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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.

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
2 tives 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 2020”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Secretary defined.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Budgetary treatment expansion and adjustment for the Harbor Main- tenance Trust Fund.
Sec. 102. Funding for navigation.
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Sec. 105. Assumption of maintenance of a locally preferred plan.
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Sec. 117. Quantification of benefits for flood risk management projects in seismic zones.
Sec. 118. Federal interest determination.
Sec. 119. Economically disadvantaged community flood protection and hurricane and storm damage reduction study pilot program.
Sec. 120. Permanent measures to reduce emergency flood fighting needs for communities subject to repetitive flooding.
Sec. 121. Emergency response to natural disasters.
Sec. 122. Study on natural infrastructure at Corps of Engineers projects.
Sec. 123. Review of Corps of Engineers assets.
Sec. 124. Sense of Congress on multipurpose projects.
Sec. 125. Beneficial reuse of dredged material; dredged material management plans.
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Sec. 133. Materials, services, and funds for repair, restoration, or rehabilitation of projects.
Sec. 134. Levee safety.
Sec. 135. National Dam Safety Program.
Sec. 136. Rehabilitation of Corps of Engineers constructed pump stations.
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Sec. 140. Flood control and other purposes.
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Sec. 142. Buy America.
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**TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS**
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Sec. 203. Feasibility study modifications.
Sec. 204. Selma, Alabama.
Sec. 205. Comprehensive study of the Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, California.
Sec. 206. Lake Okeechobee regulation schedule, Florida.
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Sec. 212. Lower Missouri Basin Flood Risk and Resiliency Study, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri.
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Sec. 214. Cougar and Detroit Dams, Willamette River Basin, Oregon.
Sec. 215. Port Orford, Oregon.
Sec. 216. Wilson Creek and Sloan Creek, Fairview, Texas.
Sec. 217. GAO study on mitigation for water resources development projects.
Sec. 218. GAO study on application of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund expenditures.
Sec. 219. GAO study on administration of environmental banks.
Sec. 220. Study on Corps of Engineers concessionaire agreements.
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Sec. 303. Tribal partnership program.
Sec. 304. Lakes program.
Sec. 305. Watercraft inspection stations.
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Sec. 311. Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa, California.
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Sec. 320. Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation Water Conservation Plan, Florida.
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Sec. 322. Miami River, Florida.
Sec. 323. Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam, Moore Haven, Florida.
Sec. 324. Taylor Creek Reservoir and Levee L–73 (Section 1), Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida.
Sec. 325. Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.
Sec. 326. San Juan-Chama project; Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico.
Sec. 327. Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut.
Sec. 328. Harris County, Texas.
Sec. 330. Regional sediment management.
Sec. 331. Additional assistance for critical projects.
Sec. 332. Project modification authorizations.
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Sec. 334. Project reauthorizations.
Sec. 335. Conveyances.
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TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

Sec. 401. Project authorizations.
Sec. 402. Special rules.
Sec. 403. Authorization of projects based on feasibility studies prepared by non-Federal interests.

1 SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.
TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. BUDGETARY TREATMENT EXPANSION AND ADJUSTMENT FOR THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

(a) In General.—Section 14003 of division B of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136) is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 14003. Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(H) Harbor maintenance activities.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for the Construction, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance accounts of the Corps of Engineers are enacted that are derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established under section 9505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that the Congress designates in statute as being for harbor operations and maintenance activities, then the adjustment for that fiscal year shall be the total of such appropriations that are derived from such Fund and designated as being for...
harbor operations and maintenance activities.’.”.

(b) **Effective Date.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136).

**SEC. 102. FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION.**

(a) **Funding for Navigation.**—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is amended, in the section heading, by striking “AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS” and inserting “FUNDING FOR NAVIGATION”.

(b) **Operation and Maintenance of Harbor Projects.**—Section 210(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(c)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) **In General.**—For each fiscal year, of the funds made available under this section (including funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund), the Secretary shall make expenditures to pay for operation and maintenance costs of the harbors and inland harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2), using—

“(A) not less than 20 percent of such funds for emerging harbor projects, to the ex-
tent there are identifiable operations and maintenance needs, including eligible breakwater and jetty needs, at such harbor projects;

“(B) not less than 12 percent of such funds for projects that are located within the Great Lakes Navigation System;

“(C) 10 percent of such funds for expanded uses carried out at donor ports, as such term is defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c); and

“(D) any remaining funds for operation and maintenance costs of any harbor or inland harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) based on an equitable allocation of such funds among such harbors and inland harbors.”;

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) ADDITIONAL USES AT EMERGING HARBORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than $5,000,000 of funds designated for emerging harbor projects under paragraph (1)(A) to pay for the costs of up to 10 projects for mainte-
nance dredging of a marina or berthing area, in
an emerging harbor, that includes an area that
is located adjacent to, or is accessible by, a
Federal navigation project, subject to subpara-
graphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EMERGING HARBORS.—
The Secretary may use funds as authorized
under subparagraph (A) at an emerging harbor
that—

“(i) supports commercial activities, in-
cluding commercial fishing operations,
commercial fish processing operations, rec-
reational and sport fishing, and commer-
cial boat yards; or

“(ii) supports activities of the Sec-
retary of the department in which the
Coast Guard is operating.

“(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—
The Secretary shall require a non-Federal inter-
est to contribute not less than 25 percent of the
costs for maintenance dredging of that portion
of a maintenance dredging project described in
subparagraph (A) that is located outside of the
Federal navigation project, which may be pro-
vided as an in-kind contribution, including
through the use of dredge equipment owned by non-Federal interest to carry out such activities.’’; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary from making an expenditure to pay for the operation and maintenance costs of a specific harbor or inland harbor, including the transfer of funding from the operation and maintenance of a separate project, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the action is necessary to address the navigation needs of a harbor or inland harbor where safe navigation has been severely restricted due to an unforeseen event; and

“(B) the Secretary provides within 90 days of the action notice and information on the need for the action to the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.’’.

(c) PRIORITIZATION.—Section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) is
amended by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(d) **Assessment of Harbors and Inland Harbors.**—Section 210(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as so redesignated) is amended by striking “expanded uses at eligible harbors or inland harbors referred to in subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “uses described in paragraphs (1)(C) and (3) of subsection (e)”.

(e) **Definitions.**—Section 210(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as so redesignated) is amended—

1. by striking paragraphs (6) through (9);
2. by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively;
3. by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **Emerging Harbor.**—The term ‘emerging harbor’ means a harbor or inland harbor referred to in subsection (a)(2) that transits less than 1,000,000 tons of cargo annually.

“(3) **Emerging Harbor Project.**—The term ‘emerging harbor project’ means a project that is assigned to an emerging harbor.”; and
(4) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by
adding at the end the following:

“(C) An in-water improvement, if the im-
provement—

“(i) is for the seismic reinforcement of
a wharf or other berthing structure, or the
repair or replacement of a deteriorating
wharf or other berthing structure, at a
port facility;

“(ii) benefits commercial navigation at
the harbor; and

“(iii) is located in, or adjacent to, a
berth that is accessible to a Federal navi-
gation project.

“(D) An activity to maintain slope stability
at a berth in a harbor that is accessible to a
Federal navigation project if such activity bene-
fits commercial navigation at the harbor.”.

SEC. 103. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE HARBOR
MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

Section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act
of 1992 (26 U.S.C. 9505 note; 106 Stat. 4851) is amend-
ed—

(1) in subsection (a)—
(A) by striking “and annually thereafter,”
and inserting “and annually thereafter concur-
rent with the submission of the President’s an-
nual budget request to Congress,”; and

(B) by striking “Public Works and Trans-
portation” and inserting “Transportation and
Infrastructure”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by adding at the end
the following:

“(D) A description of the expected expend-
itures from the trust fund to meet the needs of
navigation for the fiscal year of the budget re-
quest.”.

SEC. 104. ADDITIONAL MEASURES AT DONOR PORTS AND
ENERGY TRANSFER PORTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2106(a) of the Water Re-
sources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C.
2238e(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) by amending clause (ii) to read as fol-

“(ii) at which the total amount of har-
bor maintenance taxes collected (including
the estimated taxes related to domestic
cargo and cruise passengers) comprise not
less than $15,000,000 annually of the total
funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust
Fund in each of the previous 3 fiscal
years;”;

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting “(including
the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo
and cruise passengers)” after “taxes collected”; and

(C) in clause (iv), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of the previous 3 fis-
cal years”;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking “fiscal year 2012” each place it appears and inserting “each of
the previous 3 fiscal years”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (8) as para-
graph (9) and inserting after paragraph (7) the fol-
lowing:

“(8) Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.—
The term ‘Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund’ means
the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established by
section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of
1986.”; and

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) to read
as follows:
“(B) at which the total amount of harbor maintenance taxes collected (including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers) comprise annually more than $5,000,000 but less than $15,000,000 of the total funding of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in each of the previous 3 fiscal years;”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(including the estimated taxes related to domestic cargo and cruise passengers)” after “taxes collected”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of the previous 3 fiscal years”.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2020” and inserting “2030”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3).
SEC. 105. ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE OF A LOCALLY PREFERRED PLAN.

Section 204(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—

“(1) ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE.—Whenever a non-Federal interest carries out improvements to a federally authorized harbor or inland harbor, the Secretary shall be responsible for operation and maintenance in accordance with section 101(b) if—

“(A) before construction of the improvements—

“(i) the Secretary determines that the improvements are feasible and consistent with the purposes of this title; and

“(ii) the Secretary and the non-Federal interest execute a written agreement relating to operation and maintenance of the improvements;

“(B) the Secretary certifies that the project or separable element of the project is constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering and design standards; and
“(C) the Secretary does not find that the project or separable element is no longer feasible.

“(2) **Federal financial participation in the costs of a locally preferred plan.**—In the case of improvements determined by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(A)(i) to deviate from the national economic development plan, the Secretary shall be responsible for all operation and maintenance costs of such improvements, as described in section 101(b), including costs in excess of the costs of the national economic development plan, if the Secretary determines that the improvements satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1).”

**SEC. 106. COAST GUARD ANCHORAGES.**

The Secretary is authorized to perform dredging at Federal expense within and adjacent to anchorages on the Columbia River established by the Coast Guard pursuant to section 7 of the Act of March 14, 1915 (33 U.S.C. 471), to provide safe anchorage for deep draft vessels commensurate with the authorized Federal navigation channel depth, including advanced maintenance.
SEC. 107. STATE CONTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.
In carrying out eligible operations and maintenance
activities within the Great Lakes Navigation System pur-
suant to section 210 of the Water Resources Development
Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238) in a State that has imple-
mented any additional State limitation on the disposal of
dredged material in the open waters of such State, the
Secretary may, pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June
22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), receive from such State, and
expend, such funds as may be contributed by the State
to cover the additional costs for operations and mainte-
nance activities for a harbor or inland harbor within such
State that result from such limitation.

SEC. 108. INLAND WATERWAY PROJECTS.
(a) In general.—Notwithstanding section 102 of
the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C.
2212), 35 percent of the costs of construction of any
project for navigation on the inland waterways shall be
paid from amounts appropriated from the Inland Water-
ways Trust Fund—
(1) during each of fiscal years 2021 through
2027; and
(2) for a project the construction of which is
initiated during such period, in each fiscal year until
such construction is complete.
(b) PRIORITIZATION.—In selecting projects described in subsection (a) for which to initiate construction during any of fiscal years 2021 through 2027, the Secretary shall prioritize projects that are included in the most recent 20-year program for making capital investments developed under section 302(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251(d)).

SEC. 109. IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER RESOURCES PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue final agency-specific procedures necessary to implement the principles and requirements and the interagency guidelines.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The procedures required by subsection (a) shall ensure that the Secretary, in the formulation of future water resources development projects—

(1) develops such projects in accordance with—

(A) the guiding principles established by the principles and requirements; and

(B) the national water resources planning policy established by section 2031(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962–3(a)); and
(2) fully identifies and analyzes national economic development benefits, regional economic development benefits, environmental quality benefits, and other societal effects.

(c) Review and Update.—Every 5 years, the Secretary shall review and, where appropriate, revise the procedures required by subsection (a).

(d) Public Review, Notice, and Comment.—In issuing, reviewing, and revising the procedures required by this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) provide notice to interested non-Federal stakeholders of the Secretary’s intent to revise the procedures;

(2) provide opportunities for interested non-Federal stakeholders to engage with, and provide input and recommendations to, the Secretary on the revision of the procedures; and

(3) solicit and consider public and expert comments.

(e) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Interagency Guidelines.—The term “interagency guidelines” means the interagency guidelines contained in the document finalized by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to section 2031 of the Water Resources Development


SEC. 110. RESILIENCY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

(a) In General.—Section 206(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(a)) is amended by inserting “, 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 the flood hazards” after “in planning to ameliorate the flood hazard”.

(b) Prioritizing Flood Risk Resiliency Technical Assistance for Economically Disadvantaged Communities.—In carrying out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), the Secretary shall prioritize the provision of technical assistance to support
flood risk resiliency planning efforts of an economically
disadvantaged community.

SEC. 111. PROJECT CONSULTATION.

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days
after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall
submit the following reports:

(1) The report required under section 1214 of
the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132
Stat. 3809).

(2) The report required under section
1120(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act
of 2016 (130 Stat. 1643).

(b) CONSULTATION.—

(1) AGENCIES AND TRIBES.—The Secretary
shall ensure that all covered community consultation
policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of
Engineers continue to be implemented, and that con-
sultations with Federal and State agencies and In-
dian Tribes required for a water resources develop-
ment project are carried out.

(2) COMMUNITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure
that any covered communities, including such com-
munities identified in the reports submitted under
subsection (a), that are found to be dispropor-
ionately or adversely affected are included in consulta-
tion policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers.

(3) Project Planning and Construction.—

The Secretary shall ensure that covered communities are consulted in the development of water resources development project planning and construction, for the purposes of achieving environmental justice and addressing any disproportionate or adverse effects on such communities.

(c) Environmental Justice Updates.—

(1) In General.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update any policies, regulations, and guidance of the Corps of Engineers related to achieving environmental justice for covered communities.

(2) Recommendations and Consultation.—

In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consult with a wide array of representatives of covered communities; and

(B) use the recommendations from the reports submitted under subsection (a).

(d) Community Engagement.—The Secretary shall ensure that in carrying out authorized water resources development projects in, and all other activities of the Corps
of Engineers related to, covered communities, the Corps of Engineers—

(1) promotes the meaningful involvement of such communities in the project development and implementation, enforcement efforts, and other activities of the Corps of Engineers;

(2) provides guidance and technical assistance to such communities to increase understanding of the project development and implementation activities, regulations, and policies of the Corps of Engineers; and

(3) cooperates with State, Tribal, and local governments with respect to activities carried out pursuant to this subsection.

(e) T R I B A L L A N D S A N D C O N S U L T A T I O N.—The Secretary shall ensure that in carrying out authorized water resources development projects and in all other activities of the Corps of Engineers, that the Corps of Engineers—

(1)(A) consults with Indian Tribes specifically on any Tribal lands near or adjacent to any activities of the Corps of Engineers, for purposes of identifying lands of ancestral, cultural, or religious importance; and
(B) cooperates with Indian Tribes to avoid, or otherwise find alternate solutions with respect to, such lands; and

(2)(A) consults with Indian Tribes specifically on any Tribal areas near or adjacent to any activities of the Corps of Engineers, for purposes of identifying lands, waters, and other resources critical to the livelihood of the Indian Tribes; and

(B) cooperates with Indian Tribes to avoid, or otherwise find alternate solutions with respect to, such areas.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMUNITY OF COLOR.—The term “community of color” means a community of individuals who are—

(A) American Indian or Alaska Native;

(B) Asian or Pacific Islander;

(C) Black, not of Hispanic origin; or

(D) Hispanic.

(2) COVERED COMMUNITY.—The term “covered community” means each of the following:

(A) A community of color.

(B) An economically disadvantaged community.

(C) A rural community.
(D) A Tribal or indigenous community.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each of the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 112. REVIEW OF RESILIENCY ASSESSMENTS.

(a) RESILIENCY ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and in conjunction with the development of procedures under section 109 of this Act, the Secretary is directed to review, and where appropriate, revise the existing planning guidance documents and regulations on the assessment of the effects of sea level rise on future water resources development projects to ensure that such guidance documents and regulations are based on the best available, peer-reviewed science and data on the current and future effects of sea level rise on coastal communities.

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

(A) coordinate the review with the Engineer Research and Development Center, other Federal and State agencies, and other relevant entities; and
(B) to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, utilize data provided to the Secretary by such agencies.

(b) Assessment of Benefits of Sea Level Rise Resiliency in Feasibility Reports.—

(1) In general.—Upon the request of a non-Federal interest, in carrying out a feasibility study for a project for flood risk mitigation, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, or ecosystem restoration under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), the Secretary shall consider whether the need for the project is predicated upon or exacerbated by conditions related to sea level rise.

(2) Sea level rise resiliency benefits.—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out a study pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall document the potential effects of sea level rise on the project, and benefits of the project relating to sea level rise, during the 50-year period after the date of completion of the project.

SEC. 113. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended by inserting “, and projects that use natural features or nature-based features (as those
terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)),”

after “nonstructural projects”.

SEC. 114. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 103(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “NONSTRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS” and inserting “PROJECTS USING NONSTRUCTURAL, NATURAL, OR NATURE-BASED FEATURES”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “nonstructural flood control measures” and inserting “a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction measure using a nonstructural feature, or a natural feature or nature-based feature (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))),”; and

(B) by striking “cash during construction of the project” and inserting “cash during construction for a nonstructural feature if the costs of land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations for such feature are estimated to exceed 35 percent”.
SEC. 115. FEASIBILITY STUDIES; REVIEW OF NATURAL AND NATURE-BASED FEATURES.

(a) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 1149(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2282 note; 132 Stat. 3787) is amended by striking “natural infrastructure alternatives” and inserting “natural feature or nature-based feature alternatives (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (32 U.S.C. 2289a))”.

(b) SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall include in each feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) for a project that contains a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction element, a summary of the natural feature or nature-based feature alternatives that were evaluated in the development of the feasibility report, and, if such alternatives were not included in the recommended plan, an explanation of why such alternatives were not included into the recommended plan.

SEC. 116. REPORT ON CORROSION PREVENTION ACTIVITIES.

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, and make publicly available,

a report that describes—

(1) the extent to which the Secretary has car-

cried out section 1033 of the Water Resources Re-

form and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C.

2350);

(2) the extent to which the Secretary has incor-

porated corrosion prevention activities (as defined in

such section) at water resources development

projects constructed or maintained by the Secretary

since the date of enactment of such section; and

(3) in instances where the Secretary has not in-

corporated corrosion prevention activities at such

water resources development projects since such

date, an explanation as to why such corrosion pre-

vention activities have not been incorporated.

SEC. 117. QUANTIFICATION OF BENEFITS FOR FLOOD RISK

MANAGEMENT PROJECTS IN SEISMIC ZONES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the non-Fed-

eral interest for a flood risk management project in a seis-

mic zone, the Secretary shall quantify the seismic hazard

risk reduction benefits for the project if the non-Federal

interest identifies, and the Secretary approves, an accept-

able methodology to quantify such benefits.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary shall—
(1) include all associated seismic hazard risk reduction benefits approved by the Secretary in the calculation of the national economic development benefit-cost ratio for a flood risk management project in a seismic hazard zone for purposes of plan formulation pursuant to section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986; and

(2) seek to maximize the combination of flood risk reduction and seismic hazard risk reduction benefits in the formulation of the national economic development alternative for such project.

SEC. 118. FEDERAL INTEREST DETERMINATION.

Section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) Federal Interest Determination.—

“(1) In general.—In preparing a feasibility report under subsection (a) for a study that will benefit an economically disadvantaged community, upon request by the non-Federal interest for the study, the Secretary shall first determine the Federal interest in carrying out the study and the projects that may be proposed in the study.

“(2) Cost share.—The costs of a determination under paragraph (1)—
“(A) shall be at Federal expense; and

“(B) shall not exceed $200,000.

“(3) DEADLINE.—A determination under paragraph (1) shall be completed by not later than 120 days after the date on which funds are made available to the Secretary to carry out the determination.

“(4) TREATMENT.—

“(A) TIMING.—The period during which a determination is being completed under paragraph (1) for a study shall not be included for purposes of the deadline to complete a final feasibility report under section 1001(a)(1) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c(a)(1)).

“(B) COST.—The cost of a determination under paragraph (1) shall not be included for purposes of the maximum Federal cost under section 1001(a)(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c(a)(2)).

“(5) REPORT TO NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—If, based on a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that a study or project is not in the Federal interest because the project will not result, or is unlikely to result, in a recommended
plan that will produce national economic development benefits greater than cost, but may result in a technically sound and environmentally acceptable plan that is otherwise consistent with section 904 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2281), the Secretary shall issue a report to the non-Federal interest with recommendations on how the non-Federal interest might modify the proposal such that the project could be in the Federal interest and feasible.”.

SEC. 119. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY FLOOD PROTECTION AND HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and implement a pilot program to evaluate opportunities to address the flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction needs of economically disadvantaged communities.

(b) PARTICIPATION IN PILOT PROGRAM.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) publish a notice in the Federal Register that requests from non-Federal interests proposals for the potential feasibility study of a flood risk
management project or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction project for an economically disadvantaged community;

(2) upon request of a non-Federal interest for such a project, provide technical assistance to such non-Federal interest in the formulation of a proposal for a potential feasibility study to be submitted to the Secretary under the pilot program; and

(3) review such proposals and select 10 feasibility studies for such projects to be carried out by the Secretary, in coordination with the non-Federal interest, under this pilot program.

(e) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting a feasibility study under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall consider whether—

(1) the percentage of people living in poverty in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project is located is above the percentage of people living in poverty in the State, based on census bureau data;

(2) the percentage of families with income above the poverty threshold but below the average household income in the county or counties (or county-equivalent entity or entities) in which the project
is located is above the percentage of the same for
the State, based on census bureau data;

(3) the percentage of the population that identi-
ifies as belonging to a minority or indigenous group
in the county or counties (or county-equivalent enti-
ty or entities) in which the project is located is above
the average percentage in the State, based on census
bureau data; and

(4) the project is addressing flooding or hurri-
cane or storm damage effects that have a dispropor-
tionate impact on a rural community or a commu-
nity of color (as such term is defined in section 111
of this Act), including Tribal or indigenous peoples.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding the require-
ments of section 105(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources De-
velopment Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215), the Federal
share of the cost of a feasibility study carried out under
the pilot program shall be 100 percent.

(e) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—When selecting feasi-
bility studies under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary shall
consider the geographic diversity among proposed
projects.

(f) STUDY REQUIREMENTS.—Feasibility studies car-
rried out under this subsection shall, to the maximum ex-
tent practical, incorporate natural features or nature-
based features (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a)), or a combination of such features and nonstructural features, that avoid or reduce at least 50 percent of flood or storm damages in one or more of the alternatives included in the final alternatives evaluated.

(g) **NOTIFICATION.**—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 the selection of each feasibility study under the pilot program.

(h) **COMPLETION.**—Upon completion of a feasibility report for a feasibility study selected to be carried out under this section, the Secretary shall transmit the report to Congress for authorization, and shall include the report in the next annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d).

(i) **SUNSET.**—The authority to commence a feasibility study under this section shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) **REPORT.**—Not later than 5 years and 10 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 Com-
mittee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report detailing the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, including—

(1) a description of proposals received from non-Federal interests pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

(2) a description of technical assistance provided to non-Federal interests under subsection (b)(2); and

(3) a description of proposals selected under subsection (b)(3) and criteria used to select such proposals.

(k) State Defined.—In this section, the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each of the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 120. PERMANENT MEASURES TO REDUCE EMERGENCY FLOOD FIGHTING NEEDS FOR COMMUNITIES SUBJECT TO REPETITIVE FLOODING.

(a) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Affected Community.—The term “affected community” means a legally constituted public body (as that term is used in section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b))—
(A) with jurisdiction over an area that has been subject to flooding in two or more events in any 10-year period; and

(B) that has received emergency flood-fighting assistance, including construction of temporary barriers by the Secretary, under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n) with respect to such flood events.

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

(b) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program to study, design, and construct water resources development projects through measures involving, among other things, strengthening, raising, extending, realigning, or otherwise modifying existing flood control works, designing new works, and incorporating natural features, nature-based features, or nonstructural features, as appropriate to provide flood and coastal storm risk management to affected communities.
(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practical, review and, where appropriate, incorporate natural features or nature-based features, or a combination of such features and nonstructural features, that avoid or reduce at least 50 percent of flood or storm damages in one or more of the alternatives included in the final alternatives evaluated.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a project described in paragraph (1) without further congressional authorization if—

(i) the Secretary determines that the project—

(I) is advisable to reduce the risk of flooding for an affected community; and

(II) produces benefits that are in excess of the estimated costs; and

(ii) the Federal share of the cost of the construction does not exceed $15,000,000.

(B) SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION.—If the Federal share of the cost of a project described in paragraph (1) exceeds $15,000,000, the Sec-
retary shall submit the project recommendation
to Congress for authorization prior to construc-
tion, and shall include the project recommenda-
tion in the next annual report submitted under
section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform
and Development Act of 2014.

(C) FINANCING.—

(i) CONTRIBUTIONS.—If, based on a
study carried out pursuant to paragraph
(1), the Secretary determines that a
project described in paragraph (1) will not
produce benefits greater than cost, the
Secretary shall allow the affected commu-
nity to pay, or provide contributions equal
to, an amount sufficient to make the re-
main ing costs of design and construction
of the project equal to the estimated value
of the benefits of the project.

(ii) EFFECT ON NON-FEDERAL
SHARE.—Amounts provided by an affected
community under clause (i) shall be in ad-
dition to any payments or contributions
the affected community is required to pro-
vide toward the remaining costs of design
and construction of the project under sec-

(4) ABILITY TO PAY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any cost-sharing agreement for a project entered into pursuant to this section shall be subject to the ability of the affected community to pay.

(B) DETERMINATION.—The ability of any affected community to pay shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary.

(C) EFFECT OF REDUCTION.—Any reduction in the non-Federal share of the cost of a project described in paragraph (1) as a result of a determination under this paragraph shall not be included in the Federal share for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3).

SEC. 121. EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following—

“(5) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—
“(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 180 days after receiving, from a non-Federal sponsor of a project to repair or rehabilitate a flood control work described in paragraph (1), a request to initiate a feasibility study to further modify the relevant flood control work to provide for an increased level of protection, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal sponsor a written decision on whether the Secretary has the authority under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) to undertake the requested feasibility study.

“(B) RECOMMENDATION.—If the Secretary determines under subparagraph (B) that the Secretary does not have the authority to undertake the requested feasibility study, the Secretary shall include the request for a feasibility study in the annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “LEVEE OWNERS MANUAL” and inserting “ELIGIBILITY”;

"(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 180 days after receiving, from a non-Federal sponsor of a project to repair or rehabilitate a flood control work described in paragraph (1), a request to initiate a feasibility study to further modify the relevant flood control work to provide for an increased level of protection, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal sponsor a written decision on whether the Secretary has the authority under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) to undertake the requested feasibility study.

“(B) RECOMMENDATION.—If the Secretary determines under subparagraph (B) that the Secretary does not have the authority to undertake the requested feasibility study, the Secretary shall include the request for a feasibility study in the annual report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “LEVEE OWNERS MANUAL” and inserting “ELIGIBILITY”;
(B) in paragraph (1), in the heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “LEVEE OWNER’S MANUAL”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) COMPLIANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the status of compliance of a non-Federal interest with the requirements of a levee owner’s manual described in paragraph (1), or with any other eligibility requirement established by the Secretary related to the maintenance and upkeep responsibilities of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall consider the non-Federal interest to be eligible for repair and rehabilitation assistance under this section if the non-Federal interest—

“(i) enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that identifies any items of deferred or inadequate maintenance and upkeep identified by the Secretary prior to the natural disaster; and
“(ii) pays, during performance of the repair and rehabilitation work, all costs to address—

“(I) any items of deferred or inadequate maintenance and upkeep identified by the Secretary; and

“(II) any repair or rehabilitation work necessary to address damage the Secretary attributes to such deferred or inadequate maintenance or upkeep.

“(B) Eligibility.—The Secretary may only enter into one agreement under subparagraph (A) with any non-Federal interest.

“(C) Sunset.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into agreements under paragraph (2) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.”; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “this subsection” and inserting “paragraph (1)”.

SEC. 122. STUDY ON NATURAL INFRASTRUCTURE AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS.

(a) Definition of Natural Feature and Nature-based Feature.—In this section, the terms “nat-
ural feature” and “nature-based feature” have the meanings given those terms in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)).

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years 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 the consideration by the Secretary of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in the study of the feasibility of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration.

(e) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of guidance or instructions issued, and other measures taken, by the Secretary to consider natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in project feasibility studies;

(2) an assessment, based on information from relevant Federal and non-Federal sources, of—
(A) the costs, benefits, and effects associated with natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features recommended by the Secretary for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration; and

(B) the effectiveness of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features;

(3) an analysis of projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and ecosystem restoration that have incorporated natural infrastructure, natural features, or nature-based features to identify best practices, including for measuring project benefits and costs;

(4) a description of any statutory, fiscal, regulatory, or other policy barriers to the appropriate consideration and use of a full array of natural infrastructure, natural features, and nature-based features in carrying out feasibility studies and projects; and

(5) any recommendations for changes to law, or to fiscal, regulatory, or other policies, to improve the use of natural infrastructure, natural features, and
nature-based features by the Corps of Engineers in carrying out feasibility studies and projects.

SEC. 123. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

Section 6002 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1349) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6002. REVIEW OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSETS.

“(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of projects constructed by the Secretary for which the Secretary continues to have financial or operational responsibility.

“(b) INVENTORY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, the Secretary shall, based on the assessment carried out under subsection (a), develop an inventory of projects or portions of projects—

“(1) that are not needed for the missions of the Corps of Engineers;

“(2) the modification of which, including though the use of natural features or nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)), could improve the sustainable operations of the project, or reduce operation and maintenance costs for the project; or
“(3) that are no longer having project purposes adequately met by the Corps of Engineers, because of deferment of maintenance or other challenges, and the divestment of which to a non-Federal entity could better meet the local and regional needs for operation and maintenance.

“(c) CRITERIA.—In conducting the assessment under subsection (a) and developing the inventory under subsection (b), the Secretary shall use the following criteria:

“(1) The extent to which the project aligns with the current missions of the Corps of Engineers.

“(2) The economic and environmental impacts of the project on existing communities in the vicinity of the project.

“(3) The extent to which the divestment or modification of the project could reduce operation and maintenance costs of the Corps of Engineers.

“(4) The extent to which the divestment or modification of the project is in the public interest.

“(5) The extent to which investment of additional Federal resources in the project proposed for divestment or modification, including investment needed to bring the project to a good state of repair, is in the public interest.
“(6) The extent to which the authorized purpose of the project is no longer being met.

“(d) **Recommendations of Non-Federal Interests.**—A non-Federal interest for a project may recommend that the Secretary include such project in the assessment or inventory required under this section.

“(e) **Report to Congress.**—

“(1) **In general.**—Upon completion of the inventory required by subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available, a report containing the findings of the Secretary with respect to the assessment and inventory required under this section.

“(2) **Inclusion.**—The Secretary shall list in an appendix any recommendation of a non-Federal interest made with respect to a project under subsection (d) that the Secretary determines not to include in the inventory developed under subsection (b), based on the criteria in subsection (e), including information about the request and the reasons for the Secretary’s determination.”.
SEC. 124. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MULTIPURPOSE PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, in coordination with non-Federal interests, should maximize the development, evaluation, and recommendation of project alternatives for future water resources development projects that produce multiple project benefits, such as navigation, flood risk management, and ecosystem restoration benefits, including through the use of natural or nature-based features and the beneficial reuse of dredged material.

SEC. 125. BENEFICIAL REUSE OF DREDGED MATERIAL; DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) National Policy on the Beneficial Reuse of Dredged Material.—

(1) In general.—It is the policy of the United States for the Corps of Engineers to maximize the beneficial reuse, in an environmentally acceptable manner, of suitable dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects.

(2) Placement of Dredged Materials.—

(A) In general.—In evaluating the placement of dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of

...
water resources development projects, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the suitability of the dredged material for a full range of beneficial uses; and

(ii) the economic and environmental benefits, efficiencies, and impacts (including the effects on living coral) of using the dredged material for beneficial uses, including, in the case of beneficial reuse activities that involve more than one water resources development project, the benefits, efficiencies, and impacts that result from the combined activities.

(B) Calculation of Federal Standard.—The economic benefits and efficiencies from the beneficial use of dredged material considered by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be included in any determination relating to the “Federal standard” by the Secretary under section 335.7 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations for the placement or disposal of such material.

(b) Beneficial Use of Dredged Material.—
(1) Pilot program projects.—Section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking “20” and inserting “30”.

(2) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, in selecting projects for the beneficial reuse of dredged materials under section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note), should ensure the thorough evaluation of project submissions from rural, small, and economically disadvantaged communities.

c) Five-year regional dredged material management plans.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the District Commander of each district of the Corps of Engineers that obtains dredged material through the construction or operation and maintenance of a water resources development project shall, at Federal expense, develop and submit to the Secretary a 5-year dredged material manage-
ment plan in coordination with relevant State agencies and stakeholders.

(2) Scope.—Each plan developed under this subsection shall include—

(A) a dredged material budget for each watershed or littoral system within the district;

(B) an estimate of the amount of dredged material likely to be obtained through the construction or operation and maintenance of all water resources development projects projected to be carried out within the district during the 5-year period following submission of the plan, and the estimated timing for obtaining such dredged material;

(C) an identification of potential water resources development projects projected to be carried out within the district during such 5-year period that are suitable for, or that require, the placement of dredged material, and an estimate of the amount of dredged material placement capacity of such projects;

(D) an evaluation of—

(i) the suitability of the dredged material for a full range of beneficial uses; and
(ii) the economic and environmental benefits, efficiencies, and impacts (including the effects on living coral) of using the dredged material for beneficial uses, including, in the case of beneficial reuse activities that involve more than one water resources development project, the benefits, efficiencies, and impacts that result from the combined activities; and

(E) the district-wide goals for beneficial reuse of the dredged material, including any expected cost savings from aligning and coordinating multiple projects (including projects across Corps districts) in the reuse of the dredged material.

(3) PUBLIC COMMENT.—In developing each plan under this subsection, each District Commander shall provide notice and an opportunity for public comment.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Upon submission of each plan to the Secretary under this subsection, each District Commander shall make the plan publicly available, including on a publicly available website.

(d) DREDGE PILOT PROGRAM.—
(1) REVISIONS.—Section 1111 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “for the operation and maintenance of harbors and inland harbors” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“for the—

“(1) harbors and inland harbors referred to in section 210(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)); or

“(2) inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).”;

and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “or inland harbors” and inserting “, inland harbors, or inland or intracoastal waterways”.

(2) COORDINATION WITH EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may carry out the dredge pilot program authorized by section 1111 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note) in coordination with Federal regional dredge demonstration programs in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.
SEC. 126. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION FOR ANADROMOUS FISH.

(a) Anadromous Fish Habitat and Passage.—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) Anadromous fish habitat and passage.—

“(A) Measures.—A project under this section may include measures to improve habitat or passage for anadromous fish, including—

“(i) installing fish bypass structures on small water diversions;

“(ii) modifying tide gates; and

“(iii) restoring or reconnecting floodplains and wetlands that are important for anadromous fish habitat or passage.

“(B) Benefits.—A project that includes measures under this paragraph shall be formulated to maximize benefits for the anadromous fish species benefitted by the project.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Prioritization.—The Secretary shall give projects that include measures described in subsection...
(a)(3) equal priority for implementation as other projects under this section.”.

SEC. 127. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 7001(c)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d(c)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(3) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) the Secretary shall not include proposals in the appendix of the annual report that otherwise meet the criteria for inclusion in the annual report solely on the basis that the proposals are for the purposes of navigation, flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, or municipal or agricultural water supply; and”.

SEC. 128. HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration program to determine the causes of, and implement measures to effectively detect, prevent, treat, and eliminate, harmful algal blooms associated with water resources development projects.
(b) **CONSULTATION; USE OF EXISTING DATA AND PROGRAM AUTHORITIES.**—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

1. consult with the heads of appropriate Federal and State agencies; and

2. make maximum use of existing Federal and State data and ongoing programs and activities of Federal and State agencies, including the activities of the Secretary carried out through the Engineer Research and Development Center pursuant to section 1109 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 610 note).

(c) **FOCUS AREAS.**—In carrying out the demonstration program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall undertake program activities related to harmful algal blooms in the Great Lakes, the tidal and inland waters of the State of New Jersey, the coastal and tidal waters of the State of Louisiana, the waterways of the counties that comprise the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, and Lake Okeechobee, Florida.

**SEC. 129. UPDATE ON INVASIVE SPECIES POLICY GUIDANCE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall periodically update the Invasive Species Policy Guidance, developed under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958
(33 U.S.C. 610) and the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), in accordance with the most recent National Invasive Species Council Management Plan developed pursuant to Executive Order 13112.

(b) INCLUSION.—The Secretary may include in the updated guidance invasive species specific efforts at federally authorized water resources development projects located in—

1. high-altitude lakes; and
2. the Tennessee and Cumberland River basins.

SEC. 130. REPORT ON DEBRIS REMOVAL.

Section 1210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3808) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1210. REPORT ON DEBRIS REMOVAL.

“Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make publicly available a report that describes—

“(1) the extent to which, during the 10 fiscal years prior to such date of enactment, the Secretary has carried out section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a);
“(2) how the Secretary has evaluated potential work to be carried out under that section; and
“(3) the extent to which the Secretary plans to start, continue, or complete debris removal activities in the 3 years following submission of the report.”.

SEC. 131. MISSOURI RIVER INTERCEPTION-REARING COMPLEX CONSTRUCTION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually 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 effects of any interception-rearing complex constructed on the Missouri River on—

(1) flood risk management and navigation; and
(2) the population recovery of the pallid sturgeon, including baseline population counts.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL IRC CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may not authorize construction of an interception-rearing complex on the Missouri River until the Secretary—

(1) submits the report required by subsection (a);
(2) acting through the Engineer Research and Development Center, conducts further research on
interception-rearing complex design, including any
effects on existing flows, flood risk management, and
navigation; and

(3) develops a plan—

(A) to repair dikes and revetments that are
affecting flood risk and bank erosion; and

(B) to establish, repair, or improve water
control structures at the headworks of con-
structed shallow water habitat side-channels.

(c) FUTURE IRC CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary shall
provide an opportunity for comment from the public
and the Governor of each affected State on any pro-
posals to construct an interception-rearing complex
after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PERIOD.—The public comment period re-
quired by paragraph (1) shall be not less than 90
days for each proposal to construct an interception-
rearing complex on the Missouri River.

SEC. 132. COST AND BENEFIT FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(a)(2)(B) of the Act of
August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(I), by inserting “, or provide
contributions equal to,” after “pay”; and

(2) in clause (ii)—
(A) in the heading, by inserting “AND CONTRIBUTIONS” after “OF PAYMENTS”;

(B) by inserting “or contributions” after “Non-Federal payments”; and

(C) by inserting “or contributions” after “non-Federal payments”.

(b) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.—Section 1161(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 701n note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the “three fiscal years preceeding” and inserting “five fiscal years preceeding”; and

(B) by striking “last day of the third fiscal year” and inserting “last day of the fifth fiscal year”;.

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, or provide contributions equal to,” before “an amount sufficient”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the Secretary determines that the damage to the structure was not as a result of negligent operation or maintenance.”.
SEC. 133. MATERIALS, SERVICES, AND FUNDS FOR REPAIR,

RESTORATION, OR REHABILITATION OF

PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any area covered by an emergency or major disaster declaration declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Secretary is authorized to accept and use materials, services, and funds, during the period the declaration is in effect, from a non-Federal interest or private entity to repair, restore, or rehabilitate a federally authorized water resources development project, and to provide reimbursement to such non-Federal interest or private entity for such materials, services, and funds, in the Secretary’s sole discretion, and subject to the availability of appropriations, if the Secretary determines that reimbursement is in the public interest.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may only reimburse for the use of materials or services accepted under this section if such materials or services meet the Secretary’s specifications and comply with all applicable laws and regulations that would apply if such materials and services were acquired by the Secretary, including sections 3141 through 3148 and 3701 through 3708 of title 40, United States Code, section 8302 of title 41, United States Code, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.
(c) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the acceptance of
materials, services, or funds under this section, the
Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter
into an agreement that specifies—

(A) the non-Federal interest shall hold and
save the United States free from any and all
damages that arise from use of materials or
services of the non-Federal interest, except for
damages due to the fault or negligence of the
United States or its contractors;

(B) the non-Federal interest shall certify
that the materials or services comply with all
applicable laws and regulations under sub-
section (b); and

(C) any other term or condition required
by the Secretary.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If an agreement under para-
graph (1) was not entered prior to materials or serv-
ces being contributed, a non-Federal interest shall
enter into an agreement with the Secretary that—

(A) specifies the value, as determined by
the Secretary, of those materials or services
contributed and eligible for reimbursement; and
(B) ensures that the materials or services comply with subsection (b) and paragraph (1).

SEC. 134. LEVEE SAFETY.

Section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each levee included in an inventory established under subsection (b) or for which the Secretary has conducted a review under subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

“(A) identify the specific engineering and maintenance deficiencies, if any; and

“(B) describe the recommended remedies to correct each deficiency identified under sub-paragraph (A), and, if requested by owner of a non-Federal levee, the associated costs of those remedies.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In identifying deficiencies and describing remedies for a levee under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with relevant non-Federal interests, including by providing an opportunity for comment by those non-Federal interests.”.
SEC. 135. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) Definitions.—Section 2 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) has an emergency action plan that—

“(I) is approved by the relevant State dam safety agency; or

“(II) is in conformance with State law and pending approval by the relevant State dam safety agency;”;

and

(ii) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) fails to meet minimum dam safety standards of the State in which the dam is located, as determined by the State; and

“(v) poses an unacceptable risk to the public, as determined by the Administrator, in consultation with the Board;”;

and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting

“under a hydropower project with an authorized
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installed capacity of greater than 1.5 megawatts” after “dam”; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR” and inserting “ELIGIBLE SUBRECIPIENT”; and

(B) by striking “The term ‘non-Federal sponsor’” and inserting “The term ‘eligible subrecipient’”.

(b) REHABILITATION OF HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL DAMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Section 8A(a) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2(a)) is amended by striking “to non-Federal sponsors” and inserting “to States with dam safety programs”.

(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Section 8A(b) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2(b)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “for a project may be used for” and inserting “to a State may be used by the State to award grants to eligible subrecipients for”.
(3) AWARD OF GRANTS.—Section 8A(c) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “State”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “an eligible high hazard potential dam to a non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “eligible high hazard potential dams to a State”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “PROJECT GRANT” and inserting “GRANT”;

(II) by striking “project grant agreement with the non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “grant agreement with the State”; and

(III) by striking “project,” and inserting “projects for which the grant is awarded,”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:
“(C) GRANT ASSURANCE.—As part of a grant agreement under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall require that each eligible subrecipient to which the State awards a grant under this section provides an assurance, with respect to the dam to be rehabilitated by the eligible subrecipient, that the dam owner will carry out a plan for maintenance of the dam during the expected life of the dam.”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “A grant provided under this section shall not exceed” and inserting “A State may not award a grant to an eligible subrecipient under this section that exceeds, for any 1 dam,”.

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8A(d) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2(d)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “to an eligible subrecipient” after “this section”; 

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR” and inserting “ELIGIBLE SUBRECIPIENT”;
(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the non-Federal sponsor shall” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient shall, with respect to the dam to be rehabilitated by the eligible subrecipient”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) demonstrate that the community in which the dam is located participates in, and complies with, all applicable Federal flood insurance programs, including demonstrating that such community is participating in the National Flood Insurance Program, and is not on probation, suspended, or withdrawn from such Program;”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking “have” and inserting “beginning not later than 2 years after the date on which the Administrator publishes criteria for hazard mitigation plans under paragraph (3), demonstrate that the Tribal or local government with jurisdiction over the area in which the dam is located has”; and
(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking “50-year period” and inserting “expected life of the dam”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN CRITERIA.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall publish criteria for hazard mitigation plans required under paragraph (2)(B).”.

(5) FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 8A(e) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “the non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “an eligible subrecipient”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years” each place it appears; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) PLAN CRITERIA AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall provide criteria, and may provide tech-
technical support, for the development and implementation of floodplain management plans prepared under this subsection.”.

(6) CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8A(i)(1) of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2(i)(1)) is amended by striking “a non-Federal sponsor” and inserting “an eligible sub-
recipient”.

SEC. 136. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED PUMP STATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PUMP STATION.—The term “eligible pump station” means a pump station—

(A) constructed, in whole or in part, by the Corps of Engineers for flood risk management purposes;

(B) that the Secretary has identified as having a major deficiency; and

(C) the failure of which the Secretary has determined would impair the function of a flood risk management project constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) REHABILITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “rehabilitation”, with respect to an eligible pump station,
means to address a major deficiency of the eligible pump station caused by long-term degradation of the foundation, construction materials, or engineering systems or components of the eligible pump station.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “rehabilitation”, with respect to an eligible pump station, includes—

(i) the incorporation into the eligible pump station of—

(I) current design standards;

(II) efficiency improvements; and

(III) associated drainage; and

(ii) increasing the capacity of the eligible pump station, subject to the condition that the increase shall—

(I) significantly decrease the risk of loss of life and property damage; or

(II) decrease total lifecycle rehabilitation costs for the eligible pump station.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may carry out rehabilitation of an eligible pump station, if the Secretary determines that the rehabilitation is feasible.
(c) Cost Sharing.—The non-Federal interest for the eligible pump station shall—

(1) provide 35 percent of the cost of rehabilitation of an eligible pump station carried out under this section; and

(2) provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, and necessary relocations associated with the rehabilitation described in subparagraph (A), at no cost to the Federal Government.

(d) Agreement Required.—The rehabilitation of an eligible pump station pursuant to this section shall be initiated only after a non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary—

(1) to pay the non-Federal share of the costs of rehabilitation under subsection (c); and

(2) to pay 100 percent of the operation and maintenance costs of the rehabilitated eligible pump station, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

(e) Treatment.—The rehabilitation of an eligible pump station pursuant to this section shall not be considered to be a separable element of the associated flood risk management project constructed by the Corps of Engineers.
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(f) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 137. NON-FEDERAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2026”;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “2023” and inserting “2026”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of the pilot program that, to the extent practicable, identifies—

“(i) the metrics for measuring the success of the pilot program;

“(ii) a process for identifying future projects to participate in the pilot program;
“(iii) measures to address the risks of a non-Federal interest constructing projects under the pilot program, including which entity bears the risk for projects that fail to meet the Corps of Engineers standards for design or quality;

“(iv) the laws and regulations that a non-Federal interest must follow in carrying out a project under the pilot program; and

“(v) which entity bears the risk in the event that a project carried out under the pilot program fails to be carried out in accordance with the project authorization or this subsection.

“(B) NEW PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may not enter into a project partnership agreement under this subsection during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ending on the date on which the Secretary issues the guidance under subparagraph (A).”.
SEC. 138. DEFINITION OF ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance defining the term “economically disadvantaged community” for the purposes of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In defining the term “economically disadvantaged community” under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the criteria under paragraphs (1) or (2) of section 301(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161), to the extent that such criteria are applicable in relation to the development of water resources development projects.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENT.—In developing the guidance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide notice and an opportunity for public comment.

SEC. 139. COST SHARING PROVISIONS FOR TERRITORIES AND INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 1156(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2310(b)) is amended by striking “inflation” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “on an annual basis for inflation.”.
SEC. 140. FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES.

Section 103(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except as” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RENEGOTIATION OF TERMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a non-Federal interest, the Secretary and the non-Federal interest may renegotiate the terms and conditions of an eligible deferred payment, including—

“(i) permitting the non-Federal contribution to be made without interest, pursuant to paragraph (1);

“(ii) recalculation of the interest rate;

“(iii) full or partial forgiveness of interest accrued during the period of construction; and

“(iv) a credit against construction interest for a non-Federal investment that benefits the completion or performance of the project or separable element.
“(B) ELIGIBLE DEFERRED PAYMENT.—An eligible deferred payment agreement under subparagraph (A) is an agreement for which—

“(i) the non-Federal contribution was made with interest;

“(ii) the period of project construction exceeds 10 years from the execution of a project partnership agreement or appropriation of funds; and

“(iii) the construction interest exceeds $45,000,000.

“(C) CREDIT FOR NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to credit any costs incurred by the non-Federal interest (including in-kind contributions) to remedy a design or construction deficiency of a covered project or separable element toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the covered project, if the Secretary determines the remedy to be integral to the completion or performance of the covered project.

“(ii) CREDIT OF COSTS.—If the non-Federal interest incurs costs or in-kind
contributions for a project to remedy a design or construction deficiency of a project or separable element which has a 100 percent Federal cost share, and the Secretary determines the remedy to be integral to the completion or performance of the project, the Secretary is authorized to credit such costs to any interest accrued on a deferred non-Federal contribution.”.

SEC. 141. REVIEW OF CONTRACTING POLICIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall complete a review of the policies, guidelines, and regulations of the Corps of Engineers for the development of contractual agreements between the Secretary and non-Federal interests and utilities associated with the construction of water resources development projects.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completing the review 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, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

(1) a summary of the results of the review; and
(2) public guidance on best practices for non-Federal interest to use when writing or developing contractual agreements with the Secretary and utilities.

(c) PROVISION OF GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall provide the best practices guidance included under subsection (b)(2) to non-Federal interests prior to the development of contractual agreements.

SEC. 142. BUY AMERICA.

With respect to all Corps of Engineers construction and rehabilitation contracts to be awarded after the date of enactment of this Act, the steel components furnished and delivered under such contracts shall be manufactured or fabricated in whole or substantial part in the United States with steel produced or made in the United States, its territories, or possessions.

SEC. 143. ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

Concurrent with each report submitted under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works a report that provides for an accounting of all outstanding feasibility studies being
conducted by the Secretary, including, for each such study, its length, cost, and expected completion date.

**TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS**

**SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**

(a) In General.—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. **TONTO CREEK, GILA RIVER, ARIZONA.**—Project for flood risk management, Tonto Creek, Gila River, Arizona.

2. **SULPHUR RIVER, ARKANSAS AND TEXAS.**—Project for ecosystem restoration, Sulphur River, Arkansas and Texas.

3. **CABLE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—Project for flood risk management, water supply, and related benefits, Cable Creek, California.
(4) DEL MAR BLUFFS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for shoreline stabilization, Del Mar Bluffs, San Diego County, California.

(5) REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS, CALIFORNIA.—Project for water conservation and water supply, Redbank and Fancher Creeks, California.

(6) RIO HONDO CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Rio Hondo Channel, San Gabriel River, California.

(7) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for coastal storm damage reduction, Southern California.

(8) SHINGLE CREEK AND KISSIMMEE RIVER, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and water storage, Shingle Creek and Kissimmee River, Osceola County, Florida.

(9) ST. JOHN’S RIVER AND LAKE JESUP, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, St. John’s River and Lake Jesup, Florida.

(10) WAIMEA RIVER, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management, Waimea River, Kauai, Hawaii.

(11) CHICAGO AREA WATERWAYS SYSTEM, ILLINOIS.—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.


(13) Lower Missouri River, Kansas.—Project for bank stabilization and navigation, Lower Missouri River, Sioux City, Kansas.

(14) Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana.—Project for flood risk management, Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana.

(15) Kent Narrows and Chester River, Maryland.—Project for navigation, Kent Narrows and Chester River, Queen Anne’s County, Maryland.

(16) Boston, Massachusetts.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Boston, Massachusetts, pursuant to the comprehensive study authorized under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2).

(17) Lower St. Croix River, Minnesota.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Lower St. Croix River, Minnesota.

(18) Escatawpa River Basin, Mississippi.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem
restoration, Escatawpa River, Jackson County, Mississippi.

(19) **Long Beach, Bay St. Louis and Mississippi Sound, Mississippi.**—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and flood risk management, Long Beach, Bay St. Louis and Mississippi Sound, Mississippi.

(20) **Pascagoula River Basin, Mississippi.**—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

(21) **Tallahoma and Tallahala Creeks, Mississippi.**—Project for flood risk management, Leaf River, Jones County, Mississippi.

(22) **Lower Osage River Basin, Missouri.**—Project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Osage River Basin, Missouri.

(23) **Upper Basin and Stony Brook (Green Brook Sub-basin), Raritan River Basin, New Jersey.**—Reevaluation of the Upper Basin and Stony Brook portions of the project for flood control, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119), including the evaluation of nonstructural measures to achieve the project purpose.
(24) LAKE ONTARIO SHORELINE, NEW YORK.— Project for coastal storm resiliency, Lake Ontario shoreline, New York.

(25) WADING RIVER CREEK, NEW YORK.— Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, flood risk management, navigation, and ecosystem restoration, Wading River Creek, New York.

(26) REEL POINT PRESERVE, NEW YORK.— Project for navigation and shoreline stabilization, Reel Point Preserve, New York.

(27) GOLDSMITH INLET, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Goldsmith Inlet, New York.

(28) TUSCARAWAS RIVER BASIN, OHIO.— Project for comprehensive watershed study, Tuscarawas River Basin, Ohio.

(29) LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN (TURNING BASIN), OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—Project to improve or add turning basins for the project for navigation, Columbia River Channel, Oregon and Washington, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 280).

(30) WILLIAMSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood risk management and levee rehabilitation, greater Williamsport, Pennsylvania.
(31) City of Charleston, South Carolina.—Project for tidal- and inland-related flood risk management, Charleston, South Carolina.

(32) Tennessee and Cumberland River Basins, Tennessee.—Project to deter, impede, or restrict the dispersal of aquatic nuisance species in the Tennessee and Cumberland River Basins, Tennessee.

(33) Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, Texas.—Modification of the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Arthur and Orange County, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1184), and authorized as a separable element of the project for Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, authorized by item 3 of section 1401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3838), to reduce the risk of flooding through the construction of improvements to interior drainage.

(34) Port of Victoria, Texas.—Project for flood risk management, Port of Victoria, Texas.

(35) Lower Fox River Basin, Wisconsin.—Project for comprehensive watershed study, Lower Fox River Basin, Wisconsin.
(36) UPPER FOX RIVER AND WOLF RIVER, WISCONSIN.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Upper Fox River and Wolf River, Wisconsin.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary shall consider any study carried out by the Secretary to formulate the modifications to the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Arthur and Orange County, Texas, identified in subsection (a)(33) to be a continuation of the study carried out for Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, Texas, authorized by a resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, approved June 23, 2004, and funded by title IV of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, under the heading “Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Construction” (Public Law 115–123; 132 Stat. 76).

SEC. 202. EXPEDITED COMPLETIONS.

(a) FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—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, St. George Harbor, Alaska.
(2) Project for shoreline stabilization, Aunu’u Harbor, American Samoa.

(3) Project for shoreline stabilization, Tutuila Island, American Samoa.

(4) Project for flood risk management, Lower Santa Cruz River, Arizona.

(5) Project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes, Coyote Valley Dam, California.

(6) Project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Del Rosa Channel, city of San Bernardino, California.

(7) Project for flood risk management, Lower Cache Creek, California.

(8) Project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Mission-Zanja Channel, cities of San Bernardino and Redlands, California.


(10) Project for flood risk management, Prado Basin, California.

(11) Project to modify the project for navigation, San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California.
(12) Project to modify the Seven Oaks Dam, California, portion of the project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113; 101 Stat. 1329–111; 104 Stat. 4611; 110 Stat. 3713; 121 Stat. 1115), to include water conservation as an authorized purpose.

(13) Project to modify the project for navigation, Delaware River Mainstem and Channel Deepening, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802; 113 Stat. 300; 114 Stat. 2602), to include the construction of a turning basin located near the Packer Avenue Marine Terminal.

(14) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project Canal 111 (C–111), South Dade County, Florida.


(17) Project for flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Blue River Basin, Kansas City, Kansas, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on September 24, 2008 (docket number 2803).

(18) Project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries east of the Mississippi River, Louisiana.

(19) Project for coastal storm risk management, Upper Barataria Basin, Louisiana.

(20) Project to replace the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges, Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

(21) Project to deepen the project for navigation, Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4094).

(22) Project for flood risk management, Rahway River Basin, New Jersey.

(23) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Highlands, New Jersey.
(24) Project for navigation, Shark River, New Jersey.

(25) Project for flood risk management, Rondout Creek-Wallkill River Watershed, New York, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on May 2, 2007 (docket number 2776).

(26) Project for ecosystem restoration and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Spring Creek South (Howard Beach), Queens, New York.

(27) Project to resolve increased silting and shoaling adjacent to the Federal channel, Port of Bandon, Coquille River, Oregon.


(29) Project for ecosystem restoration, Hood River at the confluence with the Columbia River, Oregon.

(30) Project for flood risk management, Rio Culebrinas, Puerto Rico.

(31) Project for flood risk management, Rio Grande de Manati, Puerto Rico.

(33) Project for flood risk management, Dorchester County, South Carolina.

(34) Project for navigation, Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina.

(35) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina.

(36) Project to modify the projects for navigation and other purposes, Old Hickory Lock and Dam and the Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, Cumberland River, Tennessee, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636), to add flood risk management as an authorized purpose.

(37) Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and related purposes, Lower Rio Grande River, Cameron County, Texas, carried out pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on May 21, 2003 (docket number 2710).

(38) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Bolongo Bay, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.
(39) Project for flood risk management, Savan Gut Phase II, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(40) Project for flood risk management, Turpentine Run, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(41) Project for navigation, North Landing Bridge, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Virginia.

(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, Tres Rios, Arizona.

(2) Project for flood control, San Luis Rey River, California.

(3) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project Canal 111 (C–111), South Dade County, Florida.


(5) Project for flood risk management, Des Moines Levee System, including Birdland Park
Levee, Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Des Moines, Iowa.

(c) WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.—

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of an assessment under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a), for the following:

(1) Kansas River Basin, Kansas.

(2) Merrimack River Basin, Massachusetts.

(d) DISPOSITION STUDIES.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a disposition study, carried out under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), for the following:

(1) The disposition of the project for Salinas Reservoir (Santa Margarita Lake), California.


SEC. 203. FEASIBILITY STUDY MODIFICATIONS.

(a) SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 142 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2930) is amended—
(1) by inserting “; and along the ocean shoreline of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties,” after “Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers”; 
(2) by inserting “and, with respect to the bay and ocean shorelines of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties, the feasibility of and the Federal interest in providing measures to adapt to rising sea levels” after “tidal and fluvial flooding”; 
(3) by striking “investigation” and inserting in its place “investigations”; and 
(4) by inserting after “San Francisco Bay region” the following: “and, with respect to the bay and ocean shorelines and streams running to the bay and ocean shorelines of San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties, the effects of proposed measures or improvements on the local economy; habitat restoration, enhancement, or expansion efforts or opportunities; public infrastructure protection and improvement; stormwater runoff capacity and control measures, including those that may mitigate flooding; erosion of beaches and coasts; and any other measures or improvements relevant to adapting to rising sea levels”.

(b) SACRAMENTO RIVER, SOUTHERN SUTTER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—The study for flood control and allied
purposes for the Sacramento River Basin, authorized by
1197), is modified to authorize the Secretary to conduct
a study for flood risk management, southern Sutter Coun-
ty between the Sacramento River and Sutter Bypass, Cali-
ifornia.

(e) SALTON SEA, CALIFORNIA.—In carrying out the
program to implement projects to restore the Salton Sea,
California, authorized by section 3032 of the Water Re-
sources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1113; 130
Stat. 1677), the Secretary is authorized to carry out a
study for the construction of a perimeter lake, or a north-
er or southern subset thereof, for the Salton Sea, Cali-
ifornia.

(d) NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR AND
TRIBUTARIES, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—The study
for flood and storm damage reduction for the New York
and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries project, author-
132), and being carried out pursuant to the Disaster Re-
lief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2), is
modified to require the Secretary to—

(1) evaluate and address the impacts of low-fre-
quency precipitation and sea-level rise on the study
area;
(2) consult with affected communities; and

(3) ensure the study is carried out in accordance with section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c).

SEC. 204. SELMA, ALABAMA.

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—

(1) provides an update on the study for flood risk management and riverbank stabilization, Selma, Alabama, authorized by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works and Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on June 7, 1961, and April 28, 1936, respectively, the completion of which the Secretary was required to expedite by section 1203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3803); and

(2) identifies project alternatives necessary to—

(A) assure the preservation of cultural and historic values associated with national historic landmarks within the study area; and
(B) provide flood risk management for economically disadvantaged communities within the study area.

SEC. 205. COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER, YOLO BYPASS, CALIFORNIA.

(a) Comprehensive Study.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Sacramento River in the vicinity of the Yolo Bypass System, California, to identify actions to be undertaken by the Secretary for the comprehensive management of the Yolo Bypass System for the purposes of flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation.

(b) Consultation and Use of Existing Data.—

(1) Consultation.—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with the Governor of the State of California, applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, non-Federal interests, the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Partnership, and other stakeholders.

(2) Use of Existing Data and Prior Studies.—To the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, the Secretary may—

(A) make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by the entities identified in paragraph (1); and
(B) incorporate—

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

(ii) the latest technical data and scientific approaches to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary may develop a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Yolo Bypass System for additional study by the Secretary.
(2) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under paragraph (1)(D) shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive study authorized under subsection (a).

(d) COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 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 detailing—

(1) the results of the comprehensive study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations developed under subsection (c);

(2) any additional, site-specific areas within the Yolo Bypass System where additional study for flood risk management or ecosystem restoration projects is recommended by the Secretary; and

(3) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) YOLO BYPASS SYSTEM.—The term “Yolo Bypass System” means the system of weirs, levees, bypass structures, and other water resources devel-
opment projects in California’s Sacramento River Valley, extending from the Fremont Weir near Woodland, California, to the Sacramento River near Rio Vista, California, authorized pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144; 39 Stat. 949).

(2) YOLO BYPASS AND CACHE CLOUGH PARTNERSHIP.—The term “Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Partnership” means the group of parties to the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough Memorandum of Understanding, effective May 2016, regarding collaboration and cooperation in the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough region.

SEC. 206. LAKE OKEECHOBEE REGULATION SCHEDULE, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the review of the Lake Okeechobee regulation schedule pursuant to section 1106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3773), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the implications of prohibiting releases from Lake Okeechobee through the S–308 and S–80 lock and dam structures on the operation of the lake in accordance with authorized purposes and seek to minimize unnecessary releases to coastal estuaries; and
(2) to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the ongoing efforts of Federal and State agencies responsible for monitoring, forecasting, and notification of cyanobacteria levels in Lake Okeechobee.

(b) MONTHLY REPORT.—Each month, the Secretary shall make public a report, which may be based on the Water Management Daily Operational Reports, disclosing the volumes of water deliveries to or discharges from Lake Okeechobee & Vicinity, Water Conservation Area I, Water Conservation Area II, Water Conservation Area III, East Coast Canals, and the South Dade Conveyance. Such report shall be aggregated and reported in a format designed for the general public, using maps or other widely understood communication tools.

(e) EFFECT.—In carrying out the evaluation under subsection (a)(1), nothing shall be construed to authorize any new purpose for the management of Lake Okeechobee or authorize the Secretary to affect any existing authorized purpose, including flood protection and management of Lake Okeechobee to provide water supply for all authorized users.

SEC. 207. GREAT LAKES COASTAL RESILIENCY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out 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), the Secretary shall—

(1) taking into account recent high lake levels within the Great Lakes, assess and make recommendations to Congress on—

(A) coastal storm and flood risk management measures, including measures that use natural features and nature-based features, as those terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a);

(B) operation and maintenance of the Great Lakes Navigation System, as such term is defined in section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238);

(C) ecosystem protection and restoration;

(D) the prevention and control of invasive species and the effects of invasive species; and

(E) recreation associated with water resources development projects;
(2) prioritize actions necessary to protect critical public infrastructure, communities, and critical natural or cultural resources; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, utilize existing data provided to the Secretary by Federal and State agencies, Indian Tribes, and other stakeholders, including data obtained through other Federal programs.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS; ADDITIONAL STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the comprehensive assessment described in subsection (a), the Secretary may make a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) such additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources development projects, to respond to changing hydrologic and climatic conditions; or
(D) geographic areas within the Great Lakes System for additional study by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—Any feasibility study carried out pursuant to a recommendation under paragraph (1)(D) shall be considered to be a continuation of the comprehensive assessment described in subsection (a).

(e) EXEMPTION FROM MAXIMUM STUDY COST AND DURATION LIMITATIONS.—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) shall not apply to any study recommended under subsection (b)(1)(D).

SEC. 208. RATHBUN LAKE, CHARITON RIVER, IOWA.

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 that evaluates—

(1) the existing allocations of storage space for Rathbun Lake, authorized pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1262; 121 Stat. 1124), including the existing allocation for municipal water supply;
(2) the feasibility of expanding the existing allocation of storage for municipal water supply; and

(3) the affordability of future municipal water supply allocations from Rathbun Lake, for residential users of such future allocations, at projected future costs.

SEC. 209. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF RESTORATION IN THE LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force established by section 7004 of Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1272) shall submit to Congress a report that summarizes the activities and recommendations of the task force, including—

(1) policies, strategies, plans, programs, projects, and activities undertaken for addressing conservation, protection, restoration, and maintenance of the coastal Louisiana ecosystem; and

(2) financial participation by each agency represented on the Task Force in conserving, protecting, restoring, and maintaining the coastal Louisiana ecosystem.
SEC. 210. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Lower Mississippi River basin, from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, to the Gulf of Mexico, to identify actions to be undertaken by the Secretary for the comprehensive management of the basin for the purposes of flood risk management, navigation, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation.

(2) FOCUS AREAS.—In conducting the comprehensive study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall investigate projects, including—

(A) projects proposed in the comprehensive coastal protection master plan entitled “Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (including any subsequent amendments or revisions), including—

(i) Ama sediment diversion;

(ii) Union freshwater diversion;

(iii) increase Atchafalaya flow to Terrebonne; and
(iv) Manchac Landbridge diversion;

and

(B) natural features and nature-based features, including levee setbacks and instream and floodplain restoration.

(b) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—

In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with applicable Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian Tribes, non-Federal interests, and other stakeholders, and, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by such parties.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In conducting the comprehensive study under subsection (a), the Secretary may develop a recommendation to Congress for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of an existing water resources development project;

(C) such additional monitoring of, or adaptive management measures to carry out with respect to, existing water resources devel-
opment projects, to respond to changing condi-
tions; or

(D) geographic areas within the Lower
Mississippi River basin for additional study by
the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—Any feasi-
bility study carried out pursuant to a recommenda-
tion under this subsection shall be considered to be
a continuation of the comprehensive study required
under subsection (a).

(d) COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CON-
GRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enact-
ment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the
House of Representatives and the Committee on Environ-
ment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—
(1) the results of the comprehensive study re-
quired by this section, including any recommenda-
tions developed under subsection (c); and

(2) any interim actions relating to existing
water resources development projects undertaken by
the Secretary during the study period.
SEC. 211. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

(a) Assessment.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the water resources needs of the Upper Mississippi River under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a).

(b) Requirements.—The Secretary shall carry out the assessment under subsection (a) in accordance with the requirements in section 1206(b) of Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1686).

SEC. 212. LOWER MISSOURI BASIN FLOOD RISK AND RESILIENCE STUDY, IOWA, KANSAS, NEBRASKA, AND MISSOURI.

(a) Additional Studies.—

(1) In general.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), upon the request of the non-Federal interest for the Lower Missouri Basin study, the Secretary shall expand the scope of such study to investigate and provide recommendations relating to—

(A) modifications to projects in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri authorized under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9(b) of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 891)) and the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation project (authorized by...
section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 19)), including modifications to the authorized purposes of such projects to further flood risk management and resiliency; and

(B) modifications to non-Federal, publicly owned levees in the Lower Missouri River Basin.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If the Secretary determines that expanding the scope of the Lower Missouri Basin study as provided in paragraph (1) is not practicable, and the non-Federal interest for such study concurs in such determination, the Secretary shall carry out such additional studies as are necessary to investigate the modifications described in paragraph (1).

(3) CONTINUATION OF LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.—The following studies shall be considered a continuation of the Lower Missouri Basin study:

(A) Any additional study carried out under paragraph (2).

(B) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers prepares for the Lower Missouri Basin study.

(C) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers pre-
pares for an additional study carried out under paragraph (2).

(D) Any study spun off from the Lower Missouri Basin study before the completion of such study.

(E) Any study spun off from an additional study carried out under paragraph (2) before the completion of such additional study.

(4) RELIANCE ON EXISTING INFORMATION.—In carrying out any study described in or authorized by this section, the Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall rely on existing data and analysis, including data and analysis prepared under section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16).

(5) CONSIDERATION; CONSULTATION.—In developing recommendations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consider the use of—

(i) structural and nonstructural measures, including the setting back of levees and removing structures from areas of recurring flood vulnerability, where advantageous, to reduce flood risk and damages in the Lower Missouri River Basin; and
(ii) where such features are locally acceptable, natural features or nature-based features (as such terms are defined in section 1184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a); and

(B) consult with applicable Federal and State agencies, Indian Tribes, and other stakeholders within the Lower Missouri River Basin and solicit public comment on such recommendations.

(6) EXEMPTION FROM MAXIMUM STUDY COST AND DURATION LIMITATIONS.—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) shall not apply to the Lower Missouri Basin study or any study described in paragraph (3).

(7) PRECONSTRUCTION, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN.—Upon completion of a study authorized by this section, if the Secretary determines that a recommended project, or modification to a project described in paragraph (1), is justified, the Secretary may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project or modification.

(8) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—For the provision of technical assistance to support small communities and economically disadvantaged communities in the planning and design of flood risk management and flood risk resiliency projects in the Lower Missouri River Basin, for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2026, there are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) $2,000,000 to carry out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to carry out such section; and

(ii) $2,000,000 to carry out section 22(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to carry out such section.

(B) CONDITIONS.—

(i) LIMITATIONS NOT APPLICABLE.—

The limitations on the use of funds in section 206(d) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 and section 22(e)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 shall
not apply to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by subparagraph (A).

(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph restricts the authority of the Secretary to use any funds otherwise appropriated to carry out section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 or section 22(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 to provide technical assistance described in subparagraph (A).

(9) COMPLETION OF STUDY; REPORT TO CONGRESS.—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 detailing—

(A) the results of the study authorized by this section;

(B) any additional, site-specific areas within the Lower Missouri River Basin for which additional study for flood risk management projects is recommended by the Secretary; and
(C) any interim actions relating to existing water resources development projects undertaken by the Secretary during the study period.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.—The term “Lower Missouri Basin study” means the Lower Missouri Basin Flood Risk and Resiliency Study, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri, authorized pursuant to section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a).

(2) SMALL COMMUNITY.—The term “small community” means a local government that serves a population of less than 15,000.

SEC. 213. PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER AND RYE HARBOR, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a written status update regarding—

(1) efforts to address the impacts of shoaling affecting the project for navigation, Rye Harbor, New Hampshire, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480); and

(2) the project for navigation, Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat.
1173), as required to be expedited under section 1317 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–270).

SEC. 214. COUGAR AND DETROIT DAMS, WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OREGON.

(a) REPORT.—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, a report providing an initial analysis of deauthorizing hydropower as a project purpose at the Cougar and Detroit Dams project.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of the potential effects of deauthorizing hydropower as a project purpose at the Cougar and Detroit Dams project on—

(A) the operation of the project, including with respect to the other authorized purposes of the project;

(B) compliance of the project with the Endangered Species Act;
(C) costs that would be attributed to other authorized purposes of the project, including costs relating to compliance with such Act; and

(D) other ongoing studies in the Willamette River Basin; and

(2) identification of any further research needed.

(c) PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the terms “Cougar and Detroit Dams project” and “project” mean the Cougar Dam and Reservoir project and Detroit Dam and Reservoir project, Willamette River Basin, Oregon, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 179).

SEC. 215. PORT ORFORD, OREGON.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, at Federal expense, 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 summary report on the research completed and data gathered by the date of enactment of this Act with regards to the configuration of a breakwater for the project for navigation, Port Orford, Oregon, authorized by section 117 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1822; 106 Stat.
(4809), for the purposes of addressing shoaling issues to minimize long-term maintenance costs.

SEC. 216. WILSON CREEK AND SLOAN CREEK, FAIRVIEW, TEXAS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a written status update regarding efforts to address flooding along Wilson Creek and Sloan Creek in the City of Fairview, Texas.

SEC. 217. GAO STUDY ON MITIGATION FOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the mitigation of the impact of water resources development projects, including the impact on fish and wildlife, consistent with the requirements of section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283), section 307(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2317(a)), and section 2036(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2283a), including—

(A) an evaluation of guidance or instructions issued, and other measures taken, by the
Secretary to ensure successful mitigation of such impacts;

(B) a review of the methods of mitigation, including the use of in-lieu fees, mitigation banking, and permittee-responsible mitigation, and their long-term effectiveness of restoring or mitigating ecosystem services impacted by such projects;

(C) a review of how the use of the different mitigation methods for such projects varies across Corps of Engineers districts;

(D) an assessment of the backlog of mitigation projects, including the number of mitigation projects pending completion to address such impacts resulting from constructed water resources development projects;

(E) an evaluation of how the Secretary tracks compliance with the mitigation requirements across Corps of Engineers districts;

(F) a review of how the mitigation requirements for water resources development projects contributes to the resilience of water resources in the United States;

(G) an assessment of whether mitigation is being done prior to or contemporaneously with
the construction of projects, as required by section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283);

(H) an evaluation of compliance with section 906(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)) for the development of specific mitigation plans for projects, whether such plans were successful in mitigating the designated impacts of the projects, and, in instances where such plans were not successful, what actions the Secretary is taking to modify the plans such that they will be successful; and

(I) an assessment of how the Secretary might take advantage of natural infrastructure in mitigation planning to reduce flood risks and flood recovery costs for some communities; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that—

(A) describes the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1);

(B) includes recommendations to ensure compliance with and successful implementation of mitigation requirements for water resources development projects; and
(C) includes recommendations to ensure existing programs and authorities include the use, to the maximum extent practicable, of natural infrastructure.

SEC. 218. GAO STUDY ON APPLICATION OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND EXPENDITURES.

(a) Study.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the operation and maintenance needs of federally authorized harbor and inland harbor projects, including—

(1) an inventory of all federally authorized harbor and inland harbor projects;

(2) an assessment of current uses of such projects (and, to the extent practicable, the national, regional, and local benefits of such uses), including the uses listed in section 210(d)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986;

(3) an assessment of the annual operation and maintenance needs associated with harbors and inland harbors referred to in subsection (a)(2) of section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238), including a breakdown of such needs for each of the following types of projects—
(A) emerging harbor projects (as defined in such section); 

(B) moderate-use harbor projects (as defined in such section on the day before the date of enactment of this Act); 

(C) high-use harbor projects (as defined in such section on the day before the date of enactment of this Act); and 

(D) projects assigned to harbors and inland harbors within the Great Lakes Navigation System (as defined in such section); 

(4) an assessment of any deferred operation and maintenance needs for such projects; 

(5) an assessment of the annual funding level trends for moderate-use harbor projects (as defined in section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–121), excluding funds awarded to donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy transfer ports (as such terms are defined in section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201));
(6) an assessment of projected needs associated
with donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and en-
ergy transfer ports (as such terms are defined in
section 2106 of the Water Resources Reform and
Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201)); and

(7) an itemization of expenditures provided to
donor ports, medium-sized donor ports, and energy
transfer ports under section 2106 of the Water Re-
sources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33

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

SEC. 219. GAO STUDY ON ADMINISTRATION OF ENVIRON-
MENTAL BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the
date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General
of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to
the appropriate committees of Congress a report that ana-
lyzes the administration of section 309 of the Coastal Wet-
lands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act to estab-
lish an environmental bank (as defined in such section), such that the Secretary—

(1) achieves the objectives of the report of the Chief of Engineers for ecosystem restoration in the Louisiana Coastal Area or the objectives of the comprehensive coastal protection master plan entitled “Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (including any subsequent amendments or revisions);

(2) promotes ridge restoration, barrier island restoration, marsh creation, nonstructural risk management, or any other projects authorized, funded, or undertaken, or proposed to be authorized, funded, or undertaken, pursuant to such comprehensive coastal protection master plan;

(3) allows for proactive investment in projects by a public or private entity seeking to generate credits to satisfy responsibilities associated with environmental compliance;

(4) allows for leveraging additional State, Parish, or Federal funds; and
(5) recommends methods for awarding additional credit for high-priority projects listed in the report and plan described in paragraph (1).

(b) CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with the Secretary, the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force, the Governor of Louisiana (or an appointee), and other stakeholders, to the extent practicable.

SEC. 220. STUDY ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONCESSIONAIRE AGREEMENTS.

(a) Study.—Not later than 1 year 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 commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of Corps of Engineers policies as they relate to the pricing of items sold by commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers rec-
reational facilities, including commoditized goods such as fuel and food items;

(2) an assessment of the impact of gross revenue fees on—

(A) the sales of items described in paragraph (1);

(B) the total revenues collected by commercial concessionaires at Corps of Engineers recreational facilities; and

(C) the amounts of the moneys paid by such concessionaires to the United States—

(i) amounts equivalent to which are appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for operation and maintenance of recreational facilities; or

(ii) that are distributed to States and counties under section 7 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701e–3);

(3) an assessment of the potential impact of using a fixed revenue fee on the sales, revenues, and amounts described in paragraph (2);

(4) an analysis of Corps of Engineers policies related to the length of commercial concessionaire contracts;
(5) an assessment of the impacts of changing
the length of commercial concessionaire contracts to
a minimum of 25 years, including assessment of—

(A) the potential effects on monetary in-
vestment in Corps of Engineers properties by
commercial concessionaires, including whether
establishing such a minimum contract length
would lead to increased investment; and

(B) whether establishing such a minimum
contract length would reduce competition, or re-
sult in commercial concessionaires providing
less value to the public or to water resources
development projects; and

(6) an assessment of whether changes in the
concessionaire fee structure or the minimum length
of a commercial concessionaire contract is in the
public interest.

SEC. 221. STUDY ON WATER SUPPLY AND WATER CON-
SERVATION AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELO-
PMENT PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after
the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall sub-
mit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastruc-
ture of the House of the Representatives and the Com-
mittee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate
a report that analyzes the benefits and consequences of including municipal water supply and water conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of Engineers in carrying out water resources development projects.

(b) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of existing water resources development projects with municipal water supply or water conservation as authorized purposes, and the extent to which such projects are utilized for such purposes;

(2) a description of existing water resources development projects with respect to which—

(A) municipal water supply or water conservation could be added as a project purpose, including those with respect to which a non-Federal interest has expressed an interest in adding municipal water supply or water conservation as a project purpose; and

(B) such a purpose could be accommodated while maintaining existing authorized purposes;

(3) a description of ongoing water resources development project studies the authorizations for which include authorization for the Secretary to study the feasibility of carrying out the project with
a purpose of municipal water supply or water con-

ervation;

(4) an analysis of how adding municipal water
supply and water conservation as a primary mission
of the Corps of Engineers would affect the ability of
the Secretary to carry out future water resources de-
velopment projects; and

(5) any recommendations of the Secretary relat-
ing to including municipal water supply and water
conservation as a primary mission of the Corps of
Engineers.

SEC. 222. PFAS REVIEW AND INVENTORY AT CORPS FACILI-
ties.

(a) Inventory of PFAS at Corps Facilities.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 18 months
after the date of enactment of this section, and an-
ually thereafter the Secretary shall complete an in-
ventory of Corps of Engineers civil works facilities
that are or may be contaminated, or could become
contaminated, by PFAS.

(2) Contents of inventory.—In carrying
out this subsection, the Secretary shall review and
identify—

(A) all facilities owned or operated by the

Corps of Engineers, for which there is a civil
works function, that are or may be contaminated, or could become contaminated, by PFAS;

(B) the nature and extent of any such contamination or potential for contamination, including any potential pathways for human exposure to PFAS;

(C) response measures taken to monitor, control, remove, or remediate PFAS, or otherwise reduce the risk of human exposure to PFAS;

(D) for facilities identified under subparagraph (A), the extent to which such facilities (or any such contamination or potential for contamination at such facilities) are related to the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers;

(E) the extent to which the Secretary, or other entities, may have responsibility for such contamination or potential for contamination; and

(F) for facilities identified under subparagraph (A), the costs to remediate and reduce the risk of human exposure to PFAS.

(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the
actions taken under this subsection shall supplement
and support work undertaken by other Federal
agencies, including actions taken pursuant to the
plan published by the Administrator of the Environ-
mental Protection Agency, titled “EPA’s Per- and
Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Action Plan”
and dated February 2019.

(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion
of the inventory under paragraph (1), and annually
thereafter concurrent with the President’s annual
budget request to Congress, the Secretary shall sub-
mit the inventory to the Committee on Transpor-
tation and Infrastructure of the House of Represent-
atives and the Committee on Environment and Pub-
lic Works of the Senate.

(b) PFAS TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.—

(1) RESEARCH SUPPORT.—The Secretary, act-
ing through the Hazardous Waste Research Center
located at the Engineer Research and Development
Center, shall, to the maximum extent practicable,
support the efforts of other Federal agencies in the
development of innovative technologies and meth-
odologies for the detection, treatment, and cleanup
of PFAS associated with Federal facilities, including
groundwater associated with such facilities.
(2) Duplication of Efforts.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to duplicate the activities undertaken by other Federal agencies as identified in subsection (a)(3).

(c) Definition.—In this section, the term “PFAS” means a perfluoroalkyl substance or polyfluoroalkyl substance with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

SEC. 223. REPORT ON RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

No 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 contains—

(1) an inventory of all recreational infrastructure and facilities associated with water resources development projects;

(2) an assessment of the annual operation and maintenance needs associated with such infrastructure and facilities;

(3) an assessment of deferred operation and maintenance needs for such infrastructure and facilities to operate safely at full capacity; and

(4) an assessment of the economic benefits of recreation to local and regional economies and bene-
fits of sustaining and improving public access at rec-
reational infrastructure and facilities.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS
AND MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

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

(1) to identify water resources development
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-Fed-
eral 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 develop-
ment projects that are no longer viable for construc-
tion; and

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

(b) PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

(1) PRELIMINARY LIST OF PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall de-
velop a preliminary list of each water resources
development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction before No-

vember 8, 2007, for which—

(i) planning, design, or construction

was not initiated before the date of enact-

ment of this Act; or

(ii) planning, design, or construction

was initiated before the date of enactment

of this Act, but for which no funds, Fed-

eral 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 CONSTRUC-

TION BACKLOG AND OPERATION AND MAINTE-

NANCE REPORT.—The Secretary may develop

the preliminary list from the comprehensive

construction backlog and operation and mainte-

nance reports developed pursuant to section

1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Develop-


(2) PREPARATION OF PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZA-

TION LIST.—
(A) Deauthorization Amount.—The Secretary shall 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 have, in the aggregate, an estimated Federal cost to complete that is at least $10,000,000,000.

(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.

(C) Inclusion of Deauthorization of Antiquated Projects.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount identified for deauthorization under paragraph (2)(A) by an amount equivalent to the estimated current value of each project, or separable element of a project, that is deauthorized by subsection (f).

(3) Sequencing of Projects.—

(A) In General.—The Secretary shall identify projects and separable elements for in-
clusion on the proposed list of projects for de-
authorization under paragraph (2) according to 
the order in which the projects and separable 
elements were authorized, beginning with the 
earliest authorized projects and separable ele-
ments and ending with the latest project or sep-
arable element necessary to meet the aggregate 
amount under paragraph (2)(A).

(B) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—The Sec-
retary may identify projects and separable ele-
ments in an order other than that established 
by subparagraph (A) if the Secretary deter-
mines, on a case-by-case basis, that a project or 
separable element is critical for interests of the 
United States, based on the possible impact of 
the project or separable element on public 
health and safety, the national economy, or the 
environment.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall so-
licit comments from the public and the Gov-
ernors 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.

(5) PREPARATION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

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

(i) considering any comments received under paragraph (4); 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.

(e) SUBMISSION OF FINAL DEAUTHORIZATION LIST TO CONGRESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW; PUBLICATION.—
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(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after
the date of the close of the comment period under
subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall—

(A) submit the final deauthorization list
and appendix prepared under subsection (b)(5)
to the Committee on Transportation and Infra-
structure 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 in-
clude in the final deauthorization list submitted
under paragraph (1) any project or separable ele-
ment with respect to which Federal funds for plan-
ning, 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 de-
authorization list under paragraph (1)(A) of this
subsection.

(d) DEAUTHORIZATION; CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the expiration of the
2-year period beginning on the date of publication of
the final deauthorization list and appendix under
subsection (c)(1)(B), a project or separable element
of a project identified in the final deauthorization
list is hereby deauthorized, unless Congress passes a
joint resolution disapproving the final deauthoriza-
tion list prior to the end of such period.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A project or separable
element of a project identified in the final de-
authorization list under subsection (c) shall not
be deauthorized under this subsection if, before
the expiration of the 2-year period referred to
in paragraph (1), the non-Federal interest for
the project or separable element of the project
provides sufficient funds to complete the project
or separable element of the project.

(B) **TREATMENT OF PROJECTS.**—Notwith-
standing subparagraph (A), each project and
separable element of a project identified in the
final deauthorization list shall be treated as de-
authorized for purposes of the aggregate de-
authorization amount specified in subsection
(b)(2)(A).

(3) **PROJECTS IDENTIFIED IN APPENDIX.**—A
project or separable element of a project identified
in the appendix to the final deauthorization list shall
remain subject to future deauthorization by Congress.

(c) Special Rules.—

(1) Post-authorization studies.—A project or separable element of a project may not be identified on the proposed deauthorization list developed under subsection (b), or the final deauthorization list developed under subsection (c), if the project or separable element received funding for a post-authorization study during the current fiscal year or any of the 10 preceding fiscal years.

(2) Treatment of project modifications.—For purposes of this section, if an authorized water resources development project or separable element of the project has been modified by an Act of Congress, the date of the authorization of the project or separable element shall be deemed to be the date of the most recent such modification.

(f) Deauthorization of Antiquated Projects.—

(1) In general.—Any water resources development project, or separable element of a project, authorized for construction prior to November 17, 1986, for which construction has not been initiated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or for
which funds have not been obligated for construction in the 10-year period prior to the date of enactment of this Act, is hereby deauthorized.

(2) IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, 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 that identifies—

(A) the name of each project, or separable element of a project, deauthorized by paragraph (1); and

(B) the estimated current value of each such project or separable element of a project.

(g) ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF INACTIVE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary or the non-Federal interest may not carry out any authorized water resources development project, or separable element of such project, for which construction has not been initiated in the 20-year period following the date of the authorization of such project or separable element, until—

(1) the Secretary provides to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment
and Public Works of the Senate a post-authorization change report that updates the economic and environmental analysis of the project or separable element; and

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate take appropriate action to address any modifications to the economic and environmental analysis for the project or separable element of the project contained in the post-authorization change report.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) POST-AUTHORIZATION CHANGE REPORT.—The term “post-authorization change report” has the meaning given such term in section 1132(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2282e).

(2) POST-AUTHORIZATION STUDY.—The term “post-authorization study” means—

(A) a feasibility report developed under section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282);

(B) a feasibility study, as defined in section 105(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)); or
(C) a review conducted under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a), including an initial appraisal that—

(i) demonstrates a Federal interest; and

(ii) requires additional analysis for the project or separable element.

(3) Water resources development project.—The term “water resources development project” includes an environmental infrastructure assistance project or program of the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 302. ABANDONED AND INACTIVE NONCOAL MINE RESTORATION.

Section 560(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2336(f)) is amended by striking “$20,000,000” and inserting “$30,000,000”.

SEC. 303. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 203(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269) is amended by striking “$12,500,000” each place it appears and inserting “$15,000,000”.
SEC. 304. LAKES PROGRAM.


(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) Ellis Pond and Guild Pond, Norwood, Massachusetts; and

“(30) Memorial Pond, Walpole, Massachusetts.”.

SEC. 305. WATERCRAFT INSPECTION STATIONS.

Section 104(d)(1)(A) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking “Arizona River Basins.” and inserting “Arkansas River Basins; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) to protect the Russian River Basin, California.”.
SEC. 306. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED DAMS.

Section 1177 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 467f–2 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “$40,000,000” and inserting “$60,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “$40,000,000” and inserting “$60,000,000”.

SEC. 307. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303, 110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202; 128 Stat. 1317) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) PROJECT CAP.—The total cost of a project carried out under this section may not exceed $15,000,000.”;

and

(2) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “$40,000,000” and inserting “$60,000,000”.

(b) OUTREACH AND TRAINING.—The Secretary shall conduct public outreach and workshops for non-Federal interests to provide information on the Chesapeake Bay
environmental restoration and protection program established under section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, including how to participate in the program.

SEC. 308. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 1103(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “$22,750,000” and inserting “$40,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “$10,420,000” and inserting “$15,000,000”.

SEC. 309. MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM.

Any Federal funds, regardless of the account from which the funds were provided, used to carry out construction of the modification to the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, authorized in section 136 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (117 Stat. 1842), shall be considered by the Secretary as initiating construction of the project such that future funds will not require a new investment decision.
SEC. 310. OUACHITA-BLACK RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, ARKANSAS.

The project for navigation, Ouachita-Black River, Arkansas, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645), is modified to include water supply as a project purpose, subject to completion by the Secretary of a feasibility study and any other review necessary for such modification.

SEC. 311. SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of project for flood control, Sacramento River, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144, 39 Stat. 949; 103 Stat. 649; 110 Stat. 3709; 112 Stat. 1841; 113 Stat. 299), consisting of a riverbed gradient restoration facility at the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Intake, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 312. LAKE ISABELLA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary, when evaluating alternative locations for construction of a permanent Isabella Lake Visitor Center by the Corps of Engineers to replace the facility impacted by the Isabella Dam safety modification project, should afford substantial weight to the site preference of the local community.
(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may acquire such interests in real property as the Secretary determines necessary or advisable to support construction of the Isabella Dam safety modification project.

(c) TRANSFER.—The Secretary may transfer any real property interests acquired under subsection (b) to any other Federal agency or department without reimbursement.

(d) ISABELLA DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Isabella Dam safety modification project” means the dam safety modification project at the Isabella Reservoir in the San Joaquin Valley, California (authorized by Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 901)), including the component of the project relating to construction a visitor center facility.

SEC. 313. LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT.

The Secretary shall align the schedules of, and maximize complimentary efforts, minimize duplicative practices, and ensure coordination and information sharing with respect to—

(1) the project for flood risk management, Lower San Joaquin River, authorized by section 1401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3836); and
(2) the second phase of the feasibility study for
the Lower San Joaquin River project for flood risk
management, authorized for expedited completion by
section 1203(a)(7) of the Water Resources Develop-

SEC. 314. SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO
COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of the project for flood control and navi-
gation, San Diego River and Mission Bay, San Diego
County, California, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946
(chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636), identified in the National
Levee Database established under section 9004 of the
Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C.
3303) as the San Diego River 3 segment and consisting
of a 785-foot-long segment of the right bank levee from
Station 209+41.75 to its end at Station 217+26.75, as
described in construction plans dated August 30, 1951,
is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment
of this Act.

SEC. 315. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT
AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 114 of the River and Har-
bor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 59h) is amended to read as
follows:
‘SEC. 114. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, WATERFRONT AREA.

“(a) AREA TO BE DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE.—The following area is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States: All of that portion of the City and County of San Francisco, California, lying shoreward of a line beginning at the intersection of the southerly right of way line of Earl Street prolongation with the Pierhead United States Government Pierhead line, the Pierhead line as defined in the State of California Harbor and Navigation Code Section 1770, as amended in 1961; thence northerly along said Pierhead line to its intersection with a line parallel with and distant 10 feet easterly from, the existing easterly boundary line of Pier 30–32; thence northerly along said parallel line and its northerly prolongation, to a point of intersection with a line parallel with, and distant 10 feet northerly from, the existing northerly boundary of Pier 30–32; thence westerly along last said parallel line to its intersection with said Pierhead line; thence northerly along said Pierhead line, to the intersection of the easterly right of way line of Van Ness Avenue, formerly Marlette Street, prolongation to the Pierhead line.

“(b) REQUIREMENT THAT AREA BE IMPROVED.—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) applies only to those parts of the area described in subsection (a) that are or will be bulkheaded, filled, or other-
wise occupied or covered by permanent structures and
does not affect the applicability of any Federal statute or
regulation that relates to filling of navigable waters or to
other regulated activities within the area described in sub-
section (a), including sections 9 and 10 of the Act of
March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401, 403), section 404 of the
Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the National

“(c) INCLUSION OF EMBARCADERO HISTORIC DIS-
TRICT.—Congress finds and declares that the area de-
scribed in subsection (a) contains the seawall, piers, and
wharves that comprise the Embarcadero Historic District
listed on the National Register of Historic Places on May
12, 2006.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5052 of the
Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C.
59h–1) is repealed.

SEC. 316. WESTERN PACIFIC INTERCEPTOR CANAL, SAC-
RAMENTO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of the project for flood protection on the
Sacramento River, authorized by section 2 of the of March
877; 55 Stat. 647; 80 Stat. 1422), consisting of the por-
tion of the levee from GPS coordinate N2147673.584
E6690904.187 to N2147908.413 E6689057.060 associ-
ated with the Western Pacific Interceptor Canal, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 317. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.

Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114, 121 Stat. 1213; 128 Stat. 1314) is amended by striking “2019” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 318. NEW LONDON HARBOR WATERFRONT CHANNEL, CONNECTICUT.

(a) In General.—The portion of the project for navigation, New London Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 13, 1902 (chapter 1079, 32 Stat. 333), described in subsection (b) is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Area Described.—The area referred to in subsection (a) is generally the portion between and around the 2 piers at the State Pier in New London, specifically the area—

(1) beginning at a point N691263.78, E1181259.26;
(2) running N 35°01′50.75″ W about 955.59 feet to a point N692046.26, E1180710.74;
(3) running N 54°58′06.78″ E about 100.00 feet to a point N692103.66, E1180792.62;
(4) running S 35°01′50.75″ E about 989.8 feet to a point N691293.17, E1181360.78; and
(5) running S 73°51′15.45″ W about 105.69 feet to the point described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 319. WASHINGTON HARBOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Washington Harbor, District of Columbia, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1031), is modified to reduce, in part, the authorized dimensions of the project, such that the remaining authorized dimensions are as follows:

(1) A 200 foot wide, 15 foot deep channel with a center line beginning at a point East 1,317,064.30 and North 440,373.32, thence to a point East 1,316,474.30 and North 440,028.31, thence to a point East 1,315,584.30 and North 439,388.30, thence to a point East 1,315,259.31 and North 438,908.30.

(2) A transition area 200 foot wide to 300 foot wide, 15 foot deep, with a center line beginning at...
a point East 1,315,259.31 and North 438,908.30 to
a point East 1,315,044.31 and North 438,748.30.

(3) A 300 foot wide, 15 foot deep channel with
a centerline beginning a point East 1,315,044.31
and North 438,748.30, thence to a point East
1,314,105.31 and North 438,124.79, thence to a
point East 1,311,973.30 and North 438,807.78,
thence to a point East 1,311,369.73 and North
438,577.42, thence to a point East 1,311,015.73
and North 438,197.57, thence to a point East
1,309,713.47 and North 435,678.91.

(4) A transition area 300 foot wide to 400 foot
wide, 15 foot deep to 24 foot deep, with a center line
beginning at a point East 1,309,713.47 and North
435,678.91 to a point East 1,307,709.33 and North
434,488.25.

(5) A 400 foot wide, 24 foot deep channel with
a centerline beginning at a point East 1,307,709.33
and North 434,488.25, thence to a point East
1,307,459.33 and North 434,173.25, thence to a
point East 1,306,476.82 and North 1,306,476.82,
thence to a point East 1,306,209.79 and North
431,460.21, thence to a point at the end of the
channel near Hains Point East 1,305,997.63 and
North 429,978.31.
SEC. 320. BIG CYPRESS SEMINOLE INDIAN RESERVATION WATER CONSERVATION PLAN, FLORIDA.

The project for ecosystem restoration, Big Cypress Seminole Indian Reservation Water Conservation Plan, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 528 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3767), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 321. CENTRAL EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.

The project for ecosystem restoration, Central Everglades, authorized by section 1401(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1713), is modified to include the project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida, Everglades Agricultural Area, authorized by section 1308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3819), and to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project as so combined.

SEC. 322. MIAMI RIVER, FLORIDA.

The portion of the project for navigation, Miami River, Florida, authorized by the Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 925; 59 Stat. 16; 74 Stat. 481; 100 Stat. 4257), beginning at the existing railroad bascule bridge and extending approximately 1,000 linear feet upstream to an existing salinity barrier and flood control structure, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.
SEC. 323. JULIAN KEEN, JR. LOCK AND DAM, MOORE HAVEN, FLORIDA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Moore Haven Lock and Dam, Moore Haven, Florida, authorized pursuant to the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1032), shall hereafter be known and designated as the “Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam.”

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Lock and Dam referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Julian Keen, Jr. Lock and Dam”.

SEC. 324. TAYLOR CREEK RESERVOIR AND LEVEE L–73 (SECTION 1), UPPER ST. JOHNS RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.

The portions of the project for flood control and other purposes, Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1176), consisting of the Taylor Creek Reservoir and Levee L–73, Section 1, within the Upper St. Johns River Basin, Florida, are no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 325. CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LOUISIANA.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, 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 plans to modify the Calcasieu River and Pass Dredged Material Management Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (December 16, 2010 DMMP/SEIS) to allow for the expansion of Dredged Material Placement Facilities (DMPFs) 17, 19, 22, D, and E to the lakeside foreshore rock boundaries during planned rehabilitation of these facilities.

SEC. 326. SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT; ABIQUIU DAM, NEW MEXICO.

(a) ABIQUIU RESERVOIR.—Section 5(b) of Public Law 97–140 (43 U.S.C. 620a note) is amended by striking “a total of two hundred thousand acre-feet of”.

(b) WATER STORAGE AT ABIQUIU DAM, NEW MEXICO.—Section 1 of Public Law 100–522 (43 U.S.C. 620a note) is amended—

(1) by striking “200,000 acre-feet of”; 

(2) by inserting “and San Juan-Chama project” after “Rio Grande system”; and 

(3) by striking “, in lieu of the water storage authorized by section 5 of Public Law 97–140, to the extent that contracting entities under section 5 of Public Law 97–140 no longer require such storage.”.
(c) WATER STORAGE.—The Secretary shall—

(1) store up to elevation 6230.00 NGVD29 at Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico, to the extent that the necessary real property interests have been acquired by any entity requesting such storage; and

(2) amend the March 20, 1986, contract between the United States of America and the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (assigned by the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico to the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority) for water storage space in Abiquiu Reservoir to allow for storage by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority of San Juan-Chama project water or native Rio Grande system water up to elevation 6230.00 NGVD29.

(d) STORAGE AGREEMENTS WITH USERS OTHER THAN THE ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall—

(1) retain or enter into new agreements with entities for a proportionate allocation of 29,100 acre-feet of storage space pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 97–140; and

(2) amend or enter into new storage agreements for storage of San Juan-Chama project water or native Rio Grande system water up to the space
allocated for each entity’s proportionate share of San Juan-Chama water.

(c) OPERATIONS DOCUMENTS.—The Secretary shall amend or revise any existing operations documents, including the Water Control Manual or operations plan for Abiquiu Reservoir, as necessary to meet the requirements of this section.

(f) LIMITATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the following limitations shall apply:

1. The storage of native Rio Grande system water shall be subject to the provisions of the Rio Grande Compact and the resolutions of the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

2. The storage of native Rio Grande system water shall only be authorized to the extent that the necessary water ownership and storage rights have been acquired by the entity requesting such storage.

3. The storage of native Rio Grande system water or San-Juan Chama project water shall not interfere with the authorized purposes of the Abiquiu Dam and Reservoir project.

4. Each user of storage space, regardless of source of water, shall pay for any increase in costs attributable to storage of that user’s water.
SEC. 327. PAWCATUCK RIVER, LITTLE NARRAGANSETT BAY AND WATCH HILL COVE, RHODE ISLAND AND CONNECTICUT.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, that portion of the project for navigation, Pawcatuck River, Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island and Connecticut, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 13), consisting of a 10-foot deep, 16-acre anchorage area in Watch Hill Cove is no longer authorized.

SEC. 328. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS.

Section 575 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3789) is repealed.

SEC. 329. CAP SANTE WATERWAY, WASHINGTON.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Cap Sante Waterway and Navigation Channel, Skagit County, Washington, authorized by the Act of March 2, 1919 (chapter 95, 40 Stat. 1285), is modified to deauthorize the portion of the project consisting of an approximately 334,434 foot area of the Federal channel within Anacortes Harbor inside and directly adjacent to the Federal breakwater and training wall structure, starting at a point with coordinates N55°70′15.552″, E121°08′19.619″, thence running S88°13′2.06″E approximately 200 feet to a point with coordinates N55°70′09.330″, E121°10′19.522″, thence running S01°...
162
1 46°58.08”W approximately 578 feet to a point with co-
2 ordinates N556431.405, E1211001.534, thence running
3 S49 49'50.23”W approximately 69 feet to a point with
4 coordinates N556387.076, E1210949.002, thence running
5 S51 53'0.25”E approximately 35 feet to a point with co-
6 ordinates N556365.662, E1210976.316, thence running
7 S49 38’58.48”W approximately 112 feet to a point with
8 coordinates N556292.989, E1210890.775, thence running
9 N88 13’1.87”W approximately 109 feet to a point with
10 coordinates N556296.367, E1210782.226, thence running
11 S46 46’58.97”W approximately 141 feet to a point with
12 coordinates N556199.527, E1210679.164, thence running
13 N88 13’1.77”W approximately 700 feet to a point with
14 coordinates N556221.305, E1209979.502, thence running
15 N01 46’58.08”E approximately 250 feet to a point with
16 coordinates N556471.184, E1209987.280, thence running
17 S88 13’1.77”E approximately 815 feet to a point with co-
18 ordinates N556445.828, E1210801.886, thence running
19 N01 46’58.08”E approximately 570 feet to the point of
20 origin.
21
22 SEC. 330. REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.
23
24 The Secretary shall expedite the activities required to
25 be carried out under section 204 of the Water Resources
26 Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) regarding the
27 use of improvement dredging of the Portsmouth Federal
navigation project in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, as a source of clean beach fill material to reinforce the stone revetment at Nantasket Beach, Hull, Massachusetts.

SEC. 331. 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) MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1840) is amended to read as follows:

“(23) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—$45,000,000 for regional water conservation, recycling, reliability, and resiliency projects in Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento Counties and the San Juan Suburban Water District, California.”.

(2) SOUTH PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(52) of the Water Resources Development Act...
of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–220) is amended by striking “$25,000,000” and inserting “$50,000,000”.

(3) MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(55) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A–221) is amended by striking “$10,000,000” and inserting “$45,000,000”.

(4) SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.—Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3773; 113 Stat. 348; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1226) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting “Boyd, Carter, Elliott, Lincoln,” after “Lee,”; and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking “$40,000,000” and inserting “$80,000,000”.


(6) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act
of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 1494; 121 Stat. 1258) is amended by striking "$32,500,000" and inserting "$57,500,000".

(7) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—Section 219(f)(32) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 337; 121 Stat. 1233) is amended by striking "$35,000,000" and inserting "$70,000,000".

(8) MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA.—Section 219(f)(231) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1266) is amended by striking "$2,000,000" and inserting "$5,000,000".


(A) in subsection (g)(1), by striking "$200,000,000" and inserting "$400,000,000"; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2), by inserting "Beaver, Jefferson," after "Washington,"

(10) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Re-

(11) EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS.—Section 219(f)(269) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1268) is amended by striking “$25,000,000” and inserting “$75,000,000”.


(A) by striking the section heading and inserting “WESTERN RURAL WATER.”;

(B) in subsections (b) and (c), by inserting “Arizona,” before “Idaho” each place it appears; and

(C) in subsection (i), by striking “for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001, $435,000,000, to remain available until ex-
pended.” and inserting the following: “, to re-
main available until expended—
“(1) for the period beginning with fiscal year
2001, $435,000,000 for Idaho, Montana, rural Ne-
veda, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming; and
“(2) $150,000,000 for Arizona.”.
(13) CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.—Section 571(h)
of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999
(113 Stat. 371; 121 Stat. 1257) is amended by
striking “$20,000,000” and inserting
“$40,000,000”.
(14) SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.—Section
340(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of
320) is amended by striking “$40,000,000” and in-
serting “$120,000,000”.
(c) LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, SEWARD, ALASKA.—
Section 5032(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development
Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114, 121 Stat. 1205) is
amended by striking “15” and inserting “20”.
SEC. 332. PROJECT MODIFICATION AUTHORIZATIONS.
(a) WATER SUPPLY.—The following project modifica-
tions for water supply, as identified in the report entitled
“Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Develop-
ment” dated February 2019, and submitted to Congress
on June 3, 2019, 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 recommendations, included in such report pursuant to section 301(c) of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b(c)):

(1) The project modification for the State of Missouri, Clarence Cannon Dam and Mark Twain Lake Project Salt River, Missouri.

(2) The project modification for the City of Plattsburg, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(3) The project modification for the City of Smithville, Smithville Lake, Missouri.

(b) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—The following project modifications for flood risk management, as identified in a report entitled “Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development”, and 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:

(1) Modification of the project for flood risk management, lower Mississippi River, authorized by the Act of May 15, 1928 (chapter 569, 45 Stat.
534), to incorporate the Wolf River Backwater and 
Nonconnah Creek levee systems into the project, au-
thorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 
(chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1575; 50 Stat. 881), subject 
to the determination of the Secretary that such sys-
tems meet all requirements applicable to such 
project.

(2) Modification of the project for flood risk 
management, Red River below Denison Dam, Arkan-
sas, Louisiana, and Texas, authorized by the Act of 
June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1219), to in-
corporate the Cherokee Park Levee into the project, 
subject to the determination of the Secretary that 
such levee meets all requirements applicable to such 
project.

SEC. 333. APPLICATION OF CREDIT.

Section 7007(d) of the Water Resources Development 
Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1277; 128 Stat. 1226) is amended 
by inserting “, or may be applied to reduce the amounts 
required to be paid by the non-Federal interest under the 
terms of the deferred payment agreements entered into 
between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the 
projects authorized by section 7012(a)(1)” before the pe-
riod at the end.
SEC. 334. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) MUDDY RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The separable elements for ecosystem restoration of the project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts, authorized by section 522 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2656), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(2) EAST CHESTER CREEK, NEW YORK.—Notwithstanding section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a), the project for navigation, East Chester Creek, New York, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 164; 100 Stat. 4181), and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579(a)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(3) CHRISTIANSTED HARBOR, UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100
Stat. 4221), the portion of the project for navigation, Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 167), and deauthorized under section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(4) Charlotte Harbor, United States Virgin Islands.—Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), the portion of the project for navigation, Charlotte Amalie (St. Thomas) Harbor, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands, authorized by the Act of August 26, 1937 (chapter 832, 50 Stat. 850), and deauthorized under section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4221), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, subject to subsection (b).

(b) Report to Congress.—The Secretary shall complete 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 post-authorization change report (as such term is defined in section 1132(d) of the Water Resources De-
SEC. 335. CONVEYANCES.

(a) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—
The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property 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) EUFAULA, ALABAMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Eufaula, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in the Department of the Army Lease No. DACW01–2–17–0747, containing 56.76 acres, more or less, and being a part of Tracts L–1268 (26.12 acres), L–1273 (13.71 acres), L–1278 (6.75 acres), and L1279 (10.36 acres) of the Walter F. George Lock and Dam and Lake project.

(2) 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.
(3) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Eufaula, Alabama, 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.

(e) MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Montgomery, Alabama, 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 is the 62.38 acres of land and water under the primary jurisdiction of the Secretary in the R.E. “Bob” Woodruff Project Area that is covered by lease number DACW01–1–05–0037, including the parcels and structure known as “Powder Magazine”.

(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, to include retaining the right to inundate with water any land transferred under this subsection.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Montgomery, Alabama, 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.
(d) Ohio River Lock and Dam Number 52, Massac County, Illinois.—

(1) Conveyance Authorized.—The Secretary
shall convey to the Massac-Metropolis Port District, Illinois, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property located north of the south bank of the Ohio River in Massac County, Illinois, that is associated with the Ohio River Lock and Dam 52.

(2) 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.

(3) Consideration.—The Massac-Metropolis Port District, Illinois, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) Clinton, Missouri.—

(1) Conveyance Authorized.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Clinton, Missouri, without
consideration, all right, title, and interest of the
United States in and to the real property described
in paragraph (2).

(4) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is
a tract of land situated in the S ½ of Section 12
and the N ½ of Section 13, Township 41 North,
Range 26 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian,
Henry County, Missouri, more particularly described
as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of
the north line of said S ½ of Section 12 and the
easterly right-of-way of State Highway No. 13;
thence easterly along the north line of said S ½ to
the northeast corner of the W ½ NW ¼ NE ¼ SW
¼ of said Section 12; thence southerly along the
east line of said W ½ NW ¼ NE ¼ SW ¼ to the
southeast corner thereof; thence easterly along the
north line of the S ½ NE ¼ SW ¼ of said Section
12 to the southwest corner of the W ½ NW ¼ NW
¼ SE ¼ of said Section 12; thence in a northeast-
erly direction to the northeast corner of said W ½
NW ¼ NW ¼ SE ¼ ; thence easterly along the
north line of said S ½ to the westerly right-of-way
of the County Road; thence in a southeasterly and
southerly direction along the westerly right-of-way of
said County Road approximately 2500 feet to the
center of Deer Creek; thence in a southwesterly di-
rection along the center of said Deer Creek, approxi-
mately 3900 feet to the south line of said N 1/2 of
Section 13; thence westerly along the south line of
said N 1/2 to the easterly right-of-way line of the St.
Louis-San Francisco Railroad; thence in a north-
westerly direction along the easterly right-of-way of
said railroad to the easterly right-of-way of said
State Highway No. 13; thence in a northeasterly di-
rection along the easterly right-of-way of said State
Highway No. 13 to the point of the beginning; and
including a roadway easement for ingress and
egress, described as a strip of land 80 feet in width,
lying 40 feet on each side of the following described
line, the initial extremities of the following described
strip being extended or reduced as required to ex-
actly adjoin the boundary lines which they meet, sit-
tuated in the S 1/2 of Section 12, Township 41 North
Range 26 West of the Fifth Principal Meridian,
Henry County, Missouri, more particularly described
as follows: Commencing at the center of said Section
12, thence S1°24'56"W, 1265.52 feet to a point,
thence N88°29'02"W, 483.97 feet to the point of
beginning of the strip of land herein described;
thence in a northeasterly direction along a curve to
the right, said curve having an initial tangent bearing of N3°44'41"E, a radius of 238.73 feet and an interior angle of 61°29'26", an arc distance of 256.21 feet to a point; thence N65°14'07"E 218.58 feet to a point; thence in a northeasterly direction along a curve to the left, having a radius of 674.07 feet and an interior angle of 36°00'01", an arc distance of 423.53 feet to a point; thence N29°14'07"E, 417.87 feet to a point; thence northeasterly along a curve to the right, having a radius of 818.51 feet and an interior angle of 14°30'01", an arc distance of 207.15 feet to a point; thence N43°44'07"E, 57.00 feet to the southerly right-of-way line of a county road, containing 2,948 acres, more or less; Excluding therefrom a tract of land situated in the S ½ of said Section 12, said Township and Range, described as commencing at the center of said Section 12; thence S1°24'56"W, 1265.52 feet to the point of beginning of the tract of land herein described; thence N88°29'02"W, 1122.50 feet; thence S1°43'26"W, 872.62 feet; thence S88°29'02"E, 1337.36 feet; thence N1°43'26"E, 872.62 feet; thence N88°29'02"W, 214.86 feet to the point of beginning, containing 26.79 acres, more or less. The above described tract
contains, in the aggregate, 177.69 acres, more or less.

(2) 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.

(3) Reversion.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(f) City of Clinton, Old Orchard Addition, Missouri.—

(1) Conveyance Authorized.—The Secretary shall convey to the City of Clinton, Missouri, 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 is Lot 28 in Old Orchard Addition, a subdivision of the City of Clinton, Henry County, Missouri, containing 0.36 acres, more or less, including any improvements thereon.

(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, including such reservations,
terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines
necessary to allow the United States to operate and
maintain the Harry S. Truman Reservoir Project.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Clinton,
Missouri, 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.

(g) TRI-COUNTY LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary
shall convey to the Tri-County Levee District, Mis-
souri, all right, title, and interest of the United
States in and to the real property described in para-
graph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is
the part of Sections 1 and 12 Township 45 North
Range 6 West of the 5th P.M. in Montgomery Coun-
ty, Missouri, described as follows: A tract of land
being 60’ wide and lying South and East of and ad-
joining the centerline of the existing levee and being
described as follows: Commencing at the NW corner
of Section 12, thence S 87° 52’ 35” E 587.4’,
thence S 01° 29' 25” W 453.68’ to the point of the
beginning; said point being in the center of the levee,
with the centerline of the levee N 77° 01’ 30”
E 164.92’, thence N 74° 26’ 55” E 250.0’, thence
N 72° 27’ 55” E 270.0’, thence N 69° 06’ 10” E
300.0’, thence N 66° 42’ 15” E 500.0’, thence N
64° 14’ 30” E 270.0’, thence N 61° 09’ 10” E
800.0’, thence N 60° 58’ 15” E 1724.45’, thence
leaving the centerline S 01° 10’ 35” W 69.43’,
then thence parallel with the above described centerline S
60° 58’ 15” W 1689.62’, thence S 61° 09’ 10” W
801.71’, thence S 64° 14’ 30” W 272.91’, thence S
66° 42’ 15” W 502.55’, thence S 69° 06’ 10” W
303.02’, thence S 72° 27’ 55” W 272.8’, thence S
74° 26’ 55” W 252.39’, thence S 77° 01’ 30” W
181.75’, thence leaving the South side of the levee
N 01° 26’ 25” E 61.96’ to the point of beginning
and containing 5.89 acres more or less.

(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 Tri-County Levee
District, Missouri, 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.

(h) JUDGE JOSEPH BARKER, JR., HOUSE, OHIO.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—In this subsection,
the term “non-Federal entity” means the Friends of
Joseph Barker, Jr., House, a nonprofit organization
in the State of Ohio.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph
(6), the Secretary shall convey to the non-Fed-
eral entity, without consideration, all right,
title, and interest of the United States in and
to the property described in paragraph (3)(A).

(B) EASEMENT.—Upon conveyance of the
property under subparagraph (A), the Secretary
shall provide to the non-Federal entity, without
consideration, an easement over the property
described in paragraph (3)(B) for access to the
conveyed property for as long as the non-Fed-
eral entity is in legal possession of the conveyed
property.

(3) DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The property referred to in paragraph (2)(A) is the following (as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act):

(i) JUDGE JOSEPH BARKER, JR.,

HOUSE.—The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point located on the southern right-of-way line of Ohio Route 7, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said Route 7 and severing the land of said United States of America parallel to and approximately 10 feet easterly of the toe of the existing dredge disposal berm, southeasterly approximately 326 feet to a point prior to the current Corps of Engineers access to the dredging spoil area; thence, northeasterly approximately 480 feet paralleling the top of the slope to the riverbank side of the house and approximately 25 feet northerly therefrom; thence, northwest approximately 302 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way
of Ohio Route 7; thence with the right-of-way of said Route 7, southwesterly approximately 485 feet to the point of beginning, containing approximately 3.51 acres.

(ii) ROAD TRACT.—The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows:
Beginning at a point located on the southern right-of-way line of Ohio Route 7, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, leaving the right-of-way of said Route 7 and severing the land of said United States of America and with the House Parcel southeasterly 25 feet; thence, northeast, running parallel to said Route 7 right-of-way, approximately 994 feet to a point of deflection; thence northeasterly 368 feet to a point beyond the existing fence corner; thence, east 140 feet to the edge of the existing Willow Island access road; thence with said access road, northwesterly approximately 62 feet to a point in the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route
thence with the right-of-way of said Route 7, southwesterly approximately 1,491 feet to the point of beginning, containing approximately 1 acre.

(B) EASEMENT.—The property referred to in paragraph (2)(B) is the following: The tract of land situated in the State of Ohio, Washington County, on the Ohio River, and being particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point at the intersection of the southern right-of-way of Ohio Route 7 and the northeast side of the existing Willow Island access road, a new corner to the land now or formerly owned by the United States of America; thence, southwest, running with said Route 7 right-of-way, approximately 30 feet to a point on the southwest side of the existing access road, and corner to the road tract; thence with said access road and the line of the road parcel, southeasterly approximately 62 feet to a point; thence leaving the road parcel and crossing the existing access road northeasterly approximately 30 feet to a point located on the northeast side of the existing access road; thence, northwesterly approximately 62 feet, to the
point of beginning, containing approximately 0.04 acre.

(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) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used by the non-Federal entity for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(6) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IMPROVEMENTS.—The Secretary shall make such improvements and alterations to the property described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) as the Secretary, in consultation with the non-Federal entity and relevant stakeholders, determines to be appropriate to facilitate conveyance of the property and provision of the easement under this subsection, subject to the condition that the total cost of those improvements and alterations undertaken by the Secretary shall be not more than $120,000.
(B) Environmental assessment.—Before making a conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(i) conduct, with respect to the property to be conveyed, an assessment of the environmental condition of the property, including an investigation of any potential hazardous, toxic, or radioactive waste present on such property; and

(ii) submit to the non-Federal entity a report describing the results of such assessment.

(C) Refusal by non-Federal entity.—

(i) In general.—Upon review by the non-Federal entity of the report under subparagraph (B), the non-Federal entity may elect to refuse the conveyance under this subsection.

(ii) Election.—An election under clause (i)—

(I) shall be at the sole discretion of the non-Federal entity; and

(II) shall be made by the non-Federal entity by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of
submission of the report under sub-
paragraph (B)(ii).

(D) DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT AC-
tivities.—The Secretary shall—

(i) notify and coordinate with the non-
Federal entity and relevant stakeholders
before carrying out any dredged material
placement activities associated with the
property described in paragraph (3)(A)
after the date on which such property is
conveyed under this subsection; and

(ii) in carrying out a dredged material
placement activity under clause (i), act in
accordance with Engineer Manual EM
1110–2–5025 (or a subsequent version of
that manual).

(7) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary
may reserve and retain from any conveyance under
this subsection a right-of-way or any other right that
the Secretary determines to be necessary for the op-
eration and maintenance of the authorized Federal
channel along the Ohio River.

(8) TREATMENT.—Conveyance to the non-Fed-
eral entity under this subsection of property de-
described in paragraph (3)(A)(i) shall satisfy all obli-
gations of the Secretary with respect to such prop-
erty under—

(A) section 306101 of title 54, United
States Code; and

(B) section 306108 of title 54, United
States Code, with respect to the effects on the
property of dredged material placement activi-
ties carried out by the Secretary after the date
of the conveyances.

(9) INAPPLICABILITY.—Subtitle I of title 40,
and chapter 4 of title 41, United States Code shall
not apply to any conveyance or easement provided
under this subsection.

(i) LEABURG FISH HATCHERY, LANE COUNTY, OR-
EGON.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the
provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall con-
vey, without consideration, to the State of Oregon,
acting through the Oregon Department of Fish and
Wildlife, all right, title, and interest of the United
States in and to the real property comprising the
Leaburg Fish Hatchery, consisting of approximately
21.55 acres, identified as tracts Q–1500, Q–1501E,
and 300E–1 and described in Department of the
Army Lease No. DACW57–1–18–0009, together with any improvements on the property.

(2) WATER RIGHTS.—The Secretary may transfer to the State of Oregon, acting through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, any water rights held by the United States that are appurtenant to the property conveyed under this subsection.

(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, including a condition that all of the property conveyed under this subsection be used and maintained by the State of Oregon for the purpose of operating a fish hatchery in perpetuity.

(4) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection is not being used or maintained by the State of Oregon for the purpose of operating a fish hatchery in perpetuity, all or any portion of the property, including any water rights transferred under this subsection, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to the United States.
(5) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—If the State of Oregon does not accept the conveyance under this subsection, the Secretary may dispose of the property, including appurtenant water rights, under subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code.

(j) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS, WILLAMETTE RIVER, OREGON.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) REAL ESTATE APPENDIX.—The term “real estate appendix” means Appendix A of the document published by the District Commander of the Portland District of the Corps of Engineers, titled “Willamette Falls Locks Willamette River Oregon Section 216 Disposition Study with Integrated Environmental Assessment”.

(B) RECEIVING ENTITY.—The term “receiving entity” means an entity identified by the State of Oregon, in consultation with the Willamette Falls Locks Commission, to receive the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(C) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS PROJECT.—The term “Willamette Falls Locks project” means the project for navigation, Wil-
lamette Falls Locks, Willamette River, Oregon,
authorized by the Act of June 25, 1910 (36
Stat. 664, chapter 382).

(D) WILLAMETTE FALLS LOCKS REPORT.—The term “Willamette Falls Locks report” means the memorandum of the Director of Civil Works with the subject “Willamette Falls Locks (WFL), Willamette River Oregon Section 216 Disposition Study with Integrated Environmental Assessment (Study)”, dated July 11, 2019.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to convey to the receiving entity, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any land in which the Federal Government has a property interest for the Willamette Falls Locks project, together with any improvements on the land, subject to the requirements of this subsection and in accordance with the Willamette Falls Locks report.

(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) **Subject to existing easements and other interests.**—The conveyance of property under paragraph (2) shall be subject to all existing deed reservations, easements, rights-of-way, and leases that are in effect as of the date of the conveyance.

(5) **Reversion.**—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this subsection cease to be held in public ownership, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(6) **Requirements before conveyance.**—

(A) **Perpetual road easement.**—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall acquire a perpetual road easement from an adjacent property owner for use of an access road, which easement shall convey with the property conveyed under such paragraph.

(B) **Environmental compliance.**—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), in accordance with the real estate appendix, the Secretary shall complete a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Com-

(C) HISTORIC PRESERVATION.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of agreement with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that identifies actions the Secretary shall take before making the conveyance under paragraph (2).

(D) REPAIRS.—Before making the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall carry out repairs to address primary seismic and safety risks in accordance with the recommendations approved in the Willamette Falls Locks report.

(7) DEAUTHORIZATION.—Beginning on the date on which the Secretary makes the conveyance under paragraph (2), the Willamette Falls Locks project is no longer authorized.

SEC. 336. REPEALS.

(a) Section 710 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2264) is repealed.

(b) Section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a) is amended—
(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(c) Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (c), the Secretary” and inserting “The Secretary”;

(B) by striking “subsections (a) and (c)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(C) by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as subsections (e) through (f), respectively.

(d) Section 6003 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 579c), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(e) Section 1301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 579d), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.
(f) Section 1302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 579e–1), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(g) Section 1301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 579d–1), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

(h) Section 1302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 579e–2), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents, are repealed.

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.—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. AK   | Port of Nome Modifications | May 29, 2020 | Federal: $368,173,000  
Non-Federal: $122,746,000  
Total: $490,919,000 |
| 2. AK   | Unalaska (Dutch Harbor) Channels | February 7, 2020 | Federal: $26,202,750  
Non-Federal: $8,734,250  
Total: $34,937,000 |
Non-Federal: $18,822,000  
Total: $72,311,000 |
Non-Federal: $6,310,000  
Total: $25,250,000 |
| 5. TX   | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazos River Floodgates and Colorado River Locks | October 23, 2019 | Total: $409,777,000, to be derived 1/2 from the general fund of the Treasury and 1/2 from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. |
| 6. TX   | Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, Harris, Chambers, and Galveston Counties | April 23, 2020 | Federal: $462,803,000  
Non-Federal: $414,045,000  
Total: $876,848,000 |
| 7. TX   | Matagorda Ship Channel Improvement Project, Port Lavaca | November 15, 2019 | Federal: $138,660,000  
Non-Federal: $79,664,000  
Total: $218,324,000 |

(2) Flood risk management.—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AZ</td>
<td>Little Colorado River at Winslow, Navajo County</td>
<td>December 14, 2018</td>
<td>Federal: $52,462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $28,249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $80,711,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CA</td>
<td>Westminster, East Garden Grove, California Flood Risk Management</td>
<td>July 9, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $314,506,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $910,092,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $1,224,598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CT, NY</td>
<td>Westchester County Streams, Byram River Basin, Fairfield County, Connect-</td>
<td>May 7, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $14,702,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uct, and Westchester County, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $14,702,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $29,405,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ND</td>
<td>Souris River Basin Flood Risk Management</td>
<td>April 16, 2019</td>
<td>Federal: $58,041,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $31,253,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $89,295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NJ</td>
<td>Peckman River Basin</td>
<td>April 29, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $95,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $51,166,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $146,188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. NM</td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande Flood Protection, Bernalillo to Belen</td>
<td>March 13, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $190,538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $102,598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $293,136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OK</td>
<td>Tulsa and West-Tulsa Levee System, Tulsa County</td>
<td>April 23, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $86,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $46,728,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $133,508,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 (3) Hurricane and storm damage risk reduction.—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DE</td>
<td>Delaware Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River</td>
<td>March 6, 2020</td>
<td>Initial Federal: $53,220,000&lt;br&gt;Initial Non-Federal: $28,660,000&lt;br&gt;Total: $81,880,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Federal: $116,380,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Non-Federal: $116,380,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Total: $232,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NJ</td>
<td>New Jersey Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River</td>
<td>April 8, 2020</td>
<td>Initial Federal: $80,780,000&lt;br&gt;Initial Non-Federal: $43,500,000&lt;br&gt;Total: $124,280,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Federal: $82,140,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Non-Federal: $82,140,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Total: $164,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NJ</td>
<td>Rahway River Basin, New Jersey Coastal Storm Risk Management</td>
<td>June 9, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $46,754,000&lt;br&gt;Non-Federal: $25,175,000&lt;br&gt;Total: $71,929,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NY</td>
<td>East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, Atlantic Coast of New York</td>
<td>August 22, 2019</td>
<td>Initial Federal: $604,203,000&lt;br&gt;Initial Non-Federal: $0&lt;br&gt;Total: $604,203,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Federal: $189,763,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Non-Federal: $189,763,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Total: $379,526,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NY</td>
<td>Hashamommeck Cove Coastal Storm Risk Management</td>
<td>December 9, 2019</td>
<td>Initial Federal: $11,549,000&lt;br&gt;Initial Non-Federal: $6,218,000&lt;br&gt;Total: $17,767,000&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Federal: $23,481,500&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Non-Federal: $23,481,500&lt;br&gt;Renourishment Total: $46,963,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. State</td>
<td>B. Name</td>
<td>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</td>
<td>D. Estimated Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RI</td>
<td>Pawcatuck River Coastal Storm Risk Management Project</td>
<td>December 19, 2018</td>
<td>Federal: $37,848,000 Non-Federal: $20,379,000 Total: $58,227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. VA</td>
<td>Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management</td>
<td>February 5, 2019</td>
<td>Federal: $909,040,000 Non-Federal: $489,480,000 Total: $1,398,520,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Flood risk management and ecosystem restoration.—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CO</td>
<td>South Platte River and Tributaries, Adams and Denver Counties</td>
<td>July 29, 2019</td>
<td>Federal: $334,412,000 Non-Federal: $200,406,000 Total: $534,818,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NY</td>
<td>Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York Reformulation</td>
<td>July 9, 2020</td>
<td>Initial Federal: $1,541,981,000 Initial Non-Federal: $0 Total: $1,541,981,000 Renourishment Federal: $742,926,500 Renourishment Non-Federal: $742,926,500 Renourishment Total: $1,485,853,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Ecosystem restoration.—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Delta Islands and Levees</td>
<td>December 18, 2018</td>
<td>Federal: $16,746,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $9,016,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $25,763,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yuba River Ecosystem Restoration</td>
<td>June 20, 2019</td>
<td>Federal: $65,014,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $35,008,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $100,022,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Loxahatchee River Watershed Restoration Project, Martin and Palm Beach Counties</td>
<td>April 8, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $372,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $368,528,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $740,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>The Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study - Brandon Road, Will County</td>
<td>May 23, 2019</td>
<td>Federal: $690,643,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $172,660,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $863,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, Bubbly Creek, Ecosystem Restoration</td>
<td>July 9, 2020</td>
<td>Federal: $11,657,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $6,277,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $17,934,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County</td>
<td>December 19, 2018</td>
<td>Federal: $23,171,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $12,476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $35,647,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>St. Louis Riverfront-Meramec River Basin Ecosystem Restoration</td>
<td>November 1, 2019</td>
<td>Federal: $60,124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Federal: $32,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $92,499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. State</td>
<td>B. Name</td>
<td>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</td>
<td>D. Estimated Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. NM   | Rio Grande, Environmental Management Program, Sandia Pueblo to Isleta Pueblo, New Mexico Ecosystem Restoration | August 5, 2019 | Federal: $16,163,000  
Non-Federal: $8,703,000  
Total: $24,866,000 |
| 9. NY, NJ | Hudson-Raritan Estuary Ecosystem Restoration | May 26, 2020 | Federal: $265,320,000  
Non-Federal: $142,864,000  
Total: $408,184,000 |
| 10. TX  | Jefferson County Ecosystem Restoration | September 12, 2019 | Federal: $37,615,000  
Non-Federal: $20,254,000  
Total: $57,869,000 |

(6) WATER SUPPLY.——

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. OR   | Willamette River Basin Review Reallocation, | December 18, 2019 | Federal: $0  
Non-Federal: $0  
Total: $0 |

(7) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.——

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State</th>
<th>B. Name</th>
<th>C. Date of Decision Document</th>
<th>D. Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. KY</td>
<td>Kentucky Lock</td>
<td>June 9, 2020</td>
<td>Total: $1,152,769,000 (to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. State</td>
<td>B. Name</td>
<td>C. Date of Decision Document</td>
<td>D. Estimated Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. NC    | Carolina Beach Integrated Beach Renourishment | June 16, 2020 | Federal: $24,205,000  
Non-Federal: $24,205,000  
Total: $48,410,000 |
| 3. NC    | Wrightsville Beach | July 2, 2020 | Federal: $53,788,000  
Non-Federal: $22,329,000  
Total: $76,117,000  
Renourishment Federal: $14,553,000  
Renourishment Non-Federal: $14,553,000  
Renourishment Total: $29,106,000 |
| 4. TX    | Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Deepening and Widening and Barge Shelves | May 4, 2020 | Federal: $403,000,000  
Non-Federal: $273,010,000  
Total: $676,010,000 |

SEC. 402. SPECIAL RULES.

(a) GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for ecosystem restoration, Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin project, Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois, authorized by section 401 of this Act, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 23, 2019, with the following modifications:

(1) The Federal share of the cost of construction shall be 80 percent.
(2) The Secretary may include the addition or substitution of technologies or measures not described in the report, as the Secretary determines to be advisable.

(b) WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW REALLOCATION STUDY.—The Secretary shall carry out the project for water supply, Willamette River Basin Review Reallocation, Oregon, authorized by section 401 of this Act, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 18, 2019, with the following modifications:

(1) The Secretary shall meet the obligations of the Corps of Engineers under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 by complying with the June 2019 NMFS Willamette Basin Review Study Biological Opinion Reasonable and Prudent Alternative until such time, if any, as it is modified or replaced, in whole or in part, through the consultation process under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(2) The Secretary may reallocate not more than 10 percent of overall storage in the joint conservation pool, as authorized by this Act and without further congressional action, if such reallocation is consistent with the ongoing consultation under section
7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 related to Willamette Valley System operations.

(3) The Secretary shall ensure that the revised reallocation is not reallocated from a single storage use, does not seriously affect authorized project purposes, and does not otherwise involve major operational changes to the project.

(c) CANO MARTIN PENA, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—Section 5127 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1242) is amended by striking “$150,000,000” and inserting “$232,430,000”.

SEC. 403. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS BASED ON FEASIBILITY STUDIES PREPARED BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, subject to subsection (b):

(1) FORT PIERCE, ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Fort Pierce, St. Lucie County, Florida, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of St. Lucie County, Florida Fort Pierce Shore Protection Project Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental
Assessment (June 2018)” and dated July 2018, at a total cost of $33,107,639, and at an estimated total cost of $97,958,972 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project.

(2) **Baptiste Collette Bayou, Louisiana.**—
The project for navigation, Baptiste Collette Bayou, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Plaquemines Parish Government’s Section 203 Study Baptiste Collette Bayou Navigation Channel Deepening Project Integrated Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment (January 2017, Amended April 2018)” and dated June 2018, at a total cost of $44,920,000.

(3) **Houma Navigation Canal, Louisiana.**—
The project for navigation, Houma Navigation Canal, Louisiana, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Houma Navigation Canal Deepening Project Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Report and DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement (June 2018)” and dated July 2018, at a total cost of $253,458,000.

(4) **Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana.**—The project for navigation, Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, as de-
scribed in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel Deepening Project Section 203 Feasibility Study (January 2019, revised January 2020)” and dated April 2020, at a total cost of $95,483,000.

(5) Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina.—The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina Navigation Improvement Project Integrated Section 203 Study & Environmental Report (February 2020)” and dated May 2020, at a total cost of $834,093,000.

(6) Chacon Creek, Texas.—The project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and other purposes, Chacon Creek, Texas, as described in the review assessment of the Secretary, titled “Review Assessment of Chacon Creek, Texas Section 203 Integrated Feasibility Report and DRAFT Environmental Assessment (August 2018)” and dated September 2018, at a total cost of $51,973,000.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may only carry out a project authorized under subsection (a)—
(1) substantially in accordance with the applicable review assessment for the project submitted by the Secretary under section 203(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as identified in subsection (a) of this section, and subject to such modifications or conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and identifies in a final assessment that addresses the concerns, recommendations, and conditions identified by the Secretary in the applicable review assessment; and

(2) after the Secretary transmits to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate such final assessment.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 203(c)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(c)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a report” and inserting “an assessment”.