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A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the French Colonial Heritage Area in the State of Missouri as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senator KERR, to introduce the Fishing Quota Act of 2003 which will address one of the most complex policy questions in fisheries management—fishing quotas. This bill will amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to authorize the establishment of new fishing quota systems. This legislation will in no way whatsoever force Fishing Quota programs upon any regional fishery management council and this is not a mandate to use Fishing Quota programs. Rather, it is intended to provide the councils with an additional conservation and management tool.

Fishing Quota programs can dramatically change the face of fishing communities and the fundamental principles of conservation and management. Therefore, this legislation was developed in a meaningful manner over the span of many years with significant input and participation from all of the many affected and interested parties.

In 1998, Congress reauthorized the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act through enactment of the Sustainable Fisheries Act, SFA. The SFA contained a substantial improvement to fisheries conservation since the original passage of the Magnuson-Stevens Act in 1976. More specifically, the SFA included a five year moratorium on new fishing quota programs and required the National Academy of Sciences, NAS, to study and report on the issue.

In 1999, the NAS issued its report, Sharing the Fish, which contained a number of important recommendations addressing the social, economic, and biological aspects of Fishing Quota programs. The Fishing Quota Act of 2003 incorporates many of the recommendations in this report and requires the National Academy of Sciences, NAS, to study and report on the issue.

During the 106th Congress, the Subcommittee on Oceans and Fisheries traveled across the country and held six hearings on reauthorizing the Magnuson-Stevens Act. We began the process in Washington, DC, and then visited fishing communities in Maine, Louisiana, Alaska, Washington, and Massachusetts. During the course of those hearings, we heard official testimony from over 70 witnesses and received statements from over 50 fishermen during open microphone sessions at each field hearing. The Subcommittee heard the comments, views, and recommendations of Federal and State officials, regional councils and members, other fishermen and fishing associations, commercial and recreational fishermen, members of the conservation community, and many other interested individuals.

After these hearings, I introduced the Individual Fishing Quota Act of 2001, S. 637, at the beginning of the 107th Congress beginning the legislative dialogue. Since then, we have heard from many stakeholders who assisted the Subcommittee in shaping and re-shaping this bill.

The Fishing Quota Act of 2003 creates a framework under which fishery management plans, FMPs, or plan amendments may establish a fishing quota system. As with other components of fisheries conservation and management, there is no "one-size-fits-all" solution to Fishing Quota programs. Therefore, this bill sets general conditions under which Fishing Quota programs may be developed, if such a program is desired. In doing so, it clearly provides the regional fishery management councils and the affected fishermen with the flexibility to shape any new Fishing Quota program to fit the needs of the fishery.

The bill ensures that any regional council which establishes a new fishing quota program will provide sustainable management of the fishery; require fair and equitable allocation of fishing quotas; consider social and economic impacts on local coastal communities; ensure adequate enforcement of the system; and take into account present participation in historical fishing practices of the relevant fishery. Additionally, the bill requires the Secretary of Commerce to conduct referenda to ensure that those most affected by fishing quotas will have the opportunity to approve the adoption of any new fishing quota program by a two-thirds vote.

This bill authorizes the potential allocation of fishing quotas to entry-level fishermen, small vessel owners, or crew members who may not otherwise be eligible for individual quotas. While this bill authorizes the transfer of fishing quotas, it requires the regional councils to define and prohibit an excess accumulation of quota shares.

This is a good bill which allows Fishing Quota programs to be created where they are needed and desired. The Fishing Quota Act of 2003 incorporates many of the suggestions we heard from those men and women who fish for a living and those who are most affected by the law and its regulations. I appreciate the participation of Senator KERRY and all the impacted stakeholders who assisted in drafting this legislation. I look forward to moving this bill through the legislative process towards final passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

S. 1106

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ‘Fishing Quota Act of 2003’.
SEC. 2. FISHING QUOTA SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Magnuson- Stevens Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b)(6) and inserting in its place the following:

"(6) establish a limited access system for the fishery in order to achieve optimum yield if, in developing such system, the Council and the Secretary take into account—

"(A) the conservation requirements of this Act with respect to the fishery;

"(B) present participation in the fishery;

"(C) historical fishing practices in, and dependence on, the fishery;

"(D) the cultural and social framework relevant to the fishery and any affected fishing communities;

"(E) the fair and equitable distribution of a public resource; and

"(F) any other relevant considerations;"

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting in its place the following:

"(d) FISHING QUOTA SYSTEMS.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Any fishery management plan or amendment that is prepared by any person or agency, including the Secretary, with respect to any fishery, may establish a fishing quota system consistent with the provisions of this Act.

"(2) IN GENERAL.—The Councils and the Secretary shall ensure that any such fishing quota system submitted and approved after September 30, 2002, complies with the requirements of this Act and—

"(A) shall prevent any person from acquiring an excessive share of the fishing quotas issued for participation in the fishery, and establish any other limits or measures necessary to prevent inequitable concentration of quota share;

"(B) shall provide for the fair and equitable initial allocation of quota share and in such allocation—

"(i) shall take into account present and historic participation in the fishery; and

"(ii) shall consider allocating a portion of the annual harvest to entry-level fishermen, small vessel owners, skippers, crew members, and fishing communities; and

"(C) may allocate shares among categories of fishing vessels, gear types, or other factors that the Councils and the Secretary determine are necessary; and

"(D) shall contain provisions for the regular review and evaluation of the system, including criteria for evaluating performance, and actions to be taken for failure to meet the criteria.

"(3) ELIGIBILITY.—Persons eligible to hold fishing quota shares are persons who are United States citizens, or who are United States nationals, permanent resident aliens qualified by Federal law to participate in the fishery.

"(4) DURATION.—Any fishing quota system established by the Secretary shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of the Fishing Quota Act of 2003 shall expire at the end of a 10-year period beginning on the date the system is established, or at the end of successive 10-year periods thereafter, unless extended by a fishery management plan amendment in accordance with this Act, for successive periods not to exceed 10 years.

"(5) REFERENDUM PROCEDURES.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (C) of section 304(d)(2) the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery, a Council may not submit to a referendum a fishery management plan amendment that creates a fishing quota system, including a secretarial plan, unless such a system, as ultimately developed, has been approved by more than two-thirds of those voting in a referendum among eligible permit holders. If a fishing quota system is approved by the requisite number of those voting, it may be revised and submitted for approval in a subsequent referendum.

(B) The Secretary shall conduct the referendum referred to in this paragraph, including notifying all persons eligible to participate in the referendum and making available to persons participating in such referendum a schedule, procedures and eligibility requirements for the referendum process and the associated fishing quota system. The Secretary shall submit within one year of enactment of the Fishing Quota Act of 2003 publish guidelines and procedures to determine procedures and requirements for conducting the referendum and to such referendum in a fair and equitable manner.

"(6) APPROPRIATIONS.—The provisions of section 407(e) shall apply in lieu of this paragraph for any fishing quota system for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery.

(D) Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, (commonly known as the "Paperwork Reduction Act") does not apply to the referendum conducted under this paragraph.

(7) NO PROVISION OF LAW.—(A) No provision of law shall be construed to limit the authority of a Council to submit, or the Secretary to approve, the termination or limitation, or without compensation, to holders of any limited access system consistent with the provisions of this Act, of a fishing quota management plan or plan amendment, or regulation that provides for a limited access system, including a fishing quota management plan or plan amendment.

(B) This subsection shall not apply to, or be construed to prohibit a Council from submitting, or the Secretary from approving under permitting, amendment of a Pacific halibut and sablefish, Southern Atlantic wreckfish, or Mid-Atlantic surf clam and ocean quahog (including means for regulating individual fishing quota programs).

(B) A Council may submit, and the Secretary may approve and publish a fishing quota management plan or program which reserves to 25 percent of any fees collected from a fishery under section 304(d)(2) to be used, pursuant to section 1103(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1271a(1)), to issue obligations that aid in financing the purchase of fishing vessels in that fishery by fishermen who fish from small vessels; and

(ii) first time purchase of fishing quotas in that fishery by entry level fishermen.

(B) A Council making a submission under subparagraph (A) shall recommend criteria, consistent with the provisions of this Act, that a fisherman must meet to qualify for guarantees under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) and the portion of funds to be allocated for guarantees under each clause.

(E) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—Section 303 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) Within 5 years after the date of enactment of the Fishing Quota Act of 2003, and every 3 years thereafter, the National Research Council shall conduct an independent review of the effectiveness of fishing quota systems conducted in Federal fisheries.

(2) The review shall be conducted by an independent panel of individuals who have knowledge and experience in fisheries conservation and management, in the implementation of fishing quota systems, or in the social or economic characteristics of fishers. The National Research Council shall ensure that members of the panel are qualified for appointment, are not active quota share holders, and provide fair representation of interests affected by fishing quota systems.
(D) an evaluation of the costs of implementing, monitoring, and enforcing the system; and (E) recommendations to the Councils and the States to ensure that quotas and management plans meet the requirements of this Act and the goals of the plans, and recommendations to the Secretary for any changes to regulations issued under section 304(d).

(4) The Secretary shall submit the report to the Congress and any appropriate Councils within 60 days after the review is completed.

(c) ACTION ON LIMITED ACCESS SYSTEMS.— Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1854) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) adding at the end the following:

(4) The term ‘United States Citizen’ means an individual who is a citizen of the United States or a corporation, partnership, association or other entity that qualifies to document a fishing vessel as a vessel of the United States under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code; and (5) striking in individual fishing quota” in paragraph (2)(i) and inserting “fishing quota system.”

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.— (1) The following provisions of that Act are amended by striking “individual fishing quota” and inserting “fishing quota”:

(A) Section 304(c)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1854(c)(1)).


(C) Section 402(b)(1)(D) (16 U.S.C. 1881b(b)(1)(D)).

(D) Section 407(a)(1)(D), (c)(1), and (c)(2)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1883(a)(1)(D), (c)(1), and (c)(2)(B)).

(2) Section 1803(b)(1)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1883(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “individual”.

SEC. 3. GULF OF MEXICO FISHING QUOTA SYSTEMS.

Section 407(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1883) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(3) The initial referendum described in paragraph (1) shall be used to determine support for whether the sale, transfer, or lease of quota shares shall be allowed.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Ms. SNOWE, to introduce the Fishing Quota Act of 2003, legislation to establish national criteria governing the use of individual fishing quota systems. Work began in earnest on this bipartisan bill in the Commerce Committee last spring, as the expiration of the national moratorium on the use of IFQs approached, and small boat fishermen voiced concerns that existing legislative criteria governing the use of IFQs would not offer sufficient protection to communities that rely on the harvest of those species. Sub-committee Chair SNOWE for her efforts to work with me and with other members of the Commerce Committee on this legislation, which draws from separate IFQ legislation that both Senator SNOWE and I introduced beginning in the 106th Congress.

The IFQ moratorium established under the 1996 Sustainable Fisheries Act was set to expire September 30, 2000. Senator SNOWE and I reported a 2-year extension of that moratorium to allow for hearings and full consultation with affected groups on the issues surrounding IFQs. Our discussions focused on the need to provide regional flexibility to fishery management and a new tool, while providing national "rules of the road." Such rules of the road would ensure IFQ systems developed after expiration of the moratorium are adopted with the support of the fishery, allocate quota fairly and equitably, address region-specific needs, further the conservation and management goals of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, prevent overallocation of the resource, and address the needs of small fishing communities, and recognize both the public nature of the resource and that issuance of an IFQ does not give rise to a compensable property interest.

To develop such rules, we worked with fellow Commerce Committee members, including Senators BREAUX, LOTT, BOXER, STEVENS, and CANTWELL, consulted with interested groups, and obtained technical advice from the National Marine Fisheries Service. While New England has historically been opposed to IFQs, other regions are interested in utilizing IFQ programs in certain fisheries. I believe the resulting bill provides a balance between the need to provide national policy guidance that concerns the economic interests of communities and harvesters, but also for development of IFQ systems, where appropriate, on a fishery-by-fishery basis. This preserves the balanced regional approach to fishery management that Congress intended in the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

I want to clarify that this bill does not authorize the establishment of "processors quota," and relates only to issuance of harvester quota.

The bill introduced by SNOWE and I are introducing today sets forth a set of national criteria that councils wishing to adopt IFQs would follow. Importantly, this bill contains a provision that directs councils to consider the use of community or area-based approaches and strategies that would preserve the vitality of small fishing communities, including the allocation of quota to a fishing community. It also directs councils to consider use of other management measures, including those that would facilitate formation of fishery cooperative arrangements, taking account of the dependence of coastal communities on these fisheries.

This bill addresses many of the concerns raised by fishermen, and I understand the many concerns of small fishermen in New England regarding the use of IFQs. I believe this bill gives fishermen the power to decide whether to implement an IFQ program and ensures that those who do operate under a fair system. First, no region can implement an IFQ system without approval of a two-thirds majority of eligible permit holders through a referendum process run by the Secretary of Commerce. In addition, any process, development or allocation would have to meet a set of national criteria. These national criteria would include: (1) ensuring a fair and equitable initial allocation of quota, including the establishment of an appeal process for fishery management and quota allocation decisions, taking into account present and historic participation in the fishery; (2) establishing limits necessary to prevent inequitable concentration of quota share; (3) preventing any person from acquiring an "excessive share"; (4) considering allocation of a portion of the annual harvest specifically to small fishermen, skippers, and fishermen; (5) establishing process for fishery management; and (6) providing for revocation of quota if the owner is no longer an active fisherman.

I also believe this bill responds to concerns that IFQ systems would undermine the national interest in conserving fishery resources held in the public trust. In order to respond to those concerns, the bill would: (1) specify that an IFQ is a permit under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and does not confer any right of compensation or any right, title or interest to any fish before it is harvested; (2) establish that the quota expires after 10 years, unless extended by a fishery management plan; (3) require that the systems promote management measures to improve the conservation and management of the fishery, including reduction of bycatch; (4) provide for regular review and evaluation of the system, including specifying actions to be taken for any failure to meet the criteria; (5) require recommendations for effective enforcement, monitoring, and management, including use of observers; and (6) require that quota be revoked from individuals subject to civil penalties under section 308 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

The bill also would require a 5-year recurring independent review of IFQ systems by the National Research Council, to: (1) evaluate the effectiveness of such systems and determine who the systems contribute to improved management, conservation and safety; (2) evaluate the social, economic and biological consequences of the systems, including economic impacts on fishing communities; (3) evaluate the costs of implementation; and (4) provide recommendations to ensure the systems meet Magnuson-Stevens Act requirements and the goals of the plans.

I believe this legislation provides guidelines for the use of IFQs that will help ensure the health of our marine fisheries. During the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, our
Nation's fisheries were at a crossroads, and action was required to remedy our marine resource management problems, to preserve the way of life in our coastal communities, and to promote the sustainable use and conservation of our marine resources for future generations and for the economic good of the National Park Service. By the end of the legislative session, this bill will help us do just that. I remain committed to the goal of establishing biologically and economically sustainable fisheries so that fishing will continue to be an important part of the culture and economy of coastal communities throughout Massachusetts, as well as the economy of the Nation.

By Mr. THOMAS:
S. 1107. A bill to enhance the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program for the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Recreation Fee Audit Act of 2003. This legislation modifies the congressionally created Recreation Fee Demonstration Program.

The issue of user fees on public lands is a difficult one. As you know, our Nation's parks and recreation areas are in serious trouble and have significant maintenance and infrastructure needs. The National Park Service alone has roughly a $3 billion backlog in maintenance and infrastructure repair. There are a number of reasons for this funding shortage, including poor park management, congressional inaction, and apathy from the American public.

Currently, the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program allows the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Forest Service to collect and expend funds for areas in need of additional financial support. Agencies collect fees for admission to a unit or site for special uses such as boating and camping fees. Collecting fees makes it possible to use 80 percent of the receipts for protection and enhancement in that area. Fees are typically used for visitor services, maintenance and repair of facilities as well as cultural and natural resource management. The remaining 20 percent is used on an agency-wide basis for parts of the system, which are precluded from participating in the Recreation Fee Demonstration program.

The legislation I am introducing today allows permanent authorization of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program for national parks, and provides some new flexibility. For example, many visitors frequent national and State parks, but are not allowed to use recreational or national pass Exchanges changeable. In cooperation with State agencies, the Secretary of the Interior will be authorized to enter into revenue sharing agreements to accept State and national park passes at sites within that State—providing a cost savings and convenience for the visitor.

In the past, concerns have been expressed about "nickel and dime" efforts where there appears to be a lack of planning. Elimination by agency officials. Fee programs under this legislation would be established at fair and equitable rates. Each unit would perform an analysis to consider benefits to the visitor, cumulative effect of fees, public policy and management objectives and feasibility of fee collection. This review would serve as a business plan for each site so that managers could utilize scarce resources in the most efficient manner.

The Recreation Fee Demonstration program was an effort by Congress to allow public land agencies to obtain funding in addition to their annual appropriations. This legislation will help provide resources for badly needed improvement projects and ensure an enhanced experience for all visitors.

We need to ensure that our national treasures are available for generations to come. I believe that Congress, the National Park Service and those interested in helping our parks should cooperate on initiatives to protect resources, increase visitor services and improve management throughout the system. Working together, we can ensure that these areas will remain affordable and accessible for everyone.

If the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Recreational Fee Authority Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. RECREATION FEE AUTHORITY.

(a) In General: in Fiscal Year 2004 and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior ("Secretary") may establish, modify, charge, collect, and allocate admission fees to a unit of the National Park System and the use of National Park Service ("Service") administered areas, lands, sites, facilities, and services (including reservations) by individuals and/or groups. Fees shall be based on an analysis by the Secretary of—

(A) the benefits and services provided to the visitor;
(B) the cumulative effect of fees;
(C) the comparable fees charged elsewhere and by other agencies and by nearby private sector operators;
(D) the direct and indirect cost and benefit to the government;
(E) public policy or management objectives served;
(F) economic and administrative feasibility of fee collection, and
(G) other factors or criteria determined by the Secretary.

(b) Number of Fees:—The Secretary shall establish the minimum number of fees and shall avoid the collection of multiple or layered fees for a wide variety of uses, activities, or programs.

(c) Analysis:—The results of the analysis together with the Secretary's determination of appropriate levels shall be transmitted to the Congress at least three months prior to publication of such fees in the Federal Register. New fees and any increases in established fees shall be published in the Federal Register and no new fee or change in the amount of fees shall take place until at least 12 months after notice is published in the Federal Register.

(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—Beginning on October 1, 2003 the Secretary may enter into agreements, including contracts to provide reasonable commissions or reimbursements with any public or private entity for visitor services, fee collection and/or processing services.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may provide discounts or fees in the event that the specific site at which the specific revenue sharing agreement is entered into except where the Secretary has established a fee that includes a unit or units located more than five miles from the site.

SEC. 3. DISTRIBUTION OF RECEIPTS.

(a) Without further appropriation, all receipts collected pursuant to the Act or from sales of the National Park Service Overseas Passport to be retained and may be expended as follows—

(1) 80 percent of amounts collected at a specific area, site, or project as determined by the Secretary, shall remain available for use by the Service on a Service-wide basis as determined by the Secretary.

(2) 20 percent of amounts collected shall remain available for use by the Service on a Service-wide basis as determined by the Secretary.

Moines generated as a result of revenue sharing agreements established pursuant to Section 2(b) of this Act, not less than 80 percent of amounts collected at a specific area, site, or project shall remain available for use by the Service on a Service-wide basis as determined by the Secretary.

(2) Not less than 80 percent of the amounts collected from the sale of the National Park Passport shall remain available for use at the specific area, site, or project at which the fees were collected and the balance of the receipts shall be distributed in accordance with paragraph 2 of this Section.

SEC. 4. EXPENDITURES.

(a) USE OF FEES AT SPECIFIC AREA, SITE, OR PROJECT.—Amounts available for expenditure at a specific area, site or project shall be accounted for separately and may be used for—

(1) repair, maintenance, facility enhancement, media services and infrastructure improvements, projects and expenses relating to visitor enjoyment, visitor services, enforcement enforcement, environmental compliance, and health and safety;

(2) interpretation, visitor information, visitor services, visitor needs assessments, monitoring, and signs;

(3) habitat enhancement, resource assessment, preservation, protection, and restoration related to recreation use, and