

Calendar No. 520

105TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
{ 105-283

GREAT LAKES FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF 1998

JULY 31, 1998.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public
Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 659]

The Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which was referred the bill (S. 659), to amend the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 to provide for implementation of recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Great Lakes Fishery Restoration Study Report, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommends that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT AND BACKGROUND

The Great Lakes—Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie and Ontario—contain almost 20 percent of the world's fresh surface water and cover approximately 95,000 square miles. Only the polar ice caps contain more fresh water than the Great Lakes. Approximately 25 percent of the total population of Canada and 10 percent of the United States population live within the Great Lakes Basin, and 25 million people use it as their water supply. The Great Lakes serve as an enormous natural and economic resource to the approximately 35 million people who reside in the Basin, generating billions of dollars in economic activity, of which almost \$7 billion is related to the fishing industry. The Basin also serves as home to hundreds of species of fish and wildlife, including 24 endangered or threatened species.

Commercial fishing pressures in the post-Civil War period led to declines in native fish populations, which further declined drastically in the 1950's and the 1960's, due to overfishing, pollution

and competition with nonindigenous species, particularly the sea lamprey. More recently, significant demands have been placed on the resources of the Great Lakes from boating, shipping, municipal and industrial water supply, waste disposal and power production.

Although efforts by resource management agencies throughout the Basin have alleviated some of the problems, the challenges to restore the resources of the Basin are profound. This is due to a number of factors, including the complexity of the ecosystem, and the complexity of the institutional framework for managing the ecosystem. Management authority ranges across two countries, eight States, two provinces, Native American tribes, municipalities, county boards, and quasi-governmental national and international agencies. Universities, research institutes, industry groups, conservation organizations and recreation groups all have an interest in the Basin's resources.

It is in this context that Congress passed the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (the Act) in 1990. The purpose of the Act was to: carry out a comprehensive study on the status, management and restoration needs of fishery resources of the Basin; develop proposals to implement recommendations resulting from that study; and provide assistance to the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, States, Indian Tribes and other interested entities to encourage cooperative conservation, restoration and management of the fish and wildlife resources and their habitat.

As required by the Act, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service) prepared the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study (the Study or Report), which was submitted to Congress in September 1995. This Study focused on the status of fishery resources and habitat in the Great Lakes Basin, including the effectiveness of present management plans, and analysis of the impacts and management control alternatives for recently introduced nonindigenous species. Thirty-two recommendations were developed regarding actions necessary to restore the fishery resources of the Basin to sustainable levels. In general, these recommendations address issues common to all five Great Lakes and their watersheds, and they identify priorities not currently funded, but nevertheless considered necessary for restoration objectives. They include planning, research, monitoring, fishery harvest management, habitat restoration, nonindigenous species control and pollution control.

The Study concluded that an ecosystem approach in the stewardship and management of Great Lakes resources is vital for the success of restoration efforts. This approach requires coordination of water quality and fish management decisions, as well as cooperation among the different authorities.

OBJECTIVES OF THE LEGISLATION

The purposes of this legislation are to develop and implement proposals, based on the results of the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study, for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources in the Great Lakes Basin.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short Title

Section 1 designates the bill as the “Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1998.”

Section 2. Findings

Section 2 sets forth the findings of Congress with respect to the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study. The Study found that despite the progress that has been made, additional actions and better coordination are needed to protect and manage fisheries and related resources in the Great Lakes Basin. The Study also recommended actions that are not currently being funded but are essential to meet goals and objectives in managing the resources of the Great Lakes Basin.

Section 3. Reference; Repeal

Congress passed two identical versions of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 in Public Laws 101–573 and 101–646. This section repeals title II of Public Law 101–646, and clarifies that any reference to the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 is a reference to the Act enacted by title I of Public Law 101–573.

Section 4. Purposes

This section updates and revises the purposes of the Act, contained in section 1003, to include development and implementation of proposals for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources in the Great Lakes Basin.

Section 5. Definitions

This section amends Section 1004 of the Act to provide definitions for “Committee”, “non-Federal source”, “Report”, and “restoration”. In addition, the definition of “nonindigenous species” is amended to include “other organism.”

Section 6. Identification, Review, and Implementation of Proposals

This section replaces section 1005 of the Act, which provided for the Study, with provisions for developing and implementing restoration proposals. Specifically, the Director of the Service is required to request, on an annual basis, proposals for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources from State Directors and Indian Tribes, in cooperation or partnership with other interested entities. Proposals must be based on the results of the Report, and must further be consistent with the goals of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, as revised in 1987, the 1954 Great Lakes Fisheries Convention, State and tribal fishery management jurisdiction, the 1980 Joint Strategic Plan for the management of Great Lakes fishery resources, the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act, and the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and joint ventures established under the plan.

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee (the Committee) is established to review the proposals, and make recommendations to the Director of the Service. The

Committee shall meet at least once a year and will operate under the auspices of the Council of Lakes Committee. The Committee shall include representatives from all State Directors and Indian Tribes with Great Lakes fish and wildlife management authority in the Great Lakes Basin. Nothing in this bill should be construed to enlarge or diminish the authority of any Indian Tribe with respect to management of fish and wildlife in the Great Lakes Basin. The Great Lakes Coordinator of the Service will serve on the Committee as an observer. Committee members must recuse themselves from consideration of proposals that the member, or the entity that the member represents, has submitted. This is intended to avoid any conflicts of interest in the Committee members' review and recommendation of individual proposals.

In reviewing proposals, the Committee shall assess their effectiveness and appropriateness in fulfilling the purposes of the Act. In recommending proposals to the Director, the Committee shall prioritize their recommendations, taking into account the effectiveness and appropriateness of proposals in fulfilling the purposes of the laws applicable to restoration of the fishery resources and habitat of the Great Lakes Basin. As emphasized in the Report, coordination on an ecosystem-wide basis is essential for restoration of the Great Lakes Basin resources. Proposals that reflect this coordination and fulfill purposes of multiple laws to restore the Great Lakes Basin should be encouraged. After considering the recommendations of the Committee, the Director of the Service shall select and fund proposals, subject to available appropriations. Not less than twenty-five percent of the cost of any proposal must be funded by non-Federal sources, either in cash or through in-kind contributions.

Control of sea lamprey populations in the Great Lakes Basin shall remain under the authority of the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, and are not subject to the cost-sharing provision.

Section 7. Reports to Congress

This section requires the Director of the Service to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and the House Committee on Resources describing actions taken to solicit, review and implement proposals under section 1005, and the progress made toward the accomplishment of the goals specified in section 1006.

Section 8. Authorization of Appropriations

This section authorizes up to \$3.5 million in appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1998–2003 for the operation of the Great Lakes Coordination Office, the Upper Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office and the Lower Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office. The legislation also authorizes \$4.5 million for each of the fiscal years 1999–2003 for implementation of fish and wildlife restoration proposals selected by the Director of the Service, of which none shall be available for costs incurred in administering the proposals.

HEARINGS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works held a hearing on S. 659 on July 7, 1998. Testimony was received from Mr.

John Rogers, Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Mr. Gary Taylor, Legislative Director of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and Mr. Thomas Crane, Program Manager of the Great Lakes Commission.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

On April 25, 1997, Senator Glenn introduced S. 659, the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1998, which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. On Wednesday, July 22, 1998, the Committee held a business meeting to consider this bill. Senator Chafee offered an amendment in the form of a substitute. S. 659, as amended, was favorably reported by voice vote.

REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT

In compliance with section 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee makes evaluation of the regulatory impact of the reported bill. The reported bill will have no regulatory impact. This bill will not have any adverse impact on the personal privacy of individuals.

MANDATES ASSESSMENT

In compliance with the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4), the Committee finds that S. 659 would impose no Federal intergovernmental unfunded mandates on State, local, or tribal governments. All of its governmental directives are imposed on Federal agencies. The bill does not directly impose any private sector mandates.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Section 403 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act requires that a statement of the cost of the reported bill, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, be included in the report. That statement follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 24, 1998.

Hon. JOHN H. CHAFEE, *Chairman,*
Committee on Environment and Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 659, the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1998.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Victoria V. Heid (for Federal costs), who can be reached at 226-2860, and Marjorie Miller (for the State, local, and tribal impact), who can be reached at 225-3220.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 659, Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1998, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on July 22, 1998

Summary

S. 659 would authorize the appropriation of \$8 million for each of the fiscal years 1999–2003 to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in the Department of the Interior for fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Great Lakes Basin.

CBO estimates that implementing S. 659 would result in outlays of about \$8 million in fiscal year 1999 and of \$40 million over the 1999–2003 period, assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts. Because S. 659 would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

S. 659 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments.

Description of the bill's major provisions

S. 659 would authorize the appropriation of \$3.5 million for each of the fiscal years 1999–2003 for the operation of the three offices that coordinate all USFWS activities in the Great Lakes Basin: the Great Lakes Coordination Office, the Upper Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office, and the Lower Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office. These offices also provide administrative and technical support to carry out these activities. The previous authorization of appropriations for these offices expired in fiscal year 1995.

S. 659 also would authorize the appropriation of \$4.5 million for each of the fiscal years 1999–2003 for the Federal costs associated with implementing fish and wildlife restoration projects approved by the Director of USFWS. The bill would establish a Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Commission, composed of representatives of States and Indian tribes to evaluate proposed projects. Under S. 659, at least 25 percent of the total cost of implementing a proposal would have to be paid by non-federal sources in cash or through in-kind contributions. The bill also would direct USFWS to prepare a report on the review, implementation, and results of fish and wildlife restoration proposals in the Great Lakes Basin by December 31, 2002.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 659 is shown in the following table. For the purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that the amounts authorized for these USFWS programs will be appropriated near the start of each fiscal year and that outlays will follow historical patterns for similar activities. We also assume that non-federal sources will provide matching contributions for restoration proposals on a timely basis. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and the environment).

by fiscal year, in Millions of Dollars

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Spending Subject to Appropriation						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Budget Authority ¹	2	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1	*2	*2	*2	0	0
Proposed Changes:						
Authorization Level	0	8	8	8	8	8
Estimated Outlays	0	7	8	8	8	8
Spending Under S. 659:						
Authorization Level ¹	2	8	8	8	8	8
Estimated Outlays	1	8	8	8	8	8

¹ The 1998 level is the amount appropriated for that year.² Less than \$500,000.*Pay-as-you-go considerations:* None.

Estimated impact on State, local, and tribal governments: S. 659 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments. State or tribal governments that seek and receive Federal funds for fish and wildlife restoration projects, as authorized by this bill, would be required to pay at least 25 percent of the projects' costs. In addition, State and tribal governments would incur some minor costs should they choose to participate in the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee. These costs would be incurred voluntarily.

Estimated impact on the private sector: S. 659 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Victoria V. Heid (226–2860); Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller (225–3220).

Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with section 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows: Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in **[black brackets]**, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman:

UNITED STATES CODE

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

CHAPTER 15B—GREAT LAKES FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION

* * * * *

Sec. 941a. PURPOSE

The purposes of this chapter are—

[(1) 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;]

[(2) to develop proposals to implement recommendations resulting from that study; and] (1) to develop and implement

proposals for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources in the Great Lakes Basin; and

[(3)] (2) to provide assistance to the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, States, Indian Tribes, and other interested entities to encourage cooperative conservation, restoration and management of the fish and wildlife resources and their [habitat of] *habitat in the Great Lakes Basin.*

Sec. 941b. DEFINITIONS

In this chapter—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) *the term “Committee” means the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee established by section 1005(c);*

[(2)] (3) the term “Director” means the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

[(3)] (4) the term “fish stock” means.—

(A) a taxonomically distinct species or subspecies of fish; or

(B) any other aggregation of fish that are geographically, ecologically, behaviorally, or otherwise limited from breeding with individuals from other groups of fish and are capable of management as a unit;

[(4)] (5) the term “Great Lakes Basin” means the air, land, water, and living organisms within the drainage basin of the Saint Lawrence River at or upstream from the point at which the river becomes the international boundary between Canada and the United States;

[(5)] (6) the term “Indian Tribe” means any Indian tribe, band, village, nation, or other organized group or community that is recognized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians;

[(6)] (7) the term “lower Great Lakes” means the region in which is located that portion of the Great Lakes Basin which is downstream from the confluence of the Saint Clair River and Lake Huron near Port Huron, Michigan;

(8) *the term “non-Federal source” includes a State government, local government, Indian Tribe, other non-Federal governmental entity, private entity, and individual;*

[(8)] (9) the term “nonindigenous species” means a species of [plant or animal] *plant, animal, or other organism that did not occur in the Great Lake Basin before European colonization of North America;*

(10) *the term “Report” means the United States Fish and Wildlife Service report entitled ‘Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study’, submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on September 13, 1995;*

(11) *the term “restoration” means rehabilitation and maintenance of the structure, function, diversity, and dynamics of a biological system, including reestablishment of self-sustaining populations of fish and wildlife;*

[(9)] (12) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army; [and]

[(10)] (13) the term “State Director” means the head of the agency, department, board, commission, or other governmental entity of each of the States of New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which is responsible for the management and conservation of the fish and wildlife resources of that State[.]; and

[(7)] (14) the term “upper Great Lakes” means that portion of the Great Lakes Basin which is upstream from the confluence of the Saint Clair River and Lake Huron near Port Huron, Michigan.

[Sec. 941c. GREAT LAKES FISHERY RESOURCES RESTORATION STUDY.—

[(a)] IN GENERAL.—The Director shall conduct a comprehensive study of the status of, and the assessment, management, and restoration needs of, the fishery resources of the Great Lakes Basin and shall provide the opportunity for the Secretary, the Administrator, State Directors, Indian Tribes, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, appropriate Canadian Government entities, and other appropriate entities to participate in the study. The Director shall complete the study by October 1, 1994.

[(b)] MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—To provide opportunities for the full participation of all affected entities in the planning and conduct of the study, the Director shall invite the entities identified in subsection (a) of this section to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the scope and focus of the study and the responsibilities of each participant for conducting the study.

[(c)] CONTENT OF STUDY.—A study under this section shall include, but not be limited to—

[(1)] identifying and describing the component drainages of the Great Lakes Basin (including the drainage for each of the Great Lakes), analyzing how the characteristics and current or expected land and water uses of those drainages have affected, and can be expected to affect in the future, the fishery resources and fish habitats of the Great Lakes Basin;

[(2)] analyzing historical fishery resource data for the Great Lakes Basin to identify the causes of past and continuing [de]clines of the fishery resources and the impediments to restoring those resources;

[(3)] evaluating the adequacy, effectiveness, and consistency of current Great Lakes interagency fisheries management plans and Federal and State water quality programs, with respect to their effects on Great Lakes fishery resources;

[(4)] analyzing the impacts of, and management control alternatives for, recently introduced nonindigenous species, including the zebra mussel, the ruffe, and the spiny water flea in accordance with the Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.);

[(5)] developing recommendations regarding—

[(A)] an action plan to analyze the effects of contaminant levels on fishery resources;

【(B) an action plan for the cooperative restoration and enhancement of depleted, nationally significant fish stocks, including lake trout, yellow perch, lake sturgeon, walleye, forage fish, and Atlantic salmon;

【(C) planning and technical assistance that should be provided to the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, States, and Indian Tribes to assist their fishery resource restoration efforts;

【(D) mitigation measures to restore and enhance fishery resources adversely affected by past Federal (including federally assisted or approved) water resource development projects and other activities;

【(E) increasing the involvement of the International Joint Commission, the Great Lakes Commission, the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, and other interjurisdictional entities regarding fishery resources protection, restoration, and enhancement;

【(F) research projects and data gathering initiatives regarding population trends of fish stocks, including population abundance and structure, interspecific competition, survival rates, and behavioral patterns;

【(G) important fishery resource habitat and other areas that should be protected, restored, or enhanced for the benefit of Great Lakes fishery resources;

【(H) how private conservation organizations, recreational and commercial fishing interests, the aquaculture industry, and the general public could contribute to the implementation of the fishery resource restoration and enhancement recommendations developed pursuant to this chapter; and

【(I) appropriate contributions that should be made by States and other non-Federal entities to the cost of activities undertaken to implement the recommendations, including a description of.—

【(i) the activities that shall be cost-shared;

【(ii) the entities or individuals which shall share the costs of those activities;

【(iii) the proportion of appropriate project and activity costs that shall be borne by non-Federal interests; and

【(iv) how the entities or individuals who share costs should finance their contribution.

【(d) PROPOSALS FOR IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Director shall develop proposals for implementing the recommendations of the study developed under subsection (c)(5) of this section. The proposals shall be consistent with the goals of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, as revised in 1987, the 1954 Great [L]akes Fisheries Convention, State and tribal fishery management jurisdiction, and the 1980 Joint Strategic Plan for the management of Great Lakes fishery resources.】

Sec. 941c. IDENTIFICATION, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS.—

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Committee, shall encourage the development and, subject to the avail-

ability of appropriations, the implementation of proposals based on the results of the Report.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PROPOSALS.—

(1) REQUEST BY DIRECTOR.—The Director shall annually request that State Directors and Indian Tribes, in cooperation or partnership with other interested entities and based on the results of the Report, submit proposals for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSALS.—A proposal under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in the manner and form prescribed by the Director and shall be consistent with the goals of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, as revised in 1987, the 1954 Great Lakes Fisheries Convention, State and tribal fishery management jurisdiction, the 1980 Joint Strategic Plan for the management of Great Lakes fishery resources, the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), and the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and joint ventures established under the plan.

(3) SEA LAMPREY AUTHORITY.—The Great Lakes Fishery Commission shall retain authority and responsibility for formulation and implementation of a comprehensive program for eradicating or minimizing sea lamprey populations in the Great Lakes Basin.

(c) REVIEW OF PROPOSALS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.—There is established the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee, which shall operate under the auspices of the Council of Lake Committees.

(2) MEMBERSHIP AND APPOINTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of representatives of all State Directors and Indian Tribes with Great Lakes fish and wildlife management authority in the Great Lakes Basin.

(B) APPOINTMENTS.—State Directors and Tribal Chairs shall appoint their representatives, who shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

(C) OBSERVER.—The Great Lakes Coordinator of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall participate as an observer of the Committee.

(D) RECUSAL.—A member of the Committee shall recuse himself or herself from consideration of proposals that the member, or the entity that the member represents, has submitted.

(3) FUNCTIONS.—The Committee shall at least annually—

(A) review proposals developed in accordance with subsection (b) to assess their effectiveness and appropriateness in fulfilling the purposes of this title; and

(B) recommend to the Director priorities for implementing the proposals, taking into account the effectiveness and appropriateness of the proposals in fulfilling the purposes of other laws applicable to restoration of the fishery resources and habitat of the Great Lakes Basin.

(d) *IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS.*—After considering the recommendations of the Committee and the goals specified in section 1006, the Director shall select proposals to be implemented and, subject to the availability of appropriations and subsection (e), fund implementation of the proposals.

(e) *COST SHARING.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not less than 25 percent of the cost of implementing a proposal selected under subsection (d) (not including the cost of establishing sea lamprey barriers) shall be paid in cash or in-kind contributions by non-Federal sources.

(2) *EXCLUSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM NON-FEDERAL SHARE.*—The Director may not consider the expenditure, directly or indirectly, of Federal funds received by a State or local government to be a contribution by a non-Federal source for purposes of this subsection.

* * * * *

Sec. 941f. Annual reports.—[Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit a report to the Committee on Merchant Marine and [F]isheries of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate. Each such report shall describe—

[(1) the progress and findings of the studies conducted under section 941c of this title, including recommendations of implementing activities, where appropriate, that would contribute to the restoration or improvement of one or more fish stocks of the Great Lakes Basin; and

[(2) activities undertaken to accomplish the goals stated in section 941d of this title.]

On December 31, 2002, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) actions taken to solicit and review proposals under section 1005;

(2) the results of proposals implemented under section 1005; and

(3) progress toward the accomplishment of the goals specified in section 1006.

Sec. 941g. Authorization of appropriations.

[(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director—

[(1) for conducting a study under section 941c of this title not more than \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 1994;

[(2) to establish and operate the Great Lakes Coordination Office under section 941f(a) of this title and Upper Great Lakes Fishery Resources Offices under section 941f(c) of this title, not more than \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 1995; and

[(3) to establish and operate the Lower Great Lakes Fishery Resources Offices under section 941f(b) (FOOTNOTE 1) of this title, not more than \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 1995.

【(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this chapter, not more than \$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 1995.】

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director—

(1) for the operation of the Great Lakes Coordination Office, the Upper Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office, and the Lower Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office under section 1007, \$3,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003; and

(2) for implementation of fish and wildlife restoration proposals selected by the Director under section 1005(d), \$4,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, of which no funds shall be available for costs incurred in administering the proposals.

