration would carry out the initiative remain forthcoming.

Representatives from the Conservation Resource Alliance and the Chesapeake Bay Foundation will testify in support of the bill, which has six cosponsors: Reps. Jenniffer Gonzalez-Colon (R-PR), Eric Swalwell (D-CA), Albio Sires (D-NY), Val Butler Demings (D-FL), Salud Carbajal (D-CA), and Barbara Lee (D-CA).

H.R. 4677 (Rep. Paul Tonko, D-NY), New York-New Jersey Watershed Protection Act

H.R. 4677 would require the Secretary of the Interior, through the USFWS, to create a New York-New Jersey Watershed Restoration Program (Program) and accompanying grant program. In carrying out the Program, the USFWS would be required to work with the two states and relevant partners in the watershed to identify, prioritize, and implement restoration and protection activities. The USFWS would be tasked in working with these partners to develop a watershed-wide strategy, provide technical assistance toward restoration, and establish and administer a grant program to support restoration projects. The bill defines the “New York-New Jersey Watershed” as “all land area whose surface water drains into New York-New Jersey Harbor, the waters contained within that land area, and the estuaries associated with those watersheds.”

The bill would authorize a total of \$300 million over six fiscal years, of which at least 75 percent (\$225 million) must be used for grants that have a 75 percent federal cost share. The remaining \$75 million would be able to be used by the USFWS to implement the requirements of the Program.

H.R. 4677 appears to be drafted to replicate the framework of the Delaware River Basin Conservation Act (DRBCA), which was included in the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN Act, P.L. 114-322).²⁰ However, there are several differences between H.R. 4677 and the DRBCA. For example, the DRBCA includes a sunset provision, and a prohibition of funds for land acquisitions by the federal government. These provisions are not included in H.R. 4677. In addition, DRBCA has a lower federal cost share (50 percent) and did not include an authorization of appropriations.

A witness from Scenic Hudson will testify in support of the bill. The bill has 25 cosponsors, including two Republicans. A previous version of this bill was introduced last Congress but did not receive a hearing in the Water, Oceans and Wildlife Subcommittee.

H.R. 4716 (Rep. Jerrold Nadler, D-NY), Refuge from Cruel Trapping Act of 2021

This bill would amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to ban the possession or use of a body-gripping trap in the National Wildlife Refuge System.²¹ First case offenders would be subject to a \$500 fine for each body gripping trap possessed and

¹⁹ <https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/biden-harris-administration-outlines-america-beautiful-initiative>

²⁰ [P.L. 114-322, Title III, Subtitle E](#)

²¹ 16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.

subsequent offenders would be subject to fines of up to \$1,000 per trap and imprisonment for up to 180 days. The bill defines body-gripping traps as “any device that is intended to kill or capture wildlife by physically restraining any part of the animal” including “steel-jaw, padded, or any other modified leghold trap, kill-type trap, snare trap, or modified version of any such trap.” The bill provides exceptions for federal government agencies who are controlling invasive species or attempting to protect a species listed under the Endangered Species Act or a species that the Secretary of the Interior has designated as sensitive. However, in order to use this exception, federal agencies must have attempted and exhausted non-lethal methods to carry out conservation goals.

Currently, decisions to permit hunting, trapping and fishing on national wildlife refuges are made on a case-by-case basis that considers biological soundness, economic feasibility, effects on other refuge programs, and public demand.²² According to the USFWS website, the agency uses trapping as a “cost-effective method” (compared to hunting and chemical control) to manage wildlife.²³ “Trapping helps protect endangered species and migratory birds, restore species in decline, prevent and reduce property damage, and control destructive invasive species”²⁴ The agency also “views trapping as a legitimate recreational and economic activity when there are harvestable surpluses of fur-bearing mammals.”²⁵ Trapping is allowed on 240 (out of 567) national wildlife refuges in 46 states.²⁶

USFWS has used trapping successfully in a number of cases to protect endangered species as well as landscapes. For example, a USFWS trapping program on the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge has been effective in eliminating nutria, a highly invasive species that eats plants, including their roots, causing severe negative impacts on wetland environments. The USFWS even noted that body gripping traps were more effective than box traps and could be set in a way to reduce the incidence of capture of non-target species.²⁷ Another example is a USFWS trapping program on National Wildlife Refuges in the State of New Jersey, which allow trapping to control predators to protect endangered beach nesting bird species such as piping plover, least tern, black skimmer, and other endangered wildlife such as bog turtles.²⁸

This proposal has met prior opposition from the USFWS, state and fish wildlife agencies and the sportsmen’s community. Specifically, the Sportsmens Alliance criticized a prior bill as imposing a “one size fits-all federal ban on trapping in refuges, and that also means not allowing biologists to decide how to handle the properties” and that the bill “could be the first step in banning all hunting on federal land.”²⁹ In 2015, the Obama administration’s USFWS Director, Dan Ashe,

²²Statement of Mr. Dan Ashe, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior Before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s FY 2016 Budget Request, May 6, 2015, <https://www.fws.gov/laws/Testimony/displaytestimony.cfm?ID=259>

²³ <https://www.fws.gov/refuges/wildlife-conservation/trapping.html>

²⁴ *Id*

²⁵ *Id*

²⁶ *Id*

²⁷ Statement of Mr. Dan Ashe, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior Before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s FY 2016 Budget Request, May 6, 2015, <https://www.fws.gov/laws/Testimony/displaytestimony.cfm?ID=259>

²⁸ *Id*.

²⁹ <https://www.sportsmensalliance.org/news/alert-federal-legislation-ban-trapping-wildlife-refuges/>

testified on a previous version of this bill and expressed serious concerns.³⁰ In his testimony, Mr. Ashe highlighted how trapping is an important management tool that USFWS uses to protect threatened and endangered species as well as USFWS impoundment dikes used to manage wetlands for migratory birds and other species.³¹ Director Ashe also anticipated that limiting trapping as a tool would strain USFWS staff time and resources and would damage USFWS's relationship with state agencies.³² Lastly, Director Ashe noted that the bill conflicted with the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) by not exempting subsistence use from the prohibitions on trapping.³³ While some changes have been made to provide some exceptions under the current bill, the language is still very restrictive and would limit the agency's ability to utilize trapping to manage invasive species and predators. It would also completely block state fish and wildlife agencies and private individuals from trapping on national wildlife refuges and ignores ANILCA concerns.

A previous version of this bill was introduced last Congress but did not receive a hearing in the Water, Oceans and Wildlife Subcommittee. The bill has 45 Democrat cosponsors.

H.R. 5973 (Rep. Debbie Dingell, D-MI), Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Reauthorization Act of 2021

The Great Lakes basin is the largest system of fresh surface water on earth and contains 84 percent of North America's water supply.³⁴

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (GLFWRA) was enacted in 1990 for the following purposes: "to carry out a comprehensive study of the status, and the assessment, management, and restoration needs, of the fishery resources of the Great Lakes Basin; to develop proposals to implement recommendations resulting from that study; and to provide assistance to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, states, Native American tribes, and other interested entities to encourage cooperative conservation, restoration and management of fish and wildlife resources and their habitat."³⁵

The USFWS completed the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study (Study) in 1995.³⁶ The Study developed 32 recommendations for actions to restore the fishery resources of the Great Lakes basin to sustainable levels.³⁷ Projects funded under GLFWRA are aimed at accomplishing the Study recommendations and other Great Lakes management plans.³⁸ It is unclear how many of these recommendations have been accomplished. The most recent report, released in 2010, concedes that "many of the 32 recommendations are complex and require long-

³⁰ Statement of Mr. Dan Ashe, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior Before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's FY 2016 Budget Request, May 6, 2015, <https://www.fws.gov/laws/Testimony/displaytestimony.cfm?ID=259>

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ [Facts and Figures about the Great Lakes, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency](#)

³⁵ Original language included in P.L. 101 – 537, subsequent reauthorizations have eliminated some of the "purposes" of the bill.

³⁶ [Report to Congress: Great Lakes Fishery Restoration Study. FWS. September 1995.](#)

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ [Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act Fact Sheet by FWS](#)

term effort, in terms of data collection, implementation of activities, and time to gauge the response of natural systems to our actions. The process of establishing interagency databases, creating geographic information systems and initiating cooperative monitoring programs has in many ways just begun, and will take many more years to be fully established.”³⁹

The GLFWRA was reauthorized in 1998, 2006, and 2016; the current authorization expired in fiscal year 2021. The 2016 law requires the USFWS to submit a report to Congress describing the actions taken to solicit and review proposals to restore fish and wildlife in the Great Lakes, the results of proposals implemented, and progress toward accomplishment of the goals Congress provided for the USFWS’s activities in the Great Lakes. The latest report was due before December 31, 2021; however, the Natural Resources Committee has not received the report or a timeline for when the report will be released.

H.R. 5973 reauthorizes GLFWRA at current funding levels of \$8 million annually until FY 2027 and requires an additional report to Congress before December 31, 2027. A representative from the Conservation Resource Alliance will testify in support of the bill, which has three cosponsors: Reps. Darin LaHood (R-IL), David Joyce (R-OH), and Paul Tonko (D-NY).

H.R. 6023 (Rep. Jim Costa, D-CA), Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2021

A semipostal stamp is a postage stamp that is sold at a higher rate than the normal price for an ordinary first-class stamp. This bill would require the United States Postal Service (USPS) to sell the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamp. USPS would be required to notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives when all copies have been sold. In 2010, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act (P.L. 111-241) directed the USPS to issue a first-class mail stamp and that any amounts collected from the sale of the stamps would support the USFWS’s Multinational Species Conservation Funds.⁴⁰ The USFWS’s Multinational Species Conservation Funds (Funds) provide grants to projects benefiting elephants, rhinos, tigers, great apes and marine turtles in their natural habitats⁴¹ and, according to the USFWS, stamp sales had raised more than \$5.7 million for the Funds as of 2019.⁴² The authorization for offering the stamp expired in 2017, at which point USPS suspended the sale, despite still having more than 49 million printed and unsold stamps on hand at the time.⁴³

The Natural Resources Committee passed an earlier version of this bill in 2019 by unanimous consent. The bill was subsequently passed by the House under suspension by voice vote.⁴⁴ The current bill has twenty four cosponsors, including two Republicans.

³⁹ [Report to Congress: Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 2006, Progress 1990-2010.](#)

⁴⁰ Public Law 111-241

⁴¹ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service International Affairs, Multinational Species Conservation Acts, <https://www.fws.gov/international/laws-treaties-agreements/us-conservation-laws/multinational-species-conservation-acts.html>

⁴² H. Rept. 116-285, <https://www.congress.gov/congressional-report/116th-congress/house-report/285>

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ <https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record/2019/11/20/house-section/article/H9086-1>

H. Res. 641 (Rep. Dan Newhouse, R-WA) Recognizing and celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the National Association of Conservation Districts and their commitment to our lands.

H. Res. 641 recognizes the 75th anniversary of the National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD). NACD is a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit organization that represents the 3,000 conservation districts in all 50 states, Washington, D.C., the United States territories of American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands and over 17,000 citizens serving on their governing boards.⁴⁵ NACD was officially created in 1946 and was originally called the National Association of Soil Conservation District Governing Officials.⁴⁶

NACD's mission is to promote responsible management and conservation of natural resources on all lands by representing locally led conservation districts and their associations through grassroots advocacy, education, and partnerships.⁴⁷

The bill has 33 cosponsors, including 20 Republicans.

IV. MAJOR PROVISIONS & ANALYSIS

H.R.1546 (Rep. Buddy Carter, R-GA)

- Reauthorizes the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking through October 7, 2026.
- Requires the Task Force to develop recommendations and establish a working group to address wildlife trafficking on the internet.

H.R. 3540 (Rep. John Sarbanes, D-MD)

- Reauthorizes NOAA's Chesapeake Bay Office authorization of appropriations until FY 2025.
- Discretionary funding varies by year, but totals \$78.9 million.

H.R. 4057 (Rep. Alan Lowenthal, D-CA)

- Authorizes the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to issue regulations to implement and enforce the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP).
- Prohibits the taking of albatrosses or petrels without a permit, authorization or exemption.

H.R. 4092 (Rep. Jared Huffman, D-CA)

- Legislatively authorizes the USFWS Coastal Program until FY 2027.
- Discretionary funding varies by year, but totals \$112.75 million.

H.R. 4677 (Rep. Paul Tonko, D-NY)

- Creates a \$300 million (over 6 years) New York-New Jersey Watershed Restoration Program

⁴⁵ National Association of Conservation Districts, About NACD, <https://www.nacdnet.org/about-nacd/>

⁴⁶ National Association of Conservation Districts, NACD History, <https://www.nacdnet.org/about-nacd/nacd-history/>

⁴⁷ *Id.*

- 75 percent of these discretionary funds must be used for grants.

H.R. 4716 (Rep. Jerrold Nadler, D-NY)

- Bans the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System.

H.R. 5973 (Rep. Debbie Dingell, D-MI)

- Reauthorizes the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act until FY 2027.
- Continues current funding levels of \$8 million annually.

H.R. 6023 (Rep. Jim Costa, D-CA)

- Authorizes the USPS to sell the remaining 49 million Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamps.

H.Res. 641 (Rep. Dan Newhouse, R-WA)

- Recognizes the 75th anniversary of the National Association of Conservation Districts.

V. COST

The bills have not received a Congressional Budget Office cost analysis.

VI. ADMINISTRATION POSITION

Unknown at this time.

VII. EFFECT ON CURRENT LAW (RAMSEYER)