



Program (Agency)	Account/Subaccount	FY2022 Enacted	FY2023 Enacted	President's FY2024 Budget Request	HOW Coalition FY2024 Request	FY2024 House Proposal	FY2024 Senate Proposal
Interior and Environment							
<i>Great Lakes</i>							
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (EPA)	Environmental Programs and Management (EPM) / Geographic Programs	\$348 million ⁱ	\$368 million ⁱⁱ	\$368 million	\$425 million ⁱⁱⁱ	\$368 million ^{iv}	\$373 million ^v
Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program (EPA)	Environmental Programs and Management	\$0 ^{vi}	\$0 ^{vii}	No detail	\$50 million ^{viii}	\$0 ^{ix}	\$0 ^x
Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act (DOI/FWS)	Resource Management / Fish and Aquatic Conservation / Aquatic Habitat and Species Conservation	\$2 million ^{xi}	\$3 million ^{xii}	\$0	\$8 million ^{xiii}	\$6 million ^{xiv}	\$3 million ^{xv}
U.S. FWS Invasive Carp (DOI/FWS)	Resource Management	\$25.2 million ^{xvi}	\$31 million ^{xvii}	\$0	\$35 million	\$29 million ^{xviii}	\$31.5 million ^{xix}
U.S.G.S. Invasive Carp (DOI/USGS)	Surveys, Investigations, and Research / Ecosystems	\$11 million ^{xx}	\$11 million ^{xxi}	\$10.6 million	\$15 million	\$11 million ^{xxii}	\$11 million ^{xxiii}
Great Lakes Science Center (DOI/USGS)	Surveys, Investigations, and Research / Ecosystems	\$14 million ^{xxiv}	\$15 million ^{xxv}	No detail	\$15 million ^{xxvi}	\$15 million ^{xxvii}	\$15 million ^{xxviii}
<i>National</i>							
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$1,639 million ^{xxix}	\$1,639 million	\$1,639 million	\$4,639 million ^{xxx}	\$535 million ^{xxxi}	\$1,6 ^{xxxii}

Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$1,126 million	\$1,126 million	\$1,126 million	\$4,126 million ^{xxxiii}	\$460.6 million ^{xxxiv}	\$1,1 ^{xxxv}
Sec. 221 Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$43 million ^{xxxvi}	\$50 million	\$280 million	\$280 million ^{xxxvii}	\$50 million	\$50 million ^{xxxviii}
Household Decentralized Wastewater Grant Program (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance	\$0	\$0	\$50 million	\$50 million ^{xxxix}	\$5 million	\$0
Small and Disadvantaged Communities (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$27.2 million	\$30.2 million	\$80 million	\$100 million ^{xl}	\$23.2 million	\$30.2 million
Reducing Lead in Drinking Water (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$22 million	\$25 million	\$182 million	\$200 million	\$25 million	\$25 million
Lead Inventorying Utilization Grant Pilot Program	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$0	\$0	No detail	\$10 million ^{xli}	\$0	\$0
Water Infrastructure Workforce Development (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Infrastructure Assistance Grants	\$4 million	\$6 million	\$17.7 million	\$20 million	\$2 million	\$6 million
Sec. 106 Clean Water State Grants (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Categorical Grants	\$231 million	\$237 million	\$279.4 million	\$500 million	\$237 million	\$237 million
Sec. 319 Non-Point Pollution (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Categorical Grants	\$178 million ^{xlii}	\$182 million	\$189 million	\$200 million ^{xliii}	\$182 million	\$182 million ^{xliv}
Public Water System Supervision Grants (EPA)	State and Tribal Assistance Grants / Categorical Grants	\$113 million ^{xlv}	\$121.5 million	\$132.6 million	\$250 million	\$94 million	\$121.5 million ^{xlvi}

Energy and Water							
GLMRIS Brandon Road Study – Preconstruction Engineering and Design (U.S. ACE)	Investigations	\$4.94 million	\$0 ^{xlvi}	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000 ^{xlvi}	\$200,000 ^{xlvi}
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration Program (U.S. ACE)	Construction	No detail	No detail	\$0	\$15 million	\$0	No detail
Great Lakes Tributary Model (U.S. ACE)	Operations and Maintenance/Regional Sediment Management Program	No detail	\$600,000 ⁱ	Sub-account: \$6.3 million	\$600,000	Sub-account: \$6 million	\$600,000 ⁱⁱ
Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal Barrier (U.S. ACE)	Operations and Maintenance	\$3 million	\$14.3 million	\$13.75 million	\$13.75 million	\$13.75 million	\$13.75 million ⁱⁱⁱ
Great Lakes Coastal Resiliency Study (U.S. ACE)	Investigations	\$500,000	\$3 million	\$3 million	\$3 million	\$3 million	\$3 million ⁱⁱⁱⁱ
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: \$39.5 million	Sub-account: \$40.5 million	Sub-account: \$40.5 million	Pending	Sub-account: \$39.5 million

Great Lakes Observing System (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Navigation, Observations, and Positioning / Integrated Ocean Observing System Regional Observations	Sub-Account: \$41 million ^{liv}	Sub-account: 42.5 million	Sub-account: 42.5 million	Sub-account: \$80.5 million	Pending	Sub-account: 42.5 million ^{lv}
<i>National</i>							
Sea Grant (NOAA)	Ocean, Coastal, and Great Lakes Research / National Sea Grant College Program	\$76 million ^{lvi}	\$80 million	\$80.1 million	\$140 million	Pending	\$80 million ^{lvii}
Coastal Zone Management Grants (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Ocean and Coast Management and Services	\$79 million	\$81.5 million	\$78.5 million	\$132 million	Pending	\$81.5 million ^{lviii}
Marine Debris Program (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Office of Response and Restoration	\$10 million ^{lix}	\$10.5 million ^{lx}	Sub-account: \$103.3 million	\$20 million	Pending	No Detail ^{lxi}
Harmful Algal Blooms (NOAA)	National Ocean Service / Coastal Science and Assessment / Competitive Research	Sub-account: \$21.5 million ^{lxii}	Sub-account: \$22.5 million ^{lxiii}	Sub-account: \$22.5 million	Sub-account: \$42 million	Pending	Sub-account: \$22.5 million ^{lxiv}
Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas (NOAA)	National Ocean Service/Ocean and Coastal Management and Services	\$61 million	\$68 million ^{lxv}	\$88 million	\$95.5 million	Pending	\$68 million ^{lxvi}
National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund (NOAA)	National Ocean Service/Ocean and Coastal Management and Services	\$34 million ^{lxvii}	\$34 million	\$0	\$40 million	Pending	\$34 million ^{lxviii}
State Foreign Ops							
Great Lakes Fishery Commission (State Department)	International Fisheries Commission	\$47 million ^{lxix}	\$50 million ^{lxx}	\$53.8 million	\$53.8 million	\$47.15 million ^{lxxi}	\$50 million ^{lxxii}

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 “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.”

House Report 117-83:

“Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.—The Committee recommends \$375,000,000 for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI), \$45,000,000 above the enacted level and \$35,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee directs the Agency and other federal partners to continue to work together 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, improve water quality, and increase 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, or 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 2021 level. 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 also 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 directs the Agency, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, to submit a report outlining the funding that has been provided for these purposes over the last five fiscal years. 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.

The Committee is aware of interest in utilizing GLRI funds in the Chicago River Watershed and encourages the Agency to brief the Committee on any benefits that might accrue to the Great Lakes from restoration work in the Chicago River.”

Senate Report 115-276:

“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.

Additionally, the Committee urges the Environmental Protection Agency and Great Lakes Interagency Taskforce to provide continued attention and resources towards building the capacity of on-the-ground partners, including States and Tribes, as ongoing partners in the stewardship of the Great Lakes. The Committee recognizes the importance of Tribal self-governance and encourages the Agency to work with Tribal governments and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to develop a proposal for the creation of a distinct GLRI Tribal program through which GLRI funds would be provided to allow Tribes the flexibility to develop the programs that are of the highest priorities to their communities, and which fulfill the spirit of self-determination, meet treaty obligations, and carry out Federal trust responsibilities.

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.”

ⁱⁱⁱ As authorized by the GLRI Act of 2019 (P.L. 116-294), \$425 million for FY2024.

^{iv} “Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI).—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) 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, can achieve both nutrient and HAB reduction benefits 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). 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 combine 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.

^v “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 and implement projects benefiting historically underserved communities.

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. Finally, the Committee recommends the GLRI Distinct Tribal Program be funded at 5 percent of the GLRI funding level.”

^{vi} “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.”

^{vii} “Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Invasive Species Program.-The Committees appreciate 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 Committees direct 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 include details of these amounts as part of the Agency's operating plan.”

^{viii} 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.

^{ix} “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.”

^x “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 with 90 days of enactment of this act.”

^{xi} “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;...”

^{xii} “Population Assessment and Cooperative Management.- The agreement provides \$36,932,000 which includes \$3,000,000 for Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act grants; \$1,000,000 for Great Lakes Consent Decree; \$818,000 for the Lake Champlain Sea lamprey program; and \$1,000,000 in General Program Activities for snakehead eradication.”

^{xiii} As authorized by the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Reauthorization Act of 2022 through 2028 (P.L. 117-287))

^{xiv} “Population Assessment and Cooperative Management.—The recommendation provides \$36,932,000, which includes \$6,000,000 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.”

^{xv} “Population Assessment and Cooperative Management.— The Committee recommends \$38,932,000 for population assessment and cooperative management activities, an increase of \$2,000,000 to the enacted level and an increase of \$5,811,000 to the budget request, and accounts for the proposed internal transfer. Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Grants are provided \$3,000,000, which is \$2,110,000 more than the request. 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 maintains enacted funding for the Lake Champlain sea lamprey program at \$818,000.”

^{xvi} “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;”

^{xvii} “Aquatic Invasive Species.-...\$31,000,000 is for invasive carp as outlined in House Report 117-400 and Senate Report 116- 123 including not less than \$4,000,000 for contract fishing;”

^{xviii} “Aquatic Invasive Species.—...The Committee continues to support 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 \$29,000,000 for invasive carp, of which \$4,000,000 is for contract fishing and no less than \$500,000 is for a new university collaboration, \$3,500,000 is to prevent the spread of quagga and zebra mussels in the West, of which \$1,250,000 is for National Invasive Species Act State and Interstate plan. The Service is encouraged to pursue technologies to aid in the elimination, mitigation, or control of aquatic nuisance species and invasive species that do not result in the addition of chemical agents to the ecosystem that can lead to harmful by-products such as algal blooms.

The \$4,000,000 provided for contract fishing will advance efforts to combat invasive carp by expanding and perfecting the combined use of contract fishing, including on the Chicago Area 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 and it is not meant to develop a sustainable commercial fishery. The Department should make every effort to make public announcements regarding contract fishing.

The Committee recognizes the importance of understanding the current economic situation as it relates to the removal and available uses of invasive carp. The Committee directs the Service to review how invasive carp that are removed through contract fishing or by other means are being utilized. To ensure best practices, the Committee directs the Service to collaborate with State Departments of Natural Resources to survey the current and potential uses, including human consumption, and shall report their findings to Congress within 120 days of enactment of this Act.”

^{xix} “Invasive Carp.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the work conducted by the Service to combat the serious threat of invasive carp and recommends \$31,500,000 for invasive carp activities, \$500,000 above the enacted level across invasive carp and Contract Fishing subaccounts. 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 Sub-basin, 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 Service is directed to continue to work with those States with existing cooperative agreements, including non-profits, 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 bio mass removal.

Additionally, \$4,400,000 is provided for implementation of State Aquatic Nuisance Species management plans to help control the spread of invasive carp.”

^{xx} “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.”

^{xxi} “Biological Threats and Invasive Species Research Program.-...The agreement also provides \$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...”

^{xxii} “Invasive Species Research Program.—The recommendation includes \$11,000,000 for research on invasive carp, of which \$3,000,000 is for research on containing or eradicating grass carp.”

^{xxiii} “Biological Threats and Invasive Species Research Program.—The bill provides \$47,422,000 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.”

^{xxiv} “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.”

^{xxv} “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.”

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

^{xxvii} “Great Lakes Science Center.—Funding for the Great Lakes Science Center is provided at no less than \$15,000,000. These resources will ensure acquisition of information necessary for fishery management decisions and to support the Center’s large vessels. The Committee supports the Center’s continued use of commercially available uncrewed surface vehicles to support the fisheries surveys being conducted with crewed vessels.”

^{xxviii} “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.”

^{xxix} “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.”

^{xxx} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50210 & Division J, Title VI, Sec. 614; P.L. 117-58), \$4.639 billion for FY2024.

^{xxxi} “Community Project Funding (CPF) Grants.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants for...the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF), the Committee recommends \$470,139,492 from the Clean Water SRF...for special project grants for the construction of...wastewater, and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.”

^{xxxii} “State Revolving Funds.—The bill provides \$2,764,962,000 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. The Committee notes that a supplemental amount of \$8,831,000,000 was appropriated for fiscal year 2024 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 \$345,125,000 from the Clean Water SRF and \$243,639,000 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.”

^{xxxiii} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50102 & Division J, Title VI, Sec. 614; P.L. 117-58), \$4.126 billion for FY2024.

^{xxxiv} “Community Project Funding (CPF) Grants.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) ... the Committee recommends...\$410,309,777 from the Drinking Water SRF for special project grants for the construction of drinking water...infrastructure and for water quality protection.”

^{xxxv} “State Revolving Funds.—The bill provides \$2,764,962,000 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. The Committee notes that a supplemental amount of \$8,831,000,000 was appropriated for fiscal year 2024 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 \$345,125,000 from the Clean Water SRF and \$243,639,000 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.”

^{xxxvi} “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).”

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

^{xxxviii} “Sewer Overflow Control Grants.—The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 to continue a grant program to control and treat sewer overflows and stormwater, as authorized in section 4106 of Public Law 115–270.”

^{xxxix} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50208; P.L. 117-58), \$50 million per year through FY2026.

^{xl} As authorized by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Sec. 50104; P.L. 117-58), \$100 million for FY2024.

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

^{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 authorized by Sec. 8502 by the James M. Inhofe National Defense Reauthorization Act of 2023 (P.L. 117-263) at \$200 million through 2027

^{xliv} “Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319).—The bill provides \$182,000,000. 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} “Public Water System Supervision.—The bill provides \$121,500,000 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} FY23 appropriations provided \$47.9 million for Brandon Road Lock & Dam construction, this year’s request asks for funds to continue the GLMRIS investigation as construction moves ahead.

^{xlviii} “Invasive Carp.-- ...Additionally, projects such as Brandon Road Lock and Dam and at the Chicago Sanitary Sewer Canal are critical to preventing the spread of invasive carp into the Great Lakes. Because these efforts are critical to keeping invasive carp out of the Chicago Area Waterways System, the Corps is urged to expedite efforts to execute a project partnership agreement for Brandon Road to enable the project to move into construction utilizing previously provided funds. If additional work can be done, the Corps is reminded that both projects are eligible to compete for the additional funds provided in this Act, and the Corps is encouraged to include appropriate funding for projects in future budget submissions. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps to 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 Committee. The Corps is further directed to implement navigation protocols shown to be effective at reducing the risk of entrainment without jeopardizing the safety of vessels and crews.”

^{xlix} “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 is disappointed the budget request does not include funding for the Brandon Road Lock and Dam, Aquatic Nuisance Species Barrier project.

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; the development, consideration, and implementation of new technological and structural countermeasures; and progress on preconstruction, engineering, and design 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 entrainment 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.”

ⁱ “Regional Sediment Management.—The agreement provides \$4,000,000 to develop integrated tools that build coastal resilience across navigation, flood risk management, and ecosystem projects within the program, 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. The Corps is directed to conduct a study and provide a report to the Committees 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. Additionally, the agreement provides \$600,000 for cooperation and coordination with the Great Lakes states to develop sediment transport models for Great Lakes tributaries that discharge to federal navigation channels.”

ⁱⁱ “Regional Sediment Management.—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.”

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

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ “Chicago Shoreline.—The Committee reiterates the WRDA 2020 Conference Report, which requires the Chicago Shoreline to be a focus area of the Great Lakes Resiliency Study.”

^{lv} “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 [IOOS].—The Committee notes the importance of the IOOS network that provides marine information used in disaster response, weather forecasting and hurricane prediction, water quality forecasting, detection of harmful algal blooms [HABs], and safe maritime operations. The Committee provides \$42,500,000 for IOOS and supports the use of supplementary funds previously provided to the agency to recapitalize observing system infrastructure based upon the highest priority needs of each region. 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 not less than the fiscal year 2023 enacted level to continue the IOOS HAB pilot programs and to support the HAB monitoring and detection test bed in the Gulf of Mexico.”

^{lvi} “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.”

^{lvii} “National Sea Grant College Program.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the Sea Grant program to enhance the practical use and conservation of coastal, marine, and Great Lakes resources to create a sustainable economy and environment, while simultaneously providing invaluable educational opportunities to students. The Committee provides \$80,000,000 the Sea Grant program.”

“Coastal Resilience.—NOAA is encouraged to support Sea Grant coastal resilience activities across all State programs, including recruitment of resilience-focused staff and enhancing research, engagement, decision support, and project implementation. NOAA is encouraged to prioritize work to enhance the coastal resilience of remote communities most at-risk for natural disasters and chronic events, with a priority given to challenges faced by Tribal, indigenous, and economically disadvantaged communities.”

^{lviii} “Coastal Management Grants.—The Committee rejects the proposed cut to Coastal Zone Management Grants and provides \$81,500,000. NOAA is encouraged, to the extent practicable, to work with States to ensure that Coastal Zone Management Grants support Tribal projects and objectives.”

^{lix} “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).”

^{lx} “Marine Debris.—The agreement provides an increase of \$500,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level for Marine Debris. NOAA is directed to support competitive extramural funding programs and the programs authorized in the Save Our Seas 2.0 Act (P.L. 116-224).”

^{lxi} “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).

The Committee notes that the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act [IIJA] (Public Law 117–58) provides \$150,000,000 over 5 years for marine debris assessment, prevention, mitigation, and removal, including \$30,000,000 in fiscal year 2024.”

^{lxii} “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.”

^{lxiii} “Harmful Algal Blooms.—The agreement provides \$22,500,000 for Competitive Research, including not less than \$14,000,000 for HABs research, including within the Great Lakes ecosystem, and adopts House direction for these funds. From within this funding, \$2,000,000 is provided 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. In addition, NOAA is encouraged 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. Further, House language is modified to provide up to \$1,000,000 to expand both existing and new program support for States to assess domoic acid levels of HAB species in the marine environment.”

^{lxiv} “Harmful Algal Blooms.—Within funding for Competitive Research, the Committee provides not less than \$14,000,000 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. Of this amount, up to \$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 uncrewed 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.”

^{lxv} “Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas.—The agreement provides \$68,000,000 for Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas, which is \$7,000,000 above the fiscal year 2022 enacted level. House language on ‘Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas’ is adopted and 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.”

^{lxvi} “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 \$68,000,000 for Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas.”

^{lxvii} “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.”

^{lxviii} “National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund [NOCSF].—The Committee summarily rejects the administration’s 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 2024.”

^{lxix} “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.”

^{lxx} “The agreement includes \$50,000,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission (GLFC) for operations and programs, including funds for the Commission to address risks to its programs, fund its infrastructure strategy, implement its invasive sea lamprey control, conduct research to aid cross-border fishery management, and manage grass carp control in the Great Lakes. The agreement also supports the efforts of the GLFC to combat other invasive carp species in the Great Lakes Basin.”

^{lxxi} “Great Lakes Fishery Commission (GLFC).—The Committee directs \$47,145,000 be made available for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, of which not less than \$37,712,000 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 to manage sea lamprey using physical barriers as well as its ongoing work to survey and capture Asian carp, especially grass carp.”

^{lxxii} “The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission [GLFC], 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.”