I

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7776

To provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 16, 2022

Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. ROUZER) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

---

A BILL

To provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Resources Development Act of 2022''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. FEDERAL BREAKWATERS AND JETTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out repair or maintenance activity of a Federal jetty or breakwater associated with an authorized navigation project, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding the authorized dimensions of the jetty or breakwater, ensure that such repair or maintenance activity is sufficient to meet the authorized purpose of such project, including ensuring that any harbor or inland harbor associated with the project is protected from projected changes in wave action or height (including changes that result from relative sea-level change over the useful life of the project).

(b) CLASSIFICATION OF ACTIVITY.—The Secretary may not classify any repair or maintenance activity of a

Federal jetty or breakwater carried out under subsection (a) as major rehabilitation of such jetty or breakwater—

(1) if the Secretary determines that—

(A) projected changes in wave action or height, including changes that result from relative sea-level change, will diminish the functionality of the jetty or breakwater to meet the authorized purpose of the project; and

(B) such repair or maintenance activity is necessary to restore such functionality; or

(2) if—

(A) the Secretary has not carried out regular and routine Federal maintenance activity at the jetty or breakwater; and

(B) the structural integrity of the jetty or breakwater is degraded as a result of a lack of such regular and routine Federal maintenance activity.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

Section 5(a)(1) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(1)), is amended by striking ''in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure'' and all that follows through ''non-Federal sponsor.'' and inserting ''in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore

protective structure or project damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature to the pre-storm level of protection, to the design level of protection, or, notwithstanding the authorized dimensions of the structure or project, to a level sufficient to meet the authorized purpose of such structure or project, whichever provides greater protection, when, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure or project for hurricane or shore protection, including to ensure the structure or project is functioning adequately to protect against projected changes in wave action or height or storm surge (including changes that result from relative sea-level change over the useful life of the structure or project), subject to the condition that the Chief of Engineers may include modifications to the structure or project to address major deficiencies or implement nonstructural alternatives to the repair or restoration of the structure if requested by the non-Federal sponsor.''.

SEC. 103. SHORELINE AND RIVERINE RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 212 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**FLOOD MITIGATION AND RIVERINE RESTORATION**

PROGRAM'' and inserting ''**SHORELINE AND RIVERINE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''undertake a program for the purpose of conducting'' and inserting ''carry out'';

(B) by striking ''to reduce flood hazards'' and inserting ''to reduce flood and hurricane and storm damage hazards (including erosion)''; and

(C) by inserting ''and shorelines'' after ''rivers'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''In carrying out the program, the'' and inserting ''The'';

(ii) by inserting ''and hurricane and storm'' after ''flood''; and

(iii) by inserting ''erosion mitigation,'' after ''reduction,'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''flood damages'' and inserting ''flood and hurricane and storm damages, including the use of natural features and nature-based features, as defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources

Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting ''and hurricane and storm'' after ''flood'';

(ii) by inserting '', shoreline,'' after ''riverine''; and

(iii) by inserting ''and coastal barriers'' after ''floodplains'';

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''FLOOD CONTROL''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or hurricane and storm damage reduction'' after ''flood control''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting ''OR HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION'' after ''FLOOD CONTROL''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or hurricane and storm damage reduction'' after ''flood control'';

(5) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or requirement for economic justification established under section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962–2), the Secretary may implement a project under this section if the Secretary determines that the project—

''(1) will significantly reduce potential flood, hurricane and storm, or erosion damages;

''(2) will improve the quality of the environment; and

''(3) is justified considering all costs and beneficial outputs of the project.'';

(6) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (32), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (33), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(34) City of Southport, North Carolina.''; and

(7) by striking subsections (f) through (i) and inserting the following:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $40,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 269) is amended by striking the item relating to section 212 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 212. Shoreline and riverine protection and restoration.''.

SEC. 104. TIDAL RIVER, BAY, AND ESTUARINE FLOOD RISK REDUCTION.

At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary is authorized, as part of an authorized feasibility study for a project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, to investigate measures to reduce the risk of flooding associated with tidally influenced portions of rivers, bays, and estuaries that are hydrologically connected to the coastal water body and located within the geographic scope of the study.

SEC. 105. REMOVAL OF MAN-MADE OBSTRUCTION TO AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out an aquatic ecosystem restoration project, at the request of a non-Federal interest and with the consent of the owner of a man-made obstruction, the Secretary shall determine whether the removal of such obstruction from the aquatic environment

within the geographic scope of the project is necessary to meet the aquatic ecosystem restoration goals of the project.

(b) REMOVAL COSTS.—If the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that removal of an obstruction is necessary, the Secretary shall consider the removal of such obstruction to be a project feature and the cost of such removal shall be shared between the Secretary and non-Federal interest as a construction cost.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall apply to any project for ecosystem restoration authorized on or after June 10, 2014.

SEC. 106. NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Engineer Research and Development Center, is authorized to carry out a study of coastal geographic land changes, with recurring national coastal mapping technology, along the coastal zone of the United States to support Corps of Engineers missions.

(b) STUDY.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall identify—

(1) new or advanced geospatial information and remote sensing tools for coastal mapping;

(2) best practices for coastal change mapping; and

(3) how to most effectively—

(A) collect and analyze such advanced geospatial information;

(B) disseminate such geospatial information to relevant offices of the Corps of Engineers, other Federal agencies, States, Tribes, and local governments; and

(C) make such geospatial information available to other stakeholders.

(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

(1) PROJECT AREA.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall carry out a demonstration project in the coastal region covering the North Carolina coastal waters, connected bays, estuaries, rivers, streams, and creeks, to their tidally influenced extent inland.

(2) SCOPE.—In carrying out the demonstration project, the Secretary shall—

(A) identify potential hazards, such as debris, sedimentation, dredging effects, and flood areas;

(B) identify best practices described in subsection (b)(2), including best practices relating to geographical coverage and frequency of mapping;

(C) evaluate and demonstrate relevant mapping technologies to identify which are the most effective for regional mapping of the transitional areas between the open coast and inland waters; and

(D) demonstrate remote sensing tools for coastal mapping.

(d) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with other Federal and State agencies that are responsible for authoritative data and academic institutions and other entities with relevant expertise.

(e) PANEL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish a panel of senior leaders from the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies that are stakeholders in the coastal mapping program carried out through the Engineer Research and Development Center.

(2) DUTIES.—The panel established under this subsection shall—

(A) coordinate the collection of data under the study carried out under this section;

(B) coordinate the use of geospatial information and remote sensing tools, and the appli-

cation of the best practices identified under the study, by Federal agencies; and

(C) identify technical topics and challenges that require multiagency collaborative research and development.

(f) USE OF EXISTING INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consider any relevant information developed under section 516(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2326b(g)).

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the results of the study carried out under this section; and

(2) any geographical areas recommended for additional study.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 107. PUBLIC RECREATIONAL AMENITIES IN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS.

At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary is authorized to study the incorporation of public recreational amenities, including facilities for hiking, biking, walking, and waterborne recreation, into a project for ecosystem restoration, including a project carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), if the incorporation of such amenities would be consistent with the ecosystem restoration purposes of the project.

SEC. 108. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) is amended by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following:

''(e) PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall, prior to executing a cost sharing agreement for a feasibility study described in subsection (a), carry out a preliminary analysis of the water resources problem that is the subject of the feasibility study in order to identify potential alternatives to address such problem.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out a preliminary analysis under this subsection, the Secretary shall include in such analysis—

''(A) a preliminary analysis of the Federal interest, costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of the project;

''(B) an estimate of the costs of, and duration for, preparing the feasibility study; and

''(C) for a flood risk management or hurricane and storm risk reduction project, at the request of the non-Federal interest, the identification of any opportunities to incorporate natural features or nature-based features into the project.

''(3) DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall complete a preliminary analysis carried out under this subsection by not later than 180 days after the date on which funds are made available to the Secretary to carry out the preliminary analysis.

''(4) COST SHARE.—The cost of a preliminary analysis carried out under this subsection—

''(A) shall be at Federal expense; and

''(B) shall not exceed $200,000.

''(5) TREATMENT.—

''(A) TIMING.—The period during which a preliminary analysis is carried out under this subsection shall not be included for the purposes of the deadline to complete a final feasibility report under subsection (a)(1).

''(B) COST.—The cost of a preliminary analysis carried out under this subsection shall not be included for the purposes of the maximum Federal cost under subsection (a)(2).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 905(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''a preliminary analysis'' and inserting ''an analysis''.

SEC. 109. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by inserting ''local government,'' after ''State or group of States,''; and

(B) by inserting ''local government,'' after ''such State, interest,'';

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$30,000,000''; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''The cost-share for assistance'' and inserting the following:

''(1) TRIBES AND TERRITORIES.—The cost-share for assistance''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1) and the limitation in section 1156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as applicable pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary is authorized to waive the collection of fees for any local government to which assistance is provided under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines is an economically disadvantaged community, as defined by the Secretary under section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note).''.

(b) WATERSHED PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—In providing assistance under section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16) or pursuant to section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), the Secretary shall, upon request, provide such assistance at a watershed scale.

SEC. 110. CORPS OF ENGINEERS SUPPORT FOR UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES; OUTREACH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States for the Corps of Engineers to strive to understand and accommodate and, in coordination with non-Federal interests, seek to address the water resources development needs of all communities in the United States, including Indian Tribes and urban and rural economically disadvantaged communities (as defined by the Secretary under section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note)).

(b) OUTREACH AND ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop, support, and implement public awareness, education, and regular outreach and engagement efforts for potential non-Federal interests with respect to the water resources development authorities of the Secretary, with particular emphasis on—

(A) technical service programs, including the authorities under—

(i) section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a);

(ii) section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16); and

(iii) section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269); and

(B) continuing authority programs, as such term is defined in section 7001(c)(1)(D) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d).

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) develop and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), technical assistance materials, guidance, and other information with respect to the water resources development authorities of the Secretary;

(B) establish and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), an appropriate point of contact at each district and division office of the Corps of Engineers for inquiries from potential non-Federal interests relating to the water resources development authorities of the Secretary;

(C) conduct regular outreach and engagement, including through hosting seminars and community information sessions, with local elected officials, community organizations, and

previous and potential non-Federal interests, on opportunities to address local water resources challenges through the water resources development authorities of the Secretary;

(D) issue guidance for, and provide technical assistance through technical service programs to, non-Federal interests to assist such interests in pursuing technical services and developing proposals for water resources development projects; and

(E) provide, at the request of a non-Federal interest, assistance with researching and identifying existing project authorizations or authorities to address local water resources challenges.

(3) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall prioritize awareness, education, and outreach and engagement efforts for urban and rural economically disadvantaged communities and Indian Tribes.

SEC. 111. PROJECT PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

Section 118 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note)—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''publish'' and inserting ''annually publish''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''select'' and inserting '', subject to the availability of appropriations, annually select''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''projects'' and inserting ''projects annually''.

SEC. 112. MANAGED AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY AND WORKING GROUP.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with applicable non-Federal interests, conduct a study at Federal expense to determine the feasibility of carrying out managed aquifer recharge projects to address drought, water resiliency, and aquifer depletion.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the study under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) assess and identify opportunities to support non-Federal interests, including Tribal communities, in carrying out managed aquifer recharge projects;

(B) identify opportunities to carry out managed aquifer recharge projects in areas that

are experiencing, or have recently experienced, prolonged drought conditions, aquifer depletion, or water supply scarcity; and

(C) assess preliminarily local hydrogeologic conditions relevant to carrying out managed aquifer recharge projects.

(3) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the study under this subsection, the Secretary shall coordinate, as appropriate, with the heads of other Federal agencies, States, regional governmental agencies, units of local government, experts in managed aquifer recharge, and Tribes.

(b) WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment, the Secretary shall establish a managed aquifer recharge working group within the Corps of Engineers.

(2) COMPOSITION.—In establishing the working group under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that members of the working group have expertise working with—

(A) projects providing water supply storage to meet regional water supply demand, particularly in regions experiencing drought;

(B) protection of groundwater supply, including promoting infiltration and increased recharge in groundwater basins, and groundwater quality;

(C) aquifer storage, recharge, and recovery wells;

(D) dams that provide recharge enhancement benefits;

(E) groundwater hydrology; and

(F) conjunctive use water systems.

(3) DUTIES.—The working group established under this subsection shall—

(A) advise and assist in the development and execution of the feasibility study under subsection (a);

(B) coordinate Corps of Engineers expertise on managed aquifer recharge;

(C) share Corps of Engineers-wide communications on the successes and failures, questions and answers, and conclusions and recommendations with respect to managed aquifer recharge projects;

(D) assist Corps of Engineers offices at the headquarter, division, and district levels with raising awareness to non-Federal interests

on the potential benefits of carrying out managed aquifer recharge projects; and

(E) develop the report required to be submitted under subsection (c).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on managed aquifer recharge that includes—

(1) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including data collected under such study and any recommendations on managed aquifer recharge opportunities for non-Federal interests, States, local governments, and Tribes;

(2) a status update on the implementation of the recommendations included in the report of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Institute for Water Resources entitled ''Managed Aquifer Recharge and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Water Security through Resilience'', published in April, 2020 (2020–WP–01); and

(3) an evaluation of the benefits of creating a new or modifying an existing planning center of expertise for managed aquifer recharge, and identify

potential locations for such a center of expertise, if feasible.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MANAGED AQUIFER RECHARGE.—The term ''managed aquifer recharge'' means the intentional banking and treatment of water in aquifers for storage and future use.

(2) MANAGED AQUIFER RECHARGE PROJECT.—The term ''managed aquifer recharge project'' means a project to incorporate managed aquifer recharge features into a water resources development project.

SEC. 113. FLOOD EASEMENT DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and maintain a database containing an inventory of—

(1) all floodplain and flowage easements held by the Corps of Engineers; and

(2) other federally held floodplain and flowage easements with respect to which other Federal agencies submit information to the Secretary.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the database established under subsection (a)—

(1) with respect to each floodplain and flowage easement included in the database—

(A) the location of the land subject to the easement (including geographic information system information);

(B) a brief description of such land, including the acreage and ecosystem type covered by the easement;

(C) the Federal agency that holds the easement;

(D) any conditions of the easement, including—

(i) the amount of flooding, timing of flooding, or area of flooding covered by the easement;

(ii) any conservation requirements; and

(iii) any restoration requirements;

(E) the date on which the easement was acquired; and

(F) whether the easement is permanent or temporary, and if the easement is temporary, the date on which the easement expires; and

(2) any other information that the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make the full database established under subsection

(a) available to the public in searchable form, including on the internet.

(d) OTHER FEDERAL EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall request information from other Federal agencies to incorporate other federally held floodplain and flowage easements into the database established under subsection (a).

SEC. 114. ASSESSMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, at Federal expense, periodically conduct an assessment of levees constructed by the Secretary or for which the Secretary has financial or operational responsibility, to identify opportunities for the modification (including realignment or incorporation of natural and nature-based features) of levee systems to—

(1) increase the flood risk reduction benefits of such systems;

(2) achieve greater flood resiliency; and

(3) restore hydrological and ecological connections with adjacent floodplains.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider and identify, with respect to each levee—

(A) an estimate of the number of structures and population at risk and protected by the levee that would be adversely impacted if the levee fails or water levels exceed the height of the levee (which may be the applicable estimate included in the levee database established under section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303), if available);

(B) the number of times the non-Federal interest has received emergency flood-fighting or repair assistance under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for the levee, and the total expenditures on post-flood repairs over the life of the levee;

(C) the functionality of the levee with regard to higher precipitation levels, including due to changing climatic conditions and extreme weather events; and

(D) the potential costs and benefits (including environmental benefits) from modifying the applicable levee system to restore connections with adjacent floodplains.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In conducting an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall prioritize levees—

(A) associated with an area that has been subject to flooding in two or more events in any 10-year period; and

(B) for which the non-Federal interest has received emergency flood-fighting or repair assistance under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), with respect to such flood events.

(3) COORDINATION.—In conducting an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall coordinate with any non-Federal interest that has financial or operational responsibility for a levee being assessed.

(c) FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.—In conducting an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider information on floods and flood damages compiled under section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a).

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

(2) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall include in each report submitted under paragraph (1)—

(A) identification of any levee for which the Secretary has conducted an assessment under subsection (a);

(B) a description of any opportunities identified under such subsection for the modification (including realignment or incorporation of natural and nature-based features) of a levee system, including the potential benefits of such modification for the purposes identified under such subsection; and

(C) a summary of the information considered and identified under subsection (b)(1).

(e) INCORPORATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall include in the levee database established under section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303) the information included in each report submitted under subsection (d).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 115. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LEVEE INSPECTIONS.

In any instance where the Secretary requires, as a condition of eligibility for Federal assistance under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), that a non-Federal sponsor of a flood control project constructed by the Secretary undertake an electronic inspection of the portion of such project that is under normal circumstances submerged, the Secretary shall provide credit or reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor of the cost of carrying out such inspection against the non-Federal share of the cost of repair or restoration of such project carried out under such section.

SEC. 116. ASSESSMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of dams constructed by the Secretary or for which the Secretary has financial or operational responsibility, to identify—

(1) any dam that is meeting its authorized purposes and that may be a priority for rehabilitation, environmental performance enhancements, or retrofits to add or replace power generation (at a pow-

ered or non-powered dam), and the recommendations of the Secretary for addressing each such dam; and

(2) any dam that does not meet its authorized purposes, has been abandoned or inadequately maintained, or has otherwise reached the end of its useful life, and the recommendations of the Secretary for addressing each such dam, which may include a recommendation to remove the dam.

(b) NATIONAL DAM INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall include in the inventory of dams required by section 6 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467d) any information and recommendations resulting from the assessment of dams conducted under subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the assessment of dams conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 117. NATIONAL LOW-HEAD DAM INVENTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of appropriate Federal and State agencies, shall—

(1) establish and maintain a database containing an inventory of low-head dams in the United States that includes—

(A) the location (including global information system information), ownership, description, current use condition, height, and length of each low-head dam;

(B) any information on public safety conditions, including signage, at each low-head dam;

(C) public safety information on the dangers of low-head dams; and

(D) any other relevant information concerning low-head dams; and

(2) include in the inventory of dams required by section 6 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467d) the information described in paragraph (1).

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall include in the database information described in subsection (a)(1) that is provided to the Secretary by Federal and State agencies pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the database established under subsection (a) publicly available, including on a publicly available website.

(d) LOW-HEAD DAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''low-head dam'' means a man-made structure, built in a river or stream channel, that is designed and built such that water flows continuously over all, or nearly all, of the crest from bank to bank.

SEC. 118. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) technical assistance to an Indian tribe, including—

''(i) assistance for planning to ameliorate flood hazards, to avoid repetitive flooding impacts, to anticipate, prepare, and adapt to changing climatic conditions

and extreme weather events, and to withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruption due to flood hazards; and

''(ii) the provision of, and integration into planning of, hydrologic, economic, and environmental data and analyses; and''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''$18,500,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$23,500,000'';

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(6) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Federal share of the cost of activities described in subsection (b)(2)(C) shall be 100 percent.''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking ''2024'' and inserting ''2026''.

SEC. 119. TRIBAL LIAISON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, for each Corps of Engineers district that contains a Tribal community, the Secretary shall establish a permanent position of Tribal Liaison to—

(1) serve as a direct line of communication between the Secretary and the applicable Tribal communities; and

(2) ensure consistency in government-to-government relations.

(b) DUTIES.—Each Tribal Liaison shall make recommendations to the Secretary regarding, and be responsible for—

(1) removing barriers to access to, and participation in, Corps of Engineers programs for Tribal communities, including by improving implementation of section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m));

(2) improving outreach to, and engagement with, Tribal communities about relevant Corps of Engineers programs and services;

(3) identifying and engaging with Tribal communities suffering from water resources challenges;

(4) improving, expanding, and facilitating government-to-government consultation between Tribal communities and the Corps of Engineers;

(5) coordinating and implementing all relevant Tribal consultation policies and associated guidelines, including the requirements of section 112 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2356);

(6) training and tools to facilitate the ability of Corps of Engineers staff to effectively engage with

Tribal communities in a culturally competent manner, especially in regards to lands of ancestral, historic, or cultural significance to a Tribal community, including burial sites; and

(7) such other issues identified by the Secretary.

(c) UNIFORMITY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize guidelines for—

(1) the duties of Tribal Liaisons under subsection (b); and

(2) required qualifications for Tribal Liaisons, including experience and expertise relating to Tribal communities and water resource issues, and the ability to carry out such duties.

(d) FUNDING.—Funding for the position of Tribal Liaison shall be allocated from the budget line item provided for the expenses necessary for the supervision and general administration of the civil works program, and filling the position shall not be dependent on any increase in this budget line item.

(e) TRIBAL COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Tribal community'' means a community of people who are recognized and defined under Federal law as indigenous people of the United States.

SEC. 120. TRIBAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BONNEVILLE DAM.—The term ''Bonneville Dam'' means the Bonneville Dam, Columbia River, Oregon, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1038), and the first section and section 2(a) of the Act of August 20, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 832, 832(a)).

(2) DALLES DAM.—The term ''Dalles Dam'' means the Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 179).

(3) JOHN DAY DAM.—The term ''John Day Dam'' means the John Day Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 179).

(4) VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—The term ''village development plan'' means the village development plan required by section 1133(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3782).

(b) CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes and Bands

of the Yakama Nation, the Nez Perce Tribe, and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, shall revise and carry out the village development plan for the Dalles Dam to provide replacement villages for each Indian village submerged as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam and the John Day Dam.

(2) EXAMINATION.—Before revising and carrying out the village development plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall conduct an examination and assessment of the extent to which Indian villages, housing sites, and related structures were displaced by the construction of the Bonneville Dam and the John Day Dam.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In revising the village development plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include, at a minimum—

(A) an evaluation of sites on both sides of the Columbia River;

(B) an assessment of suitable private, State, and Federal lands; and

(C) an estimated cost and tentative schedule for the construction of each replacement village.

(c) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE ON FEDERAL LAND.—In carrying out subsection (b)(1), the Secretary may construct housing or provide related assistance on land owned by the United States.

(d) ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (b)(1), the Secretary may acquire land or interests in land for the purpose of providing housing and related assistance.

(2) ADVANCE ACQUISITION.—The Secretary may acquire land or interests in land under paragraph (1) before completing all required documentation and receiving all required clearances for the construction of housing or related improvements on the land.

(3) DISPOSAL OF UNSUITABLE LAND.—In the event the Secretary determines that land or an interest in land acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (2) is unsuitable for the purpose for which it was acquired, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of the land or interest in land by sale and credit the proceeds to the appropriation, fund, or account used to purchase the land or interest in land.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1178(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1675; 132 Stat. 3781) is repealed.

SEC. 121. COST SHARING PROVISIONS FOR THE TERRITORIES AND INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 1156(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) for any organization that—

''(A) is composed primarily of people who are—

''(i) recognized and defined under Federal law as indigenous people of the United States; and

''(ii) from a specific community; and

''(B) assists in the social, cultural, and educational development of such people in that community.''.

SEC. 122. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COVID–19 IMPACTS TO COASTAL AND INLAND NAVIGATION.

It is the sense of Congress that, for fiscal years 2023 and 2024, the Secretary should, to the maximum extent practicable, seek to maintain the eligibility of a donor port, energy transfer port, or medium-sized donor port, as defined in section 2106(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c(a)), that received funding under section 2106 of such Act in fiscal year 2020, but that the Secretary determines would no longer be eligible for such funding as a result of a demonstrable impact on the calculations required by the definitions of a donor port, energy transfer port, or medium-sized donor port contained in such section due to a reduction in domestic cargo shipments related to the COVID–19 pandemic.

SEC. 123. ASSESSMENT OF REGIONAL CONFINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL FACILITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct assessments of the availability of confined aquatic disposal facilities for the disposal of contaminated dredged material.

(b) INFORMATION AND COMMENT.—In conducting an assessment under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) solicit information from stakeholders on potential projects that may require disposal of con-

taminated sediments in a confined aquatic disposal facility;

(2) solicit information from the applicable division of the Corps of Engineers on the need for confined aquatic disposal facilities; and

(3) provide an opportunity for public comment.

(c) NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION REGION ASSESSMENT.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall prioritize conducting an assessment of the availability of confined aquatic disposal facilities in the North Atlantic Division region for the disposal of contaminated dredged material in such region.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of any assessments conducted under this section, including any recommendations of the Secretary for the construction of new confined aquatic disposal facilities or expanded capacity for confined aquatic disposal facilities.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''North Atlantic Division region'' means the area located within

the boundaries of the North Atlantic Division of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 124. STRATEGIC PLAN ON BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a strategic plan that identifies opportunities and challenges relating to furthering the policy of the United States to maximize the beneficial use of suitable dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects, as described in section 125(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2326g).

(b) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategic plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with relevant Federal agencies involved in the beneficial use of dredged material;

(2) solicit and consider input from State and local governments and Indian Tribes, while seeking to ensure a geographic diversity of input from the various Corps of Engineers divisions; and

(3) consider input received from other stakeholders involved in beneficial use of dredged material.

(c) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall include in the strategic plan developed under subsection (a)—

(1) identification of any specific barriers and conflicts that the Secretary determines impede the maximization of beneficial use of dredged material at the Federal, State, and local level, and any recommendations of the Secretary to address such barriers and conflicts; and

(2) identification of specific measures to improve interagency and Federal, State, local, and Tribal communications and coordination to improve implementation of section 125(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2326g).

SEC. 125. FUNDING TO REVIEW MITIGATION BANKING PROPOSALS FROM NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC ENTITIES.

Section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2352) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND REVIEW PROPOSALS**'' after ''**PERMITS**'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) FUNDING TO REVIEW MITIGATION BANK PROPOSALS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms 'mitigation bank' and 'mitigation bank instrument' have the meanings given those terms in section 230.91 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

''(2) PROPOSAL REVIEW.—The Secretary, after public notice, may accept and expend funds contributed by a non-Federal public entity to expedite the review of a proposal for a mitigation bank for which the non-Federal public entity is the sponsor, without regard to whether the entity plans to sell a portion of the credits generated by a mitigation bank instrument of the entity to other public or private entities, if the entity enters into an agreement with the Secretary that requires the entity to use for a public purpose any funds obtained from the sale of such credits.

''(3) EFFECT ON OTHER ENTITIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that expediting the review of a proposal for a

mitigation bank through the use of funds accepted and expended under this subsection does not adversely affect the timeline for review (in the Corps of Engineers district in which the mitigation bank is to be located) of such proposals of other entities that have not contributed funds under this subsection.

''(4) EFFECT ON REVIEW.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under paragraph (1) will not impact impartial decision making with respect to proposals for mitigation banks, either substantively or procedurally.

''(5) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that all final decisions regarding proposals for mitigation banks carried out using funds authorized under this subsection are made available to the public in a common format, including on the internet, and in a manner that distinguishes final decisions under this subsection from other final actions of the Secretary.

''(B) DECISION DOCUMENT.—The Secretary shall—

''(i) use a standard decision document for reviewing all proposals using funds accepted under this subsection; and

''(ii) make the standard decision document, along with all final decisions regarding proposals for mitigation banks, available to the public, including on the internet.''; and

(3) in paragraph (1) of subsection (f), as so redesignated—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) a comprehensive list of the proposals for mitigation banks reviewed and approved using funds accepted under subsection (e) during the previous fiscal year; and''.

SEC. 126. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, other Federal and State agencies, and the applicable non-Federal interest, shall coordinate efforts to re-

move or remediate contaminated sediments associated with the following water resources development projects:

(1) The project for ecosystem restoration, South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, Bubbly Creek, Illinois, authorized by section 401(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2740).

(2) The project for ecosystem restoration and recreation, Willamette River, Oregon, authorized by section 1401(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1714).

(3) The project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Mahoning River, Ohio, being carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

(4) The project for navigation, South Branch of the Chicago River, Cook County, Illinois, in the vicinity of Collateral Channel.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall jointly submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on efforts to remove or reme-

diate contaminated sediments associated with the projects identified in subsection (a), including, if applicable, any specific recommendations for actions or agreements necessary to undertake such work.

SEC. 127. RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

In carrying out military training activities or otherwise fulfilling military training requirements, units or members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces may perform services and furnish supplies in support of a water resources development project or program of the Corps of Engineers without reimbursement.

SEC. 128. PAYMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS FROM APPROPRIATION FOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Section 36 of the Act of August 10, 1956 (33 U.S.C. 583a), is amended—

(1) by striking ''Regular officers of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and reserve officers of the Army who are assigned to the Corps of Engineers,'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The personnel described in subsection (b)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) PERSONNEL DESCRIBED.—The personnel referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

''(1) Regular officers of the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

''(2) The following members of the Army who are assigned to the Corps of Engineers:

''(A) Reserve component officers.

''(B) Warrant officers (whether regular or reserve component).

''(C) Enlisted members (whether regular or reserve component).''.

SEC. 129. CIVIL WORKS RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TESTING, AND EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out basic, applied, and advanced research needs as required to aid in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of water resources development projects and to support the missions and authorities of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to test and apply technology, tools, techniques, and materials developed pursuant to such subsection at authorized water resources development projects, in consultation with the non-Federal interests for such projects.

(c) OTHER TRANSACTIONAL AUTHORITY.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out subsection (a), and pursuant to the authority under section 4022 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary is authorized to enter into a transaction to carry out prototype projects to support basic, applied, and advanced research needs that are directly relevant to the civil works missions and authorities of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days before the Secretary enters into a transaction under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of—

(A) the dollar amount of the transaction; and

(B) the entity carrying out the prototype project that is the subject of the transaction.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the

Senate a report describing the use of the authority under this subsection.

(4) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under this subsection shall terminate 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may coordinate and consult with Federal agencies, State and local agencies, Indian Tribes, universities, consortiums, councils, and other relevant entities that will aid in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of water resources development projects.

(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish a separate appropriations account for administering funds made available to carry out this section.

(f) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FOCUS AREAS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should prioritize using amounts made available to carry out this section for the research, development, testing, and evaluation of technology, tools, techniques, and materials that will—

(1) advance the use of natural features and nature-based features, as defined in section 1184(a) of

the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a));

(2) improve the reliability and accuracy of technologies related to water supply;

(3) improve the management of reservoirs owned and operated by the Corps of Engineers; and

(4) lead to future cost savings and advance project delivery timelines.

SEC. 130. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding section 4141 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary may provide assistance through contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants to—

(1) the University of Missouri to conduct economic analyses and other academic research to improve water management, enhance flood resiliency, and preserve water resources for the State of Missouri, the Lower Missouri River Basin, and Upper Mississippi River Basin; and

(2) Oregon State University to conduct a study on the associated impacts of wildfire on water resource ecology, water supply, quality, and distribution in the Willamette River Basin and to develop a water resource assessment and management platform for the Willamette River Basin.

SEC. 131. WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.

(a) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may carry out capital improvements for the Washington Aqueduct that the Secretary determines necessary for the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the Aqueduct.

(b) BORROWING AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (4) and subsection (c), the Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States such amounts as are sufficient to cover any obligations that will be incurred by the Secretary in carrying out capital improvements for the Washington Aqueduct under subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount borrowed by the Secretary under paragraph (1) may not exceed $40,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(3) AGREEMENT.—Amounts borrowed under paragraph (1) may only be used to carry out capital improvements with respect to which the Secretary has entered into an agreement with each customer.

(4) TERMS OF BORROWING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide amounts borrowed under paragraph (1) under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of

Treasury determines to be necessary and in the public interest.

(B) TERM.—The term of any loan made under paragraph (1) shall be for a period of not less than 20 years.

(C) PREPAYMENT.—There shall be no penalty for the prepayment of any amounts borrowed under paragraph (1).

(c) CONTRACTS WITH CUSTOMERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not borrow any amounts under subsection (b) until such time as the Secretary has entered into a contract with each customer under which the customer commits to pay a pro rata share (based on water purchase) of the principal and interest owed to the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

(2) PREPAYMENT.—Any customer may pay, in advance, the pro rata share of the principal and interest owed by the customer, or any portion thereof, without penalty.

(3) RISK OF DEFAULT.—A customer that enters into a contract under this subsection shall, as a condition of the contract, commit to pay any additional amount necessary to fully offset the risk of default on the contract.

(4) OBLIGATIONS.—Each contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall include such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may require so that the total value to the Government of all contracts entered into under paragraph (1) is estimated to be equal to the obligations of the Secretary for carrying out capital improvements for the Washington Aqueduct.

(5) OTHER CONDITIONS.—Each contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) include other conditions consistent with this section that the Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury determine to be appropriate; and

(B) provide the United States priority in regard to income from fees assessed to operate and maintain the Washington Aqueduct.

(d) CUSTOMER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''customer'' means—

(1) the District of Columbia;

(2) Arlington County, Virginia; and

(3) Fairfax County, Virginia.

TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) NEW PROJECTS.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'' submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress:

(1) DUDLEYVILLE, ARIZONA.—Project for flood risk management, Dudleyville, Arizona.

(2) CONN CREEK DAM, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, Conn Creek Dam, California.

(3) CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, including sea level rise, and shoreline stabilization, City of Huntington Beach, California.

(4) NAPA RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for navigation, Federal Channel of Napa River, California.

(5) PETALUMA RIVER WETLANDS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, City of Petaluma, California.

(6) CITY OF RIALTO, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, City of Rialto and vicinity, California.

(7) NORTH RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, including sea level rise, and ecosystem restoration, North Richmond, California.

(8) UPPER YUBA RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, Upper Yuba River, California.

(9) STRATFORD, CONNECTICUT.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and flood risk management, Stratford, Connecticut.

(10) WOODBRIDGE, CONNECTICUT.—Project for flood risk management, Woodbridge, Connecticut.

(11) FEDERAL TRIANGLE AREA, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Project for flood risk management, Federal Triangle Area, Washington, District of Columbia, including construction of improvements to interior drainage.

(12) POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Project for rec-

reational access, including enclosed swimming areas, Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, District of Columbia.

(13) WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA.—Project for water supply, including the identification of a secondary water source and additional water storage capability for the Washington Metropolitan Area, Washington, District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

(14) DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for periodic beach nourishment for the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Duval County shoreline, Florida, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1092; 90 Stat. 2933), for an additional period of 50 years, Duval County shoreline, Florida.

(15) TOWN OF LONGBOAT KEY, FLORIDA.—Project for whole island hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Town of Longboat Key, Florida.

(16) LAKE RUNNYMEDE, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Lake Runnymede, Florida.

(17) TAMPA BACK BAY, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, including the use of natural

features and nature-based features for protection and recreation, Tampa Back Bay, Florida.

(18) PORT TAMPA BAY AND MCKAY BAY, FLORIDA.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Tampa Bay, Florida, including McKay Bay.

(19) LAKE TOHOPEKALIGA, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Lake Tohopekaliga, Florida.

(20) CITY OF ALBANY, GEORGIA.—Project for flood risk management, City of Albany, Georgia.

(21) CITY OF EAST POINT, GEORGIA.—Project for flood risk management, City of East Point, Georgia.

(22) FLINT RIVER BASIN HEADWATERS, CLAYTON COUNTY, GEORGIA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Flint River Basin Headwaters, Clayton County, Georgia.

(23) TYBEE ISLAND, GEORGIA.—Project for periodic beach nourishment for the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Tybee Island, Georgia, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5), for an additional period of 50 years, Tybee Island, Georgia.

(24) WAIKĪKĪ, HAWAII.—Project for ecosystem restoration and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Waikīkī, Hawaii.

(25) ASSAWOMPSET POND COMPLEX, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for ecosystem restoration, flood risk management, and water supply, Assawompset Pond Complex, Massachusetts.

(26) CHARLES RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Charles River, Massachusetts.

(27) CHELSEA CREEK AND MILL CREEK, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including bank stabilization, City of Chelsea, Massachusetts.

(28) CONNECTICUT RIVER STREAMBANK EROSION, MASSACHUSETTS, VERMONT, AND NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Project for streambank erosion, Connecticut River, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire.

(29) DEERFIELD RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Deerfield River, Massachusetts.

(30) TOWN OF NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for ecosystem restoration and

flood risk management between Whiting's and Falls ponds, North Attleborough, Massachusetts.

(31) TOWN OF HULL, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Hull, Massachusetts.

(32) CITY OF REVERE, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management and marsh ecosystem restoration, City of Revere, Massachusetts.

(33) LOWER EAST SIDE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, Lower East Side Detroit, Michigan.

(34) ELIJAH ROOT DAM, MICHIGAN.—Project for dam removal, by carrying out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), Elijah Root Dam, Michigan.

(35) GROSSE POINTE SHORES AND GROSSE POINTE FARMS, MICHIGAN.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Grosse Pointe Shores and Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan.

(36) SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties, Michigan.

(37) TITTABAWASSEE RIVER WATERSHED, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, eco-

system restoration, and related conservation benefits, Tittabawassee River, Chippewa River, Pine River, and Tobacco River, Midland County, Michigan.

(38) SOUTHWEST MISSISSIPPI, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Wilkinson, Adams, Warren, Claiborne, and Jefferson counties, Mississippi.

(39) CAMDEN AND GLOUCESTER COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.—Project for tidal and riverine flood risk management, Camden and Gloucester counties, New Jersey.

(40) EDGEWATER, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, Edgewater, New Jersey.

(41) MAURICE RIVER, NEW JERSEY.—Project for navigation and for beneficial use of dredged materials for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and ecosystem restoration, Maurice River, New Jersey.

(42) NORTHERN NEW JERSEY INLAND FLOODING, NEW JERSEY.—Project for inland flood risk management in Hudson, Essex, Union, Bergen, Hunterdon, Morris, Somerset, Warren, Passaic, and Sussex counties, New Jersey.

(43) RISER DITCH, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, including channel improvements, and other related water resource needs related to Riser Ditch in the communities of South Hackensack, Hasbrouck Heights, Little Ferry, Teterboro and Moonachie, New Jersey.

(44) ROCKAWAY RIVER, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including bank stabilization, Rockaway River, New Jersey.

(45) TENAKILL BROOK, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, Tenakill Brook, New Jersey.

(46) VERONA, CEDAR GROVE, AND WEST CALDWELL, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management along the Peckman River Basin in the townships of Verona (and surrounding area), Cedar Grove, and West Caldwell, New Jersey.

(47) WHIPPANY RIVER WATERSHED, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, Morris County, New Jersey.

(48) LAKE FARMINGTON DAM, NEW MEXICO.—Project for water supply, Lake Farmington Dam, New Mexico.

(49) MCCLURE DAM, NEW MEXICO.—Project for dam safety improvements and flood risk management, McClure Dam, City of Santa Fe, New Mexico.

(50) BROOKLYN NAVY YARD, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Brooklyn Navy Yard, New York.

(51) UPPER EAST RIVER AND FLUSHING BAY, NEW YORK.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Upper East River and Flushing Bay, New York.

(52) HUTCHINSON RIVER, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Hutchinson River, New York.

(53) MOHAWK RIVER BASIN, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management, navigation, and environmental restoration, Mohawk River Basin, New York.

(54) NEWTOWN CREEK, NEW YORK.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Newtown Creek, New York.

(55) SAW MILL RIVER, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration to address areas in the City of Yonkers and the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson within the 100-year flood zone, Saw Mill River, New York.

(56) MINERAL RIDGE DAM, OHIO.—Project for dam safety improvements and rehabilitation, Mineral Ridge Dam, Ohio.

(57) BRODHEAD CREEK WATERSHED, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Brodhead Creek Watershed, Pennsylvania.

(58) CHARTIERS CREEK WATERSHED, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood risk management, Chartiers Creek Watershed, Pennsylvania.

(59) COPLAY CREEK, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood risk management, Coplay Creek, Pennsylvania.

(60) BERKELEY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Berkeley County, South Carolina.

(61) BIG SIOUX RIVER, SOUTH DAKOTA.—Project for flood risk management, City of Watertown and vicinity, South Dakota.

(62) TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE RIVER BASINS, TENNESSEE.—Project to deter, impede, or restrict the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species in the Tennessee-Tombigbee River Basins, Tennessee.

(63) EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management for economically disadvan-

taged communities, as defined by the Secretary pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note), along the United States-Mexico border, El Paso County, Texas.

(64) GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY-CHANNEL TO PALACIOS, TEXAS.—Project for navigation, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway-Channel to Palacios, Texas.

(65) SIKES LAKE, TEXAS.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Sikes Lake, Texas.

(66) SOUTHWEST BORDER REGION, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management for economically disadvantaged communities, as defined by the Secretary pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note), along the United States-Mexico border in Webb, Zapata, and Starr counties, Texas.

(67) LOWER CLEAR CREEK AND DICKINSON BAYOU, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, Lower Clear Creek and Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

(68) CEDAR ISLAND, VIRGINIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, hurricane and storm damage

risk reduction, and navigation, Cedar Island, Virginia.

(69) BALLINGER CREEK, WASHINGTON.—Project for ecosystem restoration, City of Shoreline, Washington.

(70) CITY OF NORTH BEND, WASHINGTON.—Project for water supply, City of North Bend, Washington.

(71) TANEUM CREEK, WASHINGTON.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Taneum Creek, Washington.

(72) CITY OF HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA.—Project for flood risk management, Huntington, West Virginia.

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the following project modifications:

(1) SHINGLE CREEK AND KISSIMMEE RIVER, FLORIDA.—Modifications to the project for ecosystem restoration and water storage, Shingle Creek and Kissimmee River, Florida, authorized by section 201(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2670), for flood risk management.

(2) JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FLORIDA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Jacksonville Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 7002 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1364), for outer channel improvements.

(3) CEDAR RIVER, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.—Modifications to the project for flood risk management, Cedar River, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, authorized by section 7002(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1366), consistent with the City of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Cedar River Flood Control System Master Plan.

(4) YABUCOA HARBOR, PUERTO RICO.—Modification to the project for navigation, Yabucoa Harbor, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 3 of the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1048), for assumption of operations and maintenance.

(5) SALEM RIVER, SALEM COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Salem River, Salem County, New Jersey, authorized by section 1 of the Act of March 2, 1907 (chapter 2509, 34 Stat. 1080), to increase the authorized depth.

(6) EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 732), for the Boat Launch Connector Channel.

(7) HIRAM M. CHITTENDEN LOCKS, LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WASHINGTON.—Modifications to the Hiram M. Chittenden Locks (also known as Ballard Locks), Lake Washington Ship Canal, Washington, authorized by the Act of June 25, 1910 (chapter 382, 36 Stat. 666), for the construction of fish ladder improvements, including efforts to address elevated temperature and low dissolved oxygen levels in the Canal.

(8) PORT TOWNSEND, WASHINGTON.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Port Townsend, Washington, authorized by section 110 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 169), for the Boat Haven Marina Breakwater.

SEC. 202. EXPEDITED COMPLETION.

(a) FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study for each of the following projects, and if the Secretary determines that the project is justified in a completed report, may proceed

directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project:

(1) Project for navigation, Branford Harbor and Stony Creek Channel, Connecticut.

(2) Project for navigation, Guilford Harbor and Sluice Channel, Connecticut.

(3) Project for ecosystem restoration, Western Everglades, Florida.

(4) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Miami, Dade County, Florida.

(5) Project for ecosystem restoration, recreation, and other purposes, Illinois River, Chicago River, Calumet River, Grand Calumet River, Little Calumet River, and other waterways in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois, authorized by section 201(a)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2670).

(6) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Chicago Shoreline, Illinois, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664; 128 Stat. 1372).

(7) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, South Central Coastal Louisiana, Louisiana.

(8) Modifications to the project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels–Seagirt Loop Deepening, Maryland, including to a depth of 50 feet.

(9) Project for New York and New Jersey Harbor Channel Deepening Improvements, New York and New Jersey.

(10) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, South Shore of Staten Island, New York.

(11) Project for flood risk management, Rio Grande de Loiza, Puerto Rico.

(12) Project for flood risk management, Rio Guanajibo, Puerto Rico.

(13) Project for flood risk management, Rio Nigua, Salinas, Puerto Rico.

(14) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Charleston Peninsula, South Carolina.

(15) Project for navigation, Tacoma Harbor, Washington.

(b) POST-AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORTS.—The Secretary shall expedite completion of a post-authorization change report for the following projects:

(1) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Flor-

ida, authorized by section 1001(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1051).

(2) Project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Howard A. Hanson Dam, Washington, authorized by section 101(b)(15) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 281).

(c) GREAT LAKES COASTAL RESILIENCY STUDY.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the comprehensive assessment of water resources needs for the Great Lakes System under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a), as required by section 1219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811; 134 Stat. 2683).

(d) MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a determination of the feasibility of improvements proposed by a non-Federal interest under section 204(f)(1)(A)(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)(1)(A)(i)), for the following:

(1) Deepening and widening of the navigation project for Coos Bay, Oregon, authorized by the Act of March 3, 1879 (chapter 181, 20 Stat. 370).

(2) Improvements to segment 1B of the navigation project for Houston Ship Channel Expansion

Channel Improvement Project, Harris, Chambers, and Galveston Counties, Texas, authorized by section 401(1)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2734).

SEC. 203. EXPEDITED MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the following feasibility studies, as modified by this section, and if the Secretary determines that a project that is the subject of the feasibility study is justified in the completed report, may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project:

(1) MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CALIFORNIA.—The study for navigation, Mare Island Strait channel, authorized by section 406 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 323), is modified to authorize the Secretary to consider the economic and national security benefits from recent proposals for utilization of the channel for Department of Defense shipbuilding and vessel repair.

(2) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN & VICINITY, LOUISIANA.—The study for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79

Stat. 1077), is modified to authorize the Secretary to investigate increasing the scope of the project to provide protection against a 200-year storm event.

(3) BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY, RHODE ISLAND AND MASSACHUSETTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The study for ecosystem restoration, Blackstone River Valley, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, authorized by section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3788), is modified to authorize the Secretary to conduct a study for water supply, water flow, and wetland restoration and protection within the scope of the study.

(B) INCORPORATION OF EXISTING DATA.—In carrying out the study described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use, to the extent practicable, any existing data for the project prepared under the authority of section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

(4) LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NEW JERSEY.—The study for flood control, Lower Saddle River, New Jersey, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat.

4119), is modified to authorize the Secretary to review the previously authorized study and take into consideration changes in hydraulic and hydrologic circumstances and local economic development since the study was initially authorized.

SEC. 204. CORPS OF ENGINEERS RESERVOIR SEDIMENTATION ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, at Federal expense, shall conduct an assessment of sediment in reservoirs owned and operated by the Secretary.

(b) CONTENTS.—For each reservoir for which the Secretary carries out an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include in the assessment—

(1) an estimation of the volume of sediment in the reservoir;

(2) an evaluation of the effects of such sediment on reservoir storage capacity, including a quantification of lost reservoir storage capacity due to the sediment and an evaluation of how such lost reservoir storage capacity affects the allocated storage space for authorized purposes within the reservoir (including, where applicable, allocations for dead storage, inactive storage, active conservation, joint use, and flood surcharge);

(3) the identification of any additional effects of sediment on the operations of the reservoir or the ability of the reservoir to meet its authorized purposes;

(4) the identification of any potential effects of the sediment over the ten-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act on the areas immediately upstream and downstream of the reservoir;

(5) the identification of any existing sediment monitoring and management plans associated with the reservoir;

(6) for any reservoir that does not have a sediment monitoring and management plan—

(A) an identification of whether a sediment management plan for the reservoir is under development; or

(B) an assessment of whether a sediment management plan for the reservoir would be useful in the long-term operation and maintenance of the reservoir for its authorized purposes; and

(7) any opportunities for beneficial use of the sediment in the vicinity of the reservoir.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report describing the results of the assessment carried out under subsection (a).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 205. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS FROM CHANGING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an assessment of the consequences of amending section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)) to authorize the operation and maintenance of navigation projects for a harbor or inland harbor constructed by the Secretary at 100 percent Federal cost to a depth of 55 feet.

(b) CONTENTS.—In carrying out the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) describe all existing Federal navigation projects that are authorized or constructed to a depth of 55 feet or greater;

(2) describe any Federal navigation project that is likely to seek authorization or modification to a depth of 55 feet or greater during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this section;

(3) estimate—

(A) the potential annual increase in Federal costs that would result from authorizing operation and maintenance of a navigation project to a depth of 55 feet at Federal expense; and

(B) the potential cumulative increase in such Federal costs during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this section; and

(4) assess the potential effect of authorizing operation and maintenance of a navigation project to a depth of 55 feet at Federal expense on other Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities, including the potential impact on activities at donor ports, energy transfer ports, emerging harbor projects, and projects carried out in the Great Lakes Navigation System, as such terms are defined in section 102(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2238 note).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report describing the results of the assessment carried out under subsection (a).

SEC. 206. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON DREDGE CAPACITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report that includes—

(1) a quantification of the expected hopper and pipeline dredging needs of authorized water resources development projects for the 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) the dredging needs to—

(i) construct deepenings or widenings at authorized but not constructed projects

and the associated operations and maintenance needs of such projects; and

(ii) operate and maintain existing Federal navigation channels;

(B) the amount of dredging to be carried out by the Corps of Engineers for other Federal agencies;

(C) the dredging needs associated with authorized hurricane and storm damage risk reduction projects (including periodic renourishment); and

(D) the dredging needs associated with projects for the beneficial use of dredged material authorized by section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note);

(2) an identification of the Federal appropriations for dredging projects and expenditures from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter;

(3) an identification of the dredging capacity of the domestic hopper and pipeline dredge fleet, including publicly owned and privately owned vessels, in each of the 10 years preceding the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) an analysis of the ability of the domestic hopper and pipeline dredge fleet to meet the expected dredging needs identified under paragraph (1), including an analysis of such ability in each of the following regions—

(A) the east coast region;

(B) the west coast region, including the States of Alaska and Hawaii;

(C) the gulf coast region; and

(D) the Great Lakes region;

(5) an identification of the dredging capacity of domestic hopper and pipeline dredge vessels that are under contract for construction and intended to be used at water resources development projects;

(6) an identification of any hopper or pipeline dredge vessel expected to be retired or become unavailable during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this section;

(7) an identification of the potential costs of using either public or private dredging to carry out authorized water resources development projects; and

(8) any recommendations of the Secretary for adding additional domestic hopper and pipeline dredging capacity, including adding public and pri-

vate dredging vessels to the domestic hopper and pipeline dredge fleet to efficiently service water resources development projects.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Corps of Engineers should add additional dredging capacity if the addition of such capacity would—

(1) enable the Corps of Engineers to carry out water resources development projects in an efficient and cost-effective manner; and

(2) be in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 207. MAINTENANCE DREDGING DATA.

Section 1133(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326f(b)(3)) is amended by inserting ", including a separate line item for all Federal costs associated with the disposal of dredged material" before the semicolon.

SEC. 208. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ECONOMIC VALUATION OF PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE, RECREATIONAL AREAS, AND HABITAT ASSOCIATED WITH PROJECT LANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of the existing statutory, regulatory, and policy requirements related to the determination of the economic value of lands that—

(1) may be provided by the non-Federal interest, as necessary, for the construction of a project for flood risk reduction or hurricane and storm risk reduction in accordance with section 103(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(i));

(2) are being maintained for open space, recreational areas, or preservation of fish and wildlife habitat; and

(3) will continue to be so maintained as part of the project.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the results of the review conducted under subsection (a), including—

(1) a summary of the existing statutory, regulatory, and policy requirements described in such subsection;

(2) a description of the requirements and process the Secretary uses to place an economic value on the lands described in such subsection;

(3) an assessment of whether such requirements and process affect the ability of a non-Federal interest to provide such lands for the construction of a project described in such subsection;

(4) an assessment of whether such requirements and process directly or indirectly encourage the selection of developed lands for the construction of a project, or have the potential to affect the total cost of a project; and

(5) the identification of alternative measures for determining the economic value of such lands that could provide incentives for the preservation of open space, recreational areas, and habitat in association with the construction of a project.

SEC. 209. DISPOSITION STUDY ON SALINAS DAM AND RESERVOIR, CALIFORNIA.

In carrying out the disposition study for the project for Salinas Dam (Santa Margarita Lake), California, pursuant to section 202(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2675), the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that the County of San Luis Obispo is provided right of first refusal for any potential conveyance of the project; and

(2) ensure that the study addresses any potential repairs or modifications to the project necessary

to meet Federal dam safety requirements prior to transferring the project.

SEC. 210. EXCESS LANDS REPORT FOR WHITTIER NARROWS DAM, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that identifies any real property associated with the Whittier Narrows Dam element of the Los Angeles County Drainage Area project that the Secretary determines—

(1) is not needed to carry out the authorized purposes of the Whittier Narrows Dam element of such project; and

(2) could be transferred to the City of Pico Rivera, California, for the replacement of recreational facilities located in such city that were adversely impacted by dam safety construction activities associated with the Whittier Narrows Dam element of such project.

(b) LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Los Angeles County Drainage Area project'' means the project for flood control, Los Angeles County Drainage Area,

California, authorized by section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4611; 130 Stat. 1690).

SEC. 211. COLEBROOK RIVER RESERVOIR, CONNECTICUT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that summarizes the benefits, costs, and other effects of terminating the contract described in subsection (b) between the United States and the Metropolitan District, Hartford, Connecticut, relating to reservoir water storage space, including—

(1) a description of entities that currently use (or have expressed an interest in using) the water provided pursuant to the contract;

(2) an accounting of the current annual costs, including annual operations and maintenance costs, owed by the Metropolitan District to use the water provided pursuant to the contract;

(3) an accounting of any unrecovered capital or operation and maintenance costs incurred by the Federal Government in constructing or maintaining the reservoir to accommodate water supply storage as an authorized purpose of the reservoir;

(4) an accounting of any potential transfer or increase in costs to the Federal Government, to the

Metropolitan District, or to any water users that could result from the termination of the contract; and

(5) any additional information that the Secretary determines appropriate for consideration of termination of the contract.

(b) CONTRACT.—The contract referred to in subsection (a) is the contract between the United States and the Metropolitan District, Hartford, Connecticut, for the use of water supply storage space in the Colebrook River Reservoir, entered into on February 11, 1965, and modified on October 28, 1975, and titled Contract DA–19–016–CIVENG–65–203.

SEC. 212. COMPREHENSIVE CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a feasibility study for resiliency and comprehensive improvements or modifications to existing water resources development projects in the central and southern Florida area, for the purposes of flood risk management, water supply, ecosystem restoration (including preventing saltwater intrusion), recreation, and related purposes.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the feasibility study under subsection (a), the Secretary—

(1) is authorized to—

(A) review the report of the Chief of Engineers on central and southern Florida, published as House Document 643, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, and other related reports of the Secretary; and

(B) recommend cost-effective structural and nonstructural projects for implementation that provide a systemwide approach for the purposes described in subsection (a); and

(2) shall ensure the study and any projects recommended under paragraph (2) will not interfere with the efforts undertaken to carry out the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan pursuant to section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680; 132 Stat. 3786).

SEC. 213. REPORT ON SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that provides an update on—

(1) Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan projects, as authorized by or pursuant to section 601

of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680; 121 U.S.C. 1269; 132 U.S.C. 3786);

(2) the review of the Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule pursuant to section 1106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3773) and section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 U.S.C. 2682); and

(3) any additional water resources development projects and studies included in the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Plan Integrated Delivery Schedule prepared in accordance with part 385 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a) the status of each authorized water resources development project or study described in such subsection, including—

(1) an estimated implementation or completion date of the project or study; and

(2) the estimated costs to complete implementation or construction, as applicable, of the project or study.

SEC. 214. REVIEW OF RECREATIONAL HAZARDS AT BUFORD DAM, LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GEORGIA.

The Secretary shall—

(1) carry out a review of potential threats to human life and safety from use of designated recreational areas at the Buford Dam, Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia, authorized by section 1 of the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 635); and

(2) install such technologies and other measures, including sirens, strobe lights, and signage, that the Secretary, based on the review carried out under paragraph (1), determines necessary for alerting the public of hazardous water conditions or to otherwise minimize or eliminate any identified threats to human life and safety.

SEC. 215. PORT FOURCHON BELLE PASS CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.

With respect to the project for navigation, Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, authorized by section 403(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2743), the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) undertake a feasibility study to modify the project to include the dredged material disposal plan recommended in the document published by the Secretary in April 2020, titled ''Review Assessment of Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel Deepening

Project Section 203 Feasibility Study (January 2019, revised January 2020)''; or

(2) review under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231) any further feasibility study undertaken by the non-Federal interest to modify the project to include a dredged material disposal plan.

SEC. 216. HYDRAULIC EVALUATION OF UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS RIVER.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall, at Federal expense, periodically carry out a study to—

(1) evaluate the flow frequency probabilities of the Upper Mississippi River and the Illinois River; and

(2) develop updated water surface profiles for such rivers.

(b) AREA OF EVALUATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall conduct analysis along the mainstem of the Mississippi River from upstream of the Minnesota River confluence near Anoka, Minnesota, to just upstream of the Ohio River confluence near Cairo, Illinois, and along the Illinois River from Dresden Island

Lock and Dam to the confluence with the Mississippi River, near Grafton, Illinois.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 20 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the results of a study carried out under subsection (a).

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Any information developed under subsection (a) shall be made publicly available, including on a publicly available website.

SEC. 217. REND LAKE, CARLYLE LAKE, AND LAKE SHELBYVILLE, ILLINOIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that summarizes the benefits, costs, and other effects of terminating the contracts described in subsection (b) between the United States and the State of Illinois, relating to reservoir water storage space, including—

(1) a description of entities that currently use (or have expressed an interest in using) the water provided pursuant to the contracts;

(2) an accounting of the current annual costs, including annual operations and maintenance costs, owed by the State of Illinois to use the water provided pursuant to the contracts;

(3) an accounting of any unrecovered capital or operation and maintenance costs incurred by the Federal Government in constructing or maintaining the reservoirs to accommodate water supply storage as an authorized purpose of the reservoirs;

(4) an accounting of any potential transfer or increase in costs to the Federal Government, to the State of Illinois, or to any water users that could result from the termination of the contracts; and

(5) any additional information that the Secretary determines appropriate for consideration of termination of the contracts.

(b) CONTRACTS.—The contracts referred to in subsection (a) are the following contracts between the United States and the State of Illinois:

(1) Contract DACW43–88–C–0088, entered into on September 23, 1988, for utilization of storage space for water supply in Rend Lake, Illinois.

(2) Contract DA–23–065–CIVENG–65–493, entered into on April 28, 1965, for utilization of

storage space for water supply in Rend Lake, Illinois.

(3) Contract DACW43–83–C–0008, entered into on July 6, 1983, for utilization of storage space in Carlyle Lake, Illinois.

(4) Contract DACW43–83–C–0009, entered into on July 6, 1983, for utilization of storage space in Lake Shelbyville, Illinois.

SEC. 218. DISPOSITION STUDY ON HYDROPOWER IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY, OREGON.

(a) DISPOSITION STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study to determine the Federal interest in, and identify the effects of, deauthorizing hydropower as an authorized purpose, in whole or in part, of the Willamette Valley hydropower project.

(2) CONTENTS.—In carrying out the disposition study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall review the effects of deauthorizing hydropower on—

(A) Willamette Valley hydropower project operations;

(B) other authorized purposes of such project;

(C) cost apportionments;

(D) dam safety;

(E) compliance with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(F) the operations of the remaining dams within the Willamette Valley hydropower project.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the Secretary, through the disposition study authorized by paragraph (1), determines that hydropower should be removed as an authorized purpose of any part of the Willamette Valley hydropower project, the Secretary shall also investigate and recommend any necessary structural or operational changes at such project that are necessary to achieve an appropriate balance among the remaining authorized purposes of such project or changes to such purposes.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Willamette Valley hydropower project'' means the system of dams and reservoir projects authorized to generate hydropower and the power features that operate in conjunction with the main regulating dam facilities, including the Big Cliff, Dexter, and Foster re-regulating dams in the Willamette River Basin, Oregon, as authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1222;

62 Stat. 1178; 64 Stat. 177; 68 Stat. 1264; 74 Stat. 499; 100 Stat. 4144).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate that describes—

(1) the results of the disposition study on deauthorizing hydropower as a purpose of the Willamette Valley hydropower project; and

(2) any recommendations required under subsection (a)(3).

SEC. 219. HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL EXPANSION CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study for modifications of the project for navigation, Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, Harris, Chambers, and Galveston counties, Texas, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2734), to incorporate into the project the construction of barge lanes immediately adjacent to either side of the Houston Ship Channel from Bolivar Roads to Morgan's Point to a depth of 12 feet.

SEC. 220. SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for navigation, Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

SEC. 221. NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study for the modification of the project for navigation, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Virginia, authorized by section 201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4090; 132 Stat. 3840) to incorporate Anchorage F into the project.

SEC. 222. COASTAL VIRGINIA, VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and navigation, Coastal Virginia, authorized by section 1201(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3802), the Secretary is authorized to enter into a written agreement with any Federal agency that owns or operates property in the area of the project to accept and expend funds from such Federal agency to include in the study an analysis with respect to property owned or operated by such Federal agency.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall use any relevant information obtained from a Federal agency described in subsection (a) to carry out the feasibility study described in such subsection.

SEC. 223. WESTERN INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study to evaluate the effectiveness of carrying out additional measures, including measures that use natural features or nature-based features, at or upstream of covered reservoirs, for the purposes of—

(1) sustaining operations in response to changing hydrological and climatic conditions;

(2) mitigating the risk of drought or floods, including the loss of storage capacity due to sediment accumulation;

(3) increasing water supply; or

(4) aquatic ecosystem restoration.

(b) STUDY FOCUS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include all covered reservoirs located in the South Pacific Division of the Corps of Engineers.

(c) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with applicable—

(A) Federal, State, and local agencies;

(B) Indian Tribes;

(C) non-Federal interests; and

(D) stakeholders, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) USE OF EXISTING DATA AND PRIOR STUDIES.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate—

(A) use existing data provided to the Secretary by entities described in paragraph (1); and

(B) incorporate—

(i) relevant information from prior studies and projects carried out by the Secretary; and

(ii) the relevant technical data and scientific approaches with respect to changing hydrological and climatic conditions.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Envi-

ronment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the results of the study; and

(2) any recommendations for additional study in specific geographic areas.

(e) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section provides authority to the Secretary to change the authorized purposes of any covered reservoir.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED RESERVOIR.—The term ''covered reservoir'' means a reservoir owned and operated by the Secretary or for which the Secretary has flood control responsibilities under section 7 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 709).

(2) NATURAL FEATURE AND NATURE-BASED FEATURE.—The terms ''natural feature'' and ''nature-based feature'' have the meanings given such terms in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)).

SEC. 224. REPORT ON SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on

Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report that describes and documents the use of contracts and subcontracts with Small Disadvantaged Businesses in carrying out the water resources development authorities of the Secretary.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall include in the report under subsection (a) information on the distribution of funds to Small Disadvantaged Businesses on a disaggregated basis.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Small Disadvantaged Business'' has the meaning given that term in section 124.1001 of title 13, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

SEC. 225. REPORT ON SOLAR ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, at Federal expense, shall conduct an assessment, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, of opportunities to install and maintain photovoltaic solar panels (including floating solar panels) at covered projects.

(2) CONTENTS.—The assessment conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) include a description of the economic, environmental, and technical viability of install-

ing and maintaining, or contracting with third parties to install and maintain, photovoltaic solar panels at covered projects;

(B) identify covered projects with a high potential for the installation and maintenance of photovoltaic solar panels and whether such installation and maintenance would require additional authorization;

(C) account for potential impacts of photovoltaic solar panels at covered projects and the authorized purposes of such projects, including potential impacts on flood risk reduction, recreation, water supply, and fish and wildlife; and

(D) account for the availability of electric grid infrastructure close to covered projects, including underutilized transmission infrastructure.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report containing the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $10,000,000 to carry out this section.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered project'' means—

(1) any property under the control of the Corps of Engineers; and

(2) any water resources development project constructed by the Secretary or over which the Secretary has financial or operational responsibility.

SEC. 226. ASSESSMENT OF COASTAL FLOODING MITIGATION MODELING AND TESTING CAPACITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Engineer Research and Development Center, shall carry out an assessment of the current capacity of the Corps of Engineers to model coastal flood mitigation systems and test the effectiveness of such systems in preventing flood damage resulting from coastal storm surges.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) identify the capacity of the Corps of Engineers to—

(A) carry out the testing of the performance and reliability of coastal flood mitigation systems; or

(B) collaborate with private industries to carry out such testing;

(2) identify any limitations or deficiencies at Corps of Engineers facilities that are capable of testing the performance and reliability of coastal flood mitigation systems;

(3) assess any benefits that would result from addressing the limitations or deficiencies identified under paragraph (2); and

(4) provide recommendations for addressing such limitations or deficiencies.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report describing the results of the assessment carried out under subsection (a).

SEC. 227. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON EASEMENTS RELATED TO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of the existing statutory, regulatory, and policy requirements and procedures related to the use, in relation to the construction of a project for flood risk management, hurricane and storm risk reduction, or environmental restoration, of covered easements that may be provided to the Secretary by non-Federal interests.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the results of the review conducted under subsection (a), including—

(1) the findings of the Secretary relating to—

(A) the minimum rights in property that are necessary to construct, operate, or maintain projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm risk reduction, or environmental restoration;

(B) whether increased use of covered easements in relation to such projects could promote greater participation from cooperating

landowners in addressing local flooding or environmental restoration challenges;

(C) whether such increased use could result in cost savings in the implementation of the projects, without any reduction in project benefits; and

(D) whether such increased use is in the best interest of the United States; and

(2) any recommendations of the Secretary relating to whether existing requirements or procedures related to such use of covered easements should be revised to reflect the results of the review.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered easement'' means an easement or other similar interest in real property that—

(1) reserves for the Secretary rights in the property that are necessary to construct, operate, or maintain a water resources development project;

(2) provides for appropriate public use of the property, and retains the right of continued use of the property by the owner of the property, to the extent such uses are consistent with purposes of the covered easement;

(3) provides access to the property for oversight and inspection by the Secretary;

(4) is permanently recorded; and

(5) is enforceable under Federal and State law.

SEC. 228. ASSESSMENT OF FOREST, RANGELAND, AND WATERSHED RESTORATION SERVICES ON LANDS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an assessment of forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services on lands owned by the Corps of Engineers, including an assessment of whether the provision of such services on such lands by non-Federal interests through good neighbor agreements would be in the best interests of the United States.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) describe the forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services provided by the Secretary on lands owned by the Corps of Engineers;

(2) assess whether such services, including efforts to reduce hazardous fuels and to restore and improve forest, rangeland, and watershed health (including the health of fish and wildlife habitats) would be enhanced by authorizing the Secretary to enter into a good neighbor agreement with a non-Federal interest;

(3) describe the process for ensuring that Federal requirements for land management plans for forests on lands owned by the Corps of Engineers remain in effect under good neighbor agreements;

(4) assess whether Congress should authorize the Secretary to enter into a good neighbor agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services on lands owned by the Corps of Engineers, including by assessing any interest expressed by a non-Federal interest to enter into such an agreement;

(5) consider whether implementation of a good neighbor agreement on lands owned by the Corps of Engineers would benefit State and local governments and Indian Tribes that are located in the same geographic area as such lands; and

(6) consult with the heads of other Federal agencies authorized to enter into good neighbor agreements with non-Federal interests.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a

publicly available website), a report describing the results of the assessment carried out under subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREST, RANGELAND, AND WATERSHED RESTORATION SERVICES.—The term ''forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services'' has the meaning given such term in section 8206 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a).

(2) GOOD NEIGHBOR AGREEMENT.—The term ''good neighbor agreement'' means a cooperative agreement or contract (including a sole source contract) entered into between the Secretary and a non-Federal interest to carry out forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services.

(3) LANDS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.—The term ''lands owned by the Corps of Engineers'' means any land owned by the Corps of Engineers, but does not include—

(A) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(B) land on which the removal of vegetation is prohibited or restricted by law or Presidential proclamation;

(C) a wilderness study area; or

(D) any other land with respect to which the Secretary determines that forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services should remain the responsibility of the Secretary.

SEC. 229. REPORT ON STATUS OF DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of the implementation of section 2040 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345).

SEC. 230. GAO STUDIES ON MITIGATION.

(a) STUDY ON MITIGATION FOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, a report on the results of a study on projects and activities to mitigate fish and wildlife losses resulting from the construction, or operation

and maintenance, of an authorized water resources development project.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) investigate the extent to which—

(i) mitigation projects and activities (including the acquisition of lands or interests in lands) restore the natural hydrologic conditions, restore native vegetation, and otherwise support native fish and wildlife species, as required under section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283);

(ii) mitigation projects or activities (including the acquisition of lands or interests in lands) are undertaken before, or concurrent with, the construction of the project;

(iii) mitigation projects or activities (including the acquisition of lands or interests in lands) are completed;

(iv) ongoing mitigation projects or activities are undertaken to mitigate for fish and wildlife losses from the operation and

maintenance of a project (including periodic review and updating of such projects or activities);

(v) the Secretary includes mitigation plans (as required under subsection (d) of such section 906) in any project study, as such term is defined in section 2034(l) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343);

(vi) processing and approval of mitigation projects and activities (including the acquisition of lands or interests in lands) affects the timeline of completion of projects; and

(vii) mitigation projects and activities (including the acquisition of lands or interests in lands) affect the total cost of projects;

(B) review any reports submitted to Congress in accordance with section 2036(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1094) on the status of construction of projects that require mitigation; and

(C) consult with independent scientists, economists, and other stakeholders with expertise and experience.

(b) STUDY ON THE COMPENSATORY MITIGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, a report on the results of a study on performance metrics for, compliance with, and adequacy in addressing project impacts of, potential mechanisms for fulfilling compensatory mitigation obligations pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the study under paragraph (1) an analysis of—

(A) the primary mechanisms for fulfilling compensatory mitigation obligations, including—

(i) mitigation banks;

(ii) in-lieu fee programs; and

(iii) direct mitigation by permittees;

(B) the timeliness of initiation and successful completion of compensatory mitigation activities in relation to when the permitted activity occurs;

(C) the timeliness of processing and approval of compensatory mitigation activities;

(D) the costs of carrying out compensatory mitigation activities borne by the Federal government, permittee, or any other involved entity;

(E) Federal and State agency oversight and short and long-term monitoring of the compensatory mitigation activities;

(F) whether the compensatory mitigation activity successfully replaces any lost or adversely affected habitat with habitat having similar functions of equal or greater ecological value; and

(G) the continued, long-term success of the compensatory mitigation activities over a 5-, 10-, 20-, and 50-year period.

(3) UPDATE.—In conjunction with the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall review and update the findings and recommendations, including a review of Federal agency compli-

ance with such recommendations, in the report of the Comptroller General entitled, ''Corps of Engineers Does Not Have an Effective Oversight Approach to Ensure That Compensatory Mitigation Is Occurring'' and dated September 2005 (GAO–05–898).

SEC. 231. STUDY ON WATERBORNE STATISTICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a review of the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center of the Corps of Engineers that includes—

(1) an assessment of ways in which the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center can improve the collection of information relating to all commercial maritime activity within the jurisdiction of a port, including the collection and reporting of records of fish landings; and

(2) recommendations to improve the collection of such information from non-Federal entities, taking into consideration—

(A) the cost, efficiency, and accuracy of collecting such information; and

(B) the protection of proprietary information.

(b) REPORT.—Upon completion of the review carried out under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the results of such review.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

(a) PURPOSES; PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST; SUBMISSION OF FINAL LIST.—Section 301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 579–2) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

''(1) to identify water resources development projects, and separable elements of projects, authorized by Congress that are no longer viable for construction due to—

''(A) a lack of local support;

''(B) a lack of available Federal or non-Federal resources; or

''(C) an authorizing purpose that is no longer relevant or feasible;

''(2) to create an expedited and definitive process for Congress to deauthorize water resources development projects and separable elements that are no longer viable for construction; and

''(3) to allow the continued authorization of water resources development projects and separable elements that are viable for construction.

''(b) PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

''(1) PRELIMINARY LIST OF PROJECTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a preliminary list of each water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction before November 8, 2007, for which—

''(i) planning, design, or construction was not initiated before the date of enactment of this Act; or

''(ii) planning, design, or construction was initiated before the date of enactment of this Act, but for which no funds, Federal or non-Federal, were obligated for planning, design, or construction of the project or separable element of the project during the current fiscal year or any of the 10 preceding fiscal years.

''(B) USE OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE REPORT.—The Secretary may develop the preliminary list from the comprehensive construction backlog and operation and maintenance reports developed pursuant to section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a).

''(2) PREPARATION OF PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

''(A) PROPOSED LIST AND ESTIMATED DEAUTHORIZATION AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall—

''(i) prepare a proposed list of projects for deauthorization comprised of a subset of projects and separable elements identified on the preliminary list developed under paragraph (1) that are projects or separable elements described in subsection (a)(1), as determined by the Secretary; and

''(ii) include with such proposed list an estimate, in the aggregate, of the Federal cost to complete such projects.

''(B) DETERMINATION OF FEDERAL COST TO COMPLETE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the Federal cost to complete shall take into account any allowances authorized by section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280), as applied to the most recent project schedule and cost estimate.

''(3) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall solicit comments from the public and the Governors of each applicable State on the proposed deauthorization list prepared under paragraph (2)(A).

''(B) COMMENT PERIOD.—The public comment period shall be 90 days.

''(4) PREPARATION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a final deauthorization list by—

''(i) considering any comments received under paragraph (3); and

''(ii) revising the proposed deauthorization list prepared under paragraph (2)(A) as the Secretary determines necessary to respond to such comments.

''(B) APPENDIX.—The Secretary shall include as part of the final deauthorization list an appendix that—

''(i) identifies each project or separable element on the proposed deauthorization list that is not included on the final deauthorization list; and

''(ii) describes the reasons why the project or separable element is not included on the final deauthorization list.

''(c) SUBMISSION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST TO CONGRESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW; PUBLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the close of the comment period under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall—

''(A) submit the final deauthorization list and appendix prepared under subsection (b)(4) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

''(B) publish the final deauthorization list and appendix in the Federal Register.

''(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The Secretary shall not include in the final deauthorization list submitted under paragraph (1) any project or separable element with respect to which Federal funds for planning, design, or construction are obligated after the development of the preliminary list under subsection (b)(1)(A) but prior to the submission of the final deauthorization list under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.''.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 301(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 579–2(b)) is repealed.

SEC. 302. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) sea level rise;

''(8) coastal storm damage reduction; and

''(9) streambank and shoreline protection.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) New York-New Jersey Watershed Basin, which encompasses all the watersheds that flow into the New York-New Jersey Harbor and their associated estuaries, including the Hudson, Mohawk, Raritan, Passaic, Hackensack, and Bronx River Watersheds and the Hudson River Estuary;

''(12) Mississippi River Watershed; and

''(13) Chattahoochee River Basin, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.''.

SEC. 303. FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.

(a) ADDITIONAL UTILIZATION OF FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.—Section 1222(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811; 134 Stat. 2661) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the Upper Missouri River Basin and the North Platte River Basin'' and inserting ''the Upper Missouri River Basin, the North Platte River Basin, and the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the Upper Missouri River Basin or the North Platte River Basin'' and inserting ''the Upper Missouri River Basin, the North Platte River Basin, or the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the Upper Missouri River Basin or the North Platte River Basin'' and inserting ''the Upper Missouri River Basin, the North Platte River Basin, or the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin''.

(b) COMPLETION OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports authorized by section 1222 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811; 134 Stat. 2661).

SEC. 304. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148; 104 Stat. 4646; 110 Stat. 3758; 113 Stat. 295; 121 Stat. 1076; 134 Stat. 2703) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (29), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (30), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(31) Salisbury Pond, Worcester, Massachusetts;

''(32) Baisley Pond, New York;

''(33) Legacy Park, Decatur, Georgia; and

''(34) White Rock Lake, Dallas, Texas.''.

SEC. 305. INVASIVE SPECIES.

(a) AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES RESEARCH.—Section 1108(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2263a(a)) is amended by inserting '', hydrilla'' after ''elodea''.

(b) HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 128(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) FOCUS AREAS.—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall undertake program activities related to harmful algal blooms in—

''(1) the Great Lakes;

''(2) the tidal and inland waters of the State of New Jersey, including Lake Hopatcong, New Jersey;

''(3) the coastal and tidal waters of the State of Louisiana;

''(4) the waterways of the counties that comprise the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California;

''(5) the Allegheny Reservoir Watershed, New York;

''(6) Lake Okeechobee, Florida;

''(7) Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia;

''(8) Rio Grande River Basin, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas;

''(9) Detroit Lake, Oregon; and

''(10) Ten Mile Lake, Oregon.''.

(c) UPDATE ON INVASIVE SPECIES POLICY GUIDANCE.—Section 501(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California.''.

SEC. 306. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) NEW YORK HARBOR, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—The New York Harbor collection and removal of

drift project authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1051; 88 Stat. 39; 104 Stat. 4615), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(b) GUANAJIBO RIVER, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Guanajibo River, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 278), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(c) RIO NIGUA, SALINAS, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Rio Nigua, Salinas, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 278), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(d) RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Rio Grande De Loiza, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Re-

form and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 307. LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Los Angeles County, California.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Los Angeles County, California, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(c) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section to a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) with the non-Federal interest

with respect to the project to be carried out with such assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest in-

curred in providing the non-Federal share of the project cost.

(C) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—Notwithstanding section 221(a)(4)(G) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(G)), the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project cost (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but the credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(D) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 to carry out this section.

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available

to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

SEC. 308. DEAUTHORIZATION OF DESIGNATED PORTIONS OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for flood risk management, Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1589; 50 Stat. 167; 52 Stat. 1215; 55 Stat. 647; 64 Stat. 177), consisting of the debris basins described in subsection (b), is no longer authorized beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DEBRIS BASINS DESCRIBED.—The debris basins referred to in subsection (a) are the following debris basins operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District: Auburn Debris Basin, Bailey Debris Basin, Big Dalton Debris Basin, Blanchard Canyon Debris Basin, Blue Gum Canyon Debris Basin, Brand Canyon Debris Basin, Carter Debris Basin, Childs Canyon Debris Basin, Dunsmuir Canyon Debris Basin, Eagle Canyon Debris Basin, Eaton Walsh Debris Basin, Elmwood Canyon Debris Basin, Emerald East Debris Basin, Emerald West Debris Retention Inlet, Hay Debris Basin,

Hillcrest Debris Basin, La Tuna Canyon Debris Basin, Little Dalton Debris Basin, Live Oak Debris Retention Inlet, Lopez Debris Retention Inlet, Lower Sunset Canyon Debris Basin, Marshall Canyon Debris Retention Inlet, Santa Anita Debris Basin, Sawpit Debris Basin, Schoolhouse Canyon Debris Basin, Shields Canyon Debris Basin, Sierra Madre Villa Debris Basin, Snover Canyon Debris Basin, Stough Canyon Debris Basin, Wilson Canyon Debris Basin, and Winery Canyon Debris Basin.

SEC. 309. SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2675) is amended by striking ''ocean shoreline'' and inserting ''bay and ocean shorelines''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out a study under section 142 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2930; 100 Stat. 4158), pursuant to section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (as amended by this section), the Secretary shall not differentiate between damages related to high tide flooding and coastal storm flooding for the purposes of determining the Federal interest or cost share.

SEC. 310. COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN.

(a) STUDY OF FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Using funds made available to carry out this section, the Secretary is authorized, at Federal expense, to carry out a study to determine the feasibility of a project for flood risk management and related purposes in the Columbia River basin and to report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate with recommendations thereon, including recommendations for a project to potentially reduce the reliance on Canada for flood risk management in the basin.

(2) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the activities described in this subsection in coordination with other Federal and State agencies and Indian Tribes.

(b) FUNDS FOR COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to expend funds appropriated for the purpose of satisfying United States obligations under the Columbia River Treaty to compensate Canada for operating Canadian storage on behalf of the United States under such Treaty.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—If the U.S. entity calls upon Canada to operate Canadian reservoir storage for flood risk management on behalf of the United States, which operation may incur an obligation to compensate Canada under the Columbia River Treaty—

(A) the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate, by not later than 30 days after the initiation of the call, a written notice of the action and a justification, including a description of the circumstances necessitating the call;

(B) upon a determination by the United States of the amount of compensation that shall be paid to Canada, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate a written notice specifying such amount and an explanation of how such amount was derived, which notification shall

not delay or impede the flood risk management mission of the U.S. entity; and

(C) the Secretary shall make no payment to Canada for the call under the Columbia River Treaty until such time as funds appropriated for the purpose of compensating Canada under such Treaty are available.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN.—The term ''Columbia River basin'' means the entire United States portion of the Columbia River watershed.

(B) COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY.—The term ''Columbia River Treaty'' means the Treaty relating to cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin, signed at Washington January 17, 1961, and entered into force September 16, 1964.

(C) U.S. ENTITY.—The term ''U.S. entity'' means the entity designated by the United States under Article XIV of the Columbia River Treaty.

SEC. 311. PORT EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.

Section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1709) is amended, in row 4 (relat-

ing to the project for navigation, Port Everglades, Florida)—

(1) by striking ''$229,770,000'' and inserting ''$561,455,000'';

(2) by striking ''$107,233,000'' and inserting ''$361,302,000''; and

(3) by striking ''$337,003,000'' and inserting ''$922,757,000''.

SEC. 312. SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION TASK FORCE.

Section 528(f)(1)(J) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3771) is amended by striking ''2 representatives of the State of Florida,'' and inserting ''3 representatives of the State of Florida, including at least 1 representative of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and 1 representative of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission,''.

SEC. 313. CHICAGO SHORELINE PROTECTION.

The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Lake Michigan, Illinois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois–Indiana State line, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide 65 percent of the cost of the locally preferred plan, as described in the Report

of the Chief of Engineers dated April 14, 1994, for the construction of the following segments of the project:

(1) Shoreline revetment at Morgan Shoal.

(2) Shoreline revetment at Promontory Point.

SEC. 314. GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Section 402(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2742) is amended by striking ''80 percent'' and inserting ''90 percent''.

SEC. 315. SOUTHEAST DES MOINES LEVEE SYSTEM, IOWA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Des Moines, Iowa.

(2) FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT.—The term ''Flood Protection Project'' means the project on the Des Moines River for local flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 896).

(3) RED ROCK DAM PROJECT.—The term ''Red Rock Dam Project'' means the project for the Red Rock Dam on the Des Moines River for flood control and other purposes, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 896).

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—The Red Rock Dam Project and the Flood Protection Project shall be modified as follows, subject to a new or amended agreement between the Secretary and the City, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b):

(1) That portion of the Red Rock Dam Project consisting of the segment of levee from Station 15+88.8W to Station 77+43.7W shall be transferred to the Flood Protection Project.

(2) The relocated levee improvement constructed by the City, from Station 77+43.7W to approximately Station 20+00, shall be included in the Flood Protection Project.

(c) FEDERAL EASEMENT CONVEYANCES.—

(1) FLOOD PROTECTION EASEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to convey, without consideration, to the City the following easements to become part of the Flood Protection Project in accordance with subsection (b):

(A) Easements identified as Tracts 3215E–1, 3235E, and 3227E.

(B) Easements identified as Partial Tracts 3216E–2, 3216E–3, 3217E–1, and 3217E–2.

(2) ADDITIONAL EASEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to convey, without consideration, to the City or to the Des Moines Metropolitan Wastewater Reclamation Authority the following easements:

(A) Easements identified as Tracts 3200E, 3202E–1, 3202E–2, 3202E–4, 3203E–2, 3215E–3, 3216E–1, and 3216E–5.

(B) Easements identified as Partial Tracts 3216E–2, 3216E–3, 3217E–1, and 3217E–2.

(3) COSTS.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this subsection shall be responsible for all administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

SEC. 316. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT STUDY.

Section 213 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2684) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) COST-SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the comprehensive study carried out under subsection (a), and any feasibility study carried out under subsection (e), shall be 100 percent.''.

SEC. 317. LOWER MISSOURI RIVER STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out streambank erosion control evaluation and demonstration projects in the Lower Missouri River through contracts with non-Federal interests, including projects for streambank protection and stabilization.

(b) AREA.—The Secretary shall carry out demonstration projects under this section on the reach of the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the confluence of the Missouri River and the Mississippi River.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of the extent of streambank erosion on the Lower Missouri River; and

(2) develop new methods and techniques for streambank protection, research soil stability, and identify the causes of erosion.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment of the Senate a report describing the results of the demonstration projects carried out under this section,

including any recommendations for methods to prevent and correct streambank erosion.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(f) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into contracts under subsection (a) shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 318. MISSOURI RIVER INTERCEPTION-REARING COMPLEXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 129 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2643), and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to carry out the construction of an interception-rearing complex at each of Plowboy Bend A (River Mile: 174.5 to 173.2) and Pelican Bend B (River Mile: 15.8 to 13.4) on the Missouri River.

(b) ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION OF RISK.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Prior to construction of the interception-rearing complexes under subsection (a), the Secretary shall perform an analysis to identify whether the interception-rearing complexes will—

(A) contribute to an increased risk of flooding to adjacent lands and properties, including local levees;

(B) affect the navigation channel, including crossflows, velocity, channel depth, and channel width;

(C) affect the harvesting of sand;

(D) affect ports and harbors; or

(E) contribute to bank erosion on adjacent private lands.

(2) MITIGATION.—The Secretary may not construct an interception-rearing complex under subsection (a) until the Secretary successfully mitigates any effects described in paragraph (1) with respect to such interception-rearing complex.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after completion of the construction of the interception-rearing complexes under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the extent to which the construction of such interception-rearing complexes affected the population recovery of pallid sturgeon in the Missouri River.

SEC. 319. MISSOURI RIVER MITIGATION PROJECT, MISSOURI, KANSAS, IOWA, AND NEBRASKA.

Section 334 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 306) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) USE OF OTHER FUNDS.—Any acres acquired using Federal funds for purposes described in subsection (a) shall be considered toward the total number of acres required under such subsection, regardless of the source of the Federal funds.''.

SEC. 320. NORTHERN MISSOURI.

(a) NORTHERN MISSOURI DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Northern Missouri'' means the counties of Buchanan, Marion, Platte, and Clay, Missouri.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Northern Missouri.

(c) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Northern Missouri, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(d) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section to a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) with the non-Federal interest with respect to the project to be carried out with such assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the Federal share of a project that is the subject of a partnership agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of the project cost.

(C) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—Notwithstanding section 221(a)(4)(G) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(G)), the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, and rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project cost (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but such

credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(D) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 to carry out this section.

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

SEC. 321. ISRAEL RIVER, LANCASTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The project for flood control, Israel River, Lancaster, New Hampshire, carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 322. MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NEW MEXICO.

The non-Federal share of the cost of the project for flood risk management, Middle Rio Grande, Bernalillo to Belen, New Mexico, authorized by section 401(2) of the

Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2735), shall be 25 percent.

SEC. 323. SOUTHWESTERN OREGON.

(a) SOUTHWESTERN OREGON DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Southwestern Oregon'' means the counties of Benton, Coos, Curry, Douglas, Lane, Linn, and Josephine, Oregon.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Southwestern Oregon.

(c) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Southwestern Oregon, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

(d) OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section to a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall enter into a partnership agreement

under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) with the non-Federal interest with respect to the project to be carried out with such assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each partnership agreement for a project entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section—

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

(ii) may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the Federal share of a

project that is the subject of a partnership agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of the project cost.

(C) CREDIT FOR LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—Notwithstanding section 221(a)(4)(G) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(G)), the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project cost (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but such credit may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(D) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 to carry out this section.

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSE.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

SEC. 324. WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TENNESSEE.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Wolf River Harbor, Tennessee, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1034), is modified to reduce, in part, the authorized dimensions of the project, such that the remaining authorized dimensions are as follows:

(1) A 250-foot-wide, 9-foot-depth channel with a center line beginning at an approximate point of 35.139634, -90.062343 and extending approximately 1,300 feet to an approximate point of 35.142077, -90.059107.

(2) A 200-foot-wide, 9-foot-depth channel with a center line beginning at an approximate point of 35.142077, -90.059107 and extending approximately 1,800 feet to an approximate point of 35.1467861, -90.057003.

(3) A 250-foot-wide, 9-foot-depth channel with a center line beginning at an approximate point of 35.148791, -90.05642 and extending approximately 5,550 feet to an approximate point of 35.160848, -90.050566.

SEC. 325. ADDICKS AND BARKER RESERVOIRS, TEXAS.

The Secretary is authorized to provide, pursuant to section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), information and advice to non-Federal interests on the removal of sediment obstructing inflow channels to the Addicks and Barker Reservoirs, authorized pursuant to the project for Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries, Texas, under section 3a of the Act of August 11, 1939 (chapter 699, 53 Stat. 1414; 68 Stat. 1258).

SEC. 326. WATER LEVEL MANAGEMENT PILOT PROJECT ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot project on water level management, as part of the operations and maintenance of the 9-foot channel projects of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System, to help redress the degrading influences of prolonged inundation or sedimentation on such projects, and to improve the quality and quantity of habitat available for fish and wildlife.

(b) CONDITIONS ON DRAWDOWNS.—In carrying out the pilot project under subsection (a), the Secretary shall carry out routine and systemic water level drawdowns of the pools created by the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System locks and dams, including drawdowns during the growing season, when—

(1) hydrologic conditions allow the Secretary to carry out a drawdown within applicable dam operating plans; or

(2) hydrologic conditions allow the Secretary to carry out a drawdown and sufficient funds are available to the Secretary to carry out any additional activities that may be required to ensure that the drawdown does not adversely affect navigation.

(c) COORDINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—

(1) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall use existing coordination and consultation processes to regularly consult with other relevant Federal agencies and States regarding the planning and assessment of water level management actions implemented under this section.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Prior to carrying out any water level management plan pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall provide notice to the public

and to navigation interests and other interested stakeholders.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System'' has the meaning given that term in section 8001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 652 note).

SEC. 327. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

Section 2010 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1270; 132 Stat. 3812) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not recommend deauthorization of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam pursuant to the disposition study carried out under subsection (d) unless the Secretary identifies a willing and capable non-Federal public entity to assume ownership of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam.

''(g) MODIFICATION.—The Secretary is authorized to investigate the feasibility of modifying, prior to deauthorizing, the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam to add ecosystem restoration, including the prevention and control of invasive species, water supply, and recreation as authorized purposes.''.

SEC. 328. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BENEFITS AND COSTS.

Section 152(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2213a(a)) is amended by striking

''a flood risk management project that incidentally generates seismic safety benefits in regions'' and inserting ''a flood risk management or coastal storm risk management project in a region''.

SEC. 329. DEBRIS REMOVAL.

Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a), is amended by striking ''or recreation'' and inserting ''ecosystem restoration, or recreation''.

SEC. 330. GENERAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) LEVEE SAFETY INITIATIVE.—Section 9005(g)(2)(E)(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303a(g)(2)(E)(i)) is amended by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2026''.

(b) TRANSFER OF EXCESS CREDIT.—Section 1020 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2223) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''10 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on December 31, 2026''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking ''10 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on December 31, 2026''.

(c) REHABILITATION OF EXISTING LEVEES.—Section 3017(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3303a note) is amended by

striking ''the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''December 31, 2026''.

(d) INVASIVE SPECIES IN ALPINE LAKES PILOT PROJECT.—Section 507(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (16 U.S.C. 4701 note) is amended by striking ''2024'' and inserting ''2026''.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL BANKS.—Section 309(e) of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 3957(e)) is amended by striking ''10'' and inserting ''12''.

SEC. 331. CONVEYANCES.

(a) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property or easement to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs,

including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to convey to the City of Tulsa-Rogers County Port Authority, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 19 acres

of Federal land located on the following 3 parcels in Rogers County, Oklahoma:

(A) Parcel 1 consists of U.S. tract 119 (partial), U.S. tract 123, U.S. tract 120, U.S. tract 125, and U.S. tract 118 (partial).

(B) Parcel 2 consists of U.S. tract 124 (partial) and U.S. tract 128 (partial).

(C) Parcel 3 consists of U.S. tract 128 (partial).

(3) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary shall reserve and retain from any conveyance under this subsection such easements, rights-of-way, and other interests that the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to ensure the continued operation of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation project (including Newt Graham Lock and Dam 18) authorized under the comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin by the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1218; 60 Stat. 634; 60 Stat. 647; 101 Stat. 1329–112; 117 Stat. 1842).

(4) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary

determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(5) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Tulsa-Rogers County Port Authority shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) REGIONAL CORPS OF ENGINEERS OFFICE, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—At such time as new facilities are available to be used as the office for the Galveston District of the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary shall convey to the Port of Corpus Christi, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The property referred to in paragraph (1) is the land known as ''Tract 100'' and ''Tract 101'', including improvements on that land, in Corpus Christi, Texas, and described as follows:

(A) TRACT 100.—The 1.89 acres, more or less, as conveyed by the Nueces County Navigation District No. 1 of Nueces County, Texas, to the United States by instrument dated October

16, 1928, and recorded at Volume 193, pages 1 and 2, in the Deed Records of Nueces County, Texas.

(B) TRACT 101.—The 0.53 acres as conveyed by the City of Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Texas, to the United States by instrument dated September 24, 1971, and recorded at Volume 318, pages 523 and 524, in the Deed Records of Nueces County, Texas.

(C) IMPROVEMENTS.—

(i) Main Building (RPUID AO–C–3516), constructed January 9, 1974.

(ii) Garage, vehicle with 5 bays (RPUID AO–C–3517), constructed January 9, 1985.

(iii) Bulkhead, Upper (RPUID AO–C–2658), constructed January 1, 1941.

(iv) Bulkhead, Lower (RPUID AO–C–3520), constructed January 1, 1933.

(v) Bulkhead Fence (RPUID AO–C–3521), constructed January 9, 1985.

(vi) Bulkhead Fence (RPUID AO–C–3522), constructed January 9, 1985.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed

under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The Port of Corpus Christi shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property (including improvements) conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 332. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) NEW PROJECTS.—Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1258) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(274) CHANDLER, ARIZONA.—$18,750,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Chandler, Arizona.

''(275) PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA.—$40,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Pinal County, Arizona.

''(276) TEMPE, ARIZONA.—$37,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and groundwater recharge, for the City of Tempe, Arizona.

''(277) BELL GARDENS, CALIFORNIA.—$12,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastruc-

ture, including water recycling and water supply, in the city of Bell Gardens, California.

''(278) CALIMESA, CALIFORNIA.—$3,500,000 for stormwater management and water supply infrastructure, including groundwater recharge and water recycling, in the city of Calimesa, California.

''(279) COMPTON CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—$6,165,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in the vicinity of Compton Creek, city of Compton, California.

''(280) DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA.—$100,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Downey, California.

''(281) LOMITA, CALIFORNIA.—$4,716,600 for stormwater management infrastructure in the city of Lomita, California.

''(282) EAST SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$70,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in East County, San Diego County, California.

''(283) EASTERN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$25,000,000 for the planning, design, and construction of water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, for the

cities of Azusa, Baldwin Park, Covina, Duarte, El Monte, Glendora, Industry, Irwindale, La Puente, La Verne, Monrovia, San Dimas, and West Covina, and for Avocado Heights, Bassett, and Valinda, California.

''(284) ESCONDIDO CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—$34,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the vicinity of Escondido Creek, city of Escondido, California.

''(285) FONTANA, CALIFORNIA.—$16,000,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in the city of Fontana, California.

''(286) HEALDSBURG, CALIFORNIA.—$23,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in the city of Healdsburg, California.

''(287) INLAND EMPIRE, CALIFORNIA.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Riverside County and San Bernardino County, California.

''(288) MARIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$28,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Marin County, California.

''(289) MAYWOOD, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the city of Maywood, California.

''(290) MONTEREY PENINSULA, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure and water supply, on the Monterey Peninsula, California.

''(291) NORTH RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including coastal flooding resilience measures for such infrastructure, in North Richmond, California.

''(292) ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA.—$40,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in the city of Ontario, California.

''(293) PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Paramount, California.

''(294) PETALUMA, CALIFORNIA.—$13,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling, in the city of Petaluma, California.

''(295) RIALTO, CALIFORNIA.—$27,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the city of Rialto, California.

''(296) RINCON RESERVATION, CALIFORNIA.—$38,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure on the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians reservation, California.

''(297) SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CALIFORNIA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and water supply, in Contra Costa County, San Joaquin County, Solano County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County, California.

''(298) SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.—$270,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water recycling, at the San Francisco International Airport, California.

''(299) SAN JOAQUIN AND STANISLAUS, CALIFORNIA.—$200,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and water supply, in San Joaquin County and Stanislaus County, California.

''(300) SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA.—$19,400,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, in the city of Santa Rosa, California.

''(301) SIERRA MADRE, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure and water supply, including earthquake resilience measures for such infrastructure and water supply, in the city of Sierra Madre, California.

''(302) SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—$25,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Howonquet Village and Resort and Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, Smith River, California.

''(303) TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA.—$100,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including groundwater recharge and water supply, in the city of Torrance, California.

''(304) WESTERN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$15,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, in the cities of Pinole, San Pablo, and Richmond, and in El Sobrante, California.

''(305) HEBRON, CONNECTICUT.—$3,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Hebron, Connecticut.

''(306) NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT.—$16,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the

town of Bozrah and the City of Norwich, Connecticut.

''(307) WINDHAM, CONNECTICUT.—$18,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Windham, Connecticut.

''(308) NEW CASTLE, DELAWARE.—$35,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in New Castle County, Delaware.

''(309) WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Washington, District of Columbia.

''(310) LONGBOAT KEY, FLORIDA.—$12,750,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Longboat Key, Florida.

''(311) MARTIN, ST. LUCIE, AND PALM BEACH COUNTIES, FLORIDA.—$100,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, to improve water quality in the St. Lucie River, Indian River Lagoon, and Lake Worth Lagoon in Martin County, St. Lucie County, and Palm Beach County, Florida.

''(312) POLK COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Polk County, Florida.

''(313) OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$20,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Okeechobee County, Florida.

''(314) ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and water supply, in Orange County, Florida.

''(315) GUAM.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, in Guam.

''(316) COUNTY OF HAWAI'I, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the County of Hawai'i, Hawaii.

''(317) HONOLULU, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii.

''(318) KAUA'I, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the County of Kaua'i, Hawaii.

''(319) MAUI, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the County of Maui, Hawaii.

''(320) DIXMOOR, ILLINOIS.—$15,000,000 for water and water supply infrastructure in the village of Dixmoor, Illinois.

''(321) FOREST PARK, ILLINOIS.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the village of Forest Park, Illinois.

''(322) LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Lake County, Illinois.

''(323) LEMONT, ILLINOIS.—$3,135,000 for water infrastructure in the village of Lemont, Illinois.

''(324) LOCKPORT, ILLINOIS.—$6,550,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Lockport, Illinois.

''(325) MONTGOMERY AND CHRISTIAN COUNTIES, ILLINOIS.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Montgomery County and Christian County, Illinois.

''(326) WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Will County, Illinois.

''(327) ORLEANS PARISH, LOUISIANA.—$100,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Orleans Parish, Louisiana.

''(328) FITCHBURG, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Fitchburg, Massachusetts.

''(329) HAVERHILL, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Haverhill, Massachusetts.

''(330) LAWRENCE, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Lawrence, Massachusetts.

''(331) LOWELL, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Lowell, Massachusetts.

''(332) METHUEN, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastruc-

ture, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Methuen, Massachusetts.

''(333) BOONSBORO, MARYLAND.—$5,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the town of Boonsboro, Maryland.

''(334) BRUNSWICK, MARYLAND.—$15,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Brunswick, Maryland.

''(335) CASCADE CHARTER TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN.—$7,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Cascade Charter Township, Michigan.

''(336) MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—$40,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, Macomb County, Michigan.

''(337) NORTHFIELD, MINNESOTA.—$33,450,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Northfield, Minnesota.

''(338) CENTERTOWN, MISSOURI.—$15,900,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the village of Centertown, Missouri.

''(339) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of St. Louis, Missouri.

''(340) ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in St. Louis County, Missouri.

''(341) MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Meridian, Mississippi.

''(342) OXFORD, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the City of Oxford, Mississippi.

''(343) MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Manchester, New Hampshire.

''(344) BAYONNE, NEW JERSEY.—$825,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Bayonne, New Jersey.

''(345) CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY.—$119,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, city of Camden, New Jersey.

''(346) ESSEX AND SUSSEX COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater in-

frastructure, including water supply, in Essex County and Sussex County, New Jersey.

''(347) FLEMINGTON, NEW JERSEY.—$4,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the Borough of Flemington, New Jersey.

''(348) JEFFERSON, NEW JERSEY.—$90,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Jefferson Township, New Jersey.

''(349) KEARNY, NEW JERSEY.—$69,900,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the town of Kearny, New Jersey.

''(350) LONG HILL, NEW JERSEY.—$7,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Long Hill Township, New Jersey.

''(351) MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Morris County, New Jersey.

''(352) PASSAIC, NEW JERSEY.—$1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the Passaic County, New Jersey.

''(353) PHILLIPSBURG, NEW JERSEY.—$2,600,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including

stormwater management, in the town of Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

''(354) RAHWAY, NEW JERSEY.—$3,250,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Rahway, New Jersey.

''(355) ROSELLE, NEW JERSEY.—$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the Borough of Roselle, New Jersey.

''(356) SOUTH ORANGE VILLAGE, NEW JERSEY.—$7,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the Township of South Orange Village, New Jersey.

''(357) SUMMIT, NEW JERSEY.—$1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Summit, New Jersey.

''(358) WARREN, NEW JERSEY.—$4,550,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Warren Township, New Jersey.

''(359) ESPAÑOLA, NEW MEXICO.—$21,995,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Española, New Mexico.

''(360) FARMINGTON, NEW MEXICO.—$15,500,000 for water infrastructure, including

water supply, in the city of Farmington, New Mexico.

"(361) MORA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.—$2,874,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Mora County, New Mexico.

"(362) SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO.—$20,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation, in the city of Santa Fe, New Mexico.

"(363) CLARKSTOWN, NEW YORK.—$14,600,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, town of Clarkstown, New York.

"(364) GENESEE, NEW YORK.—$85,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water supply, in Genesee County, New York.

"(365) QUEENS, NEW YORK.—$119,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in Queens, New York.

"(366) YORKTOWN, NEW YORK.—$40,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Yorktown, New York.

''(367) BRUNSWICK, OHIO.—$4,510,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Brunswick, Ohio.

''(368) BROOKINGS, OREGON.—$2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the City and Port of Brookings, Oregon.

''(369) MONROE, OREGON.—$6,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Monroe, Oregon.

''(370) NEWPORT, OREGON.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Newport, Oregon.

''(371) LANE COUNTY, OREGON.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and storage, distribution, and treatment systems, in Lane County, Oregon.

''(372) PALMYRA, PENNSYLVANIA.—$36,300,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Palmyra Township, Pennsylvania.

''(373) PIKE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$10,000,000 for water and stormwater management infrastructure, including water supply, in Pike County, Pennsylvania.

''(374) PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA.—$20,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including

stormwater management, in the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

''(375) POCONO, PENNSYLVANIA.—$22,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Pocono Township, Pennsylvania.

''(376) WESTFALL, PENNSYLVANIA.—$16,880,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Westfall Township, Pennsylvania.

''(377) WHITEHALL, PENNSYLVANIA.—$6,000,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in Whitehall Township and South Whitehall Township, Pennsylvania.

''(378) BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$7,462,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in Beaufort County, South Carolina.

''(379) CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$25,583,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Charleston, South Carolina.

''(380) MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$7,822,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.

''(381) PORTLAND, TENNESSEE.—$1,850,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Portland, Tennessee.

''(382) SMITH COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—$19,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Smith County, Tennessee.

''(383) TROUSDALE, MACON, AND SUMNER COUNTIES, TENNESSEE.—$178,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Trousdale County, Macon County, and Sumner County, Tennessee.

''(384) VIRGIN ISLANDS.—$1,584,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the United States Virgin Islands.

''(385) BONNEY LAKE, WASHINGTON.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Bonney Lake, Washington.

''(386) BURIEN, WASHINGTON.—$5,000,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in the city of Burien, Washington.

''(387) ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON.—$3,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Ellensburg, Washington.

''(388) NORTH BEND, WASHINGTON.—$30,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of North Bend, Washington.

''(389) PORT ANGELES, WASHINGTON.—$7,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the City and Port of Port Angeles, Washington.

''(390) SNOHOMISH, WASHINGTON.—$56,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Snohomish County, Washington.

''(391) WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE.—$200,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, water supply, and conservation, in Chelan County, King County, Kittitas County, Pierce County, Snohomish County, Skagit County, and Whatcom County, Washington.

''(392) MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.—$4,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.''.

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the project modifications described in this subsection are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(2) MODIFICATIONS.—

(A) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1840; 134 Stat. 2718) is amended by striking ''Suburban''.

(B) LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(93) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1840; 121 Stat. 1259) is amended—

(i) by striking ''$3,000,000'' and inserting ''$103,000,000'';

(ii) by striking ''wastewater and water related infrastructure,'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management,''; and

(iii) by inserting ''Dominguez Channel, Santa Clarita Valley,'' after ''La Habra Heights,''.

(C) BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO.—Section 219(f)(109) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–220) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for water supply infrastructure'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water supply''.

(D) CHARLOTTE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(121) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$3,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$33,000,000 for wastewater and''.

(E) MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(128) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$6,250,000 for'' and inserting ''$190,250,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including''.

(F) ALBANY, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(130) of the Water Resources Develop-

ment Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$4,000,000 for a storm drainage system,'' and inserting ''$109,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows),''.

(G) ATLANTA, GEORGIA.—Section 219(e)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''.

(H) EAST POINT, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(136) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$15,000,000 for stormwater management and other''.

(I) COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(54) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–220) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$100,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and other''.

(J) CALUMET REGION, INDIANA.—Section 219(f)(12)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1843) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$125,000,000''.

(K) BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(f)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000'' and inserting ''$90,000,000''.

(L) SOUTH CENTRAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(f)(153) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1262) is amended by striking ''$2,500,000'' and inserting ''$12,500,000''.

(M) ST. CHARLES, ST. BERNARD, PLAQUEMINES, ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST. JAMES, AND ASSUMPTION PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—

(i) ST. CHARLES, ST. BERNARD, AND PLAQUEMINES PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(c)(33) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–219) is

amended by striking ''Water and wastewater infrastructure'' and inserting ''Water supply and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater infrastructure''.

(ii) ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST. JAMES, AND ASSUMPTION PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(c)(34) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–219) is amended—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''BAPTIST AND ST. JAMES'' and inserting ''BAPTIST, ST. JAMES, AND ASSUMPTION''; and

(II) by striking ''Baptist and St. James'' and inserting ''Baptist, St. James, and Assumption''.

(iii) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.—Section 219(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1192) is amended—

(I) by striking the ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16);

(II) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting a semicolon; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(18) $70,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(33); and

''(19) $36,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(34).''.

(N) MICHIGAN COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS.—Section 219(f)(157) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1262) is amended by striking ''correction of combined sewer overflows'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including correction of combined sewer overflows)''.

(O) ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 219(f)(66)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat 2763A–221) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$30,000,000 for wastewater infrastruc-

ture, including stormwater management, and other''.

(P) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat 2763A–220; 117 Stat. 1838; 130 Stat. 1677; 132 Stat. 3818; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended by striking ''$110,000,000'' and inserting ''$165,000,000''.

(Q) EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA.—Section 219(f)(10)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat 4835; 113 Stat. 336) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$52,000,000''.

(3) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the operation of section 6001(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016), any project included on a list published by the Secretary pursuant to such section the authorization for which is amended by this subsection remains authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 333. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL PROJECTS.

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the project modifications described in this section are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(b) PROJECTS.—

(1) CHESAPEAKE BAY.—Section 510(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202; 128 Stat. 1317) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''infrastructure and'' before ''resource protection'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) wastewater treatment and related facilities;

''(F) water supply and related facilities;''.

(2) NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.—Section 552(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3780) is amended—

(A) by striking ''design and construction assistance'' and inserting ''design, repair, replacement, and construction assistance''; and

(B) by striking ''treatment, and distribution facilities'' and inserting ''treatment, stormwater management, and water distribution facilities''.

(3) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 566 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3786; 113 Stat. 352) is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting ''**SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA AND LOWER DELAWARE RIVER BASIN**.'';

(B) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and the Lower Delaware River Basin'' after ''southeastern Pennsylvania'';

(C) in subsection (b), by striking ''southeastern Pennsylvania, including projects for waste water treatment and related facilities,'' and inserting ''southeastern Pennsylvania and the Lower Delaware River Basin, including projects for wastewater treatment and related

facilities (including sewer overflow infrastructure improvements and other stormwater management),'';

(D) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) AREAS DEFINED.—In this section:

''(1) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.—The term 'southeastern Pennsylvania' means Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery Counties, Pennsylvania.

''(2) LOWER DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.—The term 'Lower Delaware River Basin' means the Schuylkill Valley, Upper Estuary, Lower Estuary, and Delaware Bay sub-watersheds of the Delaware River Basin in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey and Delaware.''; and

(E) in subsection (h), by striking ''to carry out this section $25,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000 to provide assistance under this section to non-Federal interests in southeastern Pennsylvania, and $20,000,000 to provide assistance under this section to non-Federal interests in the Lower Delaware River Basin''.

(4) FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FLORIDA.—Section 109 of division B of ap-

pendix D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–554, 114 Stat. 2763A–222; 121 Stat. 1217) is amended in subsection (f) by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

(5) NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA.—Section 569(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 368; 121 Stat. 1232) is amended by striking ''$54,000,000'' and inserting ''$80,000,000''.

(6) MISSISSIPPI.—Section 592 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 379; 117 Stat. 1837; 121 Stat. 1233; 123 Stat. 2851) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''and surface water resource protection and development'' and inserting ''surface water resource protection and development, stormwater management, and drainage systems''; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking ''$200,000,000'' and inserting ''$300,000,000''.

(7) LAKE TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA.—Section 108(g) of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public

Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2942) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(8) CENTRAL NEW MEXICO.—Section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 380) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by inserting ''water reuse,'' after ''conservation,''; and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking ''$50,000,000'' and inserting ''$100,000,000''.

(9) SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 313(g)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845; 109 Stat. 407; 110 Stat. 3723; 113 Stat. 310; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1146; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended by striking ''$400,000,000'' and inserting ''$410,000,000''.

(10) OHIO AND NORTH DAKOTA.—Section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 381; 119 Stat. 2261; 121 Stat. 1140; 121 Stat. 1944) is amended in subsection (h), by striking ''$240,000,000'' and inserting ''$250,000,000''.

(11) TEXAS.—Section 5138 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1250) is amended in subsection (g) by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$80,000,000''.

(12) LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VERMONT AND NEW YORK.—Section 542 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2671; 121 Stat. 1150; 134 Stat. 2652) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by striking ''planning'' and inserting ''clean water infrastructure planning, design, and construction''; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking ''$32,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(13) WESTERN RURAL WATER.—Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 139; 117 Stat. 142; 117 Stat. 1836; 118 Stat. 440; 121 Stat. 1219; 123 Stat. 2851; 128 Stat. 1316; 130 Stat. 1681; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended—

(A) in subsection (i)(1), by striking ''$435,000,000'' and inserting ''$800,000,000''; and

(B) in subsection (i)(2), by striking ''$150,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the operation of section 6001(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Water Resources

Development Act of 2016), any project included on a list published by the Secretary pursuant to such section the authorization for which is amended by this section remains authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 401. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'' submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports or decision documents designated in this section:

(1) NAVIGATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AK	Elim Subsistence Harbor Study, Elim	March 12, 2021	Federal: $74,905,000 Non-Federal: $1,896,000 Total: $76,801,000
2. CA	Port of Long Beach Deep Draft Navigation, Los Angeles County	October 14, 2021	Federal: $71,985,500 Non-Federal: $73,447,500 Total: $145,433,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
3. GA	Brunswick Harbor Modifications, Glynn County	March 11, 2022	Federal: $10,774,500 Non-Federal: $3,594,500 Total: $14,369,000

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AL	Selma Flood Risk Management and Bank Stabilization	October 7, 2021	Federal: $15,533,100 Non-Federal: $8,363,900 Total: $23,897,000
2. AL	Valley Creek Flood Risk Management, Bessemer and Birmingham	October 29, 2021	Federal: $17,725,000 Non-Federal: $9,586,000 Total: $27,311,000
3. CA	Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, Woodland and Vicinity	June 21, 2021	Federal: $215,152,000 Non-Federal: $115,851,000 Total: $331,003,000
4. NE	Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes	January 24, 2022	Federal: $91,491,400 Non-Federal: $52,156,300 Total: $143,647,700
5. OR	Portland Metro Levee System	August 20, 2021	Federal: $77,111,100 Non-Federal: $41,521,300 Total: $118,632,400

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CT	Fairfield and New Haven Counties Coastal Storm Risk Management	January 19, 2021	Federal: $92,937,000 Non-Federal: $50,043,000 Total: $142,980,000
2. FL	Florida Keys, Monroe County, Coastal Storm Risk Management	September 24, 2021	Federal: $1,513,531,000 Non-Federal: $814,978,000 Total: $2,328,509,000
3. FL	Pinellas County, Treasure Island and Long Key Segments, Coastal Storm Risk Management	October 29, 2021	Initial Federal: $8,627,000 Initial Non-Federal: $5,332,000 Total: $13,959,000 Renourishment Federal: $92,000,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: $101,690,000 Renourishment Total: $193,690,000
4. LA	Upper Barataria Basin Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction	January 28, 2022	Federal: $1,005,001,000 Non-Federal: $541,155,000 Total: $1,546,156,000
5. PR	San Juan Metropolitan Area Coastal Storm Risk Management	September 16, 2021	Federal: $245,418,000 Non-Federal: $131,333,000 Total: $376,751,000
6. SC	Folly Beach, Coastal Storm Risk Management	October 26, 2021	Initial Federal: $45,490,000 Initial Non-Federal: $5,054,000 Total: $50,544,000 Renourishment Federal: $164,424,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: $26,767,000 Renourishment Total: $191,191,000

(4) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. TX	Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration	September 16, 2021	Federal: $19,237,894,000 Non-Federal: $11,668,393,000 Total: $30,906,287,000

(5) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CA	Prado Basin Ecosystem Restoration, San Bernardino, Riverside and Orange Counties	April 22, 2021	Federal: $33,976,000 Non-Federal: $18,294,000 Total: $52,270,000

(6) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
1. DC	Washington, DC, and Vicinity Flood Risk Management	July 22, 2021	Federal: $17,740,000 Non-Federal: $0 Total: $17,740,000
2. LA	Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity	December 16, 2021	Federal: $807,000,000 Non-Federal: $434,000,000 Total: $1,241,000,000
3. LA	West Bank and Vicinity	December 17, 2021	Federal: $431,000,000 Non-Federal: $232,000,000 Total: $663,000,000

○