



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: June 13, 2022
Subject: Hybrid Legislative Hearing on H.R. 4768, H.R. 6936, H.R. 6949, H.R. 7398, H.R. 7792, H.R. 7793, and H.R. 7801

The Subcommittee on Water, Oceans and Wildlife will hold a hybrid legislative hearing on H.R. 4768, the *Detrimental Erosion Forcing Enhanced Needs to Defend (DEFEND) the Great Lakes Act* (Joyce); H.R. 6936, the *Stamp Out Invasive Species Act* (Stefanik); H.R. 6949, the *Delaware River Basin Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2022* (Evans); H.R. 7398, the *Prohibit Wildlife Killing Contests Act of 2022* (Cohen); H.R. 7792, the *Water Data Act* (Stansbury); the H.R. 7793, the *Rio Grande Water Security Act* (Stansbury); and H.R. 7801, *to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Coastal and Estuarine Resilience and Restoration Program* (Levin) on **Thursday, June 16, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. EDT**, in room 1324 Longworth House Office Building and via Cisco Webex.

Republican Members are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to participate in person from the hearing room.

Member offices are requested to notify Rob MacGregor (Robert.MacGregor@mail.house.gov) **no later than Tuesday, June 14, at 4:30 p.m. EDT**, 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

- This hearing features two Republican bills: one that would enhance the Great Lakes ecosystem without increasing federal authorizations and one that encourages voluntary contributions to enhance conservation and combat invasive species.
- In contrast, one Democrat bill pre-empts state wildlife laws and would hinder successful hunting practices aimed at reducing predators such as coyotes.
- Other Democrat bills on the hearing agenda authorize new programs and make costly authorizations.



II. WITNESSES

Panel I – Members

- TBD

Panel II – Stakeholders

- **Dr. Timothy Mihuc** (*H.R. 6936*) [Republican witness]
Coordinator of the Lake Champlain Research Institute at SUNY Plattsburgh
Plattsburgh, NY
- **Stephanie Garcia Richard** (*H.R. 7398*)
Commissioner of Public Lands
New Mexico State Land Office
Santa Fe, NM
- **Nikki Ghorpade** (*H.R. 6949*)
Government Affairs Manager
Great Lakes/Atlantic Region
Ducks Unlimited
Washington, DC
- **Mike A. Hamman, P.E.** (*H.R. 7792* and *H.R. 7793*)
State Engineer
State of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM

III. BACKGROUND

[H.R. 4768](#) (Rep. David Joyce, R-OH) To require the Secretary of the Army to initiate at least five projects to reduce the loss and degradation of Great Lakes coastal wetlands, and for other purposes. *Detrimental Erosion Forcing Enhanced Needs to Defend (DEFEND) the Great Lakes Act.*

The American side of the Great Lakes has over 4,530 miles of coastline, which is greater than the entire length of the coast from Maine to Texas.¹ This shoreline, in some cases, requires significant maintenance as flooding and waves cause constant erosion. Some hard-hit parts of the shoreline can retract by as much as a foot each year. This loss and degradation threaten the shoreline and the surrounding ecosystem, as well as nearby human structures.

¹ Fritz Klug, *Great Lakes Have the Most Miles of Coastline in Contiguous US*, M Live (April 2, 2013), https://www.mlive.com/news/2013/04/who_has_more_miles_of_coastline.html#:~:text=There%20are%204%2C530%20miles%20of%20coastline%20on%20the%20Pacific%20Ocean.

To help address this problem, H.R. 4768 would direct the Secretary of the Army (Secretary) to initiate at least five projects to reduce the risk of loss and degradation of coastal wetlands along the shorelines of the Great Lakes. Under the bill, the Secretary would have two years to initiate these five projects.

The bill would direct the Secretary to initiate the projects under Section 206 of the *Water Resources Development Act of 1996*.² Section 206 would allow the Secretary to carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration projects to improve the quality of the environment and the elements and features of an estuary. The section would require that non-Federal interests shall provide 35 percent of the cost of construction of any project and pay 100 percent of any operation, maintenance, and replacement and rehabilitation costs. The section is currently authorized at \$62.5 million for each fiscal year and not more than \$10 million in Federal funds may be allotted for a project at any single locality.

H.R. 4768 has one Republican cosponsor. The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has the primary jurisdiction of this legislation since it involves the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

H.R. 6936 (Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-NY) To provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit programs that combat invasive species. *Stamp Out Invasive Species Act.*

According to the U.S. Forest Service's Southern Research Station, 50,000 non-native invasive animal and plant species have been introduced to the United States, resulting in economic costs estimated at more than \$100 billion annually.³ The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has inventoried 79,236,607 acres containing invasive plant species.⁴ In Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, the BLM was only able to treat 264,979 acres (0.33 percent of infested acres controlled).⁵

Currently, the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) has two 75-cent fundraising stamps (known as semipostal stamps) available for purchase, the Breast Cancer Research Stamp and the Save Vanishing Species Stamp.⁶ The price of a semipostal stamp pays for the First-Class single-piece postage rate in effect at the time of purchase plus an amount to fund causes that have been determined to be in the national public interest.⁷ The Breast Cancer Research Semipostal was issued in 1998 and was the first semipostal in U.S. history and, as of April 2022, the stamp raised over \$94.4 million for breast cancer research. Under current law, 70 percent of the net amount raised is given to the National Institutes of Health and 30 percent is given to the Medical Research Program at the Department of Defense (DOD). The Save Vanishing Species

² 33 U.S.C. 2330.

³ USDA, *Partners Work Together to Educate Public on Treating Non-Native Invasive Species* (June 20, 2016), <https://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/news/615>.

⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau Invasive Species Program Highlights and Spending Report for Fiscal Years 2020-2021, February 2022,

file:///X:/Water.%20Power%20&%20Oceans/Invasive%20Species/JDA%20DOI%20Invasive%20Species%20Report%20to%20Congress_2022.0228%20FINAL.pdf.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ USPS, Semipostal Stamps, <https://about.usps.com/what/corporate-social-responsibility/activities/semipostals.htm>.

⁷ *Id.*

Semipostal was first issued in 2011. As of April 2022, the stamp has raised more than \$6.9 million to help protect threatened and vanishing species.⁸ Under current law, 100 percent of the net amount raised is transferred to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to support the Multinational Species Conservation Funds.

The *Stamp Out Invasive Species Act* would offer the public an opportunity to contribute towards federal programs aimed at combating invasive species. This bill expresses the Sense of Congress that invasive species pose a serious threat to our natural ecosystems, significantly harm native plant and animal populations, and cause detrimental economic damage to local communities. This bill would direct USPS to issue a “Combating Invasive Species Semipostal Stamp” which would be priced between 15 to 25 percent higher than a standard first-class stamp. The Combating Invasive Species Semipostal would be available for purchase for two years beginning no later than twelve months after the date the bill is enacted. Net proceeds from the sale of this stamp would be split evenly between the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Department of the Interior (DOI) to support programs that work to combat invasive species. This bill would have the secondary effect of raising awareness of invasive species amongst the public, which should lead to an increase in efforts to prevent or mitigate them, such as an increase in the number of boat owners who participate in vessel decontamination.

H.R. 6936 has eleven cosponsors, including five Republicans and six Democrats.

[H.R. 6949](#) (Rep. Dwight Evans, D-PA) To amend the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act to reauthorize Delaware River Basin conservation programs, and for other purposes. *Delaware River Basin Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2022.*

This bill would amend Section 3504(c)(1) of the *Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Act* to change the maximum federal share under the Delaware River Basin Restoration Grant Program from 50 percent to 90 percent for projects that serve small, rural, or disadvantaged communities.⁹ The Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) would be authorized to entirely waive the federal cost share requirements if the grant recipient is “unable to pay, or would experience significant financial hardship if required to pay, the non-Federal share.”

Subtitle E “Delaware River Basin Conservation” of the *WIIN Act* created the Delaware River Basin restoration program.¹⁰ Subtitle E directed the Secretary to adopt a Basin-wide strategy to facilitate and target restoration activities. The goals of the restoration activities are to improve water quality, increase opportunities for public access, sustain fish and wildlife habitat and improve water management while increasing engagement with local communities and increasing scientific capacity. To accomplish these goals, the *WIIN Act* created a “Delaware River Basin Restoration Grant Program” to provide matching grants to state and local governments, nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, and other eligible entities. This grant program had a maximum Federal cost share of 50 percent, which this bill seeks to change. The bill would also

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ [Public Law 114-322](#)

¹⁰ *Id.*

strike Section 3506 of the *WIIN Act* which prevents the federal government from using funds to acquire land and would change the sunset from 2023 to 2030.¹¹

H.R. 6949 has thirteen cosponsors, including one Republican.

H.R. 7398 (Rep. Steve Cohen, D-TN) To prohibit wildlife killing contests on public lands, and for other purposes. *Prohibit Wildlife Killing Contests Act of 2022.*

State fish and wildlife agencies have long been recognized as the primary and most well-equipped managers of fish and wildlife in the United States.¹² Congress affirmed state agency authority for fish and wildlife management on Federal lands in organic Acts for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service and Department of Defense (DOD) military installations.¹³ Each statute directs that to the maximum extent practicable, hunting and fishing seasons and bag limits on these federal lands shall conform to state agency regulations.¹⁴

H.R. 7398 would place a blanket prohibition on any person from organizing, sponsoring, conducting, or participating in a wildlife killing contest on federal lands unless they target ungulates or birds of the orders Galliformes (turkeys, chicken, quail, etc.) or Anatidae (ducks, geese, swans, etc.) or wildlife classified as invasive by the National Invasive Species Information Center. The bill would accomplish this by requiring the heads of federal land management agencies to issue regulations preventing these contests. Lastly, the bill includes a preemption clause that would protect states who have more stringent regulations but not states that have less stringent regulations.

The bill could prevent states from being able to manage coyotes and other predators on federal lands within their state borders. Notably, the National Invasive Species Information Center cited in the bill does not list coyotes as an invasive species and the findings section in the bill refers to coyotes as “ecologically important carnivores.” However, the Invasive Species Compendium (ISC), which is an encyclopedic resource not cited in the bill that brings together a wide range of different types of science-based information to support decision-making in invasive species management worldwide, identifies coyotes as invasive.¹⁵ The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is one of the lead partners in the development of the ISC, which has been resourced by a diverse international consortium of government departments, non-governmental organizations and private companies.¹⁶ According to the ISC website, coyotes’ negatively impact livestock operations, endangered species, and sometimes kill pets.¹⁷ The ISC also notes that attacks on humans are infrequent although increasing.¹⁸

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation, *State Fish and Wildlife Management Authority*,

<https://congressionalsportsmen.org/policies/state/state-fish-and-wildlife-management-authority>.

¹³ <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-114shrg99406/html/CHRG-114shrg99406.htm>, Testimony of RONALD J. REGAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES, FEBRUARY 9, 2016.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ CABI, *About the Invasive Species Compendium*, <https://www.cabi.org/isc/about>; CABI, *Invasive Species Compendium*, *Canis Latrans*, <https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/90296#tosummaryOfInvasiveness>.

¹⁶ CABI, *About the Invasive Species Compendium*, <https://www.cabi.org/isc/about>.

¹⁷ CABI, *Invasive Species Compendium*, *Canis Latrans*, *Summary of Invasiveness*, <https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/90296#tosummaryOfInvasiveness>.

¹⁸ *Id.*

Wildlife hunting contests aim to curtail the impacts of coyotes, other predators and invasive species that can cause issues such as livestock depredations and degradation of endangered species habitat.¹⁹ These contests are only conducted for species with healthy populations and must abide by state fish and wildlife policies, including take limits.²⁰ These contests typically target predators such as foxes, bobcats, and coyotes, all of which are managed by the states.²¹ This bill would undermine state authority to manage species within their borders across all types of land and would be a significant overreach of federal authority.

H.R. 7398 has eighteen Democrat cosponsors.

[H.R. 7792](#) (Rep. Melanie Stansbury, D-NM) To provide for a national water data framework, and for other purpose. *Water Data Act*

The bill would require the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to create and lead a federal “water data council” (council) with the heads of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the Departments of Agriculture (USDA), Commerce, Defense (DOD), Energy (DOE), Health and Human Services (HHS), and Homeland Security (DHS) to develop and implement a “National Water Data Framework” for integrating, sharing, and using water data.

The council would have 180 days from the bill’s enactment to publish a report detailing, among other requirements, the National Water Data Framework, metrics for achieving the framework, grants and assistance provided to state, tribal, and local entities toward the development and adoption of new technologies and tools. H.R. 7792 would authorize \$15 million annually for fiscal years (FY) 2023 through 2027 to accomplish these requirements. The bill would create a permanent federal advisory committee tasked with helping the council in developing the National Water Data Framework. The bill would also initiate a new \$125 million grant program over five years to support programs and projects that facilitate implementation of the National Water Data Framework.

The bill has thirteen cosponsors, including two Republicans.

[H.R. 7793](#) (Rep. Melanie Stansbury, D-NM) To provide for the water security of the Rio Grande Basin, to reauthorize irrigation infrastructure grants, and for other purposes. *Rio Grande Water Security Act*.

Title I of the bill would establish a Rio Grande Basin federal agency working group (working group) made up of at least fourteen different federal agencies and departments “to develop and implement an integrated water resources management plan for the Rio Grande Basin using the best available science, data, and local knowledge.” The bill would require the plan to be developed within two years of enactment and to include several recommendations, such as

¹⁹ <https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/90296#tosummaryOfInvasiveness>

²⁰ Guest Opinion: Hunting contests have their place in PA, Carl M. Johnston, <https://www.buckscountycouriertimes.com/story/opinion/columns/2022/04/02/hunting-contests-help-the-community-in-pa/65347651007/>

²¹ *Id.*

infrastructure improvements, data and monitoring needs, ways of increasing water conservation, and a timeline for implementing the plan over a 30-year period.

The bill would authorize federal agencies involved in the working group to implement recommended projects and activities related to the plan. In addition, agencies would be allowed to waive or reduce the federal cost share requirements for those projects. Lastly, the working group would be authorized until fiscal year 2052 and provided “such sums as necessary” for that time period.

The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) testified on similar legislation, S. 4236, in the Senate. The agency stated that it “supports the intent of Title I but has concerns with the duration of this proposed legislation. Reclamation feels that completing the Basin Study which will be a 3-year process will be an important step prior to developing and implementing an integrated plan. Implementation of an Integrated Plan would also be contingent on resolution of ongoing litigation in the *Texas vs. New Mexico* Supreme Court case.”²²

Title II would reauthorize the Rio Grande Pueblos irrigation infrastructure grants authorized under the *Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009* (Section 9106 of P.L. 111-11), which authorized Reclamation to plan and implement improvements to irrigation infrastructure for the eighteen Pueblos in the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico.²³ In particular, Reclamation would be required to: assess the condition of the irrigation infrastructure of the Rio Grande Pueblos; establish priorities for the rehabilitation of that irrigation infrastructure in accordance with specified criteria; and implement projects to rehabilitate and improve the irrigation infrastructure.²⁴ The law requires Reclamation to update its original report to Congress every four years with an updated list of projects recommended for implementation. The updated report was expected to be sent to Congress by September 2021, however the 124-page report was submitted on June 2, 2022. The report listed more than 300 projects totaling \$280 million in initial (appraisal level) costs between the eighteen Pueblos.²⁵

Congress authorized \$4 million to conduct a study of the irrigation infrastructure within the eighteen Rio Grande pueblos, and \$6 million in each fiscal year until 2019 to address identified infrastructure improvements. This program has been authorized on an annual basis through the final Energy and Water Appropriations bill. H.R. 7793 would reauthorize the program until fiscal year 2032 and would replace the \$6 million appropriations authorization with “such sums as are necessary”.

The bill has four cosponsors, including Rep. Yvette Herrell (R-NM).

²² Statement of Camille Calimlim Touton, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water and Power, May 25, 2022.

<https://www.energy.senate.gov/services/files/792F68B8-391C-49A7-AF5C-79327E872429>.

²³ The eighteen New Mexico Pueblo tribes within the basin, in alphabetic order, are Acoma, Cochiti, Isleta, Jemez, Laguna, Nambé, Ohkay Owingeh, Picuris, Pojoaque, San Felipe, San Ildefonso, Sandia, Santa Ana, Santa Clara, Santo Domingo, Taos, Tesuque and Zia.

²⁴ Sec. 9106(a)(2) of P.L. 111-11, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009.

²⁵ FY22 Budget Justifications, page 260, https://www.usbr.gov/budget/2022/FY_2022_Reclamation_Budget_Justifications.pdf; [https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Enclosure - Rio Grande Pueblos Irrigation Infrastructure Report.pdf](https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Enclosure_-_Rio_Grande_Pueblos_Irrigation_Infrastructure_Report.pdf).

H.R. 7801 (Rep. Mike Levin, D-CA) To amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Coastal and Estuarine Resilience and Restoration Program, and for other purposes.

The Department of Commerce, Justice, and State Appropriations Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-77), directed the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to establish a Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program (CELCP) “for the purpose of protecting important coastal and estuarine areas that have significant conservation, recreation, ecological, historical, or aesthetic values, or that are threatened by conversion from their natural or recreational state to other uses.”²⁶ In 2009, the CELCP became a part of the *Coastal Zone Management Act* (CZMA; 16 U.S.C. 1452 et seq.), with funding authorized for up to \$60 million each year until fiscal year 2013.²⁷

Grants under CELCP are specifically authorized for the purpose of acquiring property or interests in property from willing sellers. While the program requires a 100 percent match, NOAA has the ability to waive the requirement for “underserved communities, communities that have an inability to draw on other sources of funding because of the small population or low income of the community, or for other reasons the Secretary deems appropriate and consistent with the purposes of the program.”²⁸

In 2010, NOAA received funding from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for CELCP projects. Even though NOAA’s appropriations authority expired in FY 2013, the last funding competition was held in fiscal year 2017 utilizing EPA funding.²⁹

H.R. 7801 would rename CELCP as the “Coastal and Estuarine Resilience and Restoration Program” and would reauthorize the now-expired funding levels of \$60 million per year through FY 2026. The bill would add “U.S. territories” to the list of eligible entities that qualify for a waiver of the grant matching requirements. The bill also eliminates the current five percent administrative costs cap and increases the amount available for NOAA to use on acquisitions benefitting National Estuarine Research Reserves to twenty percent (from 15 percent).

The bill would direct the Secretary of Commerce to designate at least five new National Estuarine Research Reserves and provides a \$47 million per year through FY 2026 appropriations authorization for the program. While authorizations of appropriations for this program expired in FY 1999, in FY 2022 the program received \$29.7 million in appropriations.

The National Estuarine Research Reserve System was established through CZMA. There are currently 30 research reserves that cover nearly 1.4 million acres. The process to designate a federal National Estuarine Research Reserve requires the nomination from the governor of the state in which the area is located and for NOAA to determine that the area is suitable for long-term research; state laws provide for the long-term protection for reserve resources; and that

²⁶ Public law 107-77, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-107publ77/html/PLAW-107publ77.htm>.

²⁷ Subtitle E of Title XII of P.L. 111-11, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-111publ11/pdf/PLAW-111publ11.pdf>

²⁸ 16 U.S.C. 1456-1(f)(2)(B).

²⁹ Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program, <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/landconservation/about/>.

designation of the area as a reserve will serve to enhance public awareness and understanding of estuarine areas and provide suitable opportunities for public education and interpretation.

Currently there are two designations in process (Louisiana and Lake Michigan/Green Bay) and two letters of interest (U.S. Virgin Islands and Florida) for National Estuarine Research Reserve sites.

The bill has three cosponsors, including two Republicans.

IV. MAJOR PROVISIONS & ANALYSIS

H.R. 4768 (Rep. David Joyce, R-OH)

- Would direct the Secretary of the Army to initiate at least five projects within two years to reduce the risk of loss and degradation of coastal wetlands along the shorelines of the Great Lakes.
- Would direct the Secretary to initiate the projects under Section 206 of the *Water Resources Development Act of 1996*.

H.R. 6936 (Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-NY)

- Would offer the public an opportunity to contribute towards federal programs aimed at combating invasive species by directing USPS to issue a “Combating Invasive Species Semipostal Stamp.”
- Would direct proceeds from stamp sales to the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior (split evenly) for programs that work to combat invasive species.

H.R. 6949 (Rep. Dwight Evans, D-PA)

- Would amend Section 3504(c)(1) of the *Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Act* to change the maximum federal share under the Delaware River Basin Restoration Grant Program from 50 percent to 90 percent for projects that serve small, rural, or disadvantaged communities.
- Would strike Section 3506 of the *WIIN Act*, which prevents the Federal Government from using funds to acquire land and would change the sunset from 2023 to 2030.

H.R. 7398 (Rep. Steve Cohen, D-TN)

- Would place a blanket prohibition on any person from organizing, sponsoring, conducting, or participating in a wildlife killing contest on public lands unless they target ungulates or birds of the orders Galliformes (turkeys, chicken, quail, etc.) or Anatidae (ducks, geese, swans, etc.) or wildlife classified as invasive by the National Invasive Species Information Center.
- Would undermine state authority to manage species within their borders across all types of land and would be a significant overreach of federal authority.

H.R. 7792 (Rep. Melanie Stansbury, D-NM)

- Would create a federal Water Data Council tasked with developing and implementing a national water data framework that will be used throughout all relevant federal agencies.

- Would create a federal advisory committee tasked with helping the council develop the national water data framework.
- Would authorize a total of \$125 million in grants over five years to support programs and projects that implement the national water data framework.

H.R. 7793 (Rep. Melanie Stansbury, D-NM)

- Would create a Rio Grande Basin federal working group tasked with developing an integrated water resource management plan for the Rio Grande basin.
- Would reauthorize the Rio Grande Pueblos grant program until FY 2032; the bill does not limit how much funding this program can receive as it replaces the appropriations authorization with “such sums as are necessary”.

H.R. 7801 (Rep. Mike Levin, D-CA)

- Would reauthorize the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program, which expired in FY 2013, until FY 2026 at \$60 million annually.
- Would authorize \$47 million per year through FY 2026 for National Estuarine Research Reserve System and directs NOAA to designate at least five new sites.
- Currently, there are two designations in process (Louisiana and Lake Michigan/Green Bay) and two letters of interest (U.S. Virgin Islands and Florida) for National Estuarine Research Reserve sites.

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)

H.R. 6949 (Evans)

H.R. 7793 (Stansbury)

H.R. 7801 (Levin)