

1999 ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

January 21, 1999 – Introduced by Representatives JOHNSRUD, JENSEN, MUSSER, HASENOHRL, J. LEHMAN, SYKORA, PORTER, SPILLNER, ALBERS, GOETSCH, VRAKAS, WARD and MONTGOMERY, cosponsored by Senators CLAUSING, SCHULTZ, BURKE, BRESKE, COWLES and DECKER. Referred to Committee on Rules.

1 **Relating to:** urging the members of the Wisconsin delegation to the U. S. Congress
2 to support proposed federal legislation that would provide revenues to
3 Wisconsin from the development of oil and natural gas resources on the outer
4 continental shelf.

5 Whereas, each year the federal government receives billions of dollars in
6 revenues from the development of oil and natural gas resources on the outer
7 continental shelf (OCS), a capital asset of this nation; and

8 Whereas, on October 7, 1998, companion bills were introduced in the U.S. house
9 of representatives (H.R. 4717, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1998) and
10 the U.S. senate (S. 2566, the Reinvestment and Environmental Act of 1998); and

11 Whereas, Wisconsin is a coastal state within the meaning of that term, as
12 defined in the bills, because it borders Lake Superior and Lake Michigan; and

13 Whereas, in their Title I Coastal Impact Assistance sections both bills dedicate
14 27% or \$1.24 billion of annual OCS revenues toward impact assistance that benefits

1 fish and wildlife, and this would amount to \$6.8 million for Wisconsin from either bill;
2 and

3 Whereas, in their Title II Land-based Recreation sections both bills dedicate
4 additional percentages of OCS revenues that would benefit land-based recreation
5 as well as the state and federal sides of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for
6 Wisconsin in the amount of \$6.2 million (S. 2566) and \$6.9 million (H.R. 4717); and

7 Whereas, in their Title III Wildlife Conservation and Restoration sections both
8 bills dedicate amounts (\$6.3 million or 10% of OCS revenues in H.R. 4717 and \$9
9 million or 7% of OCS revenues in S. 2566) that would be used to fund wildlife
10 conservation and related recreation and education in Wisconsin; and

11 Whereas, since the early 1970's the department of natural resources has,
12 working through the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
13 (IAFWA), and more recently through the IAFWA-led Teaming With Wildlife
14 Coalition, supported a permanent budget authority mechanism for nongame wildlife
15 modeled after the proven Federal Aid in Wildlife (Pittman-Roberts) and Sport Fish
16 Restoration Program (Dingell-Johnson); and

17 Whereas, with year 2000 oil and gas revenue estimates of \$4.59 billion, the
18 department of natural resources could get additional federal revenues equal to or
19 greater than the current combined Pittman-Roberts and Dingell-Johnson income
20 for a comprehensive wildlife program, and especially for nongame fish and wildlife,
21 allowing for the development of proactive, fully responsive conservation education
22 programs such as Watchable Wildlife; and

23 Whereas, both bills were introduced with bipartisan sponsorship and with the
24 support of more than 3,000 conservation organizations and related businesses; now,
25 therefore, be it

