



Program (Agency)	Account/Subaccount	FY2022 Enacted	FY2023 HOW Coalition Request	FY23 POTUS Budget Request	FY23 House Proposal	FY23 Senate Proposal
Interior and Environment						
<i>Great Lakes</i>						
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (EPA)	Environmental Programs and Management (EPM) / Geographic Programs	\$348 million ⁱ	\$400 million ⁱⁱ	\$340.1 million	\$368 million ⁱⁱⁱ	\$358 million ^{iv}
Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program (EPA)	Environmental Programs and Management	\$0 ^v	\$50 million ^{vi}	\$0	\$0 ^{vii}	\$0 ^{viii}
Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (DOI/FWS)	Resource Management / Fish and Aquatic Conservation / Aquatic Habitat and Species Conservation	\$2 million ^{ix}	\$8 million ^x	n/a	\$3 million ^{xi}	\$2 million ^{xii}
U.S. FWS Invasive Carp (DOI/FWS)	Resource Management	\$25.2 million ^{xiii}	\$26 million	n/a	\$26 million ^{xiv}	\$27 million ^{xv}
U.S.G.S. Invasive Carp (DOI/USGS)	Surveys, Investigations, and Research / Ecosystems	\$11 million ^{xvi}	\$11 million	Sub-Account: \$47.9 million	\$11 million ^{xvii}	\$11 million ^{xviii}
Great Lakes Science Center (DOI/USGS)	Surveys, Investigations, and Research / Ecosystems	\$14 million ^{xix}	\$15 million ^{xx}	No detail	\$15 million ^{xxi}	\$14 million ^{xxii}
<i>National</i>						
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$1,639 million ^{xxiii} (\$443.6 million ^{xxiv})	\$4,380 million ^{xxv}	\$1,639 million	\$1,752 million ^{xxvi}	\$1,689 million ^{xxvii}

Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$1,126 million (\$397.8 million ^{xxviii})	\$3,870 million ^{xxix}	\$1,126 million	\$1,126 million ^{xxx}	\$1,176 million ^{xxxi}
Sec. 221 Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$43 million ^{xxxii}	\$280 million ^{xxxiii}	\$280 million	\$280 million	\$51 million ^{xxxiv}
Household Decentralized Wastewater Grant Program (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	No detail	\$50 million ^{xxxv}	\$50 million	\$5 million	\$0
Small and Disadvantaged Communities (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$27.2 million	\$80 million ^{xxxvi}	\$80 million	\$42.6 million	\$31.2 million ^{xxxvii}
Reducing Lead in Drinking Water (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$22 million	\$182 million ^{xxxviii}	\$182 million	\$51 million	\$26 million ^{xxxix}
Lead Inventorying Utilization Grant Pilot Program	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	No detail	\$10 million ^{xl}	No detail	No detail	No detail
Water Infrastructure Workforce Development (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$4 million	\$18 million	\$17.7 million	\$5 million	\$6 million ^{xli}
Sec. 106 Clean Water State Grants (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Categorical Grants	\$231 million	\$500 million	\$251.5 million	\$243.9 million	\$238.5 million
Sec. 319 Non-Point Pollution (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Categorical Grants	\$178 million ^{xlii}	\$200 million ^{xliii}	\$189 million	\$190 million	\$185 million ^{xliiv}
Public Water System Supervision Grants (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Categorical Grants	\$113 million ^{xliv}	\$250 million	\$132.6 million	\$132.6 million	\$121.6 million ^{xlvi}

Energy and Water						
Brandon Road Lock & Dam, Aquatic Nuisance Species Barrier (U.S. ACE)	Construction	N/A	\$47.9 million	\$47.9 million	\$47.9 million	\$47.9 million ^{xlvi}
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration Program (U.S. ACE)	Construction	No detail	\$15 million	No detail	No detail	No detail
Great Lakes Tributary Model (U.S. ACE)	Operations and Maintenance	No detail	\$600,000	Sub-account: \$100,000	Sub-account: \$3.5 million ^{xlvi}	\$600,000 ^{xlvi}
Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal Barrier (U.S. ACE)	Operations and Maintenance	\$3 million	\$14.3 million	\$14.3 million	\$14.3 million ^l	\$14.3 million ^{li}
Great Lakes Coastal Resiliency Study (U.S. ACE)	Investigations	\$500,000	\$3 million	\$600,000	\$3 million	\$3 million
Commerce, Justice, Science						
<i>Great Lakes</i>						
Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab (NOAA)	Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research / Ocean, Coastal, and Great Lakes Research / Laboratories and Cooperative Institutes	Sub-account: \$37.1 million	Sub-account: \$40 million	Sub-account: \$38 million	Sub-account: \$42 million	Sub-account: \$40 million ^{lii}
Great Lakes Observing System (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Navigation, Observations, and Positioning / Integrated Ocean Observing System Regional Observations	Sub-Account: \$41 million ^{liii}	Sub-account: \$75.3 million	Sub-account: \$40.5 million	Sub-account: \$44 million ^{liiv}	Sub-account: \$46 million ^{liiv}

<i>National</i>						
Sea Grant (NOAA)	Ocean, Coastal, and Great Lakes Research / National Sea Grant College Program	\$76 million ^{lvi}	\$140 million	\$76.3 million	\$96.5 million ^{lvii}	\$90 million ^{lviii}
Coastal Zone Management Grants (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Ocean and Coast Management and Services	\$79 million	\$132 million	\$78.5 million	\$89 million ^{lix}	\$84 million
Marine Debris Program (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Office of Response and Restoration	No Detail ^{lx}	\$15 million	No detail	\$1 million above enacted ^{lxi}	No detail ^{lxii}
Harmful Algal Blooms (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Coastal Science and Assessment / Competitive Research	Sub-account: \$21.5 million ^{lxiii}	Sub-account: \$42 million	Sub-account: \$35.5 million	Sub-account: \$25.5 million ^{lxiv}	Sub-account: \$30 million ^{lxv}
Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas (NOAA)	National Ocean Service/Ocean and Coastal Management and Services	\$61 million	\$84.5 million	\$86.8 million	\$68 million ^{lxvi}	\$70 million ^{lxvii}
National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund (NOAA)	National Ocean Service/Ocean and Coastal Management and Services	\$34 million ^{lxviii}	\$40 million	\$0	\$34 million ^{lix}	\$34 million ^{lxx}
State Foreign Ops						
Great Lakes Fishery Commission (State Department)	International Fisheries Commission	\$47 million ^{lxxi}	\$47 million	Sub-account: \$53.8 million	\$47 million ^{lxxii}	\$50 million ^{lxxiii}

Prepared by Alexis Lopez-Cepero, Senior Legislative Analyst, Healing Our Waters-Great Lakes Coalition (8/5/22)
Contact (202) 454-3382 or alopez-cepero@npca.org with any questions.

ⁱ “Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.—The agreement provides \$348,000,000 for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The Agency shall continue to follow the direction as provided in House Report 117-83 and Senate Report 115-276 related to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.”

ⁱⁱ As authorized by the GLRI Act of 2019 (P.L. 116-294), \$400 million for FY2023.

ⁱⁱⁱ “Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.—The Committee recommends \$368,000,000 for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI), \$20,000,000 above the enacted level and \$27,889,000 above the request. The Committee directs the Agency and other federal partners to continue to work in coordination with the Great Lakes States, Tribes, local authorities, and nonfederal stakeholders to prioritize action-oriented projects across the five focus areas in lieu of additional studies, monitoring, and evaluations. Such projects include, but are not limited to, remediating and delisting Areas of Concern, reducing nutrient runoff, preventing, and controlling invasive species,

improving water quality, and increasing coastal resiliency through restoration and protection of streambanks, natural coastlines, and shorelines. As the Agency distributes funds across the five focus areas, Tribal related activities should be maintained at not less than \$15,000,000.

The Committee remains concerned by the rise in harmful algal blooms (HABs) due to an increase in extreme weather events and climate variability throughout the Great Lakes, and believes that investing GLRI funding in innovative projects including wetland and other natural infrastructure project designs, technologies, algae remediation through harvesting or cultivation, or through other approaches, both nutrient and HAB reduction benefits can be achieved at landscape scales. The Agency is directed to brief the Committee on its current and historical allocation of funds among the five focus areas, with a focus on Area 3 (nutrients) and Area 4 (habitat) in fiscal year 2022. Additionally, the Committee urges the Agency to focus on HAB reduction efforts in Great Lakes regions where nutrient loading contributes the most to HABs. The Committee strongly supports projects that have cross-cutting benefits across focus areas and directs the Agency to use GLRI funding to support efforts that yield benefits to more than one focus area by combining resources from multiple focus areas and to develop a more flexible and responsive allocation process which ensures that States and local communities have the capacity and tools to respond to the growing threat that HABs and other environmental challenges pose to the Great Lakes. The Committee encourages Agency funds to be made available to expand breakwaters and advance local shoreline mitigation measures that protect water quality and provide much needed protection for Great Lakes shorelines threatened by rising lake levels.

The Committee also recognizes that environment-based mitigation measures such as the creation of wetlands, conservation easements, and natural flood plains to slow the flow rate of rivers, creeks, and streams, are innovative tools to mitigate the severity of future floods in the Great Lakes Bay region. The Committee urges the Agency to work in coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as well as state, local, and tribal governments, and business and non-profit stakeholders, on developing conservation and environment-based flood mitigation measures to reduce the impact of floods on communities within the Great Lakes Bay region, including the Tittabawassee River Watershed.

^{iv} “Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.—A long-term goal of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative [GLRI] articulated in the GLRI Action Plan calls for land use, recreation, and economic activities that are managed to ensure that nearshore aquatic, wetland, and upland habitats will sustain the health and function of natural communities. The Committee is aware that metropolitan planning organizations in the region are working on site-specific land-use and economic development projects with local communities bordering the Great Lakes that can help advance this effort. The Agency is encouraged to work with these groups to advance this long-term goal as they allocate funding under the GLRI. The Committee encourages Agency funds for Great Lakes projects to be made available for projects in the historic Great Lakes Basin, which includes the Chicago River Watershed.

The Committee encourages the Agency to work with the other members of the Great Lakes Interagency Taskforce to incorporate environmental justice and equity into the GLRI program and to prioritize grantmaking for projects benefiting environmental justice and historically underserved communities. The Agency is urged to examine barriers and limitations under existing grant practices, promote community engagement and local capacity building, and implement new practices that encourage community-driven projects and equitable access to the benefits resulting from GLRI investments, thereby increasing the share of GLRI grants to communities of color, Indigenous communities, and low-income communities. In undertaking this examination, the Committee encourages the Agency to reconvene the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration, which was first established under E.O. 13340, to review the strategy published in 2005 and revise and reissue updated strategic recommendations that guide the GLRI program, along with the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, so as to incorporate principles of environmental justice and climate change in the restoration and protection of the Great Lakes and its tributaries. The Committee directs the Agency to brief the Committee in 180 days of enactment of this act on the status of this effort.

The Committee is encouraged by the Agency’s commitment to accelerate the clean-up of Areas of Concern. The Committee notes that there is currently no community representation standard for Areas of Concern Public Advisory Councils, which are the entities charged with increasing public awareness, representing public priorities, and ensuring project implementation. The Committee urges the Agency to brief the Committee on how communities most impacted by Areas of Concern are represented in decision-making processes, steps to enhance community engagement and local capacity building, and the Agency’s plan for engaging the Great Lakes community in the development of Action Plan IV.”

^v “Great lakes and lake Champlain Invasive Species Program.—The Committees appreciate receiving the Agency’s recent plan on its previous and planned actions to implement the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program as authorized by the Vessel Incident Discharge Act (Public Law 115-282). In fiscal year 2022, the Committees expect the Agency to implement its plan expeditiously and direct the Agency to continue to use funds from the appropriate Geographic Programs to address invasive species in the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain.”

^{vi} As authorized by the Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (Sec. 903(g); P.L. 115-282), \$50 million per year through FY2023.

^{vii} “Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program.— The Committee expects the Agency to continue to use funds from the appropriate Geographic Programs to address invasive species in the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain at not less than the enacted levels.”

^{viii} “Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program.— The Committee appreciates the ongoing research to combat aquatic nuisance species transported by commercial shipping and ballast water operations in order to implement the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program as authorized by the Vessel Incident Discharge Act (Public Law 115–282). The Committee directs the Agency to use funds from the appropriate Geographic Program to build on these implementation efforts to reduce the risk of introduction of invasive species into the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain. The Agency is directed to brief the Committee on the details of these funding amounts.”

^{ix} “Population Assessment and Cooperative Management.—The agreement provides \$33,965,000 which includes \$2,000,000 for Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act grants;...”

^x As proposed by the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Reauthorization Act of 2021 (S. 3069 & H.R. 5973)

^{xi} “Population Assessment and Cooperative Management.—The recommendation provides \$37,031,000, which provides \$1,000,000 to implement the Great Lakes Consent Decree and \$3,000,000 for the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act. The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act is supplemented with funding from the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The recommendation does not accept the proposed reductions and maintains no less than the enacted funding level for the Lake Champlain Sea Lamprey program, the Pacific Salmon treaty, and the Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Commission, and funds them at the enacted level, and provides \$18,064,000 for general program activities. The Committee remains supportive of the annual Memorandum of Agreement with the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to provide funding for sea lamprey treatment, assessment, and program administration.”

^{xii} “Population Assessment and Cooperative Management.—The Committee recommends \$35,231,000 for population assessment and cooperative management activities, an increase of \$1,266,000 above the enacted level and \$810,000 above the budget request. Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Grants are provided \$2,000,000. The program supports critical work to restore Great Lakes fisheries and inform management decisions through sound science. This includes the Great Lakes Mass Marking Program, which is essential to assessing hatchery production and supporting a robust fishery. Within funds provided, the Service is encouraged to support these important efforts. The recommendation does not accept the proposed reductions for the Lake Champlain sea lamprey program and provides no less than \$818,000.”

^{xiii} “Aquatic Invasive Species.—The agreement includes \$42,713,000 for aquatic invasive species programs, of which... \$25,200,000 is for invasive carp as outlined in House Report 117-83 and Senate Report 116-123 including not less than \$3,200,000 for contract fishing;”

^{xiv} “Aquatic Invasive Species.—The recommendation includes \$44,720,000... The Committee continues funding to aid the Service in working to prevent Invasive carp from entering the Great Lakes, and to control and eradicate them from the Mississippi River, its six sub-basins, the Upper Mississippi River, Missouri River, Arkansas-Red White River, Lower Mississippi River, Tennessee Cumberland River, and Ohio River, and Kentucky Lake, and Lake Barkley. This recommendation includes \$26,000,000 for Invasive carp, of which \$4,000,000 is for contract fishing; \$1,011,000 is for Sea Lamprey administration costs; \$500,000 is for hydrilla, eel and milfoil

invasive grasses; \$2,776,000 is for prevention... The \$4,000,000 provided for contract fishing will create jobs while advancing efforts to combat invasive carp by expanding and perfecting the combined use of contract fishing, including on the Chicago Aera Waterways System, and deterrents to extirpate invasive carp, including grass carp, where already established, pursuant to individual State laws and regulations and as called for in management plans. Contract fishing has proven to be an extremely effective management tool. The Service shall continue to work with its State partners to gather data to analyze the impacts of contract fishing to control abundance and movement of invasive carp, including grass carp, and to make every effort to make public announcements for contract fishing. The Service is to make sure adequate resources are provided to support the efforts of the Invasive Carp Regional Coordinating Committee and is encouraged to maintain a Service employee as the Mississippi Interstate Cooperative Resource Association (MICRA) Coordinator and to assist the MICRA Chair and MICRA Executive Committee with various tasks. The Committee recognizes the importance of understanding the current economic situation as it relates to the removal and uses of Invasive carp. In fiscal year 2022, the Committee directed the Department of Interior to hold a one-day forum modeled on the March 25, 2021 Department of the Interior oil and gas forum to review how Invasive carp that are removed through contract fishing or by other means are being utilized. The Service is directed to brief the Committee within 120 days of enactment of this Act on current and potential uses, including human consumption and as a potential source for bait, and to maintain a link on their website to this forum.”

^{xv} “Invasive Carp.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the work conducted by the Service to combat the serious threat of invasive carp and recommends \$27,000,000 for invasive carp activities, \$5,000,000 more than the enacted level. Overall, this funding is aimed at protecting and enhancing activities in the Great Lakes to prevent invasive carp from entering and establishing in the Great Lakes. Funding provided should also be used to control invasive carp in the Mississippi River and its Sub-basins, including the Upper Mississippi River Sub-basin; Missouri River Sub-basin; Arkansas-Red-White River Sub-basin; Lower Mississippi River Sub-basin; Tennessee Cumberland Sub-basin; and Ohio River Subbasin, including in Kentucky Lake, Lake Barkley, and the Ohio River. The Service should consider the utility of creating a dedicated funding source to increase the intensity and geographic scope of efforts to prevent entry into the Great Lakes and control in areas where invasive carp are currently located. The additional \$5,000,000 is provided for the Service to continue to work with those states with existing cooperative agreements, including nonprofits, to develop and implement innovative solutions to reduce invasive carp populations. The Committee encourages the Service to focus on invasive species removal as it relates to the eradication efforts for invasive Carp. While the Committee recognizes the importance of studying and understanding invasive carp patterns, the Service is encouraged to take action on a strategy that increases the focus on biomass removal. The Committee directs the Service to report back within 60 days of enactment of this act detailing how fiscal year 2021 and fiscal year 2022 funds have been expended, along with a strategy for targeting and removing increased tonnage of invasive Carp in the Ohio, Tennessee, and Cumberland River basins. Additionally, \$4,400,000 is provided for implementation of State Aquatic Nuisance Species management plans to help control the spread of invasive carp.”

^{xvi} “Biological Threats and Invasive Species Research Program.—The agreement provides \$40,431,000 including...\$11,000,000 for invasive carp research, of which \$3,000,000 is for research on grass carp. The direction found in Senate Report 116-123 is continued for invasive carp, coral disease, and invasive species research, detection, and response efforts. Additional resources for invasives species were provided in Public Law 117-58 to the Office of the Secretary.”

^{xvii} “Biological Threats and Invasive Species Research Program.—The recommendation provides \$46,780,000 which includes... \$11,000,000 is provided to continue critical research for Invasive carp, including \$3,000,000 for research to contain or eradicate grass carp such as the Survey’s on-going work to develop species-specific toxicants for grass carp. The Department is directed to update the Committee on phytoplankton changes in the Great Lakes since 1980.

^{xviii} “Biological Threats and Invasive Species Research Program.—The bill provides \$45,380,000 for the Biological Threats and Invasive Species Research Program... The bill provides \$11,000,000 to address Invasive Carp issues in the Great Lakes and Upper Mississippi River Basin. In order to effectively control the spread of Invasive Carp, the Committee expects all six sub-basins of the Mississippi River Basin will be included in funding opportunities.”

^{xix} “Great Lakes Science.—The Committees support Great Lakes science and the USGS collaboration with the broader Great Lakes Partnership to implement priority science. These resources will ensure delivery of information needed for Great Lakes management decisions. Funding for Great Lakes Science is provided at no less than \$14,000,000.”

^{xx} As authorized by the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2020 (Sec. 201; P.L. 116-94), \$15 million per year through FY2025.

^{xxi} “Great Lakes Science Center.—Funding for the Great Lakes Science Center is provided at no less than \$15,000,000. The Committee supports the Great Lakes Science Center’s collaboration with the broader Great Lakes Partnership to implement priority science needs for biological assessment tools and technologies. These additional resources will ensure acquisition of information necessary for fishery management decisions and to support the Center’s large vessels.”

^{xxii} “Great Lakes Science Center.—The Committee supports the Great Lakes Science Center’s collaboration with the broader Great Lakes Partnership to implement priority science. These resources will ensure delivery of information needed for Great Lakes management decisions. The Committee expects this work to continue at no less than the enacted level.”

^{xxiii} “Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF).—The agreement provides \$1,638,826,000 for the Clean Water SRF and directs the Agency to brief the Committees on addressing the impacts of nonpoint source pollution and stormwater runoff through the use of nature-based and other low impact development techniques.”

^{xxiv} “Community Project Funding Items/Congressionally Directed Spending Items.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, the Committees recommend \$443,639,051 from the Clean Water SRF and \$397,766,044 from the Drinking Water SRF be for Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending grants for the construction of drinking water, waste-water, and storm-water infrastructure and for water quality protection. Each project shall provide not less than 20 percent matching funds from non-Federal sources, unless approved for a waiver. Applicable Federal requirements that would apply to a Clean Water State Revolving Fund or Drinking Water State Revolving Fund project grant recipient shall apply to a grantee receiving a CPF grant under this section. The Committees note that the following funding sources are to be treated as non-Federal funds and can be used to meet the non-Federal matching fund requirement: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant program; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Program; and Appalachian Regional Commission grants. Funding made available to jurisdictions through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (P.L. 117-2) are considered Federal funds and may not be applied towards the non-Federal cost share requirement. A detailed list of projects is in the table titled “Interior and Environment Incorporation of Community Project Funding Items/Congressionally Directed Spending Items.””

^{xxv} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50210 & Division J, Title VI, Sec. 614; P.L. 117-58), \$4.38 billion for FY2023.

^{xxvi} “Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF).—The Committee recommends \$1,751,646,000 for the Clean Water SRF, requires at least 10 percent of funds to be used for green infrastructure or energy efficiency projects, reserves \$2,000,000 for technical assistance and training grants, and requires that 10 percent of grant funds be used for additional subsidization. The Committee urges the Agency to use funding for the Clean Water SRF to protect freshwater sources and to assist water utilities in protecting communities from PFAS. Additionally, to the extent there are sufficient eligible project applications, up to 20 percent of the funds made available through the CWSRF to each state may be used for projects that seek to mitigate known sources of pollution, including failing septic systems, and improve water quality. The Committee notes that wastewater treatment facilities are some of the largest industrial users of electricity in the nation and provides Green Project Reserve (GPR) funds as part of the CWSRF to encourage states to improve energy and water efficiency at treatment facilities. The Committee reminds the Agency of prior directives to develop a uniform reporting framework which states may use to report their GPR spending, and directs the Agency to develop and make available to states tools and metrics that allow states to quantify estimated energy and water savings benefits of these investments. The Agency is also reminded of the prior requirement to provide entities that provide technical assistance to wastewater and drinking water treatment facilities clear guidance on metrics for how to utilize GPR set asides. Finally, the Agency is directed to increase its cooperation on GPR technical assistance with the Department of Energy’s Advanced Manufacturing Office and the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Rural Development Program.”

Note: Community Project Funding Grants.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants...the Committee recommends \$553,401,264 from the Clean Water SRF be for special project grant for the construction of drinking water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.

^{xxvii} “State Revolving Funds.—The bill provides \$2,864,942,000 for State Revolving Funds [SRFs] to support drinking and clean water infrastructure. These funds provide support for critical investments in water infrastructure in communities across the country. These funds include \$12,000,000 for small drinking water system monitoring as authorized by America’s Water Infrastructure Act for the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule 5. The Committee notes that a supplemental amount of \$8,429,000,000 was appropriated for Fiscal Year 2023 for the State Revolving Funds in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58).

Infrastructure Projects.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, the Committee recommends \$335,606,000 from the Clean Water SRF and \$229,610,000 from the Drinking Water SRF be for Congressionally Directed Spending grants for the construction of drinking water, waste-water, and storm-water infrastructure and for water quality protection. Each project shall provide not less than 20 percent matching funds from non-Federal sources, unless approved for a waiver. Applicable Federal requirements that would apply to a Clean Water State Revolving Fund or Drinking Water State Revolving Fund project grant recipient shall apply to a grantee receiving a congressionally directed spending grant under this section. The Committee notes that the following funding sources are to be treated as non-Federal funds and can be used to meet the non-Federal matching fund requirement: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant Program; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Program; and Appalachian Regional Commission grants. Funding made available to jurisdictions through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2) is considered Federal funds and may not be applied towards the non-Federal cost share requirement. With approval from the project recipient, the Administrator may provide funding by grant or cooperative agreement to States to administer any Congressional Directed Spending projects being co-funded by the State SRF program or to support administration of other Congressional Directed Spending projects. A detailed list of projects is located in the table titled “Congressionally Directed Spending” accompanying this explanatory statement.

The Committee provides a total of \$565,216,000 in funding for over 310 drinking water and clean water Congressionally Directed Spending projects. In the Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Appropriations bill (Public Law 117–103), the Committees provided \$841,415,095 in funding for 483 drinking water and clean water Congressionally Directed Spending and Community Project Funding projects. These community initiated projects are locally identified priorities to address pressing environmental challenges. The Committee reminds EPA that these projects are vital community priorities and strongly urges EPA to prioritize and expedite support for grant recipients as they implement these projects. The Committee is concerned that EPA does not have dedicated resources necessary to expeditiously implement this new program and fully support recipients as they address applicable Federal grant requirements. For example, from field investigation, the Committee understands that water program administration and implementation of all 44 high priority water infrastructure projects provided for Region 10 in Fiscal Year 2022 is the responsibility of a single manager, on top of their prior job responsibilities, because there are no dedicated administrative funds for staff to implement these grants. Accordingly, the Committee provides \$20,000,000 in new funding and repurposes \$10,700,000 in existing funds for salaries, expenses, and administration for Congressionally Directed Spending and Community Project Funding grants provided in Fiscal Year 2022 and in this act.

^{xxviii} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50210 & Division J, Title VI, Sec. 614; P.L. 117-58), \$4.38 billion for FY2023.

^{xxix} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50102 & Division J, Title VI, Sec. 614; P.L. 117-58), \$4.38 billion for FY2023.

^{xxx} “Drinking Water State Revolving Fund.—The Committee recommends \$1,126,096,000 for the Drinking Water SRF, allows funds to be used to finance green infrastructure or energy efficiency projects, and requires that 14 percent be used for additional subsidization.”

Note: Community Project Funding Grants.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants...the Committee recommends \$381,263,499 from the Drinking Water SRF be for special project grant for the construction of drinking water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.

^{xxxi} See xxvii

^{xxxii} “Combined Sewer Overflow Grants.-The agreement provides \$43,000,000 for Combined Sewer Overflow Grants to control and treat sewer overflows as authorized and in accordance with section 4106 of America’s Water Infrastructure Act (P.L. 115-270).”

^{xxxiii} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50204; P.L. 117-58), \$280 million per year through FY2026.

^{xxxiv} “Sewer Overflow Control Grants.—The Committee recommends \$51,000,000 to continue a grant program to control and treat sewer overflows and stormwater, as authorized in section 4106 of Public Law 115–270. The Committee encourages the Agency to undertake projects that principally address degraded or deficient drainage systems in low lying areas in low- and moderate-income communities that have recently incurred severe flooding events and continue to experience reoccurring localized flooding that is of acute concern to the affected community. The Committee notes the importance of projects that manage, reduce, or capture stormwater, or that otherwise improve municipal wastewater systems, thereby reducing flood risk, protecting public health, and enhancing the economic vitality of the community.”

^{xxxv} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50208; P.L. 117-58), \$280 million per year through FY2026.

^{xxxvi} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50104; P.L. 117-58), \$80 million for FY2023.

^{xxxvii} “Assistance to Small and Disadvantaged Communities.—The bill provides \$31,158,000 to continue a grant program to assist small and disadvantaged communities develop and maintain adequate water infrastructure, as authorized in section 2104 of Public Law 114–322. In addition to these funds, \$1,000,000,000 was appropriated in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58) for this program to address emerging contaminants for Fiscal Year 2023.”

^{xxxviii} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50105; P.L. 117-58), \$100 million per year through FY2026.

^{xxxix} “Reducing Lead in Drinking Water.—The bill provides \$26,011,000 to continue a grant program to provide assistance to 101 eligible entities for lead reduction projects, as authorized in section 2105 of Public Law 114–322.”

^{xl} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50105; P.L. 117-58), \$10 million authorized to carry out the pilot program.

^{xli} “Water Infrastructure Workforce Development.—The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 to continue a grant to support workforce development for drinking water and wastewater system workers, as authorized by section 4304 of Public Law 115–270.”

^{xlii} “Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319) .-The agreement provides \$178,000,000 for Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319) Grants. Within existing resources, the Committees urge the Agency to work with recipients to prioritize efforts to reduce non-point source pollution to help significantly reduce both the frequency and severity of Harmful Algal Blooms. The Committees also support ongoing efforts through non-point source programs and other mechanisms to reduce the amounts of plastic and other trash from entering waterways.”

^{xliii} As proposed by the Local Water Protection Act (H.R. 2008 & S. 29)

^{xliv} “Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319).—The bill provides \$185,000,000. The Committee expects the Agency to examine the allocation formula to ensure that resources are spent in areas with the most pressing need.”

^{xlv} “Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision.-The agreement provides \$113,000,000 in Public Water System Supervision Grants, \$1,000,000 above the enacted level. Of the funds provided, \$10,000,000 is to further support States, Territories, and Tribes in addressing PF AS and other contaminants of emerging concern as they carry out their Public Water System Supervision programs.”

^{xlvi} “Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision.—The bill provides \$121,566,000 in Public Water System Supervision Grants. Of the funds provided, \$12,000,000 is to further support States, Territories, and Tribes in addressing PFAS and other contaminants of emerging concern as they carry out their Public Water System Supervision programs.”

^{xlvii} “INVASIVE CARP—The Corps is undertaking multiple efforts to stop invasive carp from reaching the Great Lakes. The Committee notes that Congress authorized a comprehensive suite of measures to counter invasive carp at the Brandon Road Lock and Dam, critical to keeping invasive carp out of the Chicago Area Waterways System, which is the only continuous connection between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River basins. The Committee notes that the Corps’ spend plan for fiscal year 2022 funding provided under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act [IIJA] (Public Law 117–58) included \$225,838,000 to initiate construction of the Brandon Road Lock and Dam, Aquatic Nuisance Species Barrier project. Further, the Committee appreciates that the fiscal year 2023 budget request includes \$47,880,500 for the project to continue this important effort. As the Corps prioritizes projects, it shall consider critical projects to prevent the spread of invasive species. The Corps is directed to provide quarterly updates to the Committee on the progress and status of efforts to prevent the further spread of invasive carp, including the Brandon Road Recommended Plan and the second array at the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal; the location and density of carp populations; the use of emergency procedures previously authorized by the Congress; and the development, consideration, and implementation of new technological and structural countermeasures; and progress on Preconstruction Engineering and Design [PED] work. The Corps shall continue to collaborate at levels commensurate with previous years with the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the State of Illinois, and members of the Invasive Carp Regional Coordinating Committee, including identifying navigation protocols that would be beneficial or effective in reducing the risk of vessels inadvertently carrying aquatic invasive species, including invasive carp, through the Brandon Road Lock and Dam in Joliet, Illinois. Any findings of such an evaluation shall be included in the quarterly briefings to the Committees. The Corps is further directed to implement navigation protocols shown to be effective at reducing the risk of entrapment without jeopardizing the safety of vessels and crews. The Corps and other Federal and State agencies are conducting ongoing research on additional potential invasive carp solutions. The Corps is directed to provide to the Committee not later than 30 days after enactment of this act a briefing on such navigation protocols and potential solutions.”

^{xlviii} “Regional Sediment Management Program.—Additional funding is provided to develop integrated tools that build coastal resilience across navigation, flood risk management, and ecosystem projects within the program. The Committee directs the Corps to conduct a study and provide a report not later than one year after enactment of this Act on how the Corps could apply dredged sediments to better increase coastal resilience and what resources are needed to implement these practices.”

^{xliv} “Regional Sediment Management.—The Committee recommends \$4,000,000 to be used to integrate existing and emerging physical coastal processing tools that focus on sediment management and apply optimization principles to placement in order to gain greater value and benefit from dredged sediments, particularly for Civil Works business lines and missions. Additional funding of \$600,000 is recommended for cooperation and coordination with the Great Lakes States to develop sediment transport models for Great Lakes tributaries that discharge to Federal navigation channels.”

ⁱ “Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier.—The Committee notes the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal (CSSC) dispersal barrier at Des Plaines River is a key control mechanism for protecting the Great Lakes from invasive carp. Over the last decade, the Corps has invested significant resources in building a permanent electric barrier on the Chicago Area Waterways System. The Committee notes that maximizing effectiveness of the CSSC can have significant immediate benefits for preventing spread of aquatic invasive species into the productive and ecologically diverse Great Lakes system.”

ⁱⁱ “Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois.— No funds recommended in this act may be used for construction of hydrologic separation measures.”

ⁱⁱⁱ “Ocean, Coastal, and Great Lakes Laboratories and Cooperative Institutes.—The Committee provides \$40,000,000, an increase of \$2,890,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level, for Ocean Laboratories and Cooperative Institutes. The Committee expects NOAA to fully fund these cooperative institutes at appropriate levels in future years, including well-established institutes focused on: watershed impacts on marine ecosystems; remote sensing; long-term monitoring of oil spill impacts on marine ecosystem health; coastal resilience; ocean exploration within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone; and HABs.”

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ “Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS).—The agreement provides an increase of \$500,000 to IOOS, including no less than \$2,500,000 to continue the five IOOS Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) pilot programs initiated in fiscal year 2020 and to continue to support the HAB monitoring and detection test bed in the Gulf of Mexico initiated in fiscal year 2021. NOS is encouraged to: (1) work to complete and operate the National High Frequency Radar System to close key gaps in the U.S. surface current mapping system; (2) expand the regional underwater profiling gliders program; and (3) increase support to maintain the buoy systems supported by IOOS and to continue to add additional buoys in regional priority areas.

The agreement notes that the IJA provides \$100,000,000 in operations funding over five years for improved and enhanced coastal, ocean, and Great Lakes observing systems, some of which may be obligated for IOOS.

^{lv} “Integrated Ocean Observing System.—The Committee continues to support the Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS) and provides \$44,000,000, an increase of \$3,000,000 over the fiscal year 2022 enacted level. The Committee supports IOOS’ effort to expand its use of underwater gliders and encourages NOAA to fill critical gaps in the current surface mapping system and to ensure streamlined access to data for weather forecasting, detection of ecological phenomena and safe maritime operations.”

^{lvi} “Integrated Ocean Observing System [IOOS].—The Committee notes the importance of the IOOS network that provides marine information used in disaster response, weather forecasting and hurricane prediction, forecasting of freshwater and marine water quality, detection of harmful algal blooms [HABs], and safe maritime operations. The Committee provides \$46,000,000 for IOOS, an increase of \$5,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level, to recapitalize and expand observing system infrastructure based upon the highest priority needs of each region. This may include buoys, high frequency radar, and underwater profiling gliders. The Committee encourages the IOOS regional associations to consider leveraging existing capabilities of the commercial sector, including uncrewed systems, to meet observational needs through commercial data buys. The Committee provides an increase of \$1,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level to continue the five IOOS HAB pilot programs initiated in fiscal year 2020 and to support the HAB monitoring and detection test bed in the Gulf of Mexico initiated in fiscal year 2021.”

^{lvii} “National Sea Grant College Program.—The agreement provides \$76,000,000 for the National Sea Grant College Program, which includes an increase of no less than \$2,000,000 above the fiscal year 2021 enacted level for the base program that funds universities in States and Territories around the country. In addition, the IJA provides \$50,000,000 over five years for marine debris prevention and removal through the National Sea Grant College Program, including \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 2022.”

^{lviii} “National Sea Grant College Program.—The Committee strongly supports the National Sea Grant College Program and provides \$96,500,000, an increase of \$7,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level.”

^{lix} “National Sea Grant College Program.—The Committee provides an increase of \$14,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level for the Sea Grant program and its research, education, extension, and outreach activities, which are critical for coastal communities and benefit the entire Nation.”

^{lx} “Coastal Zone Management Grants.—The recommendation includes \$89,000,000 for Coastal Zone Management Grants, an increase of \$10,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level. The Committee notes that States are facing increased costs associated with the implementation of funding provided for coastal projects through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), Public Law 117–58. The increase provided for this program is intended to address this need. The grants are vital to the local-state-Federal investment needed to address the coastal hazards that threaten communities and coastal dependent economies.”

^{lxi} “Marine Debris.—The IJA provides \$150,000,000 over five years for marine debris assessment, prevention, mitigation, and removal, including \$30,000,000 in fiscal year 2022. In lieu of House language on Marine Debris, NOS is encouraged to prioritize funding for projects that support cleanup efforts within marine sanctuaries or marine national monuments, projects in rural and remote communities that lack infrastructure to address their marine debris problems, and projects that address the impact of marine debris in freshwater systems that are a source of drinking water. NOS is also encouraged to support the programs authorized in the Save our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116-224).”

^{lxi} “Marine Debris.—The recommendation provides an increase of \$1,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level for Marine Debris. Within available funds, the Committee directs NOAA to create a regional pilot program to coordinate with Federal, state, or Tribal partners on efforts to inventory and remove derelict vessels and fishing gear, with a goal of developing a cost-effective national strategy for mitigating these sources of marine debris.”

^{lxii} “Marine Debris.—Within the funding provided, NOAA shall support competitive extramural funding programs and the programs authorized in the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (Public Law 116–224). 32 The Committee notes that the IJA provides \$150,000,000 over 5 years for marine debris assessment, prevention, mitigation, and removal, including \$30,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.”

^{lxiii} “Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs).—The agreement provides \$21,500,000 for Competitive Research, including not less than \$13,500,000 for HABs research, and adopts House direction for these funds. From within these funds, the agreement also provides up to \$2,000,000 to explore innovative methods to increase monitoring and detection of HABs in freshwater systems by partnering with a consortium of academic institutions with expertise in unmanned aircraft systems and to accelerate deployment of effective methods of intervention and mitigation to reduce the frequency, severity, and impact of HAB events in freshwater systems, including the Great Lakes ecosystem. NOS is encouraged to expand its collaboration with coastal States across the country to address HABs in the marine environment.”

^{lxiv} “Harmful Algal Blooms.—The Committee remains highly concerned about the increasing prevalence of HABs in every U.S. State and Territory and the corresponding impacts on human health, drinking water, fisheries, and the broader economy. The recommendation includes not less than \$4,500,000 to support and expand the ongoing work at IOOS to enhance the Nation’s capacity for monitoring and detection of HABs by leveraging the expertise of the IOOS regional associations—including through expanding the deployment of in situ observing assets as part of the National Harmful Algal Bloom Observing Network (HABON)—in order to improve HABs warning and forecast accuracy. IOOS is directed to coordinate with the National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) on the implementation of these funds. The Committee also provides no less than \$15,000,000 for HABs research. The Committee encourages this research to include an evaluation of the impacts of HAB-causing nutrients, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus, as they enter coastal areas from tributaries. Further research should prioritize development of methods of prevention, mitigation, and control to reduce the frequency, severity, and impacts of HAB events in freshwater and saltwater systems and provide special attention to research in areas most economically and environmentally impacted by HABs, including the possible contamination of drinking water. The Committee encourages NOAA to work to ensure that new technology and mitigation efforts have minimal environmental impacts. Within funding provided for HABs across NOAA, no less than \$1,000,000 may be used to expand both existing and new program support for States to assess domoic acid levels of HAB species in the marine environment. For all HABs-related work, NOAA shall coordinate with the Interagency Working Group on Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act.”

^{lxv} “Harmful Algal Blooms.—The Committee understands that HABs in their various forms are a national problem that require collaboration with local partners to monitor, predict, track, and respond to HAB events. Within funding for Competitive Research, the Committee provides not less than \$17,500,000 to accelerate deployment of effective methods of intervention and mitigation to reduce the frequency, severity, and impact of HAB events in marine and freshwater systems, including the Great Lakes ecosystem. Of this amount, \$2,000,000 shall be used to explore innovative methods to increase monitoring and detection of HABs in freshwater systems by partnering with academic institutions with expertise in unmanned aircraft systems.

Given the high economic cost related to HAB events relative to the current research investment in the Gulf of Mexico, the Committee encourages NOAA to fund long-term HAB research in the Gulf of Mexico that further develops ongoing partnerships involving academic institutions, the private sector, and State governments.”

^{lxvi} “Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas.—The Committee provides \$68,000,000 for Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas, which is \$7,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level. The Committee continues to support the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and the expansion of the network of protected marine and Great Lakes areas. The Committee notes that a number of sites have languished in the inventory of successful nominations without progressing to final designation as new National Marine Sanctuaries. Therefore, within these additional funds, NOAA shall prioritize the final designation of such sites. The Committee also notes the unique maritime history and ecological importance of the Great Lakes and supports efforts to identify and preserve the most notable of these elements. Further, the Committee directs NOAA to prioritize conservation, education, mapping, and research efforts across the agency in the National Marine Sanctuary system.”

^{lxvii} “Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas.—The Committee recognizes the importance of Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas to preserve regions for conservation, recreational, ecological, historical, scientific, cultural, archeological, and educational purposes and supports the expansion of the network. The Committee provides \$70,000,000 for Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas, which is \$9,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level. Within the increased funding provided, NOS shall continue to support ongoing sanctuary designation processes and is encouraged to commence designations of new sites, in particular within the Great Lakes ecosystem.”

^{lxviii} “National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund (NOCSF).—The agreement provides \$34,000,000 for the NOCSF, also known as the National Coastal Resilience Fund. In addition, the IJA provides \$492,000,000 over five years for the NOCSF, including \$98,400,000 in fiscal year 2022.”

^{lxix} “National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund.—The Committee provides \$34,000,000 for the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund, including for project planning and design, such as watershed scale planning and technical assistance to identify where and what specific coastal resilience projects will provide the greatest benefit in preparation for expected climate impacts, such as sea level rise. The Committee encourages support for projects that strengthen natural infrastructure of communities in which coastal flooding poses the greatest risk to public safety.”

^{lxx} “National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund [NOCSF].—The Committee roundly rejects the administration’s surprising proposal to eliminate the NOCSF, also known as the National Coastal Resilience Fund, and provides \$34,000,000. Of the amount provided, not less than \$4,000,000 shall be for project planning and design. In selecting the areas of focus for the NOCSF, NOAA and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation should consider proposals that enhance ocean and coastal management; bolster coastal infrastructure and resilience; support regional collaborative efforts and partnerships; and help coastal communities adapt to changing ocean conditions. In addition, the IJA provides \$492,000,000 over 5 years for the NOCSF, including \$98,400,000 in fiscal year 2023.”

^{lxxi} “The agreement includes \$47,060,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission (GLFC) for operations and programs, including sea lamprey control, cross border fishery management and research, and grass carp control in the Great Lakes. Within the total, \$9,000,000 is included for the Lake Champlain and Lake Memphremagog basins, \$500,000 for the Lake Memphremagog fishery, and \$1,000,000 to address grass carp in the Great Lakes. The agreement also supports the efforts of the GLFC to combat other invasive carp species in the Great Lakes Basin.”

^{lxxii} “Great Lakes Fishery Commission (GLFC).—The Committee recommendation includes \$47,060,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission of which not less than \$37,560,000 is for operations, sea lamprey control requirements, and fishery research, for the Great Lakes. The recommendation also includes not less than \$1,000,000 to address grass carp in the Great Lakes. The Committee intends that the funds made available for the GLFC be prioritized for meeting the United States obligations under the 1954 Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries. The Committee is concerned by aging infrastructure in the Great Lakes Basin and supports the implementation of the Commission’s infrastructure plan.”

^{lxxiii} “The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, including funds for the Commission to address risks to its programs, fund its infrastructure strategy, control the invasive sea lamprey, conduct science and research to aid cross-border fishery management, and control grass carp in the Great Lakes. The amount also includes \$10,000,000 for the Lake Champlain and Lake Memphremagog basins, \$500,000 for the Lake Memphremagog fishery, and \$1,000,000 to address grass carp in the Great Lakes. The Committee also supports the efforts of the GLFC to combat other invasive carp species outside of the Great Lakes Basin.”