AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

111TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
111–654

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2010

SEPTEMBER 29, 2010.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. OBERSTAR, from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5892]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5892) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Development Act of 2010".

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

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

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 1001. Project authorizations.
Sec. 1002. Small projects for flood damage reduction.
Sec. 1003. Small projects for emergency streambank protection.
Sec. 1004. Small projects for navigation.
Sec. 1005. Small projects for improvement of the quality of the environment.
Sec. 1006. Small projects for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration.
Sec. 1007. Small projects for shoreline protection.
Sec. 1008. Small projects for aquatic plant control.

89–006

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Credit for in-kind contributions.
Sec. 2002. Fish and wildlife mitigation.
Sec. 2003. Remote and subsistence harbors.
Sec. 2004. Revision of project partnership agreement.
Sec. 2005. Independent peer review.
Sec. 2006. Safety assurance review.
Sec. 2007. Funding for harbor maintenance programs.
Sec. 2008. Funding to process permits.
Sec. 2009. Project modifications for improvement of environment.
Sec. 2010. Aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration.
Sec. 2011. Operation and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric facilities.
Sec. 2012. Repeal.
Sec. 2013. Cost estimates for feasibility reports.
Sec. 2014. Mitigation status report.
Sec. 2015. Use of American iron, steel, and manufactured goods.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 3001. Douglas Harbor, Juneau, Alaska.
Sec. 3002. Nogales Wash and tributaries flood control project, Arizona.
Sec. 3003. Rio de Flag, Arizona.
Sec. 3004. Tres Rios, Arizona.
Sec. 3005. Russian River project, Sonoma County, California.
Sec. 3006. South Sacramento County streams, California.
Sec. 3007. Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado.
Sec. 3008. Rio Grande environmental management program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.
Sec. 3009. Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia.
Sec. 3010. Kissimmee River restoration, Florida.
Sec. 3011. Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida.
Sec. 3012. Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia.
Sec. 3013. Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.
Sec. 3014. Lower Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky.
Sec. 3015. Wood River levee system reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois.
Sec. 3016. Little Calumet River, Indiana.
Sec. 3017. Rhodes Point Jetty, Smith Island, Maryland.
Sec. 3018. Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.
Sec. 3019. Ada, Minnesota.
Sec. 3020. Montevideo, Minnesota.
Sec. 3021. Two Harbors, Minnesota.
Sec. 3022. Blue River basin, Kansas City, Missouri.
Sec. 3023. Lower Assunpink Creek, Trenton, New Jersey.
Sec. 3024. Ocean Gate, Ocean County, New Jersey.
Sec. 3025. Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York.
Sec. 3026. Spring Creek, New York.
Sec. 3027. Hocking River basin, Monday Creek, Ohio.
Sec. 3028. Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay ecosystem restoration, Oregon and Washington.
Sec. 3029. Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, Texas.
Sec. 3030. Dallas Floodway, Dallas, Texas.
Sec. 3031. Houston-Galveston navigation channels, Texas.
Sec. 3032. Project reauthorization.
Sec. 3033. Project deauthorizations.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

Sec. 4001. Hollis, Alaska.
Sec. 4002. Bullard Wash, Goodyear, Arizona.
Sec. 4003. Lower Santa Cruz River, Casa Grande, Arizona.
Sec. 4004. Maricopa County, Arizona.
Sec. 4005. Ouachita River, Ouachita, Union, and Ashley Counties, Arkansas.
Sec. 4006. Oil Trough, Arkansas.
Sec. 4007. Randolph County, Arkansas.
Sec. 4008. Berkeley Marina, Berkeley, California.
Sec. 4009. Chelsea Wetlands, Hercules, California.
Sec. 4010. Colorado Lagoon and Alamitos Bay, Long Beach, California.
Sec. 4011. Lodi Lake, Lodi, California.
Sec. 4012. Oakland-Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, Oakland, California.
Sec. 4013. Noyo Harbor District, Noyo, California.
Sec. 4014. Port of San Francisco, San Francisco, California.
Sec. 4015. Redwood City Navigation Channel, California.
Sec. 4016. Rialto Channel and Cactus Channel, Rialto, California.
Sec. 4017. Sacramento Regional Sanitation District, Sacramento, California.
Sec. 4018. San Pablo Bay, Hercules, California.
Sec. 4019. Stockton, California.
Sec. 4020. Tijuana River environmental restoration, San Diego, California.
Sec. 4021. Tijuana River wetlands restoration, San Diego County, California.
Sec. 4022. Ventura River, Ventura County, California.
Sec. 4023. Willowbrook, Los Angeles County, California.
Sec. 4024. Fountain Creek watershed, Pueblo, Colorado.
Sec. 4025. Ralston Creek, Arvada, Colorado.
Sec. 4026. Holly Pond and Norotan River, Stamford, Connecticut.
Sec. 4027. Housatonic River, New Milford, Connecticut.
Sec. 4028. Long Island Sound and Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut.
Sec. 4029. Meriden, Connecticut.
Sec. 4030. South Cove, Old Saybrook, Connecticut.
Sec. 4031. West River, New Haven Harbor, West Haven, Connecticut.
Sec. 4032. Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.
Sec. 4033. Washington, District of Columbia.
Sec. 4034. Lake County, Florida.
Sec. 4035. Marion County, Florida.
Sec. 4036. Miami, Florida.
Sec. 4037. Oakland Park, Florida.

Sec. 4038. Riviera Beach, Florida.
Sec. 4039. South Daytona, Florida.
Sec. 4040. Tampa, Florida.
Sec. 4041. Peavine Creek, Decatur, Georgia.
Sec. 4042. Richland Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.
Sec. 4043. Study for water supply, Georgia.
Sec. 4044. Suwannee Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.
Sec. 4045. Agat and Merizo, Guam.
Sec. 4046. Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii.
Sec. 4047. Waialua-Kaiaka watershed, Oahu, Hawaii.
Sec. 4048. Albany Park, Chicago, Illinois.
Sec. 4049. Carpenter Creek, Carpentersville, Illinois.
Sec. 4050. Des Plaines River, Cook County, Illinois.
Sec. 4051. Ferson-Otter Creek Dam, St. Charles, Illinois.
Sec. 4052. Middle Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri.
Sec. 4053. North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
Sec. 4054. River Park and Ronan Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
Sec. 4055. Thillens Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
Sec. 4056. Village of Skokie, Illinois.
Sec. 4057. Bowman Creek, South Bend, Indiana.
Sec. 4058. Lake Michigan watershed, Indiana.
Sec. 4059. Burlington, Iowa.
Sec. 4060. Beneficial use of dredged material, Louisiana and Mississippi.
Sec. 4061. Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.
Sec. 4062. LaBranche Wetlands, St. Charles and St. John Counties, Louisiana.
Sec. 4063. Ruth Canal freshwater diversion, Vermilion, Louisiana.
Sec. 4064. Anacostia River watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.
Sec. 4065. Chesapeake Bay Shoreline study, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.
Sec. 4066. Dredged material disposal, Baltimore Harbor, Maryland.
Sec. 4067. Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island recreation and public access, Maryland.
Sec. 4068. Capisic Brook, Portland, Maine.
Sec. 4069. Fishing and Gooseberry Islands, Kittery, Maine.
Sec. 4070. Southern Maine/New Hampshire dredged material disposal study, Maine and New Hampshire.
Sec. 4071. Assabet, Charles, and Sudbury watersheds, Middlesex and Essex Counties, Massachusetts.
Sec. 4072. Hoosic River watershed, North Adams, Massachusetts.
Sec. 4073. Mystic River watershed, Massachusetts.
Sec. 4074. Quequechan River, Fall River, Massachusetts.
Sec. 4075. Clinton River, Clinton Township, Michigan.
Sec. 4076. Hamilton Dam, Flint, Michigan.
Sec. 4077. Upper Peninsula Flood Recovery, Michigan.
Sec. 4078. Amory, Mississippi.
Sec. 4079. Coastal Mississippi ecosystem restoration, Mississippi.
Sec. 4080. Fulton, Mississippi.
Sec. 4081. Gulfport, Mississippi.
Sec. 4082. Lucedale, Mississippi.
Sec. 4083. Magby Creek and Vernon Branch, Lowndes County, Mississippi.
Sec. 4084. Blue River basin, Kansas City, Missouri.
Sec. 4085. Little Blue River, Jackson County, Missouri.
Sec. 4086. St. Louis, Missouri.
Sec. 4087. Las Vegas Wash, Las Vegas, Nevada.
Sec. 4088. New Hampshire.
Sec. 4089. Piscataqua River, New Hampshire.
Sec. 4090. Barnegat Bay watershed, Ocean and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey.
Sec. 4091. Beverly, New Jersey.
Sec. 4092. Borough of Pine Beach, New Jersey.
Sec. 4093. Haddon Township, New Jersey.
Sec. 4094. Rahway River watershed, New Jersey.
Sec. 4095. Third River, Belleville, Bloomfield, and Nutley, New Jersey.
Sec. 4096. Passaic River Channel, Nutley, New Jersey.
Sec. 4097. Township of Ocean, New Jersey.
Sec. 4098. Preakness Brook, Wayne, New Jersey.
Sec. 4099. Dona Ana, New Mexico.
Sec. 4100. Hidalgo County, New Mexico.
Sec. 4101. Otero County, New Mexico.
Sec. 4102. Valencia County, New Mexico.
Sec. 4103. Glen Cove, New York.
Sec. 4104. Hawtree basin, Hamilton Beach, New York.
Sec. 4105. Kill van Kull, Port Richmond, Staten Island, New York.
Sec. 4106. Mariners Marsh and Arlington Marsh, Staten Island, New York.
Sec. 4107. New York, New York.
Sec. 4108. Norton Basin Inlet, Far Rockaway, New York.
Sec. 4109. Queens, New York.
Sec. 4110. Rockaway Beach Seawall, Rockaway, New York.
Sec. 4111. Roosevelt island, East River, New York, New York.
Sec. 4112. Charlotte, North Carolina.
Sec. 4113. Nantahala River, Swain, North Carolina.
Sec. 4114. Missouri River and tributaries, South and Central North Dakota, North Dakota.
Sec. 4115. Big Creek watershed, Ohio.
Sec. 4116. Brandywine Creek watershed, Ohio.
Sec. 4117. Carlisle Township, Lorain County, Ohio.
Sec. 4118. Cuyahoga River watershed and Tuscarawas River watershed, Summit County, Ohio.
Sec. 4119. Euclid Creek watershed, Ohio.
Sec. 4120. Healy Creek, Brunswick, Ohio.
Sec. 4121. Lower Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio.
Sec. 4122. Ohio River, Ohio.
Sec. 4123. Shaker Lakes, Shaker Heights and Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
Sec. 4124. Stark County, Ohio.
Sec. 4125. Tinkers Creek watershed, Ohio.
Sec. 4126. Upper Tuscarawas River, Cuyahoga County, Ohio.
Sec. 4127. West Creek watershed, Ohio.
Sec. 4128. Yellow Creek and Short Creek, Jefferson County, Ohio.
Sec. 4129. Ferry Creek Reservoir, Brookings, Oregon.

Sec. 4130. Oregon Navigation Jetties and Breakwaters, Oregon.
Sec. 4131. Port Orford, Oregon.
Sec. 4132. Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 4133. Delaware River and tributaries, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 4134. Elk Creek, Meadville, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 4135. Mill Creek, Erie, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 4136. Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 4137. Western Pennsylvania flood damage reduction.
Sec. 4138. Guayama, Puerto Rico.
Sec. 4139. Rincon, Puerto Rico.
Sec. 4140. Providence, Rhode Island.
Sec. 4141. South Carolina.
Sec. 4142. James River, South Dakota.
Sec. 4143. Station Camp Creek, Gallatin, Tennessee.
Sec. 4144. Brazos River, Texas.
Sec. 4145. Hickory Creek, City of Balch Springs, Texas.
Sec. 4146. Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels (Barbours Cut), Texas.
Sec. 4147. Port of Galveston, Texas.
Sec. 4148. Simsboro Aquifer, City of Bastrop, Texas.
Sec. 4149. Navasota River watershed, Grimes County, Texas.
Sec. 4150. Rio Grande basin, Texas.
Sec. 4151. Roma, Texas.
Sec. 4152. Cottonwood Heights, Utah.
Sec. 4153. Emery Town, Utah.
Sec. 4154. Big Sandy River reallocation study, Virginia and West Virginia.
Sec. 4155. Buckroe and Grandview Beaches, Hampton, Virginia.
Sec. 4156. Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia.
Sec. 4157. Hampton, Virginia.
Sec. 4158. James River watershed, Virginia.
Sec. 4159. Elliott Bay, Seattle, Washington.
Sec. 4160. Green River, Kent, Washington.
Sec. 4161. Vancouver Lake watershed, Vancouver, Washington.
Sec. 4162. Lake Michigan shoreline, City of Cudahy, Wisconsin.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 5001. Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
Sec. 5002. Saint Lawrence Seaway.
Sec. 5003. Watershed management.
Sec. 5004. Comprehensive shoreline restoration.
Sec. 5005. Northeast Coastal Region ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 5006. Anacostia watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland.
Sec. 5007. Egmont Key, Florida.
Sec. 5008. Cambridge, Maryland.
Sec. 5009. Hart-Miller Island, Maryland.
Sec. 5010. Gallops Island, Boston, Massachusetts.
Sec. 5011. Sharkey County, Mississippi.
Sec. 5012. Charleston Harbor Post 45 Project, Charleston, South Carolina.
Sec. 5013. Sense of Congress on the promotion of General Michael J. Walsh to Major General, United States Army.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

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

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 1001. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this section, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes 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 designated in this section:

(1) MID-CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT, CHESAPEAKE BAY, DORCHESTER COUNTY, MARYLAND.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2009, at a total cost of $1,612,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,045,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $567,000,000.

(2) MISSISSIPPI COASTAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM, HANCOCK, HARRISON, AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MISSISSIPPI.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 15, 2009, at a total cost of $1,182,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $746,750,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $435,850,000.

(3) WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET (TOPSAIL BEACH), PENDER COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach), Pender County, North Carolina: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 2009, at a total cost of $32,131,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $20,708,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,423,000, and at an estimated total cost of $113,904,000 for periodic beach nourishment over the 50-year life of the project,

with an estimated Federal cost of $56,952,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $56,952,000.

SEC. 1002. SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s):

(1) DEL ROSA CHANNEL, SAN BERNADINO, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Del Rosa Channel, San Bernadino, California.

(2) LAGUNA CREEK, VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Laguna Creek, Vacaville, California.

(3) ULATIS CREEK, VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Ulatis Creek, Vacaville, California.

(4) SANDERSON GULCH, DENVER, COLORADO.—Project for flood damage reduction, Sanderson Gulch, Denver, Colorado.

(5) WILLOW CREEK, CREEDE, COLORADO.—Project for flood damage reduction, Willow Creek, Creede, Colorado.

(6) BIG ECON RIVER, ORANGE, FLORIDA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Big Econ River, Orange, Florida.

(7) BAY GALL CREEK, WARNER ROBBINS, GEORGIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Bay Gall Creek, Warner Robbins, Georgia.

(8) DES PLAINES RIVER, PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Des Plaines River, Park Ridge, Illinois.

(9) KISHWAUKEE RIVER, DEKALB, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Kishwaukee River, DeKalb, Illinois.

(10) NAVAJO CREEK, PALOS HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Navajo Creek, Palos Heights, Illinois.

(11) STONY CREEK, OAK LAWN, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Stony Creek, Oak Lawn, Illinois.

(12) VICINITY OF THE 71ST STREET DITCH, JUSTICE, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, in the vicinity of the 71st Street Ditch, Justice, Illinois.

(13) WEST BRANCH OF MILL CREEK, PALOS PARK, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, West Branch of Mill Creek, Palos Park, Illinois.

(14) DRY RUN CREEK, WATERLOO, IOWA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dry Run Creek, Waterloo, Iowa.

(15) LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.—Project for flood damage reduction, Louisville, Kentucky.

(16) BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND.—Project for flood damage reduction, Baltimore City, Maryland, in the vicinity of Druid Hill Park.

(17) PINE TREE BROOK, AVON, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Pine Tree Brook, Avon, Massachusetts.

(18) PINE TREE BROOK, MILTON, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts.

(19) HARDING CANAL SEAWALL, DETROIT, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood damage reduction, Harding Canal Seawall, Detroit, Michigan.

(20) BIG RIVER, HIGH RIDGE, MISSOURI.—Project for flood damage reduction, Big River, High Ridge, Missouri.

(21) SAW MILL RIVER BASIN, GREEHBURGH, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Saw Mill River basin, Greehburgh, New York.

(22) SPARKILL CREEK, ORANGETOWN, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Sparkill Creek, Orangetown, New York.

(23) INDEPENDENCE, OHIO.—Project for flood damage reduction, Independence, Ohio.

(24) VALLEY VIEW, OHIO.—Project for flood damage reduction, Valley View, Ohio.

(25) WINYEH BAY, GEORGETOWN, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Winyeh Bay, Georgetown, South Carolina.

(26) DEL RIO, VAL VERDE, TEXAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Del Rio, Val Verde, Texas.

(27) CRAFORD BAY SEAWALL, PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Craford Bay Seawall, Portsmouth, Virginia.

(28) SOUTHERN BRANCH OF THE ELIZABETH RIVER, PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia.

(29) ROXBURY AND WESTPOINT TOWNSHIPS, WISCONSIN.—Project for flood damage reduction, Roxbury and Westpoint Townships, Wisconsin.

SEC. 1003. SMALL PROJECTS FOR EMERGENCY STREAMBANK PROTECTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r):

(1) NAKNEK RIVER, NAKNEK, ALASKA.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Naknek River, Naknek, Alaska.

(2) QUINNIPIAC RIVER, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Quinnipiac River, New Haven, Connecticut.

(3) BISCAYNE BAY, NORTH BAY VILLAGE, FLORIDA.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Biscayne Bay, North Bay Village, Florida.

(4) BRONX RIVER, NEW YORK, NEW YORK.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Bronx River, New York, New York.

(5) OHIO RIVER, IRONTON, OHIO.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Ohio River, Ironton, Ohio.

(6) NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Newport, Rhode Island.

(7) TIVERTON, RHODE ISLAND.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Tiverton, Rhode Island.

SEC. 1004. SMALL PROJECTS FOR NAVIGATION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(1) DETROIT RIVER, WYANDOTTE, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Detroit River, Wyandotte, Michigan.

(2) STOUTS CREEK, LACEY TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY.—Project for navigation, Stouts Creek, Lacey Township, New Jersey.

(3) BROWN'S RIVER, NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Brown's River, Nassau County, New York.

(4) DETROIT HARBOR, WISCONSIN.—Project for navigation, Detroit Harbor, Wisconsin.

SEC. 1005. SMALL PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is appropriate, may carry out the project under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a):

(1) RHEEM CREEK, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.

(2) RODEO CREEK, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.

SEC. 1006. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM AND ESTUARY RESTORATION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is appropriate, may carry out the project under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330):

(1) EMERYVILLE HARBOR, EMERYVILLE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Emeryville Harbor, Emeryville, California.

(2) LOS ANGELES RIVER, CUDAHY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Los Angeles River, Cudahy, California.

(3) LAGUNA SALADA, PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Laguna Salada, Pacifica, California.

(4) ANIMAS RIVER, LA PLATA, COLORADO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Animas River, La Plata, Colorado.

(5) NORTH FORK OF THE GUNNISON RIVER, DELTA, COLORADO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, North Fork of the Gunnison River, Delta, Colorado.

(6) LINE AND CANE CREEKS, HENRY COUNTY, GEORGIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Line and Cane Creeks, Henry County, Georgia.

(7) BREMME CREEK, DUPAGE, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Bremme Creek, DuPage, Illinois.

(8) BLACKBERRY CREEK, KENDALL, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Blackberry Creek, Kendall, Illinois.

(9) GOMPERS PARK, NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Gompers Park, North Branch Chicago River, Illinois.

(10) KANKAKEE RIVER, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Kankakee River, Will County, Illinois.

(11) PRAIRIE CREEK WATERSHED, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Prairie Creek Watershed, Will County, Illinois.

(12) WEST BRANCH OF THE DUPAGE RIVER, DUPAGE, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, West Branch of the DuPage River, DuPage, Illinois.

(13) LONG CREEK WATERSHED, CUMBERLAND, MAINE.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Long Creek Watershed, Cumberland, Maine.

(14) CABIN BRANCH WATERSHED, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Cabin Branch Watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.

(15) LITTLE PAINT BRANCH STREAM, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Little Paint Branch Stream, Prince George's County, Maryland.

(16) LOWER BEAVERDAM CREEK, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Lower Beaverdam Creek, Prince George's County, Maryland.

(17) NORTHEAST ANACOSTIA RIVER, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Northeast Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.

(18) NORTHWEST ANACOSTIA RIVER, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Northwest Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.

(19) ASSABET RIVER, MIDDLESEX AND WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Assabet River, Middlesex and Worcester, Massachusetts.

(20) LEWIS BAY, YARMOUTH, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Lewis Bay, Yarmouth, Massachusetts.

(21) PIG'S EYE LAKE, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Pig's Eye Lake, St. Paul, Minnesota.

(22) BARNEGAT BAY, OCEAN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Barnegat Bay, Ocean County, New Jersey.

(23) BRANCHPORT CREEK, OCEANPORT BOROUGH, NEW JERSEY.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Branchport Creek, Oceanport Borough, New Jersey.

(24) HACKENSACK RIVER, HUDSON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Hackensack River, Hudson County, New Jersey.

(25) LAKE TOPANEMUS, FREEHOLD, NEW JERSEY.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Lake Topanemus, Freehold, New Jersey.

(26) LAS CRUCES DAM, DONA ANA, NEW MEXICO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Las Cruces Dam, Dona Ana, New Mexico.

(27) PUGSLEY CREEK, CASTLE HILL, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Pugsley Creek, Castle Hill, New York.

(28) OLENTANGY RIVER, FRANKLIN, OHIO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Olentangy River, Franklin, Ohio.

(29) SCIOTO RIVER, FRANKLIN, OHIO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Scioto River, Franklin, Ohio.

(30) WOONASQUATUCKET RIVER, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Woonasquatucket River, Providence, Rhode Island.

(31) CLAYTOR LAKE, PULASKI, VIRGINIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Claytor Lake, Pulaski, Virginia.

SEC. 1007. SMALL PROJECTS FOR SHORELINE PROTECTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g):

(1) DEERFIELD BEACH, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for shoreline protection, Deerfield Beach, Broward County, Florida.

(2) BARNEGAT, OCEAN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for shoreline protection, Barnegat, Ocean County, New Jersey.

(3) MANHASSET BAY, PORT WASHINGTON, NEW YORK.—Project for shoreline protection, Manhasset Bay, Port Washington, New York.

SEC. 1008. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project for aquatic nuisance plant control in the Republican River basin, Colorado, under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610).

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In carrying out the project under subsection (a), the Secretary may control and eradicate riverine nuisance plants.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. CREDIT FOR IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) LIMITATION; SAVINGS PROVISION.—Section 221(a)(4)(E) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(a)(4)(E)) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

"(ii) LIMITATION.—In any case in which a specific provision of law provides for a non-Federal interest to receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study for, or construction or operation and maintenance of, a water resources project, the Secretary shall apply—

"(I) the specific provision of law instead of this paragraph; or

"(II) at the request of the non-Federal interest, the specific provision of law and such provisions of this paragraph as the non-Federal interest may request.

"(iii) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subparagraph affects the applicability of subsection (a)(4)(C).".

(b) WATER RESOURCES PROJECT DEFINED.—Section 221(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by moving subparagraphs (A) and (B) (as so redesignated) and the matter following such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking "(b)" and all that follows through "The term" and inserting the following:

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

"(1) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—The term"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) WATER RESOURCES PROJECT.—The term 'water resources project' includes projects studied, reviewed, designed, constructed, operated and maintained, or otherwise subject to Federal participation under the authority of the civil works program of the Secretary of the Army for the purposes of navigation, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, hurricane and storm damage reduction, water supply, recreation, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife conservation, water quality, environmental infrastructure, resource protection and development, and related purposes.".

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 221(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(c)) is amended by striking "enforcible" and inserting "enforceable".

SEC. 2002. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.

(a) MITIGATION PLANS AS PART OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—Section 906(d)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting "for damages to ecological resources, including terrestrial and aquatic resources, and" after "mitigate";

(B) by inserting "ecological resources and" after "impact on"; and

(C) by inserting "without the implementation of mitigation measures" before the period; and

(2) by inserting before the last sentence the following: "If the Secretary determines that mitigation to in-kind conditions is not possible, the Secretary shall identify in the report the basis for that determination.".

(b) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 906(d)(3)(A) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)(3)(A)) is amended by inserting ", at a minimum," after "complies with".

SEC. 2003. REMOTE AND SUBSISTENCE HARBORS.

Section 2006 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2242) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to project studies that include—

"(1) a feasibility study, as defined in section 105(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)); or

"(2) a detailed project report, as defined in such section 105(d) and carried out under section 107(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(a)).".

SEC. 2004. REVISION OF PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.

Section 2008(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2340(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "This subsection shall apply without regard to whether the original partnership agreement was entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection.".

SEC. 2005. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.

(a) TIMING OF PEER REVIEW.—Section 2034(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) REASONS FOR TIMING.—If the Chief of Engineers does not initiate a peer review for a project study at a time described in paragraph (2), the Chief shall make publicly available, including on the Internet, for each of such times the reasons for not conducting the review, and shall include the reasons in the decision document for the project study.".

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PANELS.—Section 2034(c)(4) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2343(c)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.—Upon identification of a project study for peer review under this section, but prior to initiation of the review by the panel of experts, the Chief of Engineers shall—

"(A) notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the review; and

"(B) make publicly available, including on the Internet, information on—

"(i) the dates scheduled for beginning and ending the review;

"(ii) the entity that has the contract for the review; and

"(iii) the names and qualifications of the panel of experts.".

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—Section 2034(f) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2343(f)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—After receiving a report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall make available to the public, including on the Internet, and transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives—

"(A) a copy of the report within 3 days of receiving the report; and

"(B) a copy of any written response of the Chief of Engineers on recommendations contained in the report within 3 days of the date of the response.

"(3) INCLUSION IN PROJECT STUDY.—A report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section and the written response of the Chief of Engineers shall be included in the final decision document for the project study.".

SEC. 2006. SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.

Section 2035 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2344) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to a safety assurance review conducted under this section.".

SEC. 2007. FUNDING FOR HARBOR MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND GUARANTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The total budget resources made available from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund each fiscal year pursuant to section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) shall be equal to the level of receipts plus interest credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for that fiscal year. Such amounts may be used only for harbor maintenance programs described in section 9505(c) of such Code.

(2) GUARANTEE.—No funds may be appropriated for harbor maintenance programs described in such section unless the amount described in paragraph (1) has been provided.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) TOTAL BUDGET RESOURCES.—The term "total budget resources" means the total amount made available by appropriations Acts from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for a fiscal year for making expenditures under section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) LEVEL OF RECEIPTS PLUS INTEREST.—The term "level of receipts plus interest" means the level of taxes and interest credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund under section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for a fiscal year as set forth in the President's budget baseline projection as defined in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) for that fiscal year submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 2008. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

Section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; 114 Stat. 2594; 119 Stat. 2169; 120 Stat. 318; 120 Stat. 3197; 121 Stat. 1067; 123 Stat. 3478) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "permits under the jurisdiction" and inserting "permits of such entities related to projects for a public purpose under the jurisdiction";

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e);

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) EFFECT ON PERMITTING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under subsection (a) will not impact impartial decision-making with respect to permits, either substantively or procedurally.

"(2) IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the evaluation of permits carried out using funds accepted under this section shall—

"(A) be reviewed by the District Commander of the Corps District in which the project or activity is located, unless the evaluation of the permit is initially conducted by the District Commander whereby the review shall be conducted by the Commander of the Corps Division in which the District is located; and

"(B) utilize the same procedures for decisions that would otherwise be required for the evaluation of permits for similar projects or activities not carried out using funds authorized under this section.

"(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds accepted under this section shall be used to carry out a review of the evaluation of permits required under subsection (b)(2)(A).

"(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public, including on the Internet."; and

(4) in subsection (e) (as redesignated), by striking "2010" and inserting "2016".

SEC. 2009. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT.

Section 1135(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(d)) is amended by striking "$5,000,000" and inserting "$10,000,000".

SEC. 2010. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM AND ESTUARY RESTORATION.

Section 206(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330(d)) is amended by striking "$5,000,000" and inserting "$10,000,000".

SEC. 2011. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION AND HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 314 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2321) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 314. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION AND HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.

"Activities currently performed by personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of navigation or hydroelectric power generating facilities, including all personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of navigational infrastructure such as floodgates, locks, and dams, at Corps of Engineers water resources projects, are considered to be inherently governmental functions and not commercial activities. This section does not prohibit contracting out major maintenance or other functions that are currently contracted out or studying services not directly connected with project maintenance and operations.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 314 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 314. Operation and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric facilities.".

SEC. 2012. REPEAL.

Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (31 U.S.C. 6505 note; 114 Stat. 2592), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act, are repealed.

SEC. 2013. COST ESTIMATES FOR FEASIBILITY REPORTS.

Section 905(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) COST ESTIMATES FOR FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—In preparing a feasibility report under this subsection, the Secretary shall include in the report, and any budget documents (including justification materials) submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an accounting of the total cost of the recommended plan and an estimate of the Federal and non-Federal participation in the plan based on the following scenarios:

"(A) The cost of the project based on optimal levels of Federal funding for the recommended plan.

"(B) The estimated cost of the project, based on a 50 percent increase in the period for implementation of the recommended plan.

"(C) The estimated cost of the project, based on a 100 percent increase in the period for implementation of the recommended plan.".

SEC. 2014. MITIGATION STATUS REPORT.

Section 2036(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2283a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—In reporting the status of all projects included in the report, the Secretary shall—

"(A) use a uniform methodology for determining the status of all projects included in the report;

"(B) use a methodology that describes both a qualitative and quantitative status for all projects in the report; and

"(C) provide specific dates for and participants in the consultations required under section 906(d)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)(4)(B)).".

SEC. 2015. USE OF AMERICAN IRON, STEEL, AND MANUFACTURED GOODS.

(a) RESTRICTION.—None of the funds authorized or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for a project unless all of the iron, steel, and manufactured goods used in the project are produced in the United States.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in any case or category of cases in which the Secretary finds that—

(1) applying subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) iron, steel, and the relevant manufactured goods are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(3) inclusion of iron, steel, and manufactured goods produced in the United States will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

(c) PUBLIC NOTICE OF WAIVER REQUEST.—If the Secretary receives a request to waive the application of subsection (a), the Secretary shall publish in a timely manner that request online and in the Federal Register.

(d) JUSTIFICATION FOR WAIVER.—If the Secretary determines that it is necessary to waive the application of subsection (a) based on a finding under subsection (b), the Secretary shall publish online and in the Federal Register a detailed written justification as to why the provision is being waived.

(e) APPLICATION.—This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. DOUGLAS HARBOR, JUNEAU, ALASKA.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, Douglas Harbor, Juneau, Alaska, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be $7,000,000.

SEC. 3002. NOGALES WASH AND TRIBUTARIES FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, ARIZONA.

The project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606) and modified by section 303 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996

(110 Stat. 3711), section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2600), and section 3008 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $55,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,400,000.

SEC. 3003. RIO DE FLAG, ARIZONA.

The project for flood damage reduction, Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2576) and modified by section 3007 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $77,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $27,000,000.

SEC. 3004. TRES RIOS, ARIZONA.

The project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $230,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $149,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $80,500,000.

SEC. 3005. RUSSIAN RIVER PROJECT, SONOMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes in the Russian River basin, California, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 177), and the project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1192), are modified as follows:

(1) The Secretary shall review the biological opinion on the water supply, flood control, and channel maintenance operations conducted by the Corps of Engineers, the Sonoma County Water Agency, and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control District, as transmitted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on September 24, 2008.

(2) If the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary is authorized to construct the project at a total cost of $92,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $59,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $32,200,000.

SEC. 3006. SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California, authorized by section 101(a)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 275), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $104,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $67,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $36,800,000.

SEC. 3007. CHATFIELD RESERVOIR, COLORADO.

Section 116 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (123 Stat. 608) is amended by striking "Colorado Department of Natural Resources is authorized" and inserting "Colorado Department of Natural Resources, or its assignee, is authorized".

SEC. 3008. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.

Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2015".

SEC. 3009. POTOMAC RIVER, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The project for flood control, Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688; 49 Stat. 1574) and modified by section 301(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3707) and section 309 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 301), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a Federal cost of $8,100,000, in accordance with the post authorization change report dated June 29, 1998.

SEC. 3010. KISSIMMEE RIVER RESTORATION, FLORIDA.

The project for ecosystem restoration, Kissimmee River Restoration, Florida, authorized by section 101(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $852,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $426,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $426,000,000.

SEC. 3011. PONCE DE LEON INLET, FLORIDA.

The project for navigation and related purposes, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 279), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $15,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $8,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,500,000.

SEC. 3012. SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GEORGIA.

The project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia, authorized by section 101(b)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 279), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $675,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $405,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $270,000,000.

SEC. 3013. CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIERS PROJECT, ILLINOIS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 3061(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1121) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) upgrade and make permanent Barrier I in its current location or at an alternative location, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;";

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking "June 14, 2005" and inserting "November 21, 2003, as amended on July 14, 2005";

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (E) and (F), respectively;

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

"(C) acquire real estate interests necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of Barrier I and Barrier II;";

(5) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (E) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection);

(6) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (F) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) and inserting "; and"; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

"(G) construct additional barriers or other fish deterrents at other locations in the vicinity of the Chicago Area Waterway System, if determined appropriate by the Secretary.".

(b) USE OF CREDIT.—Section 3061(b)(2) of such Act (121 Stat. 1121) is amended by striking "paragraph (1)(E)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(F)".

(c) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—Section 3061(d) of such Act (121 Stat. 1121) is amended by adding the end the following: "The study shall include a fully developed analysis of an alternative for hydrologic separation between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River basins. The hydrologic separation alternative shall include identification of measures to prevent the transfer of aquatic nuisance species between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River basins through surface water.".

SEC. 3014. LOWER OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS AND KENTUCKY.

The project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $1,991,000,000.

SEC. 3015. WOOD RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION, MADISON COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

The project for flood damage reduction, Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois, authorized by section 1001(20) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1053), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $120,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $78,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $42,000,000.

SEC. 3016. LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA.

The project for flood control, Little Calumet River, Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4115) and modified by section 127 of the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2259), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $275,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $206,000,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $69,000,000.

SEC. 3017. RHODES POINT JETTY, SMITH ISLAND, MARYLAND.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, Rhodes Point Jetty, Smith Island, Maryland, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be $7,000,000.

SEC. 3018. MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

Section 522 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2656) is amended by striking "draft evaluation report of the New England District Engineer entitled 'Phase I Muddy River Master Plan', dated June 2000" and inserting "Final Decision Document and Environmental Assessment Report of the New England District Engineer entitled 'Muddy River Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts', dated September 2003, at a total cost of $79,200,000".

SEC. 3019. ADA, MINNESOTA.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood damage reduction, Wild Rice River, Ada, Minnesota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,600,000.

SEC. 3020. MONTEVIDEO, MINNESOTA.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood damage reduction, Montevideo, Minnesota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,000,000.

SEC. 3021. TWO HARBORS, MINNESOTA.

Section 3101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1133) is amended by striking "$7,000,000" and inserting "$14,000,000".

SEC. 3022. BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

The project for flood control, Blue River basin, Kansas City, Missouri, authorized by section 101(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $45,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $34,125,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,375,000.

SEC. 3023. LOWER ASSUNPINK CREEK, TRENTON, NEW JERSEY.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Lower Assunpink Creek, Trenton, New Jersey, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be $10,000,000.

SEC. 3024. OCEAN GATE, OCEAN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for emergency streambank protection, Ocean Gate, Ocean County, New Jersey, being carried out under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), shall be $4,500,000.

SEC. 3025. ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NEW YORK.

Section 554 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781), as amended by section 3122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1139), is further amended by striking "$20,000,000" and inserting "$27,000,000".

SEC. 3026. SPRING CREEK, NEW YORK.

The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Spring Creek, New York, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be $6,000,000.

SEC. 3027. HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OHIO.

Section 1001(37)(B)(iii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1055) is amended by striking "$1,270,000" and inserting "$12,000,000".

SEC. 3028. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER AND TILLAMOOK BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

Section 536(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2662) is amended by striking "$30,000,000" and inserting "$45,000,000".

SEC. 3029. CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.

The project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas, authorized by section 1001(40) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1056) is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $447,604,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $183,827,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $263,777,000.

SEC. 3030. DALLAS FLOODWAY, DALLAS, TEXAS.

The project for flood control, Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", ap-

proved March 2, 1945, and modified by section 5141 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1253), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $882,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $573,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $308,700,000.

SEC. 3031. HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TEXAS.

The project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), is modified to authorize the Secretary to extend the boundaries of the Galveston channel approximately 2600 feet beyond Pier 38, if the Secretary determines that the extension is feasible.

SEC. 3032. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATION.

The following project may be carried out by the Secretary and no construction on any such project may be initiated until the Secretary determines that the project is feasible: The Vincennes, Indiana portion of the project for flood control, Wabash River basin, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 649) and deauthorized by section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4209).

SEC. 3033. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) POTOMAC RIVER, WASHINGTON CHANNEL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—The portion of the project for navigation, Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831; 49 Stat. 1028), beginning at Washington Harbor Channel Geometry Centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 103+73.12, coordinates North 441,948.20, East 1,303,969.30, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Anacostia, Virginia, Washington and Magazine Bar Shoal Channels, Washington, D.C., Sheet 6 of 6, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore district, July 2007; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: N. 40 degrees 10 minutes 45 seconds E., 200.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 400-foot-wide channel thence binding on said outline the following three courses and distances: S. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds E., 1,507.86 feet to a point, thence; S. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds E., 2,083.17 feet to a point, thence; S. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds E., 363.00 feet to a point, thence; S. 78 degrees 32 minutes 56 seconds W., 200.00 feet to a point binding on the centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 65+54.31, coordinates North 438,923.9874, East 1,306,159.9738, thence; continuing with the aforementioned centerline the following courses and distances: N. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds W., 330.80 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 68+85.10, thence; N. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds W., 2,015.56 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 89+00.67, thence; N. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds W., 1,472.26 feet to the point of beginning.

(2) CHICAGO HARBOR, ILLINOIS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Chicago Harbor, authorized by the River and Harbor Acts of March 3, 1899 and March 2, 1919, beginning at the southwest corner of Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago sluice gate that abuts the north wall of the Chicago River Lock thence running north for approximately 290 feet, thence running east approximately 1,000 feet, thence running south approximately 290 feet, thence running west approximately 1,000 feet to the point of origin.

(3) IPSWICH RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Ipswich River, Massachusetts, adopted by the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 5, 1886, consisting of a 4-foot channel located at the entrance to the inner harbor at Ipswich Harbor, lying northwesterly of a line commencing at: N3,074,938.09, E837,154.87, thence running easterly approximately 60 feet to a point with coordinates N3,074,972.62, E837,203.93.

(4) MENEMSHA CREEK, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Menemsha Creek, Massachusetts, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1945, consisting of the following areas—

(A) beginning at a point, N129,112.54, E1,566,926.30, running north 52 degrees 12 minutes 55.9 seconds east 208.68 feet to a point N129,240.39, E1,567,091.22, running south 77 degrees 28 minutes 13.7 seconds east 170.0 feet to a point N129,203.51, E1,567,257.17, running south 37 degrees 25 minutes 45.4 seconds east 101.04 feet to a point N129,123.28, E1,567,318.58, running north 77 degrees 28 minutes 13.7 seconds west 223.32 feet to a point N129,171.72, E 1,567,100.58, running south 52 degrees 12 minutes 55.9 seconds west 174.00 feet to a point N129,065.12,

E1,566,963.06, running north 37 degrees 47 minutes 04.1 seconds west 60.00 feet to the point of origin, and

(B) beginning at a point, N128,895.78, E1,566,940.39, thence running north 52 degrees 31 minutes 25.8 seconds east 135.91 feet to a point N128,978.47, E1,567,048.25, thence running south 77 degrees 28 minutes 13.7 seconds east 80.63 feet to a point N128,960.98, E1,567,126.96, thence running south 37 degrees 25 minutes 32.9 seconds east 70.67 feet to a point N128,904.86, E1,567,169.91, thence running north 73 degrees 59 minutes 15.6 seconds west 139.90 feet to a point N128,943.45, E 1,567,035.44, thence running south 52 degrees 31 minutes 25.8 seconds west 103.96 feet to a point N128,880.20, E1,566,952.94, thence running north 38 degrees 50 minutes 43.8 seconds west 20.01 feet to the point of origin.

(5) BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RHODE ISLAND.—The portion of the project for navigation, Block Island Harbor of Refuge, Rhode Island, adopted by the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 11, 1870, consisting of the cut-stone breakwater lining the west side of the Inner Basin, beginning at a point, N32,179.55, E312,625.53, thence running northerly approximately 76.59 feet to a point with coordinates N326,655.92, E312,631.32, thence running northerly approximately 206.81 feet to a point with coordinates N32,858.33, E312,673.74, thence running easterly approximately 109.00 feet to a point with coordinates N32,832.15, E312,779.54.

(b) ADDITIONAL DEAUTHORIZATIONS.—The following projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act, except with respect to any portion of such a project that has been completed before such date or is under construction on such date:

(1) The project for flood protection and related purposes, Cache River basin, Arkansas and Missouri, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 172).

(2) The Lower White River, Big Creek and tributaries, Arkansas, element of the project for flood control and improvement of the Lower Mississippi River, authorized by section 1 of the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), and modified by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1076).

(3) The project for navigation, Noyo River and Harbor, California, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1176) and modified by section 146 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2931).

(4) The project for navigation, Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Dangerfield, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731).

(5) The project for flood control, Hocking River at Logan, Ohio, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4122).

(6) The Shipyard River Upper Channel and Upper Turning basin elements of the project for navigation, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4096).

(7) The environmental enhancements element of the project for flood control, Nonconnah Creek and Johns Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124).

(8) The recreation element of the project for flood control, Nonconnah Creek and Johns Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124).

(9) The project for flood protection, Santa Barbara County Coastal Streams and tributaries in the area of Goleta, California, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1826) and modified by section 102(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4804).

(10) The project for flood control, Harris Fork Creek, Tennessee and Kentucky, authorized by section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2921).

(11) The project for flood control, Buena Vista, Virginia, authorized by section 101(a)(24) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610) and modified by section 118(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4824).

TITLE IV—STUDIES

SEC. 4001. HOLLIS, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, Hollis, Alaska.

SEC. 4002. BULLARD WASH, GOODYEAR, ARIZONA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Bullard Wash, Goodyear, Arizona.

SEC. 4003. LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, CASA GRANDE, ARIZONA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for the Lower Santa Cruz River study area, Casa Grande, Arizona.

SEC. 4004. MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes, including nonstructural solutions, for Maricopa County, Arizona.

SEC. 4005. OUACHITA RIVER, OUACHITA, UNION, AND ASHLEY COUNTIES, ARKANSAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, bank stabilization, and related water resource purposes for the Ouachita River, Ouachita, Union, and Ashley Counties, Arkansas.

SEC. 4006. OIL TROUGH, ARKANSAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oil Trough, Arkansas.

SEC. 4007. RANDOLPH COUNTY, ARKANSAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Randolph County, Arkansas.

SEC. 4008. BERKELEY MARINA, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for Berkeley Marina, Berkeley, California.

SEC. 4009. CHELSEA WETLANDS, HERCULES, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and flood damage reduction for Chelsea Wetlands, Hercules, California.

SEC. 4010. COLORADO LAGOON AND ALAMITOS BAY, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration between Colorado Lagoon and Alamitos Bay, Long Beach, California.

SEC. 4011. LODI LAKE, LODI, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and streambank stabilization for Lodi Lake, Lodi, California.

SEC. 4012. OAKLAND-INNER HARBOR TIDAL CANAL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation improvements for the Oakland-Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, Oakland, California.

SEC. 4013. NOYO HARBOR DISTRICT, NOYO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for Noyo Harbor District, Noyo, California.

SEC. 4014. PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Port of San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

SEC. 4015. REDWOOD CITY NAVIGATION CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for Redwood City Navigation Channel, California.

SEC. 4016. RIALTO CHANNEL AND CACTUS CHANNEL, RIALTO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Rialto Channel and Cactus Channel, Rialto, California.

SEC. 4017. SACRAMENTO REGIONAL SANITATION DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction in the Sacramento Regional Sanitation District, Sacramento, California.

SEC. 4018. SAN PABLO BAY, HERCULES, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for San Pablo Bay, Hercules, California.

SEC. 4019. STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for navigation channel deepening for Stockton, California.

SEC. 4020. TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, water supply, water quality, recreation, and other water-related issues including the impacts of water flows from Mexico for the Tijuana River basin, San Diego, California.

SEC. 4021. TIJUANA RIVER WETLANDS RESTORATION, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and wetland restoration along the Tijuana River, San Diego County, California.

SEC. 4022. VENTURA RIVER, VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ventura River, Ventura County, California.

SEC. 4023. WILLOWBROOK, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Willowbrook, Los Angeles County, California.

SEC. 4024. FOUNTAIN CREEK WATERSHED, PUEBLO, COLORADO.

The Secretary shall conduct a sediment impact analysis study to determine the sediment transport parameters for Fountain Creek watershed, Pueblo, Colorado.

SEC. 4025. RALSTON CREEK, ARVADA, COLORADO.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ralston Creek, Arvada, Colorado.

SEC. 4026. HOLLY POND AND NOROTAN RIVER, STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration for Holly Pond and Norotan River, Stamford, Connecticut.

SEC. 4027. HOUSATONIC RIVER, NEW MILFORD, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along the Housatonic River, New Milford, Connecticut.

SEC. 4028. LONG ISLAND SOUND AND MILL RIVER, STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for Long Island Sound and Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut.

SEC. 4029. MERIDEN, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Meriden, Connecticut.

SEC. 4030. SOUTH COVE, OLD SAYBROOK, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the South Cove, Old Saybrook, Connecticut.

SEC. 4031. WEST RIVER, NEW HAVEN HARBOR, WEST HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, storm damage reduction, including a review of bulkhead condition for West River, New Haven Harbor, West Haven, Connecticut.

SEC. 4032. CHESAPEAKE BAY, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Army Corps of Engineers projects in the Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

SEC. 4033. WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, including green technologies, for Washington, District of Columbia.

SEC. 4034. LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental protection, Lake County, Florida.

SEC. 4035. MARION COUNTY, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Marion County, Florida.

SEC. 4036. MIAMI, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Miami, Florida.

SEC. 4037. OAKLAND PARK, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oakland Park, Florida.

SEC. 4038. RIVIERA BEACH, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Riviera Beach, Florida.

SEC. 4039. SOUTH DAYTONA, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for South Daytona, Florida.

SEC. 4040. TAMPA, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Tampa, Florida.

SEC. 4041. PEAVINE CREEK, DECATUR, GEORGIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for Peavine Creek, Decatur, Georgia.

SEC. 4042. RICHLAND CREEK, LAWRENCEVILLE, GEORGIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Richland Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.

SEC. 4043. STUDY FOR WATER SUPPLY, GEORGIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of municipal and industrial water supply for the State of Georgia.

(b) STUDY COMPONENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall review—

(1) currently available water supplies;

(2) expected future demand for potable water;

(3) current water uses, including per capita use rates;

(4) opportunities to augment existing supplies, including through increased conservation and improved efficiencies;

(5) the effect of water supply policies and uses on the environment;

(6) the effect of water supply policies on the economy;

(7) the effect of water supply policies and uses on upstream and downstream uses;

(8) the impacts of water supply policies on threatened and endangered species; and

(9) the impacts of consumptive uses on instream uses.

(c) TIMING.—The Secretary shall complete the study not later than 2 years following the first obligation of funds for the study.

SEC. 4044. SUWANNEE CREEK, LAWRENCEVILLE, GEORGIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Suwannee Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.

SEC. 4045. AGAT AND MERIZO, GUAM.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Agat and Merizo, Guam.

SEC. 4046. WAIAKEA STREAM AND PALAI STREAM, HILO, HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii.

(b) PRIOR WORK.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, any work undertaken in the formulation of a project for flood damage reduction, Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii, initiated under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

SEC. 4047. WAIALUA-KAIAKA WATERSHED, OAHU, HAWAII.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, water supply, and related water resource purposes for the Waialua-Kaiaka watershed, Oahu, Hawaii.

SEC. 4048. ALBANY PARK, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Albany Park, Chicago, Illinois.

SEC. 4049. CARPENTER CREEK, CARPENTERSVILLE, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Carpenter Creek, Carpentersville, Illinois.

SEC. 4050. DES PLAINES RIVER, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for the Des Plaines River, Cook County, Illinois.

SEC. 4051. FERSON-OTTER CREEK DAM, ST. CHARLES, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Ferson-Otter Creek Dam, St. Charles, Illinois.

SEC. 4052. MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ILLINOIS AND MISSOURI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing a program for environmental restoration for the Middle Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri.

SEC. 4053. NORTH BRANCH OF THE CHICAGO RIVER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and related water resource purposes for the North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

SEC. 4054. RIVER PARK AND RONAN PARK, NORTH BRANCH OF THE CHICAGO RIVER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and shoreline protection for River Park and Ronan Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

SEC. 4055. THILLENS PARK, NORTH BRANCH OF THE CHICAGO RIVER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and shoreline protection for Thillens Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

SEC. 4056. VILLAGE OF SKOKIE, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Village of Skokie, Illinois.

SEC. 4057. BOWMAN CREEK, SOUTH BEND, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Bowman Creek, South Bend, Indiana.

SEC. 4058. LAKE MICHIGAN WATERSHED, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, and related water resource purposes for the Lake Michigan watershed, Indiana.

SEC. 4059. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Burlington, Iowa.

SEC. 4060. BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL, LOUISIANA AND MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Federal hopper dredge Wheeler, as part of routine testing and use under its ready reserve status pursuant to section 3 of the Act of August 11, 1888 (33 U.S.C. 622(c); 110 Stat. 3705), for support of projects for the beneficial reuse of material dredged from federally maintained waterways at the following locations:

(1) Projects in connection with the comprehensive plan for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, pursuant to section 7002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1270).

(2) Projects in connection with the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, authorized by section 1001 of this Act.

SEC. 4061. JESUIT BEND, PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LOUISIANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.

(b) USE OF LOCAL REPORT.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary may include elements of the report prepared by the non-Federal interest for Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, if the Secretary determines that such elements are feasible.

SEC. 4062. LABRANCHE WETLANDS, ST. CHARLES AND ST. JOHN COUNTIES, LOUISIANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for flood control and improvement of the Lower Mississippi River, Bonnet Carre Spillway, authorized by section 1 of the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), to add environmental restoration as a project purpose.

(b) REVIEW.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall review operational and structural changes to the project to restore the LaBranche Wetlands, St. Charles and St. John Counties, Louisiana.

SEC. 4063. RUTH CANAL FRESHWATER DIVERSION, VERMILION, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the project for the improvement of Bayou Teche and the Vermilion River, Louisiana, authorized by section 3 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 641), and the project for flood protection in the Teche-Vermilion basins, Louisiana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1420), to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water supply, Ruth Canal, Vermilion, Louisiana.

SEC. 4064. ANACOSTIA RIVER WATERSHED, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Anacostia River watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.

SEC. 4065. CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE STUDY, MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND VIRGINIA.

In carrying out the study for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, being carried out under the Committee Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted May 23, 2001, the Secretary shall determine the feasibility of carrying out projects on federally owned property for shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and improvement of water quality of the Chesapeake Bay.

SEC. 4066. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL, BALTIMORE HARBOR, MARYLAND.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredged material disposal at Cox Creek Dredged Material Disposal Site for Baltimore Harbor, Maryland.

SEC. 4067. MID-CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, MARYLAND.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island, Maryland, as authorized by section 1001 of this Act.

SEC. 4068. CAPISIC BROOK, PORTLAND, MAINE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration, flood damage reduction, and stormwater management for Capisic Brook, Portland, Maine.

SEC. 4069. FISHING AND GOOSEBERRY ISLANDS, KITTERY, MAINE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Fishing and Gooseberry Islands, Kittery, Maine.

SEC. 4070. SOUTHERN MAINE/NEW HAMPSHIRE DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL STUDY, MAINE AND NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for southern Maine and New Hampshire.

SEC. 4071. ASSABET, CHARLES, AND SUDBURY WATERSHEDS, MIDDLESEX AND ESSEX COUNTIES, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes, Assabet, Charles, and Sudbury watersheds, Middlesex and Essex Counties, Massachusetts.

SEC. 4072. HOOSIC RIVER WATERSHED, NORTH ADAMS, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Hoosic River watershed, North Adams, Massachusetts.

SEC. 4073. MYSTIC RIVER WATERSHED, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Mystic River watershed, Massachusetts.

SEC. 4074. QUEQUECHAN RIVER, FALL RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for the Quequechan River, Fall River, Massachusetts.

SEC. 4075. CLINTON RIVER, CLINTON TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Clinton River, Clinton Township, Michigan.

SEC. 4076. HAMILTON DAM, FLINT, MICHIGAN.

In carrying out the review under the authority of section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1830) of the project for flood control, Flint River, Michigan, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 311), the Secretary shall include a review of Hamilton Dam, Flint, Michigan.

SEC. 4077. UPPER PENINSULA FLOOD RECOVERY, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for Upper Peninsula Flood Recovery, Michigan.

SEC. 4078. AMORY, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Amory, Mississippi.

SEC. 4079. COASTAL MISSISSIPPI ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration and related water resource purposes for coastal Mississippi.

SEC. 4080. FULTON, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Fulton, Mississippi.

SEC. 4081. GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, Gulfport, Mississippi.

SEC. 4082. LUCEDALE, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, water supply, recreation, and related water resource purposes for Lucedale, Mississippi.

SEC. 4083. MAGBY CREEK AND VERNON BRANCH, LOWNDES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Magby Creek and Vernon Branch in Lowndes County, Mississippi.

SEC. 4084. BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for flood protection and other purposes in the Blue River basin, vicinity of

Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (80 Stat. 1409), to include additional flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreational measures, Kansas City, Missouri.

SEC. 4085. LITTLE BLUE RIVER, JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for stream bank stabilization for Little Blue River, Jackson County, Missouri.

SEC. 4086. ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, especially examining the floodwall pump station, for St. Louis, Missouri.

SEC. 4087. LAS VEGAS WASH, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Las Vegas Wash, Las Vegas, Nevada.

SEC. 4088. NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Secretary, in collaboration with all relevant Federal and non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, academia, and the general public, shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study of all watersheds in New Hampshire for water quality, habitat degradation, environmental restoration, water supply, and potential impacts of climate change for New Hampshire.

SEC. 4089. PISCATAQUA RIVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate sediment and nutrient pollution in the Piscataqua River system to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water quality for the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire.

SEC. 4090. BARNEGAT BAY WATERSHED, OCEAN AND MONMOUTH COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Barnegat Bay watershed, Ocean and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey.

SEC. 4091. BEVERLY, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, including consideration of a gabion wall, for Beverly, New Jersey.

SEC. 4092. BOROUGH OF PINE BEACH, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, including consideration of floating wave attenuators off shore, for Borough of Pine Beach, New Jersey.

SEC. 4093. HADDON TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Haddon Township, New Jersey.

SEC. 4094. RAHWAY RIVER WATERSHED, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Rahway River watershed, New Jersey.

SEC. 4095. THIRD RIVER, BELLEVILLE, BLOOMFIELD, AND NUTLEY, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction for Third River, Belleville, Bloomfield, and Nutley, New Jersey.

SEC. 4096. PASSAIC RIVER CHANNEL, NUTLEY, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, environmental restoration, and recreation for the Passaic River Channel, Nutley, New Jersey.

SEC. 4097. TOWNSHIP OF OCEAN, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for the Township of Ocean, New Jersey.

SEC. 4098. PREAKNESS BROOK, WAYNE, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Preakness Brook, Wayne, New Jersey.

SEC. 4099. DONA ANA, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of adding hydropower to existing irrigation canals for Dona Ana, New Mexico.

SEC. 4100. HIDALGO COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Hidalgo County, New Mexico.

SEC. 4101. OTERO COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Otero County, New Mexico.

SEC. 4102. VALENCIA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Valencia County, New Mexico.

SEC. 4103. GLEN COVE, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and environmental restoration for Glen Cove, New York.

SEC. 4104. HAWTREE BASIN, HAMILTON BEACH, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration for Hawtree basin, Hamilton Beach, New York.

SEC. 4105. KILL VAN KULL, PORT RICHMOND, STATEN ISLAND, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration for Kill Van Kull, Port Richmond, Staten Island, New York.

SEC. 4106. MARINERS MARSH AND ARLINGTON MARSH, STATEN ISLAND, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Mariners Marsh and Arlington Marsh, Staten Island, New York.

SEC. 4107. NEW YORK, NEW YORK.

(a) INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF BULKHEADS AND SEAWALLS.—

(1) INVENTORY.—The Secretary shall conduct an inventory of bulkheads and seawalls constructed around the city of New York, New York, including the boroughs of Brooklyn, the Bronx, Manhattan, Staten Island, and Queens.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF REHABILITATION NEEDS.—In conducting the inventory required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assess the condition of the bulkheads and seawalls and the need for rehabilitation or modification of the bulkheads and seawalls.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the inventory and assessment required by subsection (a).

(c) INTERIM ACTIONS.—If the Secretary determines that a bulkhead or seawall referred to in subsection (a) presents an imminent and substantial risk to public safety, the Secretary may carry out measures to prevent or mitigate that risk.

(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this section shall be 65 percent.

(e) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate officials of the city of New York and the State of New York.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 4108. NORTON BASIN INLET, FAR ROCKAWAY, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Norton Basin Inlet, Far Rockaway, New York.

SEC. 4109. QUEENS, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Queens, New York, between 116th and 156th Streets.

SEC. 4110. ROCKAWAY BEACH SEAWALL, ROCKAWAY, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Rockaway Beach Seawall, Rockaway, New York.

SEC. 4111. ROOSEVELT ISLAND, EAST RIVER, NEW YORK, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and shoreline protection for Roosevelt Island, East River, New York, New York.

SEC. 4112. CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration in support of the Surface Water Improvement and Management Initiative for Charlotte, North Carolina.

SEC. 4113. NANTAHALA RIVER, SWAIN, NORTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes, Nantahala River, Swain, North Carolina.

SEC. 4114. MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, SOUTH AND CENTRAL NORTH DAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Missouri River and tributaries, South and Central North Dakota, North Dakota.

SEC. 4115. BIG CREEK WATERSHED, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Big Creek watershed, Ohio.

SEC. 4116. BRANDYWINE CREEK WATERSHED, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Brandywine Creek watershed, Ohio.

SEC. 4117. CARLISLE TOWNSHIP, LORAIN COUNTY, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Carlisle Township, Lorain County, Ohio.

SEC. 4118. CUYAHOGA RIVER WATERSHED AND TUSCARAWAS RIVER WATERSHED, SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes, Cuyahoga River watershed and Tuscarawas River watershed, Summit County, Ohio.

SEC. 4119. EUCLID CREEK WATERSHED, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Euclid Creek watershed, Ohio.

SEC. 4120. HEALY CREEK, BRUNSWICK, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, streambank erosion, and sedimentation control for Healy Creek, Brunswick, Ohio.

SEC. 4121. LOWER MAUMEE RIVER, TOLEDO, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Lower Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio.

SEC. 4122. OHIO RIVER, OHIO.

Section 4070 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1183) is amended by striking "Ohio River" and inserting "Ohio River and tributaries".

SEC. 4123. SHAKER LAKES, SHAKER HEIGHTS AND CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Shaker Lakes, Shaker Heights and Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

SEC. 4124. STARK COUNTY, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Stark County, Ohio.

SEC. 4125. TINKERS CREEK WATERSHED, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Tinkers Creek watershed, Ohio.

SEC. 4126. UPPER TUSCARAWAS RIVER, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Upper Tuscarawas River, Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

SEC. 4127. WEST CREEK WATERSHED, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for West Creek watershed, Ohio.

SEC. 4128. YELLOW CREEK AND SHORT CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Yellow Creek and Short Creek, Jefferson County, Ohio.

SEC. 4129. FERRY CREEK RESERVOIR, BROOKINGS, OREGON.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Ferry Creek Reservoir, Brookings, Oregon.

SEC. 4130. OREGON NAVIGATION JETTIES AND BREAKWATERS, OREGON.

(a) INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF NAVIGATION JETTIES AND BREAKWATERS.—

(1) INVENTORY.—The Secretary shall conduct an inventory of federally constructed navigation jetties and breakwaters in the State of Oregon.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF REHABILITATION NEEDS.—In conducting the inventory required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assess the condition of the navigation jetties and breakwaters and the need for rehabilitation or modification of the jetties and breakwaters.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the inventory and assessment required by subsection (a).

(c) INTERIM ACTIONS.—If the Secretary determines that a jetty or breakwater referred to in subsection (a) presents an imminent and substantial risk to public safety, the Secretary may carry out measures to prevent or mitigate that risk.

(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this section shall be 65 percent.

(e) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate officials of the State of Oregon.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 4131. PORT ORFORD, OREGON.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements with examination of navigational breakwaters for Port Orford, Oregon.

SEC. 4132. BUHL LAKE, SHARON, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a multipurpose project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania.

(b) PRIOR WORK.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, any work undertaken in the formulation of a project for environmental restoration, Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania, initiated under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 110 Stat. 3679).

SEC. 4133. DELAWARE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for the Delaware River and tributaries, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 4134. ELK CREEK, MEADVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water quality for Elk Creek, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 4135. MILL CREEK, ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, focusing on the Mill Creek Drift Catcher, for Mill Creek, Erie, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 4136. SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 4137. WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.

Section 4077 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1184) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania" and inserting "Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania, the Monongahela River basin, Pennsylvania"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "Shaler Township" and inserting "Shaler Township, Hampton Township, Harmar Township".

SEC. 4138. GUAYAMA, PUERTO RICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction for Guayama, Puerto Rico.

SEC. 4139. RINCON, PUERTO RICO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and shoreline protection for the Municipality of Rincon, Puerto Rico.

SEC. 4140. PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for the rivers in Providence, Rhode Island.

SEC. 4141. SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary, in collaboration with all relevant Federal and non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, academia, and the general public, shall conduct comprehensive watershed studies of all 8 watersheds in South Carolina for water quality, habitat condition, environmental restoration, water supply, and the potential impacts of climate change for South Carolina.

SEC. 4142. JAMES RIVER, SOUTH DAKOTA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for channel restoration and improvements on the James River, South Dakota, authorized by section 401(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4128) to add ecosystem restoration and watershed improvements as project purposes.

SEC. 4143. STATION CAMP CREEK, GALLATIN, TENNESSEE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Station Camp Creek, Gallatin, Tennessee.

SEC. 4144. BRAZOS RIVER, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study assessing the long-term impacts of water use, withdrawal, recirculation, and downstream impacts on the Whitney Lake Reservoir, Texas.

SEC. 4145. HICKORY CREEK, CITY OF BALCH SPRINGS, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Hickory Creek, City of Balch Springs, Texas.

SEC. 4146. HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS (BARBOURS CUT), TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of modifying the Barbours Cut element of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), to a depth of 45 feet.

SEC. 4147. PORT OF GALVESTON, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for dredged material disposal in the vicinity of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666).

SEC. 4148. SIMSBORO AQUIFER, CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Simsboro Aquifer for water supply for the City of Bastrop, Texas.

SEC. 4149. NAVASOTA RIVER WATERSHED, GRIMES COUNTY, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for the Navasota River watershed, Grimes County, Texas.

SEC. 4150. RIO GRANDE BASIN, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and water supply for the Rio Grande basin, Texas.

SEC. 4151. ROMA, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Roma, Texas.

SEC. 4152. COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for streambank stabilization for Cottonwood Heights, Utah.

SEC. 4153. EMERY TOWN, UTAH.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of existing water supply resources for Emery Town, Utah.

SEC. 4154. BIG SANDY RIVER REALLOCATION STUDY, VIRGINIA AND WEST VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of reallocating water storage at 6 reservoirs to optimize benefits for multiple-purpose use in the Big Sandy River watershed, Virginia and West Virginia.

SEC. 4155. BUCKROE AND GRANDVIEW BEACHES, HAMPTON, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection for Buckroe and Grandview Beaches, Hampton, Virginia.

SEC. 4156. FORT MONROE, HAMPTON, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, including offshore breakwaters, for Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia.

SEC. 4157. HAMPTON, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Hampton, Virginia.

SEC. 4158. JAMES RIVER WATERSHED, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the water resource needs, including current and projected future needs, for the James River watershed, Virginia.

SEC. 4159. ELLIOTT BAY, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation channel deepening for Elliott Bay, Seattle, Washington.

SEC. 4160. GREEN RIVER, KENT, WASHINGTON.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Green River, Kent, Washington.

SEC. 4161. VANCOUVER LAKE WATERSHED, VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON.

The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental quality and environmental restoration, especially related to salmon and steelhead recovery issues, for the Vancouver Lake watershed, Vancouver, Washington.

SEC. 4162. LAKE MICHIGAN SHORELINE, CITY OF CUDAHY, WISCONSIN.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection for the Lake Michigan shoreline, City of Cudahy, Wisconsin.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 5001. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1) by striking "pilot";

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

"(C) IN-KIND SERVICES.—In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), the non-Federal interest may provide any portion of the non-Federal share of the costs of the project carried out under this section in the form of in-kind services and materials.

"(D) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—In accordance with section 2007 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2222), funds provided by a Federal department or agency other than the Corps of Engineers for a project carried out under this section shall be credited towards the non-Federal share of the cost of project.";

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

"(e) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than $10,000,000 in Federal funds may be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality.";

(5) by striking subsection (g) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) and inserting the following:

"(g) PROJECTS.—The Secretary may carry out projects under this section in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, with the goal of carrying out projects in each of the States of Delaware, New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia and the District of Columbia."; and

(6) in subsection (j) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) by striking "$40,000,000" and inserting "$50,000,000".

(b) RESTORATION OF CHESAPEAKE BAY ECOSYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop at Federal expense and submit to Congress a comprehensive plan to prioritize projects within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including projects in the Anacostia, Elizabeth, James, Patapsco, Patuxent, Potomac, Rappahannock, Susquehanna, and York River basins.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the plan developed under paragraph (1)—

(A) focuses on integrating existing and potential future work of the Corps of Engineers;

(B) is developed in consultation with the Chesapeake Bay Program maintained under section 117 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267)); and

(C) encompasses all actions of the Corps of Engineers that are necessary to assist in the implementation of the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, as defined in section 117 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267)).

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $1,000,000.

SEC. 5002. SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY.

Section 5015(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1196) is amended by striking "$134,650,000" and inserting "$185,638,028".

SEC. 5003. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT.

Section 5002(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1190) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9) by striking "Esopus, Plattekill, and Rondout Creeks" and inserting "Esopus, Rondout, and Wallkill watersheds"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(19) San Gabriel River watershed, California.

"(20) South Platte River watershed, Colorado.

"(21) Loxahatchee River watershed, Jupiter, Florida.

"(22) Hudson River watershed, Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties, New York.

"(23) Muskingum River basin, Ohio.".

SEC. 5004. COMPREHENSIVE SHORELINE RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, and emergency streambank protection compo-

nents of projects at the locations described in subsection (b) if the Secretary determines that such component is feasible.

(b) PROJECT LOCATIONS.—The locations referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) Miller Knox Shoreline, Richmond, California.

(2) Mississippi River, Davenport, Iowa.

(3) Lake Michigan (in the vicinity of the former USX Site), Chicago, Illinois.

(4) Pond and Mill Creek watershed, Louisville, Kentucky.

(5) Massachusetts Bay (in the vicinity of Georges Island), Boston, Massachusetts.

(6) Mississippi River (in the vicinity of the lower St. Anthony Falls), Minneapolis, Minnesota.

(7) Brush Creek, Kansas City, Missouri.

(8) Mississippi River, Kimmswick, Missouri.

(9) Delaware River, Trenton, New Jersey.

(10) East River, New York, New York.

(11) Upper New York Bay, Staten Island, New York.

(12) Abbott's Creek, Lexington, North Carolina.

(13) Ohio River, Belpre, Ohio.

(14) Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(15) Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela Rivers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

(16) Ohio River, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

(17) Fields Point, Narragansett Bay, Providence, Rhode Island.

(18) Congaree River, Columbia, South Carolina.

(19) Wolf Creek Harbor, Mississippi River, Tennessee.

(20) Ruston Way Seawall, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, Washington.

(21) Lower Yahara River, McFarland, Wisconsin.

(c) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than $5,000,000 in Federal funds may be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality.

(d) RECREATION.—The Secretary may include recreational components as part of a project carried out under this section.

(e) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000 for each fiscal years 2011 through 2016.

SEC. 5005. NORTHEAST COASTAL REGION ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall plan, design, and construct projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration within the coastal waters of the Northeastern United States from Virginia to Maine, including associated bays, estuaries, and critical riverine areas.

(b) GENERAL COASTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, the Governors of the coastal States from Virginia to Maine, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties, shall assess the needs regarding, and opportunities for, aquatic ecosystem restoration within the coastal waters of the Northeastern United States.

(2) PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop a general coastal management plan based on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1), maximizing the use of existing plans and investigations. The Secretary shall include in the plan the following:

(A) An inventory and evaluation of coastal habitats.

(B) Identification of aquatic resources in need of improvement.

(C) Identification and prioritization of potential aquatic habitat restoration projects.

(D) Identification of geographical and ecological areas of concern, including—

(i) finfish habitats;

(ii) diadromous fisheries migratory corridors;

(iii) shellfish habitats;

(iv) submerged aquatic vegetation;

(v) wetlands; and

(vi) beach dune complexes and other similar habitats.

(c) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—The Secretary may carry out an aquatic ecosystem restoration project under this section if the project—

(1) is consistent with the management plan developed under subsection (b); and

(2) provides for—

(A) the restoration of degraded aquatic habitat (including coastal, saltmarsh, benthic, and riverine habitat);

(B) the restoration of geographical or ecological areas of concern, including the restoration of natural river and stream characteristics;

(C) the improvement of water quality; or

(D) other projects or activities determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(d) COST SHARING.—

(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The management plan developed under subsection (b) shall be completed at Federal expense.

(2) RESTORATION PROJECTS.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section shall be 35 percent.

(e) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than $10,000,000 in Federal funds may be allocated under this section for an eligible project.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2011 and each fiscal year thereafter, including funds for the completion of the management plan.

SEC. 5006. ANACOSTIA WATERSHED, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, emergency streambank protection, and aquatic plant control components of the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan, developed pursuant to section 5060 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1215), if the Secretary determines that such component is feasible.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership.

(c) FEDERAL LANDS.—In carrying out a project component under subsection (a), the Secretary shall waive any cost share to be provided by non-Federal interests for any portion of the project component that benefits federally owned property.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 5007. EGMONT KEY, FLORIDA.

The Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out those portions of the project for shoreline stabilization, Egmont Key, Florida, carried out under section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g), that benefit federally owned property.

SEC. 5008. CAMBRIDGE, MARYLAND.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out projects for environmental protection and restoration at the Blackwater Wildlife Refuge, Cambridge, Maryland. In carrying out such projects, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

SEC. 5009. HART-MILLER ISLAND, MARYLAND.

After the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may not consider the use or expansion of Hart-Miller Island, Maryland, in any dredged material management plan.

SEC. 5010. GALLOPS ISLAND, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project for the environmental remediation of Gallops Island, Boston, Massachusetts. In carrying out such project, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 5011. SHARKEY COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.

Funding for the operation and maintenance of the multiagency wildlife and environmental interpretative and education center, authorized by section 145(f) of Division H of Public Law 108–199 (118 Stat. 443), shall be provided by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5012. CHARLESTON HARBOR POST 45 PROJECT, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reconnaissance and feasibility studies for the Charleston Harbor Post 45 Project, Charleston, South Carolina, and if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, shall proceed directly to project preconstruction, engineering, and design.

SEC. 5013. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PROMOTION OF GENERAL MICHAEL J. WALSH TO MAJOR GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Brigadier General Michael J. Walsh has had a distinguished 30-year career with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, including as—

(A) District Commander of the San Francisco District, San Francisco, California, from 1994 to 1996;

(B) District Commander of the Sacramento District, Sacramento, California, from 1998 to 2001;

(C) Executive Director of Civil Works, Corps Headquarters, Washington, District of Columbia, from 2001 to 2003;

(D) Chief of Staff, Corps Headquarters, Washington, District of Columbia, from 2003 to 2004;

(E) Commander of the South Atlantic Division, Atlanta, Georgia, from 2004 to 2006;

(F) Commander for the Corps Gulf Region Division, Baghdad, Iraq, from 2006 to 2008; and

(G) Commander of the Mississippi Valley Division, Vicksburg, Mississippi, from 2008 to 2010.

(2) General Walsh has held a wide variety of Army command and staff assignments, including—

(A) project management officer for Engineer Branch, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe (SHAPE);

(B) Environmental Task Force Leader, Fort Stewart, Georgia;

(C) Executive Officer, 92nd Engineer Battalion, Fort Stewart, Georgia, and Saudi Arabia;

(D) Project Engineer and Assistant Area Engineer, Baltimore District;

(E) Construction Officer, 18th Engineer Brigade, Darmstadt, Germany; and

(F) Commander, Company B, 94th Engineer Battalion, Darmstadt, Germany.

(3) General Walsh has received several awards of the United States Army, including 2 Bronze Stars, 4 Legions of Merit, and numerous lesser awards.

(4) On October 27, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate unanimously approved the nomination of General Walsh to the rank of Major General, United States Army.

(5) General Walsh's nomination was unreasonably delayed on the floor of the Senate for 7 months.

(6) On May 19, 2010, the nomination of General Walsh to Major General of the United States Army was confirmed by the United States Senate by unanimous consent.

(7) On June 2, 2010, Brigadier General Walsh was formally promoted to the rank of Major General.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that General Walsh should be congratulated for his promotion to the rank of Major General, United States Army, and should be commended for his duty and dedication to the United States, to the United States Army, and to the Corps of Engineers.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

H.R. 5892, as amended, the "Water Resources Development Act of 2010", includes project authorizations, modifications, deauthorizations, studies, and policy initiatives for the Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) Civil Works Program—the nation's largest water resources program. The bill authorizes and directs the Corps to carry out various studies, projects, and programmatic authorities relating to navigation, flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, water supply, recreation, environmental restoration and protection, and other water-related activities.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

H.R. 5892, as amended, the "Water Resources Development Act of 2010", demonstrates the continuing commitment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure (Committee) to the nation's water resources infrastructure, and a regular authorization schedule for the Civil Works Program of the Corps, which was instituted by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99–662) (WRDA 1986). The Committee believes that passage of H.R. 5892 is vitally important to fulfill commitments to non-Federal

sponsors, to be responsive to new and emerging water resources needs, and to fine-tune the Corps' missions and responsibilities.

VALUE OF THE CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM

The Committee recognizes the value of the Corps and the Corps' Civil Works missions to the nation and the critical importance of maintaining these vital contributions. Over the years, the Corps has maintained flexibility in its Civil Works missions to meet the changing needs of the nation. The Corps has an impressive history of helping to meet the nation's water resources needs. For more than 175 years, the Corps has supported navigation needs by maintaining and improving the nation's waterways in 41 States. The Corps also maintains 300 commercial harbors, through which more than two billion tons of cargo pass each year. With more than 13 million American jobs dependent on our import and export trade, these ports are vital to our economic security. The ports and waterways maintained by the Corps also play a vital role in our nation's defense.

The Corps' flood damage reduction efforts range from small, local protection projects (levees or non-structural flood damage reduction measures) to major dams. Today, most Corps constructed flood damage reduction projects are owned by sponsoring cities, towns, and agricultural districts, but the Corps continues to maintain and operate 383 dams and reservoirs for flood damage reduction. These projects have prevented an estimated $706 billion in flood damage, most of that within the last 25 years. The cumulative cost for building and maintaining these projects is $119 billion. Thus, for every dollar invested, more than six dollars in potential damages have been saved.

Legislation passed in 1990 established environmental protection as one of the primary missions of the Corps—together with navigation and flood damage reduction. Since that time, ecosystem restoration projects have grown increasingly popular throughout the country, resulting in an annual investment of more than $1.3 billion in Federal support for environmental activities. The Corps has provided leadership on large-scale ecosystem restoration projects, including restoring the hydrologic regime for the Everglades in Florida, undertaking an ecosystem restoration project for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway system, and addressing wetland losses of catastrophic proportion in Coastal Louisiana. In addition, the Corps carries out environmental and natural resource management programs at its projects, manages thousands of square miles of forest and wildlife habitat, monitors water quality at its dams, and undertakes restoration activities to address ongoing adverse environmental impacts of existing Corps' projects and facilities.

As the Corps' Civil Works program continues to evolve in its service to the nation, the Committee notes with interest the efforts of the Chief of Engineers to encourage a more holistic approach to water resources management. Over the past few years, the Committee has heard from numerous witnesses how an increased emphasis on watershed and basin-wide planning, conducted in conjunction with state and local governments and non-public stakeholders, can lead to a more sustainable use of water resources that integrates water development, protection, and restoration, as well

as attempts to balance the often competing uses of water, both for human development activities and the natural system. This need for enhanced coordination on a watershed basis has taken on urgency with increased evidence of altered weather patterns and shifting hydrologic cycles in the nation, and the growing unpredictability of reliable sources of potable water. The Corps can play a particularly important role in facilitating planning when the issues affecting water resources concern multiple jurisdictions. The Corps is encouraged to pursue efforts to improve coordination and cooperation in the development of recommended approaches to address water resources problems and formulating plans to solve these problems.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS PLANNING PROCESS

In recent years, there has been some controversy regarding the planning process used by the Corps to develop water resources projects. The Civil Works program is a $4.5 billion to $5.5 billion annual program. Of that amount, between $135 million and $145 million is invested annually to study water resources needs, to determine if there is a Federal interest in meeting those needs, and to develop recommendations for water resources projects that are technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

For certain small projects, Congress has authorized the Corps to participate in the development and construction under continuing authorities. The Federal participation in these small projects is limited to between $500,000 and $7 million per project, depending on the project type. For all other projects, the Corps must first receive authorization from Congress to proceed with a study, either by statute or, if the Corps previously has conducted a study in the same geographic area, in the form of a Committee resolution.

Once authorized, a water resources study begins with a reconnaissance study. The reconnaissance phase is a relatively quick examination of the problem (generally costing no more than $100,000 and lasting 12 months) during which the Corps determines if there is a Federal interest and a potentially feasible project. If the Corps determines, based on the reconnaissance study, that there is a potentially feasible water resources project, it may seek the participation of a non-Federal interest willing to share in 50 percent of the study costs (for studies for projects other than inland navigation) and proceed to a full feasibility study. When funded at capability, a feasibility study generally takes about two years.

To ensure that a project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, the Corps must conduct a study in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policy, including the 1983 Principles and Guidelines issued by the Water Resources Council, Engineering Regulations issued by the Corps (and most recently comprehensively revised in 1999), and other guidance periodically issued by the Chief of Engineers. Studies for projects with an estimated total cost of more than $45 million are also subject to a peer review by an independent panel of experts, pursuant to section 2034 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (P.L. 110–114) (WRDA 2007). Studies that result in a report of the Chief of Engineers recommending a water resources project are submitted to Congress for authorization. Other than

projects constructed under continuing authorities, the Corps may not proceed to construction of a project until it is specifically authorized by Congress. This authorization is traditionally undertaken in a water resources development bill.

SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 1. Short title; table of contents

This section provides that the short title of this Act is the "Water Resources Development Act of 2010" and includes a table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary

This section defines the term "Secretary" for purposes of this Act as the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 1001. Project authorizations

This section authorizes projects for water resources development and conservation to be carried out substantially in accordance with the reports of the Chief of Engineers cited for each project, except as otherwise provided.

I. Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland

Location of the Study Area: The study area is located in the Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland.

Problems and Opportunities Identified in Study: Land subsidence, rising sea level, and wave action are causing valuable remote island habitats to be lost throughout the Chesapeake Bay. Approximately 10,500 acres of island habitat has been lost in the middle-eastern portion of Chesapeake Bay in the last 150 years, and should present island loss rates continue in the future, it is estimated that remote island habitats will disappear from the Mid-Chesapeake Bay region within 20 years. The Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project would restore thousands of acres of lost wetland and upland island habitats. This restoration would provide critical regional habitats supporting resident fisheries and wildlife, while providing an environmentally sound method for the disposal of dredged material from the Chesapeake Bay approach channels to the Port of Baltimore.

The Dredged Material Management Plan and Tiered Environmental Impact Statement (DMMP EIS) (USACE, 2005) concluded that there is insufficient capacity for dredged material placement to meet Federal and State of Maryland dredging needs in the next 20 years and that there is potential for overloading and subsequent loss of capacity at existing placement sites if new placement sites are not constructed. More than 130 miles of dredged shipping channels serve the Port of Baltimore, and annual channel maintenance and improvement projects require that approximately four to five million cubic yards of sediment be dredged from these Federal and State channels. In addition, the State of Maryland's Dredged Material Management Act of 2001 phases out open water placement of dredged material within Maryland waters by 2010, which will re-

sult in insufficient placement capacity to meet the annual need for maintenance dredging activity.

The Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project provides multiple opportunities to address the problems by:

- Restoring habitat that is used by many species of migratory birds, as well as fish and other wildlife species, as resting, nesting, foraging, and production areas;
- Reducing the rate of island erosion, thereby promoting conditions conducive to restoration and protection of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) by decreasing localized sediment inputs and improving local water clarity;
- Providing spawning, nursery, and sheltered habitat for juvenile and forage fish species, epibenthic invertebrates, and benthic infauna by restoring wetland and shallow water areas;
- Protecting shallow water areas from storm and wave forces, providing suitable habitat for the sustainable growth of SAV;
- Providing essential nursery and foraging habitat for numerous fish in restored wetland and shallow water habitats;
- Protecting shoreline for avian, reptilian, and mammalian species resting, nesting, and foraging areas;
- Meeting the dredged material capacity shortfall as projected in the DMMP of 30 to 70 million cubic yards of dredged material over the 20-year planning period; and
- Providing shoreline protection and reducing impacts from storms by reducing wave heights.

Alternative Plans Considered: Plan formulation was conducted to determine a recommended plan that would provide ecosystem benefits within site-specific constraints and meet the long-term dredged material placement need of 3.2 million cubic yards per year (mcy/y). The plan formulation process had two primary phases, both of which included various ranking, scoring, and screening processes. First, potential locations suitable for a large island restoration project and meeting the project objectives of habitat restoration and dredged material capacity were identified. Second, feasible alternative alignments were then developed to meet the engineering and environmental design constraints for the potential site (or sites). Plan formulation activities were all done in collaboration with the Bay Enhancement Working Group (BEWG) as detailed below.

Management Measures and Alternative Plans.

- *Island Site Selection.* The process to select a site for large island restoration had two components: (1) identify all potential locations for a large island restoration project within the study area (105 total existing or former island sites); and (2) rank these sites using engineering and environmental criteria and public input. Eight feasible island sites were carried forward for additional consideration using the ranking process developed by the BEWG as part of the State of Maryland's DMMP process. The process evaluated sites on the basis of 52 parameters to determine each site's environmental suitability as a dredged material placement site. Based on the results of the process, James and Barren Islands were selected for detailed alternatives development.
- *Selection of Alternatives.* Four Barren Island alignments, five James Island alignments, and 20 additional alignments that were

combinations at both James Island and Barren Island were used to develop an array of 145 feasible alignment alternatives for evaluation. The screening of the alternatives involved multiple analysis tools, including: (1) geographic information system (GIS) analysis; (2) engineering and design suitability screening; (3) ecosystem benefits determination using Island Community Units (ICU) analysis; (4) cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis; and (5) input from resource agencies. Once feasible alignment alternatives were identified, these alignments were optimized to maximize ecosystem benefits and placement efficiency by evaluating multiple wetland and upland proportions in conjunction with variable upland dike heights, minimization of the project footprint, and resource agency input.

Description of Recommended Plan: The Recommended Plan consists of constructing James Island Alignment 5, with a habitat proportion of 45 percent upland to 55 percent wetland and an upland dike height of 20 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW), in combination with protection and restoration at Barren Island through the construction of Alignment E. The recommended plan will restore 2,144 acres of remote island habitat (2,072 acres at James Island and 72 acres at Barren Island), while also protecting approximately 1,325 acres of potential SAV habitat adjacent to Barren Island and providing approximately 90 to 95 mcy, or approximately 28 to 30 years, of dredged material placement capacity.

The recommended plan was chosen to minimize the project footprint and reduce overall project costs without significantly reducing the capacity or ecosystem benefits or dredged material capacity of the project. The recommended plan had fewer ICUs than the James Alignment 5/Barren Alignment D alternative mainly because the recommended plan has a smaller wetland habitat proportion in the James Island portion of the project, and a smaller Barren Island component of the project. The James Alignment 5/Barren Alignment E was also significantly less expensive.

In response to an External Peer Review comment, an additional analysis was performed with the ICUs to incorporate the loss of open water habitat from island restoration. The re-analysis did not result in a change in the selection of the recommended plan. Over its project life, the recommended plan provides a total of 22,045 net ICUs. The only alternative that provides a greater number of total net ICUs is the James Alignment 5/Barren protection alternative at 40 percent/60 percent upland/wetland ratio which provides a net of 23,275 ICU, but does so at a higher cost.

Physical Data on Project Features: The recommended project alternative fulfills the primary objective of the study authority; which is ecosystem restoration while simultaneously meeting a complimentary objective that is the beneficial use of dredged material. The plan will restore 2,144 acres of remote island habitat and protect 1,325 acres of SAV through the placement of 90 to 95 mcy over 28 to 30 years. Benefits for ecosystem restoration projects are not expressed in monetary terms, which preclude a benefit-to-cost ratio. The ecosystem restoration outputs for this study are expressed in ICUs based on complex metrics used to measure their significance. A rigorous Cost Effectiveness and Incremental Cost Analysis was conducted to support the selection of the recommended alternative. This alternative produces substantial eco-

logical benefits, which exceed the Federal Standard, in the most efficient and cost effective manner. The recommended alternative will produce 813 total annual ICUs. The James Island component will produce 459 annual ICUs at an annual cost of $69,682 per ICU and the Barren Island component will produce 354 annual ICUs at an annual cost of $4,702 per ICU. Federal interest is established for the recommended alternative based on the production of maximum ecosystem restoration benefits in the most cost effective manner. Total project cost is $1,612,000,000 of which $1,045,000,000 is at Federal expense and $567,000,000 is the responsibility of the non-Federal sponsor.

Views of States and Non-Federal Interests: The State of Maryland responded via letter dated 19 September 2008, with no comment during the 30-day State and Federal agency review period, which began on 20 September 2008, and expired on 20 October 2008.

Views of Federal and Regional Agencies: The U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) responded via letter dated 20 October 2008, with no comment. The Department of Commerce (DOC) responded via email dated 27 October 2008, with no comment. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responded via letter dated 7 October 2008, with no comment.

Status of NEPA Document: A Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report was completed for the project. The Notice of Availability for the Final SEIS/EIR was published in the Federal Register on 19 September 2008; the final date for comments was 20 October 2008. No significant comments have been received.

Estimated Implementation Cost:	
Corps of Engineers	$1,045,000,000
Non-Federal Interest	567,000,000
Total	$1,612,000,000

Description of Non-Federal O&M Cost: The Maryland Port Administration, under the auspices of the Maryland Department of Transportation is the non-Federal sponsor for the project. The estimated total first cost including contingencies for the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project is $1.612 billion based on October 2008 price levels. The Federal share of the total project costs would be $1.045 billion for the Federal Government (65 percent) and $567 million for the non-Federal sponsor (35 percent). Operations, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement (OMRR&R) costs for the completed project are projected to be less than two percent of the total project coast and would be a non-Federal responsibility. The first costs for the recommended recreation facilities are estimated at $210,000. The Federal Government and the non-Federal sponsor will each share 50 percent of the cost or $105,000. Since the recreation features are not planned to be constructed until the project is largely complete, OMRR&R costs would be incurred beyond the period of analysis for the project and so are not included in the project cost.

Estimated Effects: The Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project provides multiple opportunities to address the problems by:

- Restoring habitat that is used by many species of migratory birds, as well as fish and other wildlife species, as resting, nesting, foraging, and production areas;

- Reducing the rate of island erosion, thereby promoting conditions conducive to restoration and protection of SAV by decreasing localized sediment inputs and improving local water clarity;
- Providing spawning, nursery, and sheltered habitat for juvenile and forage fish species, epibenthic invertebrates, and benthic infauna by restoring wetland and shallow water areas;
- Protecting shallow water areas from storm and wave forces, providing suitable habitat for the sustainable growth of SAV;
- Providing essential nursery and foraging habitat for numerous fish in restored wetland and shallow water habitats;
- Protecting shoreline for avian, reptilian, and mammalian species resting/nesting/foraging areas;
- Meeting the dredged material capacity shortfall as projected in the DMMP of 30 to 70 million cubic yards of dredged material over the 20-year planning period; and
- Providing shoreline protection and reducing impacts from storms by reducing wave heights.

Current Status of Chief of Engineers Report: A final Chief's report was signed on 24 August 2009.

II. Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Mississippi

Location of the Study Area: The Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program (MsCIP) Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan) study area consists of the three Mississippi coastal counties: Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson.

Problems and Opportunities: The problems identified by the study team, State, county, and city officials, residents, and agency staff, included Hurricane-induced:

- Storm surge caused significant damage to structures and infrastructure within the three-county (Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson) MsCIP study area;
- Storm surge caused significant damage to coastal ecosystems and fish and wildlife resources within the three-county study area;
- Saltwater intrusion within the Mississippi Sound ecosystem and associated coastal environments; and
- Erosion of coastal wetlands and coastal infrastructure within the three county MsCIP study area.

Comprehensive, system-wide opportunities were identified during the MsCIP planning process to guide the development and evaluation of solutions to the region's water resource problems. An overall theme of Comprehensive Plan opportunities is not merely to reverse the harm done by the storms of 2005 hurricane season (e.g., Hurricanes Katrina and Rita), but, as importantly, to promote the long-term future sustainability of physical, human, and environmental resources within the study area.

The comprehensive, system-wide opportunities include:

- Assisting in sustainable redevelopment of hurricane damaged physical, environmental, and human resources within the MsCIP study area;
- Reducing the susceptibility of residential, commercial, and public structures and infrastructure to hurricane induced

storm damages within the three-county (Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson) MsCIP study area;

- Assisting in the recovery and long-term sustainability of coastal wetlands that support important fish and wildlife resources within the study area;
- Accelerating the recovery and assist in the long-term sustainability of maritime forest environments that suffered hurricane induced damages;
- Restoring barrier island environments that suffered hurricane induced storm damages in a manner that promotes long-term sustainability of their fish and wildlife resources;
- Reducing saltwater intrusion within the Mississippi Sound coastal environment; and
- Assisting in the recovery of coastal ecosystems and infrastructure damaged by erosion during the hurricane events of 2005 and support programs that promote long-term erosion reduction and limit erosion potential during future hurricane events.

Alternative Plans Considered: A system-wide approach was used in formulating the MsCIP Comprehensive Plan to ensure that both the MsCIP and the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LaCPR) efforts were fully coordinated and developed complementary plans for the restoration of the Gulf coastal region as an integrated system.

In addition, the planning effort has taken a top-down, comprehensive planning approach, beginning with development of a Comprehensive Plan to address the overall water resources problems and opportunities of the region. Building off of the comprehensive identification of problems and opportunities, the planning effort then proceeded to develop site-specific problems, opportunities, and solutions that contribute to accomplishing the comprehensive vision for the restoration and protection of the Mississippi Gulf Coast. The results of this effort led to a comprehensive regional plan that addresses hurricane and storm damage reduction and environmental restoration needs, as well as recommending a variety of site-specific projects either for immediate implementation or further investigation and subsequent implementation.

The Draft MsCIP Comprehensive Plan Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement (Report) contain both a Comprehensive Plan and a variety of water resource development projects that were developed through the planning process. The Report also describes components of the Comprehensive Plan, which require additional investigations prior to identifying a specific recommendation for construction.

The planning process utilized in the MsCIP study was a highly iterative process. Multiple iterations of the Corps' six planning steps were required due to the fact that new problems or data were constantly being identified. In addition, the development of large-scale plans, such as "Lines of Defense" (LOD), brought new problems and opportunities to light, which needed to be included in the planning process. The following sections describe the specific measures considered and the results of the screening and evaluation process.

Description of Recommended Plan: The Comprehensive Plan has been developed in a progressive fashion with plan elements to be implemented: (1) in the short term (interim projects); (2) in the near term (recommended for construction); (3) following limited additional evaluation and documentation (AED); (4) following more detailed evaluation and documentation of a specific plan element (contingent authorization); and (5) those elements requiring significant study, design, and documentation (feasibility study). Each plan feature has been developed to be a cost-efficient feature with significant advancement toward the comprehensive goal of developing a resilient coastal zone; however, the synergistic benefits will accrue as more of the plan features are implemented. These synergistic benefits between plan features have not been estimated. Implementation of the comprehensive plan could ultimately result in the acquisition and/or flood-proofing of more than 58,000 parcels within the zone having a one percent chance of annual inundation (100-year floodplain), reduction of risk to areas considered to have moderately high risk from storm surge effects, restoration and/or enhancement of over 30,000 acres of coastal forest, wetland, estuarine, and beach and dune habitats, and the continued sustainability of the Mississippi Sound ecosystem.

The Report supports the recommendation of the following tentatively selected features to Congress for authority to implement the MsCIP Comprehensive Plan:

1. Construct the list of projects seeking a construction Record of Decision (ROD):
   - Barrier Island Restoration;
   - Turkey Creek Ecosystem Restoration;
   - Bayou Cumbest Ecosystem Restoration;
   - Dantzler Ecosystem Restoration;
   - Admiral Island Ecosystem Restoration;
   - Franklin Creek Ecosystem Restoration;
   - High Hazard Area Risk Reduction Plan (HARP Phase 1);
   - Deer Island Ecosystem Restoration;
   - Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Restoration;
   - Coast-wide Beach and Dune Restoration;
   - Moss Point Municipal Structures Relocation;
   - Waveland Residential Structure Flood Proofing;
   - Forrest (Forest) Heights Levee Elevation.
2. Conduct feasibility level investigations for: investigations of:
   - Long-term High Hazard Area Risk Reduction Features;
   - Escatawpa River Freshwater Diversion;
   - Additional Environmental Restoration Features; and
   - Additional Structural Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction Features.

The Congressional authorization for this study mandated a comprehensive approach to solutions for water resource problems in coastal Mississippi. The comprehensive nature of the study team's approach included identifying solutions regardless of implementation authority or agency. Therefore, a number of tentatively selected plan features also include education and hurricane preparedness. These features include:

- Hurricane Risk Reduction Education;
- Hurricane and Storm Warning Systems;

- Hurricane Evacuation Planning Services Floodplain Management;
- Building Codes;
- Zoning Codes; and
- Relocation of Critical Infrastructure and Services (LOD 5).

Feasibility level investigations concerning freshwater diversion at Violet, Louisiana, are authorized by Congress under WRDA 2007. Section 3083 of WRDA 2007 authorized the design and implementation of a project for diversion of freshwater at or near Violet, Louisiana, for the purposes of reducing salinity in the western Mississippi Sound, enhancing oyster production, and promoting the sustainability of coastal wetlands. The MsCIP supports this action as a critical element to sustain the ecosystems of coastal Mississippi. This Report supports a recommendation to Congress for funding this project in full coordination with the States of Mississippi and Louisiana, the appropriate entities within the Corps, and other interested stakeholders.

The following table identifies how the tentatively recommended components of the Comprehensive Plan address the Congressional concerns identified in the authorization. These components are "keystone" pieces of the Comprehensive Plan on which later recommendations would build. These plan elements have been determined to be technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. Each of these tentatively recommended components are designed to be implemented and function as stand alone units should additional time be required to design all plan components or additional plan components be determined to not be cost effective.

TABLE 2—COMPONENTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Recommendation	Areas of concern			
	Storm damage reduction	Erosion reduction	Salt water intrusion	Fish and wildlife
High Hazard Area Risk Reduction Plan	•			•
Additional Damage Reduction Alternatives	•			
Additional Ecosystem Restoration Alternatives	•	•		•
Barrier Island Restoration	•	•	•	•
Violet, LA Fresh Water Diversion	•	•	•	•
Escatawpa Fresh Water Diversion			•	•
Beach and Dune Restoration	•	•		•
SAV Restoration				•
Moss Point Municipal Structure Relocation	•			•
Waveland Floodproofing	•			
Forrest (Forest) Heights Levee	•			
Deer Island Restoration	•	•		•
Turkey Creek Restoration	•			•
Bayou Cumbest Restoration				•
Dantzler Restoration				•
Admiral Island Restoration	•			•
Franklin Creek Restoration	•			•

Views of States, Non-Federal Interests and Other Countries: The State of Mississippi Clearinghouse for Federal Programs responded by letter dated 31 August 2009. The letter states the following: "None of the state agencies involved in the review had comments

or recommendations at this time. This concludes the State Clearinghouse review, and we encourage appropriate action as soon as possible. A copy of this letter is to be attached to the application as evidence of compliance with Executive Order 12372 review requirements."

Views of Federal and Regional Agencies: The DOI responded by letter dated 27 July 2009 with a request for a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prior to the Barrier Island construction and additional analysis to include a littoral zone deposition area near Cat Island. The DOC, responded by letter dated 5 August 2009, with no comment. The Department of Transportation (DOT) responded by phone on 10 August 2009, with no comment. The U.S. Coast Guard responded by letter dated 25 September, with no comment. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services responded by letter dated 16 September 2009, with no comment. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development responded via telephone on 6 August 2009 with no comment. The EPA, Region 4, responded by letter dated 30 July 2009 with no comment. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) responded via email on 2 September 2009, with no comment.

Status of NEPA Document: A Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report was completed for the project. The Notice of Availability for the Final SEIS/EIR was published in the Federal Register on 1 July 2009; the final date for comments was 3 August 2009.

Estimated Implementation Cost:	
Corps of Engineers	$265,110,000
Non-Federal Interest	142,750,000
Total	$407,860,000

Estimated Effects of the Recommended Plan: The Comprehensive Plan provides integrated systems-based solutions and tentatively selected plans that address: hurricane and storm damage reduction, ecosystem and restoration and fish and wildlife preservation, reduction of damaging saltwater intrusion, and reduction of coastal erosion. The tentatively selected plans also provide measures that aid in: regional economic redevelopment, positive societal effects, and long-term measures to reduce risk to the public and property.

The benefits of the recommended MsCIP Comprehensive Plan are as follows:

1. Construction projects:

• Barrier Island Restoration—Maintain and sustain the fragile Mississippi Sound ecosystem with its economic, recreational, environmental, and aesthetic benefits, provide for additional nesting habitat for threatened and endangered sea turtles and over wintering critical habitat for the piping plover, fishery losses avoided by restoration of the island equate to $43 million in average annual benefits.

• Turkey Creek Ecosystem Restoration—689 acres of wet pine savannah restoration.

• Bayou Cumbest Ecosystem Restoration—110 acres of tidal marsh and 38 acres of scrub shrub habitat restoration.

• Dantzler Ecosystem Restoration—385 acres of wet pine savannah restoration.

• Admiral Island Ecosystem Restoration—62 acres of tidal marsh and 61 acres of scrub shrub habitat restoration.

• Franklin Creek Ecosystem Restoration—149 acres of wet pine savannah restoration.

• Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Restoration—Additional study via an in-situ pilot project which will inform future restoration efforts.

• Coast-wide Beach and Dune Restoration—Restores piping plover habitat and habitat for other shorebirds, provides eco-tourism opportunities, and enhance overall quality of life in coastal Mississippi. The construction of elevated dunes, situated immediately seaward of developed areas, provides additional protection against smaller hurricanes.

• Moss Point Municipal Structures Relocation—The relocation of these facilities would greatly reduce future damages to the local infrastructure and provide a higher confidence in uninterrupted public service in future events.

• Waveland Residential Structure Flood Proofing—Twenty-five structures in the Waveland area that would be safely elevated out of the one percent chance storm event. Future damages to these structures would be significantly reduced and the area would serve as an example of smart growth.

• Forrest (Forest) Heights Levee Improvements—Equivalent annual damages reduced by the 21-foot levee are estimated to be $331,508. In addition, the levee improvement provide a significant boost to the cohesiveness of the historically significant community, preserve the culture and heritage of its predominantly minority residential population, and greatly improve their overall quality of life.

• High Hazard Area Risk Reduction Plan (HARP Phase 1)—The average annual average damages avoided for the 2,000 highest risk properties along the coastline were determined to be $33,000,000.

2. Feasibility level investigations:

• Escatawpa River Diversion and Grand Bay Marsh Ecosystem Restoration—A freshwater diversion project in the area, if feasible, may serve to enhance the wildlife resources of the area. The need for freshwater diversion at the Grand Bay savannahs and marshes would help restore the predominant wet pine savannah habitat.

• Additional Damage Reduction Alternatives—A very preliminary estimate of annual without-project damages for these potential structural solutions totals well over $60 million. The implementation of ring levees and/or other structural components in these areas would reduce a significant portion of storm-related damages and warrants further feasibility level consideration.

• Additional Coastal Mississippi Ecosystem Restoration Alternatives—This analysis identified 38 additional potential restoration sites which would primarily restore the hydrology and natural landscape of the coastal counties with incidental risk reduction benefits, or which would primarily reduce the risk to life and property from future hurricane storm surge events and secondly provide for substantial environmental benefit. The total restoration potential for these 38 sites is 27,380 acres.

• Feasibility analysis of the Long-term HARP—The benefits of an ongoing acquisition and relocation program for coastal Mississippi could be tremendous taken into account the implications of

sea level rise, continued development along the coast, and the frequency and magnitude of storms known to affect this area of the northern Gulf of Mexico. The additional study effort aimed at developing the framework and guidelines, detailed benefits, and costs would involve local and State interests as well as FEMA.

3. Education and hurricane preparedness to be implemented by others:

• Hurricane Risk Reduction Education—Warn residents of coastal Mississippi as to the extreme hazard to all that reside in the area, from the dual hazards of wind and surge/waves.

• Hurricane and Storm Warning Systems—Make all residents and visitors aware of the current hurricane threat.

• Hurricane Evacuation Planning—An evacuation plan, with preservation of life as the single most important goal, is an essential component of a comprehensive plan for ensuring the safety of residents of and visitors to the coast of Mississippi.

• Floodplain Management—Data and information developed in this analysis provides local government tools to be used in the determination of how to manage development or location of inhabited development, infrastructure, businesses, hazardous waste facilities, sites that contain large, un-anchored structural components when developing Master Plans for their communities.

• Building Codes—Assure that the latest design and construction techniques are being used that apply to hurricane-resistant construction.

• Zoning Codes—Counties and cities may make full use of the resources provided under this study to limit development in highest hazard areas to those uses that will incur lesser damage and risks to life and safety.

• Relocation of Critical Infrastructure and Services (LOD 5)—Relocation of critical infrastructure and services outside the Maximum Probable Intensity (MPI) boundary so that these facilities and structures are capable of surviving the event, so that they can function after recession of the surge, to provide services and protect lives and property.

4. Feasibility level investigations concerning freshwater diversion at Violet, LA (authorized by Congress under WRDA 2007):

• Achieve each State's goals of establishing and maintaining salinity regimes for oysters and introducing sediment into the eroding Biloxi marshes of Louisiana.

Current Status of Chief of Engineers Report: A final Chief's report was signed on 25 September 2009.

III. West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach), North Carolina

Location of the Study Area: Topsail Beach is located at the southern end of Topsail Island adjacent to New Topsail Inlet in Pender County on the central North Carolina coast.

Problems and Opportunities Identified in Study: Topsail Beach is subject to hurricanes and other tropical storms, and northeasters. The long-term erosion and short-term erosion from various storms erode the beach and undermine homes and other structures along the shoreline. A lesser amount of damage occurs from flooding and wave action. The average annual structural damage is estimated at $9,238,000 when evaluated at October 2006 levels and a 4⅞ per-

cent interest rate. The loss of the beach between the shoreline and the existing structures reduces the area available for recreation and for natural habitat, such as sea turtle nesting.

Alternative Plans Considered: Both nonstructural and structural measures were considered. Nonstructural measures considered are changes in regulations and physical modifications to reduce damages. Nonstructural regulatory measures are coastal building codes, building construction setbacks, and floodplain regulations. Most regulatory measures are no longer considered for potential in the alternative plans because these measures have already been implemented, they do not affect older structures, and there are few remaining vacant lots, suitable for development, which would benefit. These measures are considered as part of the existing and without-project conditions. Another category of nonstructural measures is removal of beachfront structures from the threat. The three removal measures are: (1) retreat landward within the same property parcel; (2) relocation a longer distance to a vacant property; and (3) demolition. Acquisition of the vacated property is included in both the relocation and demolition measures. All of these removal measures were retained for consideration in the nonstructural alternative.

Structural measures considered were beachfills and hard structures such as breakwaters, seawalls, revetments, bulkheads, groin fields and a terminal groin. Beachfill measures consist of berms, dunes, and terminal sections. The beachfill measures are considered some of the most appropriate, since they mimic the natural environment and can be shaped to maximize net storm damage reduction benefits. A terminal groin at New Topsail Inlet was included in the National Economic Development (NED) plan in the 1991 Chief of Engineers report, although it was not part of the authorized plan. This terminal groin was also retained for consideration in the general reevaluation report (GRR). The other types of hard structure measures were dropped from further consideration because, although they may reduce structural damages, each would have different potential adverse impacts to the beach.

Description of Recommended Plan: The selected plan for recommendation is the locally-preferred plan (LPP), Plan 1250X. The NED Plan having the highest net benefits is Plan 1550. Both plans meet the project objectives and constraints. Table 1 provides pertinent physical data on the Authorized Plan, the GRR LPP, and the GRR NED Plan.

TABLE 1—TOPSAIL BEACH, NC

Dimensions	Plan dimensions		
	Authorized HD 393/102/2	GRR, LPP, Plan 1250X	GRR, NED, Plan 1550
Dune, topwidth	25 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Dune, elevation, NGVD	13.6 feet	12 feet	15 feet
Dune, landward slope	5H:1V	5H:1V	5H:1V
Dune, seaward slope	5H:1V	10H:1V	10H:1V
Dune and storm berm, width	35 feet	None	None
Dune and storm berm, elevation, NGVD	9.6 feet	None.	
Dune and storm berm, seaward slope	5H:1V	None	None
Beach berm, width	40 feet	50 feet	50 feet
Beach berm, elevation, NGVD	7.6 feet	7 feet	7 feet
Beach berm, seaward slope	12H:1V	15H:1V	15H:1V
Dune and berm fill, length	10,250 feet	23,200 feet	22,800 feet

TABLE 1—TOPSAIL BEACH, NC—Continued

Dimensions	Plan dimensions		
	Authorized HD 393/102/2	GRR, LPP, Plan 1250X	GRR, NED, Plan 1550
North transition section, length	7,150 feet	2,000 feet	2,000 feet
South transition section, length	1,800 feet	1,000 feet	1,400 feet
Total Length	19,200 feet	26,200 feet	26,200 feet
Volume, initial, in-place	*4,566,000 CY	2,387,000 CY	3,420,000 CY
Volume, renourishment, in place	644,000 CY	690,000 CY	690,000 CY
Renourishment interval	2 years	25 feet	4 years
Borrow source	Banks Channel	12 feet	Off Shore

The project sponsor supports for Plan 1250X as the LPP. During completion of the Draft GRR, the sponsor indicated that some of the reasons for preferring Plan 1250X over NED Plan 1550 are:

- Both plans move the shoreline significantly seaward;
- Plan 1250X costs 24.1 percent less, but reduces net benefits 2.3 percent;
- Plan 1250X has the greatest HSDR benefit-to-cost ratio, and the second highest total benefit-to-cost ratio;
- Plan 1250X has a lower cost to the Town;
- Plan 1250X will have lower Congressional appropriation requirements; and
- Plan 1250X provides better protection to the Godwin Avenue area.

Other common features of both plans are dune vegetation and construction of dune walkover structures. The real estate to be acquired for the project will be a Perpetual Beach Storm Damage Reduction Easement for approximately 397 parcels. Based on project maps and ground examination, no structures appear to be impacted. There is no separable recreation feature, however incidental recreation benefits will be gained from the wider beach.

Views of States, Non-Federal Interests and Other Countries: The State of North Carolina responded via letter dated 15 September 2008, with comment during the 30-day State and Federal agency review period, which began on 16 August 2008 and expired on 16 September 2008. The State requested that the Corps coordinate with the North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program to support revisions to the Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps. The State also requested the Corps to fully support the local officials in communicating risks, both with and without the project and coastal flood hazard to the public.

Views of Federal and Regional Agencies: The DOI responded via letter dated 12 September 2008, with comment on the sea level rise in decision making and the Corps explained that sea level rise are unlikely to affect the plan selection, the projects compliance with Executive Order 11988, and wise floodplain development that the Corps discussed in the report. The DOC responded via letter dated 30 September 2008, with no comment. The Mineral Management Services responded via letter dated 2 September 2008, with many comments pertaining to plan formulation, environmental effects to plans considered, models used to evaluate offshore sediment transport, impacts to sea turtles, and mitigation measures. EPA responded via letter dated 12 September 2008, with comments on shortening the 50-year project life, the use of the Generalized Risk and Uncertainty Coastal Plan (GRANDUC) coastal response model

relating to modeling hurricanes, and possible erosion of deposited fill material. FEMA responded via email 25 September 2008, with no comment.

Status of NEPA Document: A Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report was completed for the project. The Notice of Availability for the Final SEIS/EIR was published in the Federal Register on 15 August 2008; the final date for comments was 16 September 2008. No significant comments have been received.

Estimated Implementation Cost:	
Corps of Engineers	$91,192,000
Non-Federal Interest	78,840,000
Total	$170,032,000

Estimated Annual O&M Costs: There are no Federal annual Operation and Maintenance (O&M) costs. The local sponsor, Town of Topsail Beach, North Carolina, will be responsible for all O&M costs for the recommended plan estimated at $22,000 annually.

Description of Non-Federal O&M Cost: Estimated OMRR&R annual costs are $22,000. The non-Federal sponsor for project implementation is the Town of Topsail Beach, North Carolina. The Town of Topsail Beach is the non-Federal cost-sharing sponsor for all features and is responsible for the OMRR&R of the project after construction.

Relationship to Other Plans: The original project was authorized in section 101(15) of the Water Resources Development Act 1992 (P.L. 102–580) (WRDA 1992) at a total cost of $14,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,600,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,500,000. The authorized project was never constructed.

Current Status of Chief of Engineers Report: A final Chief's report was signed on 28 September 2009.

Sec. 1002. Small projects for flood damage reduction

This section directs the Secretary to study and carry out projects for flood damage reduction under the authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (P.L. 80–858), which authorizes $55,000,000 a year for Federal participation in small flood damage reduction projects up to $7,000,000 per project, with a minimum 35 percent non-Federal cost-share, at the following locations:

1. Del Rosa Channel, San Bernadino, California.
2. Laguna Creek, Vacaville, California.
3. Ulatis Creek, Vacaville, California.
4. Sanderson Gulch, Denver, Colorado.
5. Willow Creek, Creede, Colorado.
6. Big Econ River, Orange, Florida.
7. Bay Gall Creek, Warner Robbins, Georgia.
8. Des Plaines, Park Ridge, Illinois.
9. Kishwaukee River, Dekalb, Illinois.
10. Navajo Creek, Palos Heights, Illinois.
11. Stony Creek, Oak Lawn, Illinois.
12. Vicinity of the 71st Street Ditch, Justice, Illinois.
13. West Branch of Mill Creek, Palos Park, Illinois.
14. Dry Run Creek, Waterloo, Iowa.
15. Louisville, Kentucky.
16. Baltimore City, Maryland.
17. Pine Tree Brook, Avon, Massachusetts.
18. Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts.

19. Harding Canal Seawall, Detroit, Michigan.
20. Big River, High Ridge, Missouri.
21. Saw Mill River basin, Greehburgh, New York.
22. Sparkill Creek, Orangetown, New York.
23. Independence, Ohio.
24. Valley View, Ohio.
25. Winyeh Bay, Georgetown, South Carolina.
26. Del Rio, Val Verde, Texas.
27. Craford Bay Seawall, Portsmouth, Virginia.
28. Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia.
29. Roxbury and Westpoint Townships, Wisconsin.

Sec. 1003. Small projects for emergency streambank protection

This section directs the Secretary to study and carry out projects for streambank erosion control under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (P.L. 79–525), which authorizes $15,000,000 a year for Federal participation in projects up to $1,500,000 per project, with a 35 percent non-Federal cost-share, at the following locations:

1. Naknek River, Naknek, Alaska.
2. Quinnipiac River, New Haven, Connecticut.
3. Biscayne Bay, North Bay Village, Florida.
4. Bronx River, New York, New York.
5. Ohio River, Ironton, Ohio.
6. Newport, Rhode Island.
7. Tiverton, Rhode Island.

Sec. 1004. Small projects for navigation

This section directs the Secretary to study and carry out projects for navigation, under the authority of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (P.L. 86–645), which authorizes $35,000,000 a year for Federal participation in small navigation projects up to $7,000,000 per project with non-Federal cost-sharing as determined under the WRDA of 1986, at the following locations:

1. Detroit River, Wyandotte, Michigan.
2. Stouts Creek, Lacey Township, New Jersey.
3. Brown's River, Nassau County, New York.
4. Detroit Harbor, Wisconsin.

Sec. 1005. Small projects for improvement of the quality of the environment

This section directs the Secretary to study and carry out a project for improvement of the environment, under the authority of section 1135 of WRDA 1986, which authorizes $40,000,000 a year for Federal participation in projects up to $5,000,000 per project, with a 25 percent non-Federal cost-share, at the following locations:

1. Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
2. Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.

Sec. 1006. Small projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration

This section directs the Secretary to study and carry out projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration under the authority of section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–303) (WRDA 1996), which authorizes $50,000,000 a year for Federal participation in small ecosystem restoration and protection projects

up to $5,000,000 per project, with a 35 percent non-Federal cost-share, at the following locations:

1. Emeryville Harbor, Emeryville, California.
2. Los Angeles River, Cudahy, California.
3. Laguna Salada, Pacifica, California.
4. Animas River, La Plata, Colorado.
5. North Fork of the Gunnison River, Delta, Colorado.
6. Line and Cane Creeks, Henry County, Georgia.
7. Bremme Creek, Dupage, Illinois.
8. Blackberry Creek, Kendall, Illinois.
9. Gompers Park, North Branch Chicago River, Illinois.
10. Kankakee River, Will County, Illinois.
11. Prairie Creek Watershed, Will County, Illinois.
12. West Branch of the Dupage River, Dupage, Illinois.
13. Long Creek Watershed, Cumberland, Maine.
14. Cabin Branch Watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.
15. Little Paint Branch Stream, Prince George's County, Maryland.
16. Lower Beaverdam Creek, Prince George's County, Maryland.
17. Northeast Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.
18. Northwest Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.
19. Assabet River, Middlesex and Worcester, Massachusetts.
20. Lewis Bay, Yarmouth, Massachusetts.
21. Pig's Eye Lake, St. Paul, Minnesota.
22. Barnegat Bay, Ocean County, New Jersey.
23. Branchport Creek, Oceanport Borough, New Jersey.
24. Hackensack River, Hudson County, New Jersey.
25. Lake Topanemus, Freehold, New Jersey.
26. Las Cruces Dam, Dona Ana, New Mexico.
27. Pugsley Creek, Castle Hill, New York.
28. Olentangy River, Franklin, Ohio.
29. Scioto River, Franklin, Ohio.
30. Woonasquatucket River, Providence, Rhode Island.
31. Claytor Lake, Pulaski, Virginia.

Sec. 1007. Small projects for shoreline protection

This section directs the Secretary to study and carry out projects under section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946, which authorizes $30,000,000 a year for Federal participation in small shoreline protection projects, up to $5,000,000 per project, with a 35 percent non-Federal cost-share, at the following locations:

1. Deerfield Beach, Broward County, Florida.
2. Barnegat, Ocean County, New Jersey.
3. Manhasset Bay, Port Washington, New York.

Sec. 1008. Small projects for aquatic plant control

Subsection (a) directs the Secretary to study and carry out a project for aquatic nuisance plant control under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610) at Republican River basin, Colorado.

Subsection (b) establishes a special rule for the project at Republican River basin, Colorado, that the Secretary may control and eradicate riverine nuisance plants.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Credit for in-kind contributions

This section amends section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (P.L. 91–611) (1970 Act) to clarify language that was added to that section by WRDA 2007.

In the years prior to WRDA 2007, the Committee received an increasing number of requests from non-Federal interests for credit for work undertaken by the non-Federal interest and associated with a Federal project. In the absence of a general authority, the Committee was accommodating these requests by individual provisions in WRDA bills.

Section 2003 of WRDA 2007 amended section 221 of the 1970 Act to provide general authority to the Secretary to provide credit for work undertaken by non-Federal interests without project-specific legislative authority. In providing the credit, certain conditions of eligibility would need to be met. Because the WRDA 2007 amendments included preconditions for eligibility, WRDA 2007 retained the project-specific credit provisions that were requested prior to WRDA 2007's enactment.

To accommodate both the general provision being added to section 221 and the project-specific provisions in the Act, WRDA 2007 included language that allowed the project-specific provision to apply rather than the general provision. Subsequent implementation of amended section 221 by the Corps has resulted in consequences contrary to the intent of the amendment. For example, where the project language allows for credit for work done prior to the date of enactment of the Act, the Corps interpreted the current language in section 221 to preclude credit for any work undertaken following the date of enactment of WRDA 2007.

This amendment addresses those contrary consequences.

Subsection (a) of the bill amends section 221(a)(4)(E) by replacing the current language in clause (ii) with language making it clear that the intent of the credit provision in section 221 is to allow the non-Federal interest to receive the benefits of the project-specific provision for credit as that project-specific provision is written, and to allow the non-Federal interest to receive the benefits of the general provision for credit where the non-Federal interest meets the eligibility conditions of the law.

For example, where a specific provision of law allows for credit for work undertaken prior to the execution of the project partnership agreement, the non-Federal interest can receive the benefits of that provision of law. If the work meets the eligibility requirements (typically that the work be integral to the project), the Secretary is to afford credit for the cost of that work against the non-Federal share. Moreover, if the non-Federal interest seeks to conduct additional work beyond the scope of the project specific credit language and with the intent of receiving credit, the Secretary is to give credit to the non-Federal sponsor for the Federal share of that work using the general credit authority in section 221.

Receiving the benefits of project specific credit language should not preclude the application of the general credit language. The amendment in this section clarifies this authority. The amendment also provides that the choice of which one or both authorities to apply is that of the non-Federal interest. The Secretary is directed to accommodate the non-Federal interest's choice. The Committee intends that the non-Federal interest have the fullest opportunity to receive credit under the project specific authority and under the general credit authority, consistent with any requirements in the law.

Subsection (b) of the bill establishes a definition of "water resources project", as used in section 221. Section 221 of the 1970 Act uses the term water resources project, but it is not defined. The Committee proposes to add a definition because the Corps has taken a narrow view of what constitutes a water resources project and does not include certain types of projects currently being carried out in its civil works program as water resources projects. This narrow interpretation by the Corps precludes the application of the terms of section 221, including the general credit authority, from being applied to projects that the Corps does not include in its definition.

The Committee is particularly concerned that the Corps specifically excludes environmental infrastructure programs or projects from being considered water resources projects. However, the Corps offers no explanation why such programs and projects are not water resources projects in the context of section 221. The environmental infrastructure programmatic authorizations refer to "water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects". Similar language appears in section 219 of WRDA 1992. These projects should fall under the broad concept of "water resources projects". The Corps' narrow interpretation is inconsistent with Congressional intent and will be changed by adding the definition.

Subsection (c) is a technical amendment to update language in section 221.

Sec. 2002. Fish and wildlife mitigation

Section 2002 makes clarifying changes to section 906 of WRDA 1986, as amended by WRDA 2007.

Subsection (a) conforms the mitigation requirements contained in section 906 to Corps' policy guidance. Current Corps policy requires mitigation for impacts to ecological resources, including both aquatic and terrestrial resources. The amendment would place the broad policy statement in statute.

Subsection (a) also clarifies that the determination of whether a proposed project will have negligible adverse impacts on fish and wildlife is to be made without consideration of proposed mitigation. Section 906 of WRDA 1986 requires that any proposal for authorization of a water resources project must contain either a specific plan to mitigate fish and wildlife losses created by such project, or a determination that the project will have negligible adverse impact on fish and wildlife. The Corps' current interpretation of that requirement can lead to less than full mitigation. The Corps conducts mitigation "to the extent incrementally justified", or sufficient such that "only negligible adverse impacts remain."

Section 906 does not permit the implementation that the Corps seeks. In the implementation guidance mitigation planning statement, the Corps states that it will use the mitigation planning process to "compensate for non-negligible impacts to aquatic and terrestrial resources to the extent incrementally justified and to ensure that the recommended project will not have more than negligible adverse impacts on ecological resources."

The Corps is correct that mitigation planning is to compensate for "non-negligible impacts". If impacts are negligible, no mitigation is required. The second part of the policy is flawed in that there is no authority in section 906 to apply an incremental cost analysis that results in adverse impacts remaining unmitigated. The third part of the policy is also flawed in that the Corps misinterprets section 906 to require mitigation up to the point that only non-negligible impacts remain following compensatory measures.

Section 906 does not require a mitigation plan such that only non-negligible impacts remain. Section 906 requires that every water resources project contain either, "(A) a recommendation with a specific plan to mitigate fish and wildlife losses created by such project, or (B) a determination by the Secretary that such project will have negligible adverse impact on fish and wildlife." These clauses are written in the disjunctive for a purpose—impacts are mitigated, or the impacts are negligible. The clauses were not written such that mitigation should occur until the impacts are negligible. By definition, and the Corp's implicit acknowledgement, the impacts are not negligible or the Corps would not have developed a mitigation plan. The content of the mitigation plan is dictated by other provision of section 906 and other laws, but the requirements of 906(d) are clear as to the preparation of a mitigation plan.

Subsection (b) clarifies that the requirement that mitigation plans for Corps projects comply with mitigation requirements under the regulatory programs administered by the Secretary is a minimum requirement. This conforms to Corps policies to include a broader analysis of ecological impacts, not only aquatic impacts, in developing mitigation plans.

Sec. 2003. Remote and subsistence harbors

This section modifies section 2006 of WRDA 2007 to correct the current interpretation of that provision by the Corps. Section 2006 of WRDA 2007 allowed for the selection of a harbor and navigation project that is remote or provides subsistence services without justifying the project solely on NED benefits.

In its implementation of section 2006, the Corps has precluded its applicability to navigation projects being studied and carried out under the authority of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (P.L. 86–645). This interpretation is contrary to the intent of section 2006, and is an unnecessarily narrow interpretation. In fact, many of the navigation projects that were intended to be beneficiaries of section 2006 are projects that would have been carried out under section 107. Therefore, the Committee included language to change the Corps' interpretation.

Sec. 2004. Revision of project partnership agreement

This section modifies section 2008 of WRDA 2007 to correct the interpretation of that provision by the Corps of Engineers as applied to the continuing authorities program.

Section 2008 provides that upon the increase in the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allocated for a water resources project or the total cost of a water resources project, the Secretary is to revise the project partnership agreement to take into account the change in Federal participation.

However, while WRDA 2007 increased the per project limits for section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 and section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, the Corps is not applying section 2008 and adjusting Federal participation in ongoing projects being carried out under those authorities. In its implementation guidance for the increased per-project limits, the guidance states, "The increased per-project limits only apply to section 107 and section 14 projects that do not have an executed PPA as of 7 November 2007."

This guidance is directly contrary to the language in section 2008. The amendment in section 2004 makes it clear that the Corps' interpretation must be changed to conform to the language in the law.

Sec. 2005. Independent peer review

This section amends section 2034 of WRDA 2007 to increase transparency in the independent review process, and make adjustments based on experience to date.

Subsection (a) adds a new paragraph to section 2034(b) to increase public disclosure concerning the decision of the Chief of Engineers to not conduct an independent review. Section 2034 requires independent reviews of certain types of project studies. To date, the Corps has shown a tendency to have independent review occur late in the study process for draft feasibility reports. However, restricting reviews to decision documents—such as draft or final feasibility reports—can perpetuate deficiencies in the planning process that the independent review process was intended to ameliorate.

Section 2034 allows the Chief of Engineers wide discretion in when to conduct the review, but to avoid "gotcha" issues arising for the first time at the end of the study process, Congress included language calling for the Chief to make a determination as to whether to conduct an independent review at three specific times during the study. These times are: (1) when the without-project conditions are identified (status quo); (2) when the array of alternatives to be considered is identified (i.e., what options will the Corps explore); and (3) when the preferred alternative is identified (i.e., the likely recommended project). The implementing guidance for section 2034 does not include these references. It does not appear that responsible officials are making these deliberations. The result can be that review comes too late in the process and results in wasted time and money.

The significance of looking at whether an independent review is called for earlier in the study process is demonstrated by the ongoing study to deepen Boston Harbor, Massachusetts.

The Final External Peer Review Report for Boston Harbor Navigation Improvement identified significant issues with certain eco-

nomic assumptions contained in the Corps' report. Earlier review of underlying economic assumptions could have allowed for corrections before the report was completed, and saved many months and millions of dollars in conducting the study. Because the review came near the end of the study, the Corps and the project sponsor incurred costs and delays unnecessarily.

The Committee intends that by requiring public disclosure of the reasons for not conducting a review at the three decision points required by law, the decision to conduct or delay review until a time later in the study process will be a deliberative one, rather than one by default.

Subsection (b) is intended to increase transparency in the process. Section 2034(c) currently requires the Chief of Engineers to notify the committees of jurisdiction of an upcoming review prior to initiating the review. In all but a very few instances, the Committee has not received these notices. The intent of the requirement was to ensure that Congressional supporters of the study under review were aware of the review, and that information could be publicly disclosed.

The failure to adhere to this simple notification requirement is unacceptable. The amendment proposed by subsection (b) reinforces the requirement that the committees of jurisdiction be notified of upcoming reviews being conducted under section 2034. In addition, the Chief of Engineers would be required to make publicly available, including on the Internet, information on the upcoming review. Information provided to the Committee indicates that the public and in some instances project sponsors are completely unaware of ongoing reviews. This also is unacceptable. This lack of transparency undercuts the credibility of the review process.

Subsection (c) adds transparency requirements for review documents after they are completed. The Corps currently does not routinely make completed independent review documents publicly available. These are public documents paid for with public funds. Therefore, subsection (c) amends section 2034 to require the completed reviews to be provided to the committees of jurisdiction and the public, including on the Internet, within three days of the Chief of Engineers receiving the report. Any responses to the review are also subject to the same three-day availability requirement.

Sec. 2006. Safety assurance review

This section adds language to section 2035 of WRDA 2007 providing that the panels established to conduct safety assurance reviews are not subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Sec. 2007. Funding for harbor maintenance program

O&M costs for general navigation features (e.g., navigation channels) are 100 percent Federal for work associated with depths not greater than 45 feet and 50 percent Federal for additional costs of maintaining depths greater than 45 feet.

The Federal share of operation and maintenance is appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (Trust Fund). The Trust Fund was created in 1986 and consists of receipts from a 0.125 percent tax imposed on the value of cargo loaded or unloaded at U.S. ports. On March 31, 1998, the Supreme Court ruled that the tax on cargo that supports the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is un-

constitutional insofar as it applies to exports. The tax on imports continues to be collected.

In the Committee's fiscal year (FY) 2011 views and estimates, the Committee expressed its ongoing concern about the growing surplus in the Trust Fund. At the end of FY 2010, the estimated surplus in this fund is expected to be $6.347 billion. This fund is supplied by taxes paid by users of ports and is meant to pay for harbor maintenance projects.

For years, more funds have been collected than have been appropriated and a large surplus in the Trust Fund has accumulated. For example, the FY 2011 President's Budget proposes to transfer $764 million from the Trust Fund to the Corps' O&M account. This problem has not been caused by a lack of needed port maintenance dredging. To the contrary, the Corps has had the capability to execute a far greater amount of work on nationally significant water projects authorized by Congress. The constraint on the performance of this valuable work has been the limited level of funding appropriated from the Trust Fund. The result has been unnecessary cost increases, significantly delayed completion dates, and delays in realizing transportation savings. At a minimum, the Committee supports annual appropriations from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for authorized purposes consistent with annual collections to the Trust Fund.

Section 2007 directs that the total budget resources made available from the Trust Fund each fiscal year pursuant to section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from the Trust Fund) be equal to the level of receipts plus interest credited to the Trust Fund for that fiscal year. Such amounts may be used only for harbor maintenance programs described in section 9505(c) of such Code. The intent of this section is to ensure that funds collected on an annual basis from the users of the nation's ports be fully utilized to meet the purposes for which they were collected—addressing the nation's backlog of harbor maintenance projects, including maintenance dredging needs.

Sec. 2008. Funding to process permits

This section amends section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106–541) (WRDA 2000), as amended, to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept funds from non-Federal public entities for the consideration of permits under the Clean Water Act and the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899.

Since its enactment, the Committee has been carefully monitoring the implementation of the section 214 authority. While this authority is very popular for those public entities that have used it, the Committee has expressed concern that allowing a regulated entity to contribute to the cost of its regulator has the potential to affect the objectivity of that regulatory. This would be contrary to the intent of the Clean Water Act and the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, and contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the section 214 authority. In recognition of this concern, Chairman James L. Oberstar requested the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the Corps' implementation of the section 214 program. In May, 2007, GAO released a report, entitled "Waters and Wetlands, Corps of Engineers Needs to Ensure that Permit Deci-

sions Made Using Funds from Nonfederal Public Entities Are Transparent and Impartial" (GAO–07–478) that demonstrated significant variability on the implementation of the section 214 program among the Corps District offices that had experience with the program, and recommended a series of measures that should be implemented by Corps District offices to avoid any potential conflict of interests in carrying out its responsibilities. Several of the concerns raised by GAO are addressed in the amendments to section 214 made by this section.

First, this section amends section 214(a) to clarify that the Secretary may only utilize this authority for the consideration and review of permits related to projects for a public purpose. The May 2007 GAO report noted that one Corps District had allowed a public entity to request the Corps review a private company's permit application under section 214. This is contrary to the intent of the section 214 program, which was created to allow non-Federal public entities to utilize the program to expedite the review of permits for projects for a public purpose (e.g., the construction of port facilities or public water supply projects). This provision clarifies that the Corps may not utilize the section 214 authority to consider and review permit applications for projects or activities that primarily benefit private individuals or companies.

Second, this section adds a new subsection (b) to implement a "higher-order review" authority under the section 214 program to require the Corps to have all permits considered and reviewed under this authority reviewed by a more senior Corps official. This recommendation is consistent with the findings of the May 2007 GAO report, and consistent with the Corps' implementation guidance for the section 214 program. The Corps is directed to include a notation that a higher order review was undertaken in its public disclosure of permits reviewed under this authority. In addition, funds contributed under section 214 by non-Federal public entities cannot be used to carry out the higher-order review requirements of this subsection.

In addition, this section adds a new subsection (d) that directs the Secretary to make all final permit decisions carried out using section 214 funds available to the public, including on the Internet. This recommendation is consistent with the findings of the May 2007 GAO report; however, in a subsequent report, dated February 19, 2010 (GAO–10–385R), GAO noted that the Corps had "fallen short in two significant oversight areas", including improving the transparency of decision making to the public by clearly posting public notices of funding decisions on district Internet sites.

Finally, this section extends the authority for the Secretary to utilize the section 214 program through December 31, 2016. The Committee will continue to oversee the implementation of the accountability measures called for by the GAO and others to ensure that use of the section 214 program does not compromise the integrity of the regulatory process, and achieves the goals of expediting the permitting review process for both those parties that utilize the 214 authority, and those that do not.

Sec. 2009. Project modifications for improvement of environment

This section amends section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of

publicly owned property" of August 13, 1946, to increase the maximum Federal participation in each project from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Sec. 2010. Aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration

This section amends section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property" of August 13, 1946, to increase the maximum Federal participation in each project from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Sec. 2011. Operation and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric facilities

Section 2011 amends section 314 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–640) (WRDA 1990) to designate all activities performed by personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of navigation projects or navigational infrastructure, including floodgates, locks, and dams, at Corps water resources projects, as inherently governmental functions.

In 2008, the Committee received testimony describing a failed effort by the previous administration to privatize approximately 2,000 full-time positions at more than 230 locks and dams, at an estimated cost of tens of millions of dollars. The Committee recognizes the importance of the nation's 12,000 miles of commercially navigable channels across the United States to its economy, homeland security, and national security, as well as the unnecessary risks in moving operation and maintenance activities at such facilities to outside contractors. Any accident or incident at a lock or dam structure on the nation's inland system could seriously jeopardize the nation's economy or its ability to quickly respond to threats to homeland or national security. To preserve the operation of these vital transportation corridors, the Committee strongly supports designation of personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of such projects and infrastructure as inherently governmental.

Sec. 2012. Repeal

This section repeals section 211 of WRDA 2000 (31 U.S.C. 6505 note; 114 Stat. 2592).

Sec. 2013. Cost estimates for feasibility reports

This section amends section 905(a) of WRDA 1986 to require the Secretary to provide additional information to Congress on the estimated costs of recommended projects based on three potential construction and funding scenarios—construction under optimal funding levels, a 50 percent delay in construction of the project, and a 100 percent delay in the construction of the project.

In recent years, the Committee has become concerned with the frequency and scope of proposed increases for the maximum costs of authorized water resources projects. Section 902 of WRDA 1986 provides statutory authority for the Secretary to increase the maximum cost of a project for: (1) modifications which do not materially alter the scope or functions of the project as authorized (up to 20 percent of the statutory total cost of the project) and (2) changes

in construction costs applied to unconstructed features as indicated by engineering or other appropriate cost indexes. However, in recent years, the Committee has learned of, or has received requests to raise the maximum cost of authorized projects well in excess of the statutory "20 percent plus inflation" adjustment currently authorized in law.

The Corps has stated that a reason for many of these cost increases is that projects often do not receive annual appropriations for construction consistent with the capability of the Corps to carry out a project, and this lack of predicable funding has caused construction delays and inefficiencies and a corresponding increase in the cost of projects. The Committee recognizes that a lack of predicable funding at capability can increase the total cost of a project; however, this reason does not adequately address similar requests for cost increases (in excess of the 20 percent plus inflation) for projects that have only recently initiated construction, such as projects that were authorized in WRDA 2007.

The Committee believes that additional information on the short-term and long-term construction costs of recommended projects will benefit Congress. For example, by providing clear information on the potential impacts that funding project construction at below capability will have on the total cost of a project, Congress will be more informed about current and future funding needs necessary to carry out ongoing and future water resource development projects.

The Committee intends that the Corps' estimates of the cost of a project, based on either a 50 percent or 100 percent increase in the period for implementation of the recommended plan, be provided solely for informational purposes. The Committee does not intend for this information to affect the economic justification of a recommended project, including any potential modification of the benefit-cost analysis currently undertaken by the Corps in recommending a project to Congress for authorization.

Sec. 2014. Mitigation Status Report

This section amends section 2036(b) of WRDA 2007. Section 2036 requires an annual report to the committees of jurisdiction on the status of mitigation required for projects of the Corps. The report is also to include information on the required consultations among the Corps, Federal agencies, and the States on the success of mitigation efforts.

The report was not submitted for 2008; and the reports submitted for 2009 and 2010 were late and not fully responsive to the requirements of section 2036. The 2010 status report, while improved, did not fulfill the statutory requirements. The reports continue a deficiency of the first report in that the Corps acknowledges that "there are different methodologies utilized by Corps districts to calculate percent of mitigation complete." The Corps does not identify the specific method used for any of the projects.

Using differing methods to determine the amount of mitigation completed eliminates the ability to compare the relative progress of the Corps in meeting its mitigation requirements, and greatly diminishes the usefulness of the information. Section 2014 would require the Corps to use uniform methods for determining mitigation status that include both qualitative and quantitative analysis.

It is also of note that the status reports submitted to date do not include information on the required consultations. The information provided to the Committee raises serious questions about whether the consultations required under section 906(d)(4)(B) of WRDA 1986 are in fact occurring. Section 2014 addresses this concern by requiring that the status report include the specific dates and participants in these consultation meetings.

Sec. 2015. Use of American iron, steel, and manufactured goods

This section addresses the use of American-made iron, steel, and manufactured goods in civil works construction projects.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 3001. Douglas Harbor, Juneau, Alaska

This section provides that the maximum Federal expenditure for the project for navigation, Douglas Harbor, Juneau, Alaska, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. § 577), shall be $7,000,000.

Sec. 3002. Nogales Wash and tributaries flood control project, Arizona

This section modifies the project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of WRDA 1990 (104 Stat. 4606) and modified by section 303 of the WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), section 302 of WRDA 2000 (114 Stat. 2600), and section 3008 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $55,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,400,000.

Sec. 3003. Rio de Flag, Arizona

This section modifies the project for flood damage reduction, Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(3) of WRDA 2000 (114 Stat. 2576) and modified by section 3007 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $77,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $27,000,000.

Sec. 3004. Tres Rios, Arizona

This section modifies the project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(4) of WRDA 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $230,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $149,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $80,500,000.

Sec. 3005. Russian River project, Sonoma County, California

This section modifies the project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes in the Russian River basin, California, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 177), and the project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1192), to: (1) require that the Secretary review the biological opinion on the water supply, flood control, and channel mainte-

nance operations conducted by the Corps, the Sonoma County Water Agency, and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control District, as transmitted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on September 24, 2008; and (2) if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $92,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $59,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $32,200,000.

Sec. 3006. South Sacramento County streams, California

This section modifies the project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California, authorized by section 101(a)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (P.L. 106–53) (WRDA 1999), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $104,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $67,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $36,800,000.

Sec. 3007. Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado

This section modifies section 116 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (123 Stat. 608) by striking "Colorado Department of Natural Resources is authorized" and inserting "Colorado Department of Natural Resources, or its assignee, is authorized".

Sec. 3008. Rio Grande environmental management program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas

This section modifies section 5056(f) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) to authorize appropriations for this program through 2015.

Sec. 3009. Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia

This section modifies the project for flood control, Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688; 49 Stat. 1574) and modified by section 301(a)(4) of WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3707) and section 309 of WRDA 1999 (113 Stat. 301), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a Federal cost of $8,100,000, in accordance with the post authorization change report dated June 29, 1998.

Sec. 3010. Kissimmee River restoration, Florida

This section modifies the project for ecosystem restoration, Kissimmee River Restoration, Florida, authorized by section 101(8) of WRDA 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $852,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $426,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $426,000,000.

Sec. 3011. Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida

This section modifies the project for navigation and related purposes, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(8) of WRDA 1999 (113 Stat. 279), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $15,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $8,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,500,000.

Sec. 3012. Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia

This section modifies the project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia, authorized by section 101(b)(9) of WRDA 1999 (113 Stat. 279), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $675,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $405,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $270,000,000.

Sec. 3013. Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois

Subsection (a) provides additional authority to the Secretary for the implementation of the projects for control of aquatic invasive species in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois, authorized by section 3061 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1121).

Subsection (b) amends section 3061(d) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1121) by directing the Secretary, in carrying out the ongoing feasibility study to prevent the spread of aquatic nuisance species between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins, to include a fully developed analysis of hydrologic separation of the basins, with a focus on the potential issues, costs, and benefits associated with hydrologic separation in the vicinity of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. The intent of this language is: (1) to direct the Corps to prioritize completion of an initial phase of this study that focuses on the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal as a potential pathway for the movement of aquatic invasive species, such as the bighead and silver carp, between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins; and (2) to direct the Corps to include in its recommendation to Congress information on the potential costs, benefits, and other associated issues that would result from undertaking a hydrologic separation of the Basins in the vicinity of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.

Sec. 3014. Lower Ohio River, Illinois and Kentucky

This section modifies the project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (P.L. 100–676) (WRDA 1988), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $1,991,000,000.

Sec. 3015. Wood River levee system reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois

This section modifies the project for flood damage reduction, Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois, authorized by section 1001(20) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1053), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $120,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $78,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $42,000,000.

Sec. 3016. Little Calumet River, Indiana

This section modifies the project for flood control, Little Calumet River, Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of WRDA 1986 (100 Stat. 4115) and modified by section 127 of the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2259), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $275,000,000, with

an estimated Federal cost of $206,000,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $69,000,000.

Sec. 3017. Rhodes Point Jetty, Smith Island, Maryland

This section modifies the project for navigation, Rhodes Point Jetty, Smith Island, Maryland, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), to increase the maximum amount of the Federal share to $7,000,000.

Sec. 3018. Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts

This section modifies section 522 of WRDA 2000 (114 Stat. 2656) by striking "draft evaluation report of the New England District Engineer entitled 'Phase I Muddy River Master Plan', dated June 2000" and inserting "Final Decision Document and Environmental Assessment Report of the New England District Engineer entitled 'Muddy River Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts', dated September 2003, at a total cost of $79,200,000".

Sec. 3019. Ada, Minnesota

This section provides that the maximum Federal expenditure for the project for flood damage reduction, Wild Rice River, Ada, Minnesota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,600,000.

Sec. 3020. Montevideo, Minnesota

This section provides that the maximum Federal expenditure for the project for flood damage reduction, Montevideo, Minnesota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,000,000.

Sec. 3021. Two Harbors, Minnesota

This section modifies section 3101(b) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1133) by striking "$7,000,000" and inserting "$14,000,000".

Sec. 3022. Blue River basin, Kansas City, Missouri

This section modifies the project for flood control, Blue River basin, Kansas City, Missouri, authorized by section 101(a)(18) of WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $45,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $34,125,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,375,000.

Sec. 3023. Lower Assunpink Creek, Trenton, New Jersey

This section provides that the maximum Federal expenditure for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Lower Assunpink Creek, Trenton, New Jersey, being carried out under section 1135 of WRDA 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be $10,000,000.

Sec. 3024. Ocean Gate, Ocean County, New Jersey

This section provides that the maximum Federal expenditure for the project for emergency streambank protection, Ocean Gate, Ocean County, New Jersey, being carried out under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), shall be $4,500,000.

Sec. 3025. Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York

This section modifies the project for shoreline protection, authorized by section 554 of WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3781), as amended by section 3122 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1139), to increase the project authorization to $27,000,000.

Sec. 3026. Spring Creek, New York

This section provides that the maximum Federal expenditure for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Spring Creek, New York, being carried out under section 1135 of WRDA 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be $6,000,000.

Sec. 3027. Hocking River basin, Monday Creek, Ohio

This section modifies section 1001(37)(B)(iii) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1055) by striking "$1,270,000" and inserting "$12,000,000".

Sec. 3028. Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay ecosystem restoration, Oregon and Washington

This section modifies section 536(g) of the WRDA of 2000 (114 Stat. 2662) to increase the authorization of appropriations for this authority to $45,000,000.

Sec. 3029. Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, Texas

This section modifies the project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas, authorized by section 1001(40) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1056) to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $447,604,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $183,827,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $263,777,000.

Sec. 3030. Dallas Floodway, Dallas, Texas

This section modifies the project for flood control, Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945, and modified by section 5141 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1253), to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $882,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $573,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $308,700,000.

Sec. 3031. Houston-Galveston navigation channels, Texas

This section modifies the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), to authorize the Secretary to extend the boundaries of the Galveston channel approximately 2600 feet beyond Pier 38, if the Secretary determines that the extension is feasible.

Sec. 3032. Project reauthorization

This section renews the authorization for the Vincennes, Indiana portion of the project for flood control, Wabash River basin, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 649).

Sec. 3033. Project deauthorizations

Subsection (a) deauthorizes a portion of the following projects for navigation: Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia; Chicago Harbor, Illinois; Ipswich River, Massachusetts; Menemsha Creek, Massachusetts; and Block Island Harbor of Refuge, Rhode Island.

Subsection (b) deauthorizes 12 specific, currently authorized but unconstructed projects or elements of projects, which were identified as eligible for deauthorization by the Corps, pursuant to section 1001 of WRDA 1986, as amended. Section 1001 of WRDA 1986 directs the Corps to provide Congress with a list of unconstructed projects, or unconstructed separable elements of projects, which have been authorized, but have not received obligation of Federal funding for the full five fiscal years preceding the transmittal of the list. All 12 projects identified in this subsection meet these criteria, and were identified as eligible for deauthorization by the Corps. The budgetary impact, according to the Corps, of deauthorizing and not constructing the 12 projects in subsection (b) is a reduction of future Federal spending of $871.8 million.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

Sec. 4001. Hollis, Alaska

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, Hollis, Alaska.

Sec. 4002. Bullard Wash, Goodyear, Arizona

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Bullard Wash, Goodyear, Arizona.

Sec. 4003. Lower Santa Cruz River, Casa Grande, Arizona

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for the Lower Santa Cruz River study area, Casa Grande, Arizona.

Sec. 4004. Maricopa County, Arizona

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes, including nonstructural solutions, for Maricopa County, Arizona.

Sec. 4005. Ouachita River, Ouachita, Union, and Ashley Counties, Arkansas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, bank stabilization, and related water resource purposes for the Ouachita River, Ouachita, Union, and Ashley Counties, Arkansas.

Sec. 4006. Oil Trough, Arkansas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oil Trough, Arkansas.

Sec. 4007. Randolph County, Arkansas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Randolph County, Arkansas.

Sec. 4008. Berkeley Marina, Berkeley, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for Berkeley Marina, Berkeley, California.

Sec. 4009. Chelsea Wetlands, Hercules, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and flood damage reduction for Chelsea Wetlands, Hercules, California.

Sec. 4010. Colorado Lagoon and Alamitos Bay, Long Beach, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration between Colorado Lagoon and Alamitos Bay, Long Beach, California.

Sec. 4011. Lodi Lake, Lodi, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and streambank stabilization for Lodi Lake, Lodi, California.

Sec. 4012. Oakland-Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, Oakland, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation improvements for the Oakland-Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, Oakland, California.

Sec. 4013. Noyo Harbor District, Noyo, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for Noyo Harbor District, Noyo, California.

Sec. 4014. Port of San Francisco, San Francisco, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Port of San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

Sec. 4015. Redwood City Navigation Channel, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for Redwood City Navigation Channel, California.

Sec. 4016. Rialto Channel and Cactus Channel, Rialto, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Rialto Channel and Cactus Channel, Rialto, California. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4017. Sacramento Regional Sanitation District, Sacramento, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction in the Sacramento Regional Sanitation District, Sacramento, California.

Sec. 4018. San Pablo Bay, Hercules, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for San Pablo Bay, Hercules, California.

Sec. 4019. Stockton, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for navigation channel deepening for Stockton, California.

Sec. 4020. Tijuana River environmental restoration, San Diego, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, water supply, water quality, recreation, and other water-related issues including the impacts of water flows from Mexico for the Tijuana River basin, San Diego, California.

Sec. 4021. Tijuana River wetlands restoration, San Diego County, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and wetland restoration along the Tijuana River, San Diego County, California.

Sec. 4022. Ventura River, Ventura County, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ventura River, Ventura County, California.

Sec. 4023. Willowbrook, Los Angeles County, California

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Willowbrook, Los Angeles County, California. In car-

rying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4024. Fountain Creek watershed, Pueblo, Colorado

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a sediment impact analysis study to determine the sediment transport parameters for Fountain Creek watershed, Pueblo, Colorado.

Sec. 4025. Ralston Creek, Arvada, Colorado

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ralston Creek, Arvada, Colorado. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4026. Holly Pond and Norotan River, Stamford, Connecticut

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration for Holly Pond and Norotan River, Stamford, Connecticut.

Sec. 4027. Housatonic River, New Milford, Connecticut

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along the Housatonic River, New Milford, Connecticut.

Sec. 4028. Long Island Sound and Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for Long Island Sound and Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut.

Sec. 4029. Meriden, Connecticut

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Meriden, Connecticut. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4030. South Cove, Old Saybrook, Connecticut

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the South Cove, Old Saybrook, Connecticut.

Sec. 4031. West River, New Haven Harbor, West Haven, Connecticut

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, storm damage reduction, including a review of bulkhead condition for West River, New Haven Harbor, West Haven, Connecticut.

Sec. 4032. Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for enhanced public ac-

cess and recreational opportunities on Army Corps of Engineers projects in the Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

Sec. 4033. Washington, District of Columbia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, including green or low-impact development technologies, for Washington, District of Columbia.

Sec. 4034. Lake County, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental protection, Lake County, Florida.

Sec. 4035. Marion County, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Marion County, Florida.

Sec. 4036. Miami, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Miami, Florida.

Sec. 4037. Oakland Park, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oakland Park, Florida.

Sec. 4038. Riviera Beach, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Riviera Beach, Florida.

Sec. 4039. South Daytona, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for South Daytona, Florida.

Sec. 4040. Tampa, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Tampa, Florida.

Sec. 4041. Peavine Creek, Decatur, Georgia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for Peavine Creek, Decatur, Georgia.

Sec. 4042. Richland Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Richland Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.

Sec. 4043. Study for water supply, Georgia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study of municipal and industrial water supply for the State of Georgia. The Secretary shall complete the study not later than two years following the first obligation of funds for the study.

Sec. 4044. Suwannee Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Suwannee Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.

Sec. 4045. Agat and Merizo, Guam

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Agat and Merizo, Guam.

Sec. 4046. Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii. In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, any work undertaken in the formulation of the project for flood damage reduction, Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii, previously initiated under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

Sec. 4047. Waialua-Kaiaka watershed, Oahu, Hawaii

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, water supply, and related water resource purposes for the Waialua-Kaiaka watershed, Oahu, Hawaii.

Sec. 4048. Albany Park, Chicago, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Albany Park, Chicago, Illinois.

Sec. 4049. Carpenter Creek, Carpentersville, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Carpenter Creek, Carpentersville, Illinois.

Sec. 4050. Des Plaines River, Cook County, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for the Des Plaines River, Cook County, Illinois.

Sec. 4051. Ferson-Otter Creek Dam, St. Charles, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Ferson-Otter Creek Dam, St. Charles, Illinois.

Sec. 4052. Middle Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing a program for environmental restoration for the Middle Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri.

Sec. 4053. North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and related water resource purposes for the North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

Sec. 4054. River Park and Ronan Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and shoreline protection for River Park and Ronan Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

Sec. 4055. Thillens Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and shoreline protection for Thillens Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

Sec. 4056. Village of Skokie, Illinois

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Village of Skokie, Illinois.

Sec. 4057. Bowman Creek, South Bend, Indiana

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Bowman Creek, South Bend, Indiana.

Sec. 4058. Lake Michigan watershed, Indiana

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, and related water resource purposes for the Lake Michigan watershed, Indiana.

Sec. 4059. Burlington, Iowa

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Burlington, Iowa.

Sec. 4060. Beneficial use of dredged material, Louisiana and Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Federal hopper dredge Wheeler, as part of routine testing and use under its ready reserve status, to support projects for the beneficial reuse of material dredged from federally maintained waterways in connection with the project for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem and the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi.

Sec. 4061. Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. In carrying out the study, the Secretary may include elements of the report prepared by the non-Federal interest for Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, if the Secretary determines that such elements are feasible.

Sec. 4062. LaBranche Wetlands, St. Charles and St. John Counties, Louisiana

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for flood control and improvement of the Lower Mississippi River, Bonnet Carre Spillway, authorized by section 1 of the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), to add environmental restoration as a project purpose. In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall review operational and structural changes to the project to restore the LaBranche Wetlands, St. Charles and St. John Counties, Louisiana.

Sec. 4063. Ruth Canal freshwater diversion, Vermilion, Louisiana

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study of the project for the improvement of Bayou Teche and the Vermilion River, Louisiana, authorized by section 3 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 641), and the project for flood protection in the Teche-Vermilion basins, Louisiana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1420), to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water supply, Ruth Canal, Vermilion, Louisiana.

Sec. 4064. Anacostia River watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Anacostia River watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.

Sec. 4065. Chesapeake Bay Shoreline study, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia

This section directs the Secretary, in conducting the study for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, being carried out under the Committee Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Sen-

ate, adopted May 23, 2001, to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects on Federally-owned property for shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and improvement of water quality of the Chesapeake Bay.

Sec. 4066. Dredged material disposal, Baltimore Harbor, Maryland

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredged material disposal at Cox Creek Dredged Material Disposal Site for Baltimore Harbor, Maryland.

Sec. 4067. Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island recreation and public access, Maryland

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island, Maryland, as authorized by section 1001 of this Act.

Sec. 4068. Capisic Brook, Portland, Maine

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration, flood damage reduction, and stormwater management for Capisic Brook, Portland, Maine.

Sec. 4069. Fishing and Gooseberry Islands, Kittery, Maine

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Fishing and Gooseberry Islands, Kittery, Maine.

Sec. 4070. Southern Maine/New Hampshire dredged material disposal study, Maine and New Hampshire

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for southern Maine and New Hampshire.

Sec. 4071. Assabet, Charles, and Sudbury watersheds, Middlesex and Essex Counties, Massachusetts

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes, Assabet, Charles, and Sudbury watersheds, Middlesex and Essex Counties, Massachusetts. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4072. Hoosic River watershed, North Adams, Massachusetts

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Hoosic River watershed, North Adams, Massachusetts. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4073. Mystic River watershed, Massachusetts

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Mystic River watershed, Massachusetts.

Sec. 4074. Quequechan River, Fall River, Massachusetts

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for the Quequechan River, Fall River, Massachusetts.

Sec. 4075. Clinton River, Clinton Township, Michigan

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Clinton River, Clinton Township, Michigan.

Sec. 4076. Hamilton Dam, Flint, Michigan

This section directs the Secretary, in carrying out the review under the authority of section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1830) of the project for flood control, Flint River, Michigan, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 311), to include a review of Hamilton Dam, Flint, Michigan.

Sec. 4077. Upper Peninsula Flood Recovery, Michigan

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for Upper Peninsula Flood Recovery, Michigan.

Sec. 4078. Amory, Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Amory, Mississippi.

Sec. 4079. Coastal Mississippi ecosystem restoration, Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration and related water resource purposes for coastal Mississippi. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4080. Fulton, Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Fulton, Mississippi.

Sec. 4081. Gulfport, Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, Gulfport, Mississippi.

Sec. 4082. Lucedale, Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, water supply, recreation, and related water resource purposes for Lucedale, Mississippi.

Sec. 4083. Magby Creek and Vernon Branch, Lowndes County, Mississippi

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Magby Creek and Vernon Branch in Lowndes County, Mississippi.

Sec. 4084. Blue River basin, Kansas City, Missouri

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for flood protection and other purposes in the Blue River basin, vicinity of Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (80 Stat. 1409), to include additional flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreational measures, Kansas City, Missouri.

Sec. 4085. Little Blue River, Jackson County, Missouri

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for stream bank stabilization for Little Blue River, Jackson County, Missouri.

Sec. 4086. St. Louis, Missouri

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, especially examining the floodwall pump station, for St. Louis, Missouri.

Sec. 4087. Las Vegas Wash, Las Vegas, Nevada

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Las Vegas Wash, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Sec. 4088. New Hampshire

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for improvement of water quality, restoration of degraded habitat, environmental restoration, water supply, and remediation of potential impacts of climate change located within the State of New Hampshire. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis and is directed to work in collaboration with all relevant Federal and non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, academia, and the general public interested in participating in this study.

Sec. 4089. Piscataqua River, New Hampshire

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to evaluate sediment and nutrient pollution in the Piscataqua River system to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental

restoration and water quality for the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire.

Sec. 4090. Barnegat Bay watershed, Ocean and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Barnegat Bay watershed, Ocean and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4091. Beverly, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, including consideration of a gabion wall, for Beverly, New Jersey.

Sec. 4092. Borough of Pine Beach, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, including consideration of floating wave attenuators, for Borough of Pine Beach, New Jersey.

Sec. 4093. Haddon Township, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Haddon Township, New Jersey.

Sec. 4094. Rahway River watershed, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Rahway River watershed, New Jersey. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4095. Third River, Belleville, Bloomfield, and Nutley, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction for Third River, Belleville, Bloomfield, and Nutley, New Jersey.

Sec. 4096. Passaic River Channel, Nutley, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, environmental restoration, and recreation for the Passaic River Channel, Nutley, New Jersey.

Sec. 4097. Township of Ocean, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage re-

duction and shoreline protection for the Township of Ocean, New Jersey.

Sec. 4098. Preakness Brook, Wayne, New Jersey

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Preakness Brook, Wayne, New Jersey.

Sec. 4099. Dona Ana, New Mexico

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of adding hydropower to existing irrigation canals for Dona Ana, New Mexico.

Sec. 4100. Hidalgo County, New Mexico

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Hidalgo County, New Mexico.

Sec. 4101. Otero County, New Mexico

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Otero County, New Mexico.

Sec. 4102. Valencia County, New Mexico

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Valencia County, New Mexico.

Sec. 4103. Glen Cove, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and environmental restoration for Glen Cove, New York.

Sec. 4104. Hawtree basin, Hamilton Beach, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration for Hawtree basin, Hamilton Beach, New York.

Sec. 4105. Kill van Kull, Port Richmond, Staten Island, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration for Kill Van Kull, Port Richmond, Staten Island, New York.

Sec. 4106. Mariners Marsh and Arlington Marsh, Staten Island, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Mariners Marsh and Arlington Marsh, Staten Island, New York.

Sec. 4107. New York, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct an inventory of bulkheads and seawalls constructed around the city of New York,

New York, including the boroughs of Brooklyn, the Bronx, Manhattan, Staten Island, and Queens. In conducting the inventory, the Secretary shall assess the condition of the bulkheads and seawalls and the need for rehabilitation or modification of the bulkheads and seawalls. If the Secretary determines that an assessed bulkhead or seawall presents an imminent and substantial risk to public safety, the Secretary may carry out measures to prevent or mitigate that risk. Subsection (f) authorizes $7,000,000 to carry out this section.

Sec. 4108. Norton Basin Inlet, Far Rockaway, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Norton Basin Inlet, Far Rockaway, New York.

Sec. 4109. Queens, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Queens, New York, between 116th and 156th Streets.

Sec. 4110. Rockaway Beach Seawall, Rockaway, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Rockaway Beach Seawall, Rockaway, New York.

Sec. 4111. Roosevelt Island, East River, New York, New York

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and shoreline protection for Roosevelt Island, East River, New York, New York.

Sec. 4112. Charlotte, North Carolina

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration in support of the Surface Water Improvement and Management Initiative for Charlotte, North Carolina.

Sec. 4113. Nantahala River, Swain, North Carolina

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes, Nantahala River, Swain, North Carolina.

Sec. 4114. Missouri River and tributaries, South and Central North Dakota, North Dakota

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Missouri River and tributaries, South and Central North Dakota, North Dakota.

Sec. 4115. Big Creek watershed, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Big Creek watershed, Ohio. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4116. Brandywine Creek watershed, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Brandywine Creek watershed, Ohio. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4117. Carlisle Township, Lorain County, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Carlisle Township, Lorain County, Ohio.

Sec. 4118. Cuyahoga River watershed and Tuscarawas River watershed, Summit County, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes, Cuyahoga River watershed and Tuscarawas River watershed, Summit County, Ohio. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4119. Euclid Creek watershed, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Euclid Creek watershed, Ohio. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4120. Healy Creek, Brunswick, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, streambank erosion, and sedimentation control for Healy Creek, Brunswick, Ohio.

Sec. 4121. Lower Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Lower Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio.

Sec. 4122. Ohio River, Ohio

This section amends section 4070 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1183) by striking "Ohio River" and inserting "Ohio River and tributaries".

Sec. 4123. Shaker Lakes, Shaker Heights and Cleveland Heights, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Shaker Lakes, Shaker Heights and Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

Sec. 4124. Stark County, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Stark County, Ohio.

Sec. 4125. Tinkers Creek watershed, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Tinkers Creek watershed, Ohio. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4126. Upper Tuscarawas River, Cuyahoga County, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Upper Tuscarawas River, Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

Sec. 4127. West Creek watershed, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for West Creek watershed, Ohio. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4128. Yellow Creek and Short Creek, Jefferson County, Ohio

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Yellow Creek and Short Creek, Jefferson County, Ohio.

Sec. 4129. Ferry Creek Reservoir, Brookings, Oregon

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Ferry Creek Reservoir, Brookings, Oregon.

Sec. 4130. Oregon Navigation Jetties and Breakwaters, Oregon

This section directs the Secretary to conduct an inventory of federally constructed navigation jetties and breakwaters in the State of Oregon. In conducting the inventory, the Secretary shall assess the condition of the navigation jetties and breakwaters and the need for rehabilitation or modification of the jetties and breakwaters. If the Secretary determines that an assessed jetty or breakwater presents an imminent and substantial risk to public safety, the Secretary may carry out measures to prevent or mitigate that risk. Subsection (f) authorizes $7,000,000 to carry out this section.

Sec. 4131. Port Orford, Oregon

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements with examination of navigational breakwaters for Port Orford, Oregon.

Sec. 4132. Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a multipurpose project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania. In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, any work undertaken in the formulation of a project for environmental restoration, Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania, previously initiated under section 206 of WRDA 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 110 Stat. 3679).

Sec. 4133. Delaware River and tributaries, Bucks County, Pennsylvania

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for the Delaware River and tributaries, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4134. Elk Creek, Meadville, Pennsylvania

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water quality for Elk Creek, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

Sec. 4135. Mill Creek, Erie, Pennsylvania

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, focusing on the Mill Creek Drift Catcher, for Mill Creek, Erie, Pennsylvania.

Sec. 4136. Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.

Sec. 4137. Western Pennsylvania flood damage reduction

This section amends section 4077 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1184) in subsection (a) by striking "Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania" and inserting "Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania, the Monongahela River basin, Pennsylvania"; and in subsection (b), by striking "Shaler Township" and inserting "Shaler Township, Hampton Township, Harmar Township".

Sec. 4138. Guayama, Puerto Rico

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction for Guayama, Puerto Rico.

Sec. 4139. Rincon, Puerto Rico

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and shoreline protection for the Municipality of Rincon, Puerto Rico.

Sec. 4140. Providence, Rhode Island

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for the rivers in Providence, Rhode Island.

Sec. 4141. South Carolina

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for improvement of water quality, restoration of degraded habitat, environmental restoration, water supply, and remediation of potential impacts of climate change located within the eight watersheds located within the State of South Carolina. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis and is directed to work in collaboration with all relevant Federal and non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, academia, and the general public interested in participating in this study.

Sec. 4142. James River, South Dakota

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for channel restoration and improvements on the James River, South Dakota, authorized by section 401(b) of WRDA 1986 (100 Stat. 4128) to add ecosystem restoration and watershed improvements as project purposes.

Sec. 4143. Station Camp Creek, Gallatin, Tennessee

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Station Camp Creek, Gallatin, Tennessee.

Sec. 4144. Brazos River, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study assessing the long-term impacts of water use, withdrawal, recirculation, and downstream impacts on the Whitney Lake Reservoir, Texas.

Sec. 4145. Hickory Creek, City of Balch Springs, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Hickory Creek, City of Balch Springs, Texas.

Sec. 4146. Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels (Barbours Cut), Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study of the feasibility of modifying the Barbours Cut element of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), to a depth of 45 feet.

Sec. 4147. Port of Galveston, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for dredged material disposal in the vicinity of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of WRDA 1996 (110 Stat. 3666).

Sec. 4148. Simsboro Aquifer, City of Bastrop, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Simsboro Aquifer for water supply for the City of Bastrop, Texas.

Sec. 4149. Navasota River watershed, Grimes County, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for the Navasota River watershed, Grimes County, Texas.

Sec. 4150. Rio Grande basin, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and water supply for the Rio Grande basin, Texas.

Sec. 4151. Roma, Texas

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Roma, Texas.

Sec. 4152. Cottonwood Heights, Utah

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for streambank stabilization for Cottonwood Heights, Utah.

Sec. 4153. Emery Town, Utah

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive study of existing water supply resources for Emery Town, Utah.

Sec. 4154. Big Sandy River reallocation study, Virginia and West Virginia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of reallocating water storage at 6 reservoirs to optimize benefits for multiple-purpose use in the Big Sandy River watershed, Virginia and West Virginia.

Sec. 4155. Buckroe and Grandview Beaches, Hampton, Virginia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection for Buckroe and Grandview Beaches, Hampton, Virginia.

Sec. 4156. Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, including offshore breakwaters, for Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia.

Sec. 4157. Hampton, Virginia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Hampton, Virginia.

Sec. 4158. James River watershed, Virginia

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the water resource needs, including current and projected future needs, for the James River watershed, Virginia. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4159. Elliott Bay, Seattle, Washington

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation channel deepening for Elliott Bay, Seattle, Washington.

Sec. 4160. Green River, Kent, Washington

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Green River, Kent, Washington.

Sec. 4161. Vancouver Lake watershed, Vancouver, Washington

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental quality and environmental restoration, especially related to salmon and steelhead recovery issues, for the Vancouver Lake watershed, Vancouver, Washington. In carrying out this study, the Secretary shall review the feasibility of carrying out a project or projects on a watershed basis.

Sec. 4162. Lake Michigan shoreline, City of Cudahy, Wisconsin

This section directs the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection for the Lake Michigan shoreline, City of Cudahy, Wisconsin.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 5001. Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program

This section amends section 510 of WRDA 1996, as amended, to explicitly provide for in-kind credit, to authorize certain Federal funds (not provided by the Secretary) be credited towards the non-Federal share of the cost of the project, to limit the maximum Federal expenditure for any individual project at a single locality to $10,000,000, and to expand the geographic scope of this authority to include the States of Delaware, New York, and West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. This section increases the authorization of appropriations for this section by $10,000,000 to a total of $50,000,000.

Subsection (b) directs the Secretary to develop, at Federal expense, and submit to Congress a comprehensive plan to prioritize projects to be carried out by the Secretary within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. In carrying out this authority, the Secretary shall ensure that the plan: (1) focuses on integrating existing and poten-

tial future work of the Corps; (2) is developed in consultation with the EPA's Chesapeake Bay program office; and (3) encompasses all actions necessary to assist in the implementation of the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, including any projects or authorities under the jurisdiction of the Corps that are necessary for implementation of Executive Order 13508.

Sec. 5002. Saint Lawrence Seaway

This section modifies section 5015(a) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1196) by striking "$134,650,000" and inserting "$185,638,028".

Sec. 5003. Watershed management

The section adds the following projects to the list of watershed management, restoration, and development projects under section 5002(d) of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1190): Esopus, Rondout, and Wallkill watersheds, New York; San Gabriel River watershed, California; South Platte River watershed, Colorado; Loxahatchee River watershed, Jupiter, Florida; Hudson River watershed, Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties, New York; and Muskingum River basin, Ohio.

Sec. 5004. Comprehensive shoreline restoration

This section authorizes $25,000,000 for each of the FY 2011 through 2016 for the Secretary to participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, and emergency streambank protection component of a project at designated locations if the Secretary determines that any such component is feasible. Not more than $5,000,000 in Federal funds may be allotted under this section for a project at any single location.

Subsection (b) designates the following locations as eligible for this authority: Miller Knox Shoreline, Richmond, California; Mississippi River, Davenport, Iowa; Lake Michigan (in the vicinity of the former USX Site), Chicago, Illinois, Pond and Mill Creek watershed, Louisville, Kentucky; Massachusetts Bay (in the vicinity of Georges Island), Boston, Massachusetts; Mississippi River (in the vicinity of the lower St. Anthony Falls), Minneapolis, Minnesota; Brush Creek, Kansas City, Missouri; Mississippi River, Kimmswick, Missouri; Delaware River, Trenton, New Jersey; East River, New York, New York; Upper New York Bay, Staten Island, New York; Abbott's Creek, Lexington, North Carolina; Ohio River, Belpre, Ohio; Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela Rivers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Ohio River, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Fields Point, Narragansett Bay, Providence, Rhode Island; Congaree River, Columbia, South Carolina; Wolf Creek Harbor, Mississippi River, Tennessee; Ruston Way Seawall, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, Washington; and Lower Yahara River, McFarland, Wisconsin.

Sec. 5005. Northeast Coastal Region ecosystem restoration

This section directs the Secretary to plan, design, and construct projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration within the coastal waters of the Northeastern United States from Virginia to Maine, including associated bays, estuaries, and critical riverine areas. The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of EPA, the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, the Governors of the coastal

States from Virginia to Maine, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties, shall develop a general coastal management plan for aquatic ecosystem restoration within the coastal waters of the Northeastern United States. The Secretary is authorized to carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration projects pursuant to the general coastal management plan. Subsection (d) authorizes an annual appropriation of $25,000,000 to carry out this section, including the completion of the general coastal management plan. Not more than $10,000,000 in Federal funds may be allocated under this section for any single eligible project.

Sec. 5006. Anacostia watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland

Subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary to participate in the ecosystem restoration, navigation, flood damage reduction, emergency streambank protection, and aquatic plant control components of the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan, developed pursuant to section 5060 of WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1215), if the Secretary determines that such component is feasible. In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership. In carrying out a project component under subsection (a), the Secretary is directed to waive the cost share to be provided by a non-Federal interest for any portion of the project that benefits Federally-owned property. Subsection (d) authorizes an appropriation of $25,000,000 to carry out this section.

Sec. 5007. Egmont Key, Florida

This section directs the Secretary to accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out those portions of the project for shoreline stabilization, Egmont Key, Florida, carried out under section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g), that benefit Federally-owned property.

Sec. 5008. Cambridge, Maryland

This section authorizes the Secretary to carry out projects for environmental protection and restoration at the Blackwater Wildlife Refuge, Cambridge, Maryland. In carrying out such projects, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Sec. 5009. Hart-Miller Island, Maryland

This section prohibits the Secretary from consideration of the use or expansion of Hart-Miller Island, Maryland, in any dredged material management plan.

Sec. 5010. Gallops Island, Boston, Massachusetts

This section authorizes the Secretary to carry out a project for the environmental remediation of Gallops Island, Boston, Massachusetts. In carrying out such project, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the National Park Service.

Sec. 5011. Sharkey County, Mississippi

This section provides that funding for the operation and maintenance of the multiagency wildlife and environmental interpretative

and education center, authorized by section 145(f) of Division H of Public Law 108–199 (118 Stat. 443), shall be provided by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 5012. Charleston Harbor Post 45 Project, Charleston, South Carolina

This section directs the Secretary to expedite completion of the reconnaissance and feasibility studies for the Charleston Harbor Post 45 Project, Charleston, South Carolina, and if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, authorizes the Secretary to undertake project preconstruction, engineering, and design.

Sec. 5013. Sense of Congress on the promotion of General Michael J. Walsh to Major General, United States Army

This section expresses the Sense of the Congress on the promotion of General Michael J. Walsh, U.S. Army.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS

The Committee received a request to direct the Corps of Engineers to budget for the construction of the recycled water pipeline extending from the Sonoma Valley Country Sanitation District Waste Water Treatment Plant and the Napa Sanitation District Waste Water Treatment Plant to the project for environmental restoration, Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California, authorized by section 1001(12) of the WRDA 2007 (121 Stat. 1051). In its implementation of section 1001(12), the Corps has taken the position that the construction of the recycled water pipeline and restoration or enhancement of Salt Ponds 1, 1A, 2, and 3 (lower ponds) are not part of the authorized Federal project. This interpretation is contrary to the intent and the plain reading of section 1001(12). In the Corps' own implementation guidance, dated March 24, 2008, it recognizes that the "project costs identified in Section 1001(12) are the costs associated with the combination of the recommended Federal project and the additional features." Accordingly, when Congress authorized this combination, its intent was that both the recommended Federal project and the recycled water pipeline and restoration and enhancement of additional Salt Ponds be implemented in tandem. The Committee directs the Corps to execute work on the combined Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration project and the recycled water pipelines and additional Salt Ponds as a single project, without the need for additional statutory language. The Committee also directs the Corps to include funding for the recycled pipelines as part of this single project in any budgetary request for the Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration, California project.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

In the 110th Congress, on April 30, 2008, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled: "Proposals for a Water Resources Development Act of 2008". The Subcommittee received testimony from the Department of the Army (Civil Works), and representatives of industry, conservation organizations, and other stakeholders. No further action was taken on this legislation in the 110th Congress.

In the 111th Congress, on November 18, 2009, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled: "Proposals for a Water Resources Development Act of 2010". The Subcommittee received testimony from Members of Congress on issues and proposals for consideration in the "Water Resources Development Act of 2010".

On April 15, 2010, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled: "Proposals for a Water Resources Development Act of 2010 Part II". The Subcommittee received testimony from the Department of the Army (Civil Works), and representatives concerned with the flood damage reduction, inland and coastal navigation, and environmental restoration missions of the Corps of Engineers.

On July 28, 2010, Chairman James L. Oberstar and introduced H.R. 5892, the "Water Resources Development Act of 2010". On July 29, 2010, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider H.R. 5892. The Committee adopted two amendments to the bill by voice vote. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered H.R. 5892, as amended, reported favorably to the House by voice vote with a quorum present.

RECORD VOTES

Clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires each committee report to include the total number of votes cast for and against on each record vote on a motion to report and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, and the names of those members voting for and against. There were no recorded votes taken in connection with consideration of H.R. 5892 or ordering the bill, as amended, reported. A motion to order H.R. 5892, as amended, reported favorably to the House was agreed to by voice vote with a quorum present.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in this report.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives does not apply where a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and is included in the report. Such a cost estimate is included in this report.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII

1. With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee references the report of the Congressional Budget Office included in the report.

2. With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the performance goals and objectives of this legislation are the improvement of navigation, flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, water supply, and recreation, and environmental restoration and protection.

3. With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5892, as amended, from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 23, 2010.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 5892, the Water Resources Development Act of 2010.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Aurora Swanson.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

H.R. 5892—Water Resources Development Act of 2010

Summary: H.R. 5892 would authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to study and participate in the construction of more than 200 new water projects. Assuming appropriation of the authorized and necessary amounts, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 5892 would cost $1.3 billion over the 2011–2015 period.

The bill also would allow the Corps to collect and spend funds contributed by private firms to expedite the evaluation of permit applications. Because the legislation would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. However, based on information from the Corps, CBO estimates that amounts collected and spent for such purposes would total less than $500,000 annually and that the net budgetary impact would be negligible. Enacting the legislation would not affect revenues.

H.R. 5892 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). Any costs to state, local, or tribal governments to comply with conditions of federal assistance would be incurred voluntarily.

H.R. 5892 would impose a private-sector mandate as defined in UMRA if the Army Corps of Engineers acquires any real estate interests by means of condemnation. CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate, if imposed, would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates ($141 million in 2010, adjusted annually for inflation).

Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 5892 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2011–2015
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Title I—Water Resource Projects:						
Estimated Authorization Level	55	56	46	47	51	255
Estimated Outlays	17	31	34	38	42	162
Title III—Project-related Provisions:						
Estimated Authorization Level	280	291	285	288	286	1,430
Estimated Outlays	84	157	192	221	241	895
Title IV—Studies:						
Estimated Authorization Level	26	5	5	0	0	36
Estimated Outlays	16	13	5	2	0	36
Title V—Miscellaneous:						
Estimated Authorization Level	63	63	64	65	67	322
Estimated Outlays	18	35	43	49	55	200
Total Changes:						
Estimated Authorization Level	424	415	400	400	404	2,043
Estimated Outlays	135	236	274	310	338	1,293

Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 5892 will be enacted in 2010 and that the necessary amounts will be appropriated for each fiscal year. Estimated outlays are based on information from the Corps of Engineers and historical spending patterns for similar water resource projects.

H.R. 5892 would authorize the Corps to conduct about 240 new studies to determine the feasibility of specific projects. Those individual projects are related to reducing damage from floods, protecting streambanks and shorelines, improving navigation, restoring aquatic ecosystems, controlling aquatic plants, and conserving water. The bill also would authorize the Corps to participate in the construction of several new projects as well as increase the federal cost-share for about 30 construction and resource projects authorized in previous legislation. Assuming appropriation of the necessary funds, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 5892 would cost $1.3 billion over the 2011–2015 period and an additional $2.2 billion in the decade following 2015.

Water Resource Projects

Title I would authorize appropriations for three new projects aimed at ecosystem restoration, coastal improvements, and shoreline restoration. Those authorizations include just over $1 billion for the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project in Maryland and $747 million for the Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program. To protect the coasts of the West Onslow Beach and the New River Inlet in North Carolina from future hurricanes and storms, the bill would authorize the appropriation of $21 million for construction of a beach berm, with an additional $57 million for beach nourishment over the 50-year life of the North Carolina projects. CEO expects that the amounts authorized for those projects would be appropriated as needed. (The Corps expects that those large projects would be implemented over the next 40 to 50 years.) CBO estimates that implementing those projects would cost about $160 million over the 2011–2015 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts.

Title I also would direct the Corps to prepare 80 studies on specific water projects. If the Corps determines that those projects are

feasible, the legislation would authorize them to be implemented. No costs are included in this estimate for those studies or construction activities because Corps already has specific authority to study and implement those types of projects.[1]

Project-related Provisions

Title III would increase the federal share of costs for about 30 water resource projects authorized under current law. The projects focus on flood control and reducing damage from floods, navigation, water conservation, and ecosystem and environmental restoration.

CEO estimates that implementing those provisions would increase federal costs for those projects by about $900 million over the 2011–2015 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts.

Title III also would withdraw the authority of the Corps to build 16 projects authorized in previous legislation. Based on information from the Corps, CBO does not expect that the agency would begin work on those projects over the next five years, either because they do not have a local sponsor, do not meet certain criteria for economic viability, or do not pass certain environmental tests. Consequently, CBO estimates that cancelling the authority to build those projects would not yield significant savings over the next several years.

Studies

Title IV would authorize the Corps to prepare approximately 160 studies that focus on reducing damages from floods, hurricanes, and storms, environmental restoration, shoreline protection, and streambank stabilization. Based on information from the Corps, CBO estimates that carrying out such studies would cost $36 million over the 2011–2015 period.

Miscellaneous

Title V would authorize the appropriation of $25 million a year for ecosystem restoration projects in the Northeast coastal region. Under the bill, the Corps would develop a general coastal management plan in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Governors of the coastal states, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties. Individual projects carried out under the plan would focus on the restoration of aquatic habitats, wetlands, migratory fish corridors, natural rivers and streams, and improving water quality. The nonfederal share for each project's cost would be 35 percent, with the federal share limited to $10 million for individual projects. CBO estimates that implementing this provision would cost $80 million over the 2011–2015 period.

This title also would authorize the appropriation of $25 million a year over the 2011–2015 period for the Corps to participate in comprehensive shoreline restoration projects and an additional $50 million for operation, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of the

[1] Several provisions of current law (the Flood Control Act of 1946 and 1948, the River and Harbor Act of 1958 and 1960, an act authorizing federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and 1996) authorize appropriations totalling $240 million a year to pursue projects for reducing flood damage, navigation, streambank and shoreline protection, aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, and aquatic plant control. In fiscal year 2010, more than $100 million was appropriated for such projects.

Saint Lawrence Seaway. In addition, smaller amounts would be authorized to implement the Anacostia River Restoration Plan and Chesapeake Bay Environmental and Ecosystem Restoration. CBO expects that amounts authorized under the title would be appropriated in the year they are needed, and CBO estimates that implementing those projects would cost $120 million over the 2011–2015 period.

General Provisions

H.R. 5892 also would require that funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) each year be equal to the level of receipts plus the interest credited to the fund for that fiscal year. Over the past five years, appropriations from the HMTF have averaged around $800 million a year—or about $600 million a year less than the revenues and interest credited to the fund. Because current law authorizes the appropriation of such sums as are necessary from the HMTF, CBO assumes that enacting this bill would not effectively increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: None.

Estimated impact on state, local, and tribal governments: H.R. 5892 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA. Water resource projects and activities authorized in the bill would benefit state, local, and tribal governments. Governments that choose to participate in the projects would incur costs, including cost-sharing requirements, but those costs would be incurred voluntarily as conditions of federal assistance.

Estimated impact on the private sector: H.R. 5892 would authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to acquire any real estate interests necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of fish dispersal barriers in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. If the Corps acquires any of those real estate interests by means of condemnation, H.R. 5892 would impose a private-sector mandate as defined in UMRA on owners of those real estate interests. The cost of the mandate would be equal to the fair-market value of those interests. CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate, if imposed, would be small and would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates ($141 million in 2010, adjusted annually for inflation).

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs: Aurora Swanson; Impact on state, local, and tribal governments: Melissa Merrell; Impact on the private sector: Amy Petz.

Estimate approved by: Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f), and 9(g) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Committee has required Members of Congress to comply with all the requirements of clause 9(e), 9(f), or 9(g) of rule XXI. H.R. 5892 does not include any limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits. The following table provides the list of congressional earmarks in H.R. 5892:

Section	Member	Project Description
1001	Cummings, Elijah E.	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2009, at a total cost of $1,565,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,015,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $550,000,000.
1001	Hoyer, Steny H.	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2009, at a total cost of $1,565,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,015,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $550,000,000.
1001	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2009, at a total cost of $1,565,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,015,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $550,000,000.
1001	McIntyre, Mike	West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach), Pender County, North Carolina.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet (Topsail Beach), Pender County, North Carolina: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 2009, at a total cost of $32,131,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $20,708,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,423,000.
1001	Ruppersberger, C. A. Dutch	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2009, at a total cost of $1,565,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,015,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $550,000,000.
1001	Sarbanes, John P.	Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 24, 2009, at a total cost of $1,565,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,015,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $550,000,000.
1001	Taylor, Gene	Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 15, 2009, at a total cost of $1,085,477,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $705,560,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $379,917,000.
1002	Baca, Joe	Del Rosa Channel, San Bernadino, California.—Project for flood damage reduction, Del Rosa Channel, San Bernadino, California.
1002	Baldwin, Tammy	Roxbury and Westpoint Townships, Wisconsin.—Project for flood damage reduction, Roxbury and Westpoint Townships, Wisconsin.
1002	Braley, Bruce L.	Dry Run Creek, Waterloo, Iowa.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dry Run Creek, Waterloo, Iowa.
1002	Brown, Corrine	Big Econ River, Orange, Florida.—Project for flood damage reduction, Big Econ River, Orange, Florida.

Section	Member	Project Description
1002	Brown, Henry E. Jr.	Winyeh Bay, Georgetown, South Carolina.—Project for flood damage reduction, Winyeh Bay, Georgetown, South Carolina.
1002	Carnahan, Russ	Big River, Jefferson, Missouri.—Project for flood damage reduction, Big River, Jefferson, Missouri.
1002	Cummings, Elijah E.	Baltimore City, Maryland.—Project for flood damage reduction, Baltimore City, Maryland, in the vicinity of Druid Hill Park.
1002	DeGette, Diana	Sanderson Gulch, Denver, Colorado.—Project for flood damage reduction, Sanderson Gulch, Denver, Colorado.
1002	Engel, Eliot L.	Saw Mill River Basin, Greenburgh, New York.—Project for flood damage reduction, Saw Mill River Basin, Greenburgh, New York.
1002	Engel, Eliot L.	Sparkill Creek, Orangetown, New York.—Project for flood damage reduction, Sparkill Creek, Orangetown, New York.
1002	Foster, Bill	Kishwaukee River, Dekalb, Illinois.—Project for flood damage reduction, Kishwaukee River, DeKalb, Illinois.
1002	Kilpatrick, Carolyn C.	Harding Canal Seawall, Detroit, Michigan.—Project for flood damage reduction, Harding Canal Seawall, Detroit, Michigan.
1002	Kucinich, Dennis J.	Independence, Ohio.—Project for flood damage reduction, Independence, Ohio.
1002	Kucinich, Dennis J.	Valley View, Ohio.—Project for flood damage reduction, Valley View, Ohio.
1002	Lipinski, Daniel	Navajo Creek, Palos Heights, Illinois.—Project for flood damage reduction, Navajo Creek, Palos Heights, Illinois.
1002	Lipinski, Daniel	Stony Creek, Oak Lawn, Illinois.—Project for flood damage reduction, Stony Creek, Oak Lawn, Illinois.
1002	Lipinski, Daniel	Vicinity of the 71st Street Ditch, Justice, Illinois.—Project for flood damage reduction, in the vicinity of the 71st Street Ditch, Justice, Illinois.
1002	Lipinski, Daniel	West Branch of Mill Creek, Palos Park, Illinois.—Project for flood damage reduction, West Branch of Mill Creek, Palos Park, Illinois.
1002	Lynch, Stephen F.	Pine Tree Brook, Avon, Massachusetts.—Project for flood damage reduction, Pine Tree Brook, Avon, Massachusetts.
1002	Lynch, Stephen F.	Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts.—Project for flood damage reduction, Pine Tree Brook, Milton, Massachusetts.
1002	Marshall, Jim	Bay Gall Creek, Warner Robbins, Georgia.—Project for flood damage reduction, Bay Gall Creek, Warner Robbins, Georgia.
1002	Miller, George	Laguna Creek, Vacaville, California.—Project for flood damage reduction, Laguna Creek, Vacaville, California.
1002	Miller, George	Ulatis Creek, Vacaville, California.—Project for flood damage reduction, Ulatis Creek, Vacaville, California.
1002	Rodriguez, Ciro D.	Del Rio, Val Verde, Texas.—Project for flood damage reduction, Del Rio, Val Verde, Texas.
1002	Salazar, John T.	Willow Creek, Creede, Colorado.—Project for flood damage reduction, Willow Creek, Creede, Colorado.
1002	Schakowsky, Janice D.	Des Plaines River, Park Ridge, Illinois.—Project for flood damage reduction, Des Plaines River, Park Ridge, Illinois.
1002	Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	Craford Bay Seawall, Portsmouth, Virginia.—Project for flood damage reduction, Craford Bay Seawall, Portsmouth, Virginia.
1002	Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia.—Project for flood damage reduction, Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia.
1002	Yarmuth, John A.	Louisville, Kentucky.—Project for flood damage reduction, Louisville, Kentucky.

Section	Member	Project Description
1003	Crowley, Joseph	Bronx River, New York, New York.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Bronx River, New York, New York.
1003	DeLauro, Rosa L.	Quinnipiac River, New Haven, Connecticut.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Quinnipiac River, New Haven, Connecticut.
1003	Kennedy, Patrick J.	Newport, Rhode Island.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Newport, Rhode Island.
1003	Kennedy, Patrick J.	Tiverton, Rhode Island.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Tiverton, Rhode Island
1003	Wasserman Schultz, Debbie	Biscayne Bay, North Bay Village, Florida.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Biscayne Bay, North Bay Village, Florida.
1003	Wilson, Charles A.	Ohio River, Ironton, Ohio.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Ohio River, Ironton, Ohio.
1003	Young, Don	Naknek River, Naknek, Alaska.—Project for emergency streambank protection, Naknek River, Naknek, Alaska.
1004	Adler, John H.	Stouts Creek, Lacey Township, New Jersey.—Project for navigation, Stouts Creek, Lacey Township, New Jersey.
1004	Israel, Steve	Brown's River, Nassau County, New York.—Project for navigation, Brown's River, Nassau County, New York.
1004	Kagen, Steve	Detroit Harbor, Wisconsin.— Project for navigation, Detroit Harbor, Wisconsin.
1004	Kilpatrick, Carolyn C.	Detroit River, Wyandotte, Michigan.—Project for navigation, Detroit River, Wyandotte, Michigan.
1005	Garamendi, John	Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
1005	Garamendi, John	Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
1005	McNerney, Jerry	Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
1005	McNerney, Jerry	Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
1005	Miller, George	Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
1005	Miller, George	Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.—Project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Rodeo Creek, Contra Costa County, California.
1006	Adler, John H.	Barnegat Bay, Ocean County, New Jersey.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Barnegat Bay, Ocean County, New Jersey.
1006	Boucher, Rick	Claytor Lake, Pulaski, Virginia.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Claytor Lake, Pulaski, Virginia.
1006	Crowley, Joseph	Pugsley Creek, Castle Hill, New York.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Pugsley Creek, Castle Hill, New York.
1006	Delahunt, Bill	Lewis Bay, Yarmouth, Massachusetts.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Lewis Bay, Yarmouth, Massachusetts.
1006	Edwards, Donna F.	Cabin Branch Watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Cabin Branch Watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.
1006	Edwards, Donna F.	Little Paint Branch Stream, Prince George's County, Maryland.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Little Paint Branch Stream, Prince George's County, Maryland.

Section	Member	Project Description
1006	Edwards, Donna F.	Lower Beaverdam Creek, Prince George's County, Maryland.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Lower Beaverdam Creek, Prince George's County, Maryland.
1006	Edwards, Donna F.	Northeast Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Northeast Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.
1006	Edwards, Donna F.	Northwest Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Northwest Anacostia River, Prince George's County, Maryland.
1006	Foster, Bill	Bremme Creek, Dupage, Illinois.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Bremme Creek, DuPage, Illinois.
1006	Foster, Bill	Blackberry Creek, Kendall, Illinois.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Blackberry Creek, Kendall, Illinois.
1006	Foster, Bill	West Branch of the Dupage River, Dupage, Illinois.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, West Branch of the DuPage River, DuPage, Illinois.
1006	Halvorson, Deborah L.	Kankakee River, Will County, Illinois.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Kankakee River, Will County, Illinois.
1006	Halvorson, Deborah L.	Prairie Creek Watershed, Will County, Illinois.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Prairie Creek Watershed, Will County, Illinois.
1006	Holt, Rush D.	Branchport Creek, Oceanport Borough, New Jersey.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Branchport Creek, Oceanport Borough, New Jersey.
1006	Holt, Rush D.	Lake Topanemus, Freehold, New Jersey.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Lake Topanemus, Freehold, New Jersey.
1006	Hoyer, Steny H.	Little Paint Branch Stream, Prince George's County, Maryland.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Little Paint Branch Stream, Prince George's County, Maryland.
1006	Kennedy, Patrick J.	Woonasquatucket River, Providence, Rhode Island.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Woonasquatucket River, Providence, Rhode Island.
1006	Kilroy, Mary Jo	Olentangy River, Franklin, Ohio.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Olentangy River, Franklin, Ohio.
1006	Kilroy, Mary Jo	Scioto River, Franklin, Ohio.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Scioto River, Franklin, Ohio.
1006	Lee, Barbara	Emeryville Harbor, Emeryville, California.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Emeryville Harbor, Emeryville, California.
1006	McCollum, Betty	Pig's Eye Lake, St. Paul, Minnesota.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Pig's Eye Lake, St. Paul, Minnesota.
1006	McGovern, James P.	Assabet River, Middlesex and Worcester, Massachusetts.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Assabet River, Middlesex and Worcester, Massachusetts.
1006	Pingree, Chellie	Long Creek Watershed, Cumberland, Maine.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Long Creek Watershed, Cumberland, Maine.
1006	Quigley, Mike	Gompers Park, North Branch Chicago River, Illinois.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Gompers Park, North Branch Chicago River, Illinois.
1006	Roybal-Allard, Lucille	Los Angeles River, Cudahy, California.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Los Angeles River, Cudahy, California.
1006	Salazar, John T.	Animas River, La Plata, Colorado.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Animas River, La Plata, Colorado.

Section	Member	Project Description
1006	Salazar, John T.	North Fork of the Gunnison River, Delta, Colorado.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, North Fork of the Gunnison River, Delta, Colorado.
1006	Scott, David	Line and Cane Creeks, Henry County, Georgia.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Line and Cane Creeks, Henry County, Georgia.
1006	Sires, Albio	Hackensack River, Hudson County, New Jersey.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Hackensack River, Hudson County, New Jersey.
1006	Speier, Jackie	Laguna Salada, Pacifica, California.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Laguna Salada, Pacifica, California.
1006	Teague, Harry	Las Cruces Dam, Dona Ana, New Mexico.—Project for aquatic ecosystem and estuary restoration, Las Cruces Dam, Dona Ana, New Mexico.
1007	Ackerman, Gary L.	Manhasset Bay, Port Washington, New York.—Project for shoreline protection, Manhasset Bay, Port Washington, New York.
1007	Adler, John H.	Barnegat, Ocean County, New Jersey.—Project for shoreline protection, Barnegat, Ocean County, New Jersey.
1007	Klein, Ron	Deerfield Beach, Broward County, Florida.—Project for shoreline protection, Deerfield Beach, Broward County, Florida.
1008	Markey, Betsy	The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project for aquatic nuisance plant control in the Republican River Basin, Colorado, under section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610).
3001	Young, Don	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, Douglas Harbor, Juneau, Alaska, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be $7,000,000.
3002	Grijalva, Raúl M.	The project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606) and modified by section 303 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2600), and section 3008 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $55,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,400,000.
3002	Pastor, Ed	The project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606) and modified by section 303 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2600), and section 3008 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $55,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,400,000.
3003	Kirkpatrick, Ann	The project for flood damage reduction, Rio De Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2576) and modified by section 3007 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1107), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $77,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $27,000,000.

Section	Member	Project Description
3004	Mitchell, Harry E.	The project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $230,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $149,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $80,500,000.
3004	Pastor, Ed	The project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $230,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $149,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $80,500,000.
3005	Thompson, Mike	The project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes in the Russian River Basin, California, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 177), and the project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1192), are modified as follows: (1) The Secretary shall review the biological opinion on the water supply, flood control, and channel maintenance operations conducted by the Corps of Engineers, the Sonoma County Water Agency, and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control District, as transmitted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on September 24, 2008. (2) If the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary is authorized to construct the project at a total cost of $92,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $59,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $32,200,000.
3005	Woolsey, Lynn C.	The project for flood control, water conservation, and related purposes in the Russian River Basin, California, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 177), and the project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1192), are modified as follows: (1) The Secretary shall review the biological opinion on the water supply, flood control, and channel maintenance operations conducted by the Corps of Engineers, the Sonoma County Water Agency, and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control District, as transmitted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on September 24, 2008. (2) If the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary is authorized to construct the project at a total cost of $92,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $59,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $32,200,000.
3006	Matsui, Doris O.	The project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California, authorized by section 101(a)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 275), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $104,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $67,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $36,800,000.
3007	DeGette, Diana	Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado
3007	Markey, Betsy	Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado
3008	Heinrich, Martin	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2015".
3008	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2015".

Section	Member	Project Description
3008	Reyes, Silvestre	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2015".
3008	Rodriguez, Ciro D.	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2015".
3008	Teague, Harry	Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Section 5056(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2015".
3009	Norton, Eleanor Holmes	The project for flood control, Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688; 49 Stat. 1574) and modified by section 301(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3707) and section 309 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 301), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a Federal cost of $8,100,000, in accordance with the post authorization change report dated June 29, 1998.
3010	Hastings, Alcee L.	The project for ecosystem restoration, Kissimmee River Restoration, Florida, authorized by section 101(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $852,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $426,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $426,000,000.
3010	Klein, Ron	The project for ecosystem restoration, Kissimmee River Restoration, Florida, authorized by section 101(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $852,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $426,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $426,000,000.
3010	Wasserman Schultz, Debbie	The project for ecosystem restoration, Kissimmee River Restoration, Florida, authorized by section 101(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $852,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $426,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $426,000,000.
3011	Kosmas, Suzanne M.	The project for navigation and related purposes, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 279), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $15,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $8,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,500,000.
3012	Barrow, John	The project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia, authorized by section 101(b)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 279), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $675,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $405,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $270,000,000.
3013	Ehlers, Vernon J.	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.
3013	Higgins, Brian	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.
3013	Kaptur, Marcy	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.
3013	Quigley, Mike	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.
3013	Sutton, Betty	Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers project, Illinois.
3014	Costello, Jerry F.	The project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky, authorized by section 3(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $1,991,000,000.

Section	Member	Project Description
3015	Costello, Jerry F.	The project for flood damage reduction, Wood River Levee System Reconstruction, Madison County, Illinois, authorized by section 1001(20) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1053), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $120,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $78,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $42,000,000.
3016	Visclosky, Peter J.	The project for flood control, Little Calumet River, Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (100 Stat. 4115) and modified by section 127 of the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 2006 (119 Stat. 2259), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $275,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $206,000,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of $69,000,000.
3017	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for navigation, Rhodes Point Jetty, Smith Island, Maryland, being carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be $7,000,000.
3018	Frank, Barney	Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.Section 522 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2656) is amended by striking "draft evaluation report of the New England District Engineer entitled 'Phase I Muddy River Master Plan', dated June 2000" and inserting "Final Decision Document and Environmental Assessment Report of the New England District Engineer entitled 'Muddy River Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts', dated September 2003, at a total cost of $79,200,000".
3019	Peterson, Collin C.	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood damage reduction, Wild Rice River, Ada, Minnesota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,600,000.
3020	Peterson, Collin C.	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood damage reduction, Montevideo, Minnesota, being carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,000,000.
3021	Oberstar, James L.	Two Harbors, Minnesota. Section 3101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1133) is amended by striking "$7,000,000" and inserting "$14,000,000".
3022	Cleaver, Emanuel	The project for flood control, Blue River Basin, Kansas City, Missouri, authorized by section 101(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $45,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $34,125,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,375,000.
3023	Holt, Rush D.	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Lower Assunpink Creek, Trenton, New Jersey, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be $10,000,000.
3024	Adler, John H.	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for emergency streambank protection, Ocean Gate, Ocean County, New Jersey, being carried out under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), shall be $4,500,000.

Section	Member	Project Description
3025	Crowley, Joseph	Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York. Section 554 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781), as amended by section 3122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1139), is further amended by striking "$20,000,000" and inserting "$27,000,000".
3025	Serrano, José E.	Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York. Section 554 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3781), as amended by section 3122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1139), is further amended by striking "$20,000,000" and inserting "$27,000,000".
3026	Weiner, Anthony D.	The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Spring Creek, New York, being carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), shall be $6,000,000.
3027	Space, Zachary T.	Hocking River Basin, Monday Creek, Ohio. Section 1001(37)(B)(iii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1055) is amended by striking "$1,270,000" and inserting "$12,000,000".
3027	Wilson, Charles A.	Hocking River Basin, Monday Creek, Ohio. Section 1001(37)(B)(iii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1055) is amended by striking "$1,270,000" and inserting "$12,000,000".
3028	Baird, Brian	Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay ecosystem restoration, Oregon and Washington. Section 536(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2662) is amended by striking "$30,000,000" and inserting "$45,000,000".
3028	Blumenauer, Earl	Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay ecosystem restoration, Oregon and Washington. Section 536(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2662) is amended by striking "$30,000,000" and inserting "$45,000,000".
3028	Wu, David	Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay ecosystem restoration, Oregon and Washington. Section 536(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2662) is amended by striking "$30,000,000" and inserting "$45,000,000".
3029	Ortiz, Solomon P.	The project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas, authorized by section 1001(40) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1056) is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $447,604,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $183,827,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $263,777,000.
3030	Johnson, Eddie Bernice	Dallas Floodway, Dallas, Texas. The project for flood control, Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945, and modified by section 5141 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1253), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $882,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $573,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $308,700,000.
3031	Green, Gene	The project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), is modified to authorize the Secretary to extend the boundaries of the Galveston channel approximately 2600 feet beyond Pier 38, if the Secretary determines that the extension is feasible.

Section	Member	Project Description
3032	Ellsworth, Brad	Vincennes, Indiana.—The Vincennes, Indiana portion of the project for flood control, Wabash River Basin, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 649) and deauthorized by section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4209).
3033	Davis, Danny K.	Project deauthorizations. Chicago Harbor, Illinois.
3033	Delahunt, Bill	Project deauthorizations. Menemsha Creek, Massachusetts.
3033	Langevin, James R.	Project deauthorizations. Block Island Harbor of Refuge, Rhode Island.
3033	Lipinski, Daniel	Project deauthorizations. Chicago Harbor, Illinois.
3033	Norton, Eleanor Holmes	Project deauthorizations. Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia.
3033	Tierney, John F.	Project deauthorizations. Ipswich River, Massachusetts.
4001	Young, Don	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, Hollis, Alaska.
4002	Grijalva, Raúl M.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Bullard Wash, Goodyear, Arizona.
4003	Kirkpatrick, Ann	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for the Lower Santa Cruz River study area, Casa Grande, Arizona.
4004	Mitchell, Harry E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes, including nonstructural solutions, for Maricopa County, Arizona.
4005	Ross, Mike	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, bank stabilization, and related water resource purposes for the Ouachita River, Ouachita, Union, and Ashley Counties, Arkansas.
4006	Berry, Marion	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oil Trough, Arkansas.
4007	Berry, Marion	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Randolph County, Arkansas.
4008	Lee, Barbara	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for Berkeley Marina, Berkeley, California.
4009	Miller, George	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and flood damage reduction for Chelsea Wetlands, Hercules, California.
4010	Richardson, Laura	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration between Colorado Lagoon and Alamitos Bay, Long Beach, California.
4011	McNerney, Jerry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and streambank stabilization for Lodi Lake, Lodi, California.
4012	Lee, Barbara	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation improvements for the Oakland-Inner Harbor Tidal Canal, Oakland, California.
4013	Thompson, Mike	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for Noyo Harbor District, Noyo, California.

Section	Member	Project Description
4014	Pelosi, Nancy	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Port of San Francisco, San Francisco, California.
4015	Eshoo, Anna G.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for Redwood City Navigation Channel, California.
4016	Baca, Joe	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Rialto Channel and Cactus Channel, Rialto, Colorado.
4017	Matsui, Doris O.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction in the Sacramento Regional Sanitation District, Sacramento, California.
4018	Miller, George	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for San Pablo Bay, Hercules, California.
4019	Cardoza, Dennis A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for navigation channel deepening for Stockton, California.
4020	Filner, Bob	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, water supply, water quality, recreation, and other water-related issues including the impacts of water flows from Mexico for the Tijuana River basin, San Diego, California.
4021	Davis, Susan A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and wetland restoration along the Tijuana River, San Diego County, California.
4021	Filner, Bob	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and wetland restoration along the Tijuana River, San Diego County, California.
4022	Capps, Lois	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ventura River, Ventura County, California.
4023	Sánchez, Linda T.	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Willowbrook, Los Angeles County, California.
4024	Salazar, John T.	The Secretary shall conduct a sediment impact analysis study to determine the sediment transport parameters for Fountain Spring watershed, Pueblo, Colorado.
4025	DeGette, Diana	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ralston Creek, Arvada, Colorado.
4025	Perlmutter, Ed	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Ralston Creek, Arvada, Colorado.
4026	Himes, James A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration for Holly Pond and Norotan River, Stamford, Connecticut.
4027	Murphy, Christopher S.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along the Housatonic River, New Milford, Connecticut.
4028	Himes, James A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements for Long Island Sound and Mill River, Stamford, Connecticut.

Section	Member	Project Description
4029	Murphy, Christopher S.	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Meriden, Connecticut.
4030	Courtney, Joe	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the South Cove, Old Saybrook, Connecticut.
4031	DeLauro, Rosa L.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, storm damage reduction, including a review of bulkhead condition for West River, New Haven Harbor, West Haven, Connecticut.
4032	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Army Corps of Engineers projects in the Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.
4032	Sarbanes, John P.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Army Corps of Engineers projects in the Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.
4033	Norton, Eleanor Holmes	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, including green technologies, for Washington, District of Columbia.
4034	Brown-Waite, Ginny	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental protection, Lake County, Florida.
4035	Brown-Waite, Ginny	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Marion County, Florida.
4036	Wasserman Schultz, Debbie	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Miami, Florida.
4037	Hastings, Alcee L.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oakland Park, Florida.
4037	Klein, Ron	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oakland Park, Florida.
4037	Wasserman Schultz, Debbie	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Oakland Park, Florida.
4038	Hastings, Alcee L.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Riviera Beach, Florida.
4038	Klein, Ron	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Riviera Beach, Florida.
4039	Kosmas, Suzanne M.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for South Daytona, Florida.
4040	Castor, Kathy	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Tampa, Florida.
4041	Lewis, John	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for Peavine Creek, Decatur, Georgia.
4042	Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Richland Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.

Section	Member	Project Description
4043	Linder, John	Study for Water Supply, Georgia
4044	Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Suwannee Creek, Lawrenceville, Georgia.
4045	Bordallo, Madeleine Z.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Agat and Merizo, Guam.
4046	Hirono, Mazie K.	(a) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii. (b) Prior work.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, any work undertaken in the formulation of a project for flood damage reduction, Waiakea Stream and Palai Stream, Hilo, Hawaii, initiated under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).
4047	Hirono, Mazie K.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, water supply, and related water resource purposes for the Waialua-Kaiaka watershed, Oahu, Hawaii.
4048	Quigley, Mike	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Albany Park, Chicago, Illinois.
4049	Foster, Bill	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Carpenter Creek, Carpentersville, Illinois.
4050	Lipinski, Daniel	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for the Des Plaines River, Cook County, Illinois.
4051	Foster, Bill	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Ferson-Otter Creek Dam, St. Charles, Illinois.
4052	Carnahan, Russ	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing a program for environmental restoration for the Middle Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri.
4052	Costello, Jerry F.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing a program for environmental restoration for the Middle Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri.
4053	Quigley, Mike	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and related water resource purposes for the North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
4054	Quigley, Mike	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and shoreline protection for River Park and Ronan Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
4055	Schakowsky, Janice D.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and shoreline protection for Thillens Park, North Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
4056	Schakowsky, Janice D.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Village of Skokie, Illinois.
4057	Donnelly, Joe	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Bowman Creek, South Bend, Indiana.

Section	Member	Project Description
4058	Visclosky, Peter J.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, and related water resource purposes for the Lake Michigan watershed, Indiana.
4059	Loebsack, David	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and stream bank stabilization for Burlington, Iowa.
4060	Cao, Anh "Joseph"	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Federal hopper dredge Wheeler, as part of routine testing and use under its ready reserve status pursuant to section 3 of the Act of August 11, 1888 (33 U.S.C. 622(c); 110 Stat. 3705), for support of projects for the beneficial reuse of material dredged from federally maintained waterways at the following locations: (1) Projects in connection with the comprehensive plan for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, pursuant to section 7002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1270). (2) Projects in connection with the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, authorized by section 1001 of this Act.
4060	Melancon, Charlie	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Federal hopper dredge Wheeler, as part of routine testing and use under its ready reserve status pursuant to section 3 of the Act of August 11, 1888 (33 U.S.C. 622(c); 110 Stat. 3705), for support of projects for the beneficial reuse of material dredged from federally maintained waterways at the following locations: (1) Projects in connection with the comprehensive plan for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, pursuant to section 7002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1270). (2) Projects in connection with the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, authorized by section 1001 of this Act.
4060	Taylor, Gene	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Federal hopper dredge Wheeler, as part of routine testing and use under its ready reserve status pursuant to section 3 of the Act of August 11, 1888 (33 U.S.C. 622(c); 110 Stat. 3705), for support of projects for the beneficial reuse of material dredged from federally maintained waterways at the following locations: (1) Projects in connection with the comprehensive plan for protecting, preserving, and restoring the coastal Louisiana ecosystem, pursuant to section 7002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1270). (2) Projects in connection with the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, authorized by section 1001 of this Act.
4061	Cao, Anh "Joseph"	(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.(b) USE OF LOCAL REPORT.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary may include elements of the report prepared by the non-Federal interest for Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, if the Secretary determines that such elements are feasible.

Section	Member	Project Description
4062	Melancon, Charlie	(a) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for [_____], Bonnet Carre Spillway, authorized by section 18 of the Flood Control Act of 1928 [(___Stat. _____)], to add environmental restoration as a project purpose. (b) Review.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall review operational and structural changes to the project to restore the LaBranche Wetlands, St. Charles and St. John Counties, Louisiana.
4063	Melancon, Charlie	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the project for the improvement of Bayou Teche and the Vermilion River, Louisiana, authorized by section 3 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 641), and the project for flood protection in the Teche-Vermilion basins, Louisiana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1420), to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water supply, Ruth Canal, Vermilion, Louisiana.
4064	Edwards, Donna F.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Anacostia River watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland.
4065	Cummings, Elijah E.	In carrying out the study for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, being carried out under the Committee Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted May 23, 2001, the Secretary shall determine the feasibility of carrying out projects on federally owned property for shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and improvement of water quality of the Chesapeake Bay.
4065	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	In carrying out the study for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, being carried out under the Committee Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted May 23, 2001, the Secretary shall determine the feasibility of carrying out projects on federally owned property for shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and improvement of water quality of the Chesapeake Bay.
4066	Cummings, Elijah E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredged material disposal at Cox Creek Dredged Material Disposal Site for Baltimore Harbor, Maryland.
4067	Cummings, Elijah E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island, Maryland, as authorized by section 1001 of this Act.
4067	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island project for enhanced public access and recreational opportunities on Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island, Maryland, as authorized by section 1001 of this Act.
4068	Pingree, Chellie	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration, flood damage reduction, and stormwater management for Capisic Brook, Portland, Maine.
4069	Pingree, Chellie	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Fishing and Gooseberry Islands, Kittery, Maine.
4070	Shea-Porter, Carol	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements and dredge material disposal for southern Maine and New Hampshire.

Section	Member	Project Description
4071	Tsongas, Niki	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes, Assabet, Charles, and Sudbury watersheds, Middlesex and Essex Counties, Massachusetts.
4072	Olver, John W.	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Hoosic River watershed, North Adams, Massachusetts.
4073	Capuano, Michael E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Mystic River watershed, Massachusetts.
4074	Frank, Barney	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for the Quequechan River, Fall River, Massachusetts.
4074	McGovern, James P.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes for the Quequechan River, Fall River, Massachusetts.
4075	Levin, Sander M.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Clinton River, Clinton Township, Michigan.
4076	Kildee, Dale E.	In carrying out the review under the authority of section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1830) of the project for flood control, Flint River, Michigan, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 311), the Secretary shall include a review of Hamilton Dam, Flint, Michigan.
4077	Stupak, Bart	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for Upper Peninsula Flood Recovery, Michigan.
4078	Childers, Travis W.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Amory, Mississippi.
4079	Taylor, Gene	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration and related water resource purposes for coastal Mississippi.
4080	Childers, Travis W.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Fulton, Mississippi.
4081	Taylor, Gene	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements, Gulfport, Mississippi.
4082	Taylor, Gene	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, water supply, recreation, and related water resource purposes for Lucedale, Mississippi.
4083	Childers, Travis W.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Magby Creek and Vernon Branch in Lowndes County, Mississippi.
4084	Cleaver, Emanuel	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for flood protection and other purposes in the Blue River Basin vicinity of Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (80 Stat. 1409), to include additional flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreational measures, Kansas City, Missouri.
4085	Cleaver, Emanuel	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for stream bank stabilization for Little Blue River, Jackson County, Missouri.

Section	Member	Project Description
4086	Carnahan, Russ	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, especially examining floodwall pump station, for St. Louis, Missouri.
4087	Titus, Dina	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Las Vegas Wash, Las Vegas, Nevada.
4088	Shea-Porter, Carol	The Secretary, in collaboration with all relevant Federal and non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, academia, and the general public, shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study of all watersheds in New Hampshire for water quality, habitat degradation, environmental restoration, water supply, and potential impacts of climate change for New Hampshire.
4089	Shea-Porter, Carol	The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate sediment and nutrient pollution in the Piscataqua River system to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water quality for the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire.
4090	Adler, John H.	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, shoreline protection, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Barnegat Bay watershed, Ocean and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey.
4091	Adler, John H.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, including consideration of a Gabion Wall, for Beverly, New Jersey.
4092	Adler, John H.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection, including consideration of floating wave attenuators off shore, for Borough of Pine Beach, New Jersey.
4093	Andrews, Robert E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Haddon Township, New Jersey.
4094	Payne, Donald M.	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Rahway River watershed, New Jersey.
4094	Sires, Albio	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for Rahway River watershed, New Jersey.
4095	Pascrell, Bill, Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction for Third River, Belleville, Bloomfield, and Nutley, New Jersey.
4096	Pascrell, Bill, Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, environmental restoration, and recreation for the Passaic River Channel, Nutley, New Jersey.
4097	Adler, John H.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for the Township of Ocean, New Jersey.
4098	Pascrell, Bill, Jr.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Preakness Brook, Wayne, New Jersey.
4099	Teague, Harry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of adding hydropower to existing irrigation canals for Dona Ana, New Mexico.
4100	Teague, Harry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Hidalgo County, New Mexico.

Section	Member	Project Description
4101	Teague, Harry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Otero County, New Mexico.
4102	Teague, Harry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Valencia County, New Mexico.
4103	Bishop, Timothy H.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and environmental restoration for Glen Cove, New York.
4104	Meeks, Gregory W.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration for Hawtree basin, Hamilton Beach, New York.
4105	McMahon, Michael E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration for Kill Van Kull, Port Richmond, Staten Island, New York.
4106	McMahon, Michael E.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Mariners Marsh and Arlington Marsh, Staten Island, New York.
4107	McMahon, Michael E.	The Secretary shall conduct an engineering study of existing bulkheads and seawalls for storm damage reduction for New York City, New York.
4107	Nadler, Jerrold	The Secretary shall conduct an engineering study of existing bulkheads and seawalls for storm damage reduction for New York City, New York.
4108	Meeks, Gregory W.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Norton Basin Inlet, Far Rockaway, New York.
4109	Weiner, Anthony D.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Queens, New York, between 116th and 156th Streets.
4110	Meeks, Gregory W.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Rockaway Beach Seawall, Rockaway, New York.
4111	Maloney, Carolyn B.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and shoreline protection for Roosevelt Island, East River, New York, New York.
4112	Watt, Melvin L.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental restoration in support of the Surface Water Improvement and Management Initiative for Charlotte, North Carolina.
4113	Shuler, Heath	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, recreation, and related water resource purposes, Nantahala River, Swain, North Carolina.
4114	Pomeroy, Earl	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Missouri River and tributaries, South and Central North Dakota, North Dakota.
4115	Fudge, Marcia L.	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Big Creek watershed, Ohio.
4116	Fudge, Marcia L.	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Brandywine Creek watershed, Ohio.
4117	Sutton, Betty	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Carlisle Township, Lorain County, Ohio.

Section	Member	Project Description
4118	Sutton, Betty	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes, Cuyahoga River watershed and Tuscarawas River watershed, Summit County, Ohio.
4119	Fudge, Marcia L.	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Euclid Creek watershed, Ohio.
4120	Sutton, Betty	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, streambank erosion, and sedimentation control for Healy Creek, Brunswick, Ohio.
4121	Kaptur, Marcy	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Lower Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio.
4122	Wilson, Charles A.	Section 4070 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1183) is amended by striking "Ohio River" and inserting "Ohio River and tributaries".
4123	Fudge, Marcia L.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Shaker Lakes, Shaker Heights and Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
4124	Boccieri, John A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Stark County, Ohio.
4125	Fudge, Marcia L.	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Tinkers Creek watershed, Ohio.
4126	Baird, Brian	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for environmental quality and environmental restoration, especially related to salmon and steelhead recovery issues, for the Vancouver Lake watershed, Vancouver, Washington.
4126	Sutton, Betty	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Upper Tuscarawas River, Cuyahoga County, Ohio.
4127	Fudge, Marcia L.	The Secretary shall conduct a watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for West Creek watershed, Ohio.
4128	Wilson, Charles A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Yellow Creek and Short Creek, Jefferson County, Ohio.
4129	DeFazio, Peter A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Ferry Creek Reservoir, Brookings, Oregon.
4130	DeFazio, Peter A.	Oregon Navigation Jetties and Breakwaters, Oregon.
4131	DeFazio, Peter A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigational improvements with examination of navigational breakwaters for Port Orford, Oregon.

Section	Member	Project Description
4132	Dahlkemper, Kathleen A.	(a) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a multipurpose project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania. (b) Prior work.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, any work undertaken in the formulation of a project for environmental restoration, Buhl Lake, Sharon, Pennsylvania, initiated under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 110 Stat. 3679).
4133	Murphy, Patrick J.	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration for the Delaware River and tributaries, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
4134	Dahlkemper, Kathleen A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and water quality for Elk Creek, Meadville, Pennsylvania.
4135	Dahlkemper, Kathleen A.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, focusing on the Mill Creek Drift Catcher, for Mill Creek, Erie, Pennsylvania.
4136	Carney, Christopher P.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.
4136	Holden, Tim	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.
4137	Altmire, Jason	Section 4077 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1184) is amended—(1) in subsection (a), by striking "Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania" and inserting "Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania, the Monongahela River basin, Pennsylvania,"; and (2) in subsection (b), by striking "Shaler Township" and inserting "Shaler Township, Hampton Township, Harmar Township,".
4138	Pierluisi, Pedro R.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction for Guayama, Puerto Rico.
4139	Pierluisi, Pedro R.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction and shoreline protection for the Municipality of Rincon, Puerto Rico.
4140	Kennedy, Patrick J.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction and related water resource purposes for the rivers in Providence, Rhode Island.
4141	Clyburn, James E.	The Secretary, in collaboration with all relevant Federal and non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, academia, and the general public, shall conduct comprehensive watershed studies of all 8 watersheds in South Carolina for water quality, habitat condition, environmental restoration, water supply, and the potential impacts of climate change for South Carolina.
4142	Herseth Sandlin, Stephanie	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the project for channel restoration and improvements on the James River, South Dakota, authorized by section 401(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4128) to add ecosystem restoration and watershed improvements as project purposes.
4143	Gordon, Bart	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration for Station Camp Creek, Gallatin, Tennessee.

Section	Member	Project Description
4144	Edwards, Chet	The Secretary shall conduct a study assessing the long-term impacts of water use, withdrawal, recirculation, and downstream impacts on the Whitney Lake Reservoir, Texas.
4145	Johnson, Eddie Bernice	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Hickory Creek, City of Balch Springs, Texas.
4146	Green, Al	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of modifying the Barbours Cut element of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), to a depth of 45 feet.
4146	Green, Gene	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of modifying the Barbours Cut element of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666), to a depth of 45 feet.
4147	Green, Al	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for dredged material disposal in the vicinity of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666).
4147	Green, Gene	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out a project for dredged material disposal in the vicinity of the project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3666).
4148	Doggett, Lloyd	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing the Simsboro Aquifer for water supply for the City of Balstrop, Texas.
4149	Edwards, Chet	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related water resource purposes for the Navasota River watershed, Grimes County, Texas.
4150	Cuellar, Henry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and water supply for the Rio Grande basin, Texas.
4151	Cuellar, Henry	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for Roma, Texas.
4152	Matheson, Jim	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for streambank stabilization for Cottonwood Heights, Utah.
4153	Matheson, Jim	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of existing water supply resources for Emery Town, Utah.
4154	Boucher, Rick	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of reallocating water storage at 6 reservoirs to optimize benefits for multiple-purpose use in the Big Sandy River watershed, Virginia and West Virginia.
4154	Rahall, Nick J. II	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the feasibility of reallocating water storage at 6 reservoirs to optimize benefits for multiple-purpose use in the Big Sandy River watershed, Virginia and West Virginia.

Section	Member	Project Description
4155	Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection for Buckroe and Grandview Beaches, Hampton, Virginia.
4156	Nye, Glenn C.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, including offshore breakwaters, for Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia.
4156	Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, including offshore breakwaters, for Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia.
4157	Nye, Glenn C.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shoreline protection for Hampton, Virginia.
4158	Nye, Glenn C.	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the water resource needs, including current and projected future needs, for the James River watershed, Virginia.
4158	Perriello, Thomas S. P,	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the water resource needs, including current and projected future needs, for the James River watershed, Virginia.
4158	Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive watershed study to determine the water resource needs, including current and projected future needs, for the James River watershed, Virginia.
4159	McDermott, Jim	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation channel deepening for Elliott Bay, Seattle, Washington.
4160	Smith, Adam	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction for the Green River, Kent, Washington.
4162	Moore, Gwen	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection for the Lake Michigan shoreline, City of Cudahy, Wisconsin.
5001	Arcuri, Michael A.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Connolly, Gerald E.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Cummings, Elijah E.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Edwards, Donna F.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Hoyer, Steny H.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Kanjorski, Paul E.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Norton, Eleanor Holmes	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Ruppersberger, C. A. Dutch	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Sarbanes, John P.	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5001	Van Hollen, Chris	Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
5002	Oberstar, James L.	Saint Lawrence Seaway. Section 5015(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1196) is amended by striking "$134,650,000" and inserting "$185,638,028".
5003	Boccieri, John A.	Watershed Management -- Muskingum River basin, Ohio
5003	Chu, Judy	Watershed management. San Gabriel River watershed, California.
5003	Hall, John J.	Section 5002(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1190) is amended—(1) in paragraph (9) by striking "Esopus, Plattekill, and Rondout Creeks" and inserting "Esopus, Rondout, and Wallkill watersheds";
5003	Hinchey, Maurice D.	Section 5002(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1190) is amended—(1) in paragraph (9) by striking "Esopus, Plattekill, and Rondout Creeks" and inserting "Esopus, Rondout, and Wallkill watersheds";

Section	Member	Project Description
5003	Klein, Ron	Watershed management. Loxahatchee River watershed, Jupiter, Florida.
5003	Markey, Betsy	Watershed management. South Platte River watershed, Colorado.
5003	Wilson, Charles A.	Watershed Management -- Muskingum River basin, Ohio
5004	Altmire, Jason	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela Rivers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
5004	Baldwin, Tammy	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Lower Yahara River, McFarland, Wisconsin.
5004	Brady, Robert A.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
5004	Braley, Bruce L.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Mississippi River, Davenport, Iowa.
5004	Brown, Henry E. Jr.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Congaree River, Columbia, South Carolina.
5004	Capuano, Michael E.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Massachusetts Bay (in the vicinity of Georges Island), Boston, Massachusetts.
5004	Carnahan, Russ	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Mississippi River, Kimmswick, Missouri.
5004	Cleaver, Emanuel	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Brush Creek, Kansas City, Missouri.
5004	Clyburn, James E.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Congaree River, Columbia, South Carolina.
5004	Cohen, Steve	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Wolf Creek Harbor, Mississippi River, Tennessee.
5004	Dicks, Norman D.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Ruston Way Seawall, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, Washington.
5004	Doyle, Michael F.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela Rivers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
5004	Doyle, Michael F.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Ohio River, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
5004	Ellison, Keith	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Mississippi River (in the vicinity of the lower St. Anthony Falls), Minneapolis, Minnesota.
5004	Fattah, Chaka	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
5004	Holt, Rush D.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Delaware River, Trenton, New Jersey.
5004	Jackson, Jesse L., Jr.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Lake Michigan (in the vicinity of the former USX Site), Chicago, Illinois.
5004	Kennedy, Patrick J.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Fields Point, Narragansett Bay, Providence, Rhode Island.
5004	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. East River, New York, New York.
5004	McMahon, Michael E.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Upper New York Bay, Staten Island, New York.
5004	Miller, George	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Miller Knox Shoreline, Richmond, California.
5004	Smith, Adam	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Ruston Way Seawall, Commencement Bay, Tacoma, Washington.
5004	Spratt, John M., Jr.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Congaree River, Columbia, South Carolina.
5004	Watt, Melvin L.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Abbott's Creek, Lexington, North Carolina.
5004	Wilson, Charles A.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Ohio River, Belpre, Ohio.
5004	Yarmuth, John A.	Comprehensive shoreline restoration. Pond and Mill Creek, Louisville, Kentucky.
5005	Bishop, Timothy H.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Courtney, Joe	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration

Section	Member	Project Description
5005	Delahunt, Bill	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	DeLauro, Rosa L.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Hall, John J.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Himes, James A.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Israel, Steve	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Langevin, James R.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Larson, John B.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Michaud, Michael H.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Murphy, Christopher S.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Pallone, Frank, Jr.	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Pingree, Chellie	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Shea-Porter, Carol	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5005	Sires, Albio	Northeast Coastal Region Ecosystem Restoration
5006	Edwards, Donna F.	Anacostia Watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland.
5006	Hoyer, Steny H.	Anacostia Watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland.
5006	Norton, Eleanor Holmes	Anacostia Watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland.
5006	Van Hollen, Chris	Anacostia Watershed, District of Columbia and Maryland.
5007	Castor, Kathy	Egmont Key, Florida. The Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out those portions of the project for shoreline stabilization, Egmont Key, Florida, [carried out under section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g)], that benefit federally owned property.
5008	Cummings, Elijah E.	The Secretary is authorized to carry out projects for environmental protection and restoration at the Blackwater Wildlife Refuge, Cambridge, Maryland. In carrying out such projects, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.
5008	Kratovil, Frank, Jr.	The Secretary is authorized to carry out projects for environmental protection and restoration at the Blackwater Wildlife Refuge, Cambridge, Maryland. In carrying out such projects, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.
5009	Cummings, Elijah E.	Hart-Miller Island
5009	Ruppersberger, C. A. Dutch	Hart-Miller Island
5009	Sarbanes, John P.	Hart-Miller Island
5010	Capuano, Michael E.	The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project for the environmental remediation of Gallops Island, Boston, Massachusetts. In carrying out such project, the Secretary shall accept funds from the Director of the National Park Service.
5011	Thompson, Bennie G.	Sharkey County, Mississippi. Funding for the operation and maintenance of the multiagency wildlife and environmental interpretative and education center, authorized by section 145(f) of Division H of Public Law 108–199 (118 Stat. 443), shall be provided by the Secretary of the Interior.
5012	Brown, Henry E. Jr.	The Secretary shall expeidte completion of the reconnaissance and feasibility studies for the Charleston Harbor Post 45 Project, Charleston, South Carolina, and if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, shall proceed directly to project preconstruction, engineering, and design.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, committee reports on a bill or joint resolution of a public character shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the measure. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure finds that Congress has the authority to enact this measure pursuant to its powers granted under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

FEDERAL MANDATES STATEMENT

The Committee adopts as its own the estimate of Federal mandates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 423 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (P.L. 104–4).

PREEMPTION CLARIFICATION

Section 423 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires the report of any Committee on a bill or joint resolution to include a statement on the extent to which the bill or joint resolution is intended to preempt state, local, or tribal law. The Committee states that H.R. 5892, as amended, does not preempt any state, local, or tribal law.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are created by this legislation.

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (P.L. 104–1).

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 221 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1970

SEC. 221. WRITTEN AGREEMENT REQUIREMENT FOR WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS.

(a) COOPERATION OF NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) CREDIT FOR IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) APPLICABILITY.—

(i) * * *

[(ii) LIMITATION.—In any case in which a specific provision of law provides for a non-Federal interest to receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study for, or construction or operation and maintenance of, a water resources project, the specific provision of law shall apply instead of this paragraph.]

(ii) LIMITATION.—In any case in which a specific provision of law provides for a non-Federal interest to receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a study for, or construction or operation and maintenance of, a water resources project, the Secretary shall apply—

(I) the specific provision of law instead of this paragraph; or

(II) at the request of the non-Federal interest, the specific provision of law and such provisions of this paragraph as the non-Federal interest may request.

(iii) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subparagraph affects the applicability of subsection (a)(4)(C).

[(b) DEFINITION OF NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—The term]

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—The term "non-Federal interest" means—

[(1)] *(A)* a legally constituted public body (including a federally recognized Indian tribe); or

[(2)] *(B)* a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government,

that has full authority and capability to perform the terms of its agreement and to pay damages, if necessary, in the event of failure to perform.

(2) WATER RESOURCES PROJECT.—The term "water resources project" includes projects studied, reviewed, designed, constructed, operated and maintained, or otherwise subject to Federal participation under the authority of the civil works program of the Secretary of the Army for the purposes of navigation, flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, hurricane and storm damage reduction, water supply, recreation, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife conservation, water quality, environmental infrastructure, resource protection and development, and related purposes.

(c) Every agreement entered into pursuant to this section shall be [enforcible] *enforceable* in the appropriate district court of the United States.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1986

* * * * * * *

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 905. FEASIBILITY REPORTS.

(a) PREPARATION OF REPORTS.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) COST ESTIMATES FOR FEASIBILITY REPORTS.—In preparing a feasibility report under this subsection, the Secretary shall include in the report, and any budget documents (including justification materials) submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an accounting of the total cost of the recommended plan and an estimate of the Federal and non-Federal participation in the plan based on the following scenarios:

(A) The cost of the project based on optimal levels of Federal funding for the recommended plan.

(B) The estimated cost of the project, based on a 50 percent increase in the period for implementation of the recommended plan.

(C) The estimated cost of the project, based on a 100 percent increase in the period for implementation of the recommended plan.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 906. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) MITIGATION PLANS AS PART OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After November 17, 1986, the Secretary shall not submit any proposal for the authorization of any water resources project to Congress in any report, and shall not select a project alternative in any report, unless such report contains (A) a recommendation with a specific plan to mitigate *for damages to ecological resources, including terrestrial and aquatic resources, and* fish and wildlife losses created by such project, or (B) a determination by the Secretary that such project will have negligible adverse impact on *ecological resources and* fish and wildlife *without the implementation of mitigation measures*. Specific mitigation plans shall ensure that impacts to bottomland hardwood forests are mitigated in-kind, and other habitat types are mitigated to not less than in-kind conditions, to the extent possible. *If the Secretary determines that mitigation to in-kind conditions is not possible, the Secretary shall identify in the report the basis for that determination.* In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate Federal and non-Federal agencies.

* * * * * * *

(3) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To mitigate losses to flood damage reduction capabilities and fish and wildlife resulting from a water resources project, the Secretary shall ensure that the mitigation plan for each water resources project complies with*, at a minimum,* the mitigation standards and

policies established pursuant to the regulatory programs administered by the Secretary.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1135. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) NON-FEDERAL SHARE; LIMITATION ON MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of any modifications or measures carried out or undertaken pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) shall be 25 percent. Not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share may be in kind, including a facility, supply, or service that is necessary to carry out the modification or measure. Not more than [$5,000,000] *$10,000,000* in Federal funds may be expended on any single modification or measure carried out or undertaken pursuant to this section.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

* * * * * * *

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 1001. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this section, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes 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 designated in this section:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(37) HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OHIO.—

(A) * * *

(B) WAYNE NATIONAL FOREST.—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(iii) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this subparagraph [$1,270,000] *$12,000,000*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2006. REMOTE AND SUBSISTENCE HARBORS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to project studies that include—

(1) a feasibility study, as defined in section 105(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(d)); or

(2) a detailed project report, as defined in such section 105(d) and carried out under section 107(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(a)).

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2008. REVISION OF PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT; COST SHARING.

(a) FEDERAL ALLOCATION.—Upon authorization by law of an increase in the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allocated for a water resources project or an increase in the total cost of a water resources project authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, the Secretary shall enter into a revised partnership agreement for the project to take into account the change in Federal participation in the project. *This subsection shall apply without regard to whether the original partnership agreement was entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection.*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2034. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.

(a) * * *

(b) TIMING OF PEER REVIEW.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) REASONS FOR TIMING.—If the Chief of Engineers does not initiate a peer review for a project study at a time described in paragraph (2), the Chief shall make publicly available, including on the Internet, for each of such times the reasons for not conducting the review, and shall include the reasons in the decision document for the project study.

[(3)**]** *(4)* LIMITATION ON MULTIPLE PEER REVIEW.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the Chief of Engineers to conduct multiple peer reviews for a project study.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF PANELS.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.— Upon identification of a project study for peer review under this section, but prior to initiation of the review, the Chief of Engineers shall notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the review.**]**

(4) CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.—Upon identification of a project study for peer review under this section, but prior to initiation of the review by the panel of experts, the Chief of Engineers shall—

(A) notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the review; and

(B) make publicly available, including on the Internet, information on—

(i) the dates scheduled for beginning and ending the review;

(ii) the entity that has the contract for the review; and

(iii) the names and qualifications of the panel of experts.

* * * * * * *

(f) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—

(1) * * *

[(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—After receiving a report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall—

[(A) make a copy of the report and any written response of the Chief of Engineers on recommendations contained in the report available to the public by electronic means, including the Internet; and

[(B) transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a copy of the report, together with any such written response, on the date of a final report of the Chief of Engineers or other final decision document for the project study.]

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—After receiving a report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section, the Chief of Engineers shall make available to the public, including on the Internet, and transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives—

(A) a copy of the report within 3 days of receiving the report; and

(B) a copy of any written response of the Chief of Engineers on recommendations contained in the report within 3 days of the date of the response.

(3) INCLUSION IN PROJECT STUDY.—A report on a project study from a panel of experts under this section and the written response of the Chief of Engineers shall be included in the final decision document for the project study.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2035. SAFETY ASSURANCE REVIEW.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to a safety assurance review conducted under this section.

SEC. 2036. MITIGATION FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE AND WETLANDS LOSSES.

(a) * * *

(b) STATUS REPORT.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—In reporting the status of all projects included in the report, the Secretary shall—

(A) use a uniform methodology for determining the status of all projects included in the report;

(B) use a methodology that describes both a qualitative and quantitative status for all projects in the report; and

(C) provide specific dates for and participants in the consultations required under section 906(d)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(d)(4)(B)).

[(3)**]** *(4)* AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make information contained in the status report available to the public, including on the Internet.

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3061. CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIERS PROJECT, ILLINOIS.

(a) * * *

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, at Federal expense, shall—

[(A) upgrade and make permanent Barrier I;**]**

(A) upgrade and make permanent Barrier I in its current location or at an alternative location, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;

(B) construct Barrier II, notwithstanding the project cooperation agreement with the State of Illinois dated **[**June 14, 2005**]** *November 21, 2003, as amended on July 14, 2005*;

(C) acquire real estate interests necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of Barrier I and Barrier II;

[(C)**]** *(D)* operate and maintain Barrier I and Barrier II as a system to optimize effectiveness;

[(D)**]** *(E)* conduct, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities, a study of a range of options and technologies for reducing impacts of hazards that may reduce the efficacy of the Barriers; **[**and**]**

[(E)] *(F)* provide to each State a credit in an amount equal to the amount of funds contributed by the State toward Barrier II[.]*; and*

(G) construct additional barriers or other fish deterrents at other locations in the vicinity of the Chicago Area Waterway System, if determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) USE OF CREDIT.—A State may apply a credit provided to the State under [paragraph (1)(E)] *paragraph (1)(F)* to any cost sharing responsibility for an existing or future Federal project carried out by the Secretary in the State.

* * * * * * *

(d) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities, shall conduct, at Federal expense, a feasibility study of the range of options and technologies available to prevent the spread of aquatic nuisance species between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins through the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal and other aquatic pathways. *The study shall include a fully developed analysis of an alternative for hydrologic separation between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River basins. The hydrologic separation alternative shall include identification of measures to prevent the transfer of aquatic nuisance species between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River basins through surface water.*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3101. TWO HARBORS, MINNESOTA.

(a) * * *

(b) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURES.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project shall be [$7,000,000] *$14,000,000*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE IV—STUDIES

* * * * * * *

SEC. 4070. OHIO RIVER, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out projects for flood damage reduction on the [Ohio River] *Ohio River and tributaries* in Mahoning, Columbiana, Jefferson, Belmont, Noble, Monroe, Washington, Athens, Meigs, Gallia, Lawrence, and Scioto Counties, Ohio.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 4077. WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of structural and nonstructural flood damage reduction, stream bank protection, storm water management, channel clearing and modification, and watershed coordination measures in the [Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania] *Mahoning River basin, Pennsylvania, the Monongahela River basin, Pennsylvania,* the Allegheny River basin, Pennsylvania, and the Upper Ohio River basin, Pennsylvania, to provide a level of flood protection sufficient to prevent future losses to communities located in such basins from flooding such as oc-

curred in September 2004, but not less than a 100-year level of flood protection.

(b) PRIORITY COMMUNITIES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the following Pennsylvania communities: Marshall Township, Ross Township, [Shaler Township] *Shaler Township, Hampton Township, Harmar Township,* Jackson Township, Harmony, Zelienople, Darlington Township, Houston Borough, Chartiers Township, Washington, Canton Township, Tarentum Borough, and East Deer Township.

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 5002. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) PROJECT LOCATIONS.—The locations referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(9) [Esopus, Plattekill, and Rondout Creeks] *Esopus, Rondout, and Wallkill watersheds*, Greene, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties, New York.

* * * * * * *

(19) San Gabriel River watershed, California.

(20) South Platte River watershed, Colorado.

(21) Loxahatchee River watershed, Jupiter, Florida.

(22) Hudson River watershed, Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties, New York.

(23) Muskingum River basin, Ohio.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 5015. SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized, using amounts contributed by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation under subsection (b), to carry out projects for operations, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation, including associated maintenance dredging, of the Eisenhower and Snell lock facilities and related navigational infrastructure for the Saint Lawrence Seaway, at a total cost of [$134,650,000] *$185,638,028*.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 5056. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through [2011] *2015*.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) * * *

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[Sec. 211. Performance of specialized or technical services.]

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 211. PERFORMANCE OF SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES.

[(a) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this section, the term "State" has the meaning given the term in section 6501 of title 31, United States Code.

[(b) AUTHORITY.—The Corps of Engineers may provide specialized or technical services to a Federal agency (other than an agency of the Department of Defense) or a State or local government under section 6505 of title 31, United States Code, only if the chief executive of the requesting entity submits to the Secretary—

[(1) a written request describing the scope of the services to be performed and agreeing to reimburse the Corps for all costs associated with the performance of the services; and

[(2) a certification that includes adequate facts to establish that the services requested are not reasonably and quickly available through ordinary business channels.

[(c) CORPS AGREEMENT TO PERFORM SERVICES.—The Secretary, after receiving a request described in subsection (b) to provide specialized or technical services, shall, before entering into an agreement to perform the services—

[(1) ensure that the requirements of subsection (b) are met with regard to the request for services; and

[(2) execute a certification that includes adequate facts to establish that the Corps is uniquely equipped to perform such services.

[(d) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

[(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the last day of each calendar year, 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 identifying any request submitted by a Federal agency (other than an agency of the Department of De-

fense) or a State or local government to the Corps to provide specialized or technical services.

[(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall include, with respect to each request described in paragraph (1)—

[(A) a description of the scope of services requested;

[(B) the certifications required under subsection (b) and (c);

[(C) the status of the request;

[(D) the estimated and final cost of the services;

[(E) the status of reimbursement;

[(F) a description of the scope of services performed; and

[(G) copies of all certifications in support of the request.

[(e) ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The Engineering Research and Development Center is exempt from the requirements of this section.]

* * * * * * *

SEC. 214. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, after public notice, may accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the evaluation of [permits under the jurisdiction] *permits of such entities related to projects for a public purpose under the jurisdiction* of the Department of the Army.

[(b) EFFECT ON PERMITTING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under subsection (a) will not impact impartial decisionmaking with respect to permits, either substantively or procedurally.]

(b) EFFECT ON PERMITTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under subsection (a) will not impact impartial decision-making with respect to permits, either substantively or procedurally.

(2) IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the evaluation of permits carried out using funds accepted under this section shall—

(A) be reviewed by the District Commander of the Corps District in which the project or activity is located, unless the evaluation of the permit is initially conducted by the District Commander whereby the review shall be conducted by the Commander of the Corps Division in which the District is located; and

(B) utilize the same procedures for decisions that would otherwise be required for the evaluation of permits for similar projects or activities not carried out using funds authorized under this section.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds accepted under this section shall be used to carry out a review of the evaluation of permits required under subsection (b)(2)(A).

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public, including on the Internet.

[(c)] *(e)* DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under this section shall be in effect from October 1, 2000, through December 31, [2010] *2016*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 522. MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts, substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the [draft evaluation report of the New England District Engineer entitled "Phase I Muddy River Master Plan", dated June 2000] *Final Decision Document and Environmental Assessment Report of the New England District Engineer entitled "Muddy River Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts", dated September 2003, at a total cost of $79,200,000*.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 536. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER AND TILLAMOOK BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section [$30,000,000] *$45,000,000*.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 206. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than [$5,000,000] *$10,000,000* in Federal funds may be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality.

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 510. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a [pilot] program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

* * * * * * *

(d) COST SHARING.—

(1) * * *

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) IN-KIND SERVICES.—In accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), the non-Federal interest may provide any portion of the non-Federal share of the costs of the project carried out under this section in the form of in-kind services and materials.

(D) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—In accordance with section 2007 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2222), funds provided by a Federal department or agency other than the Corps of Engineers for a project carried out under this section shall be credited towards the non-Federal share of the cost of project.

(e) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than $10,000,000 in Federal funds may be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality.

[(e)**]** *(f)* COOPERATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall cooperate with the heads of appropriate Federal agencies, including—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(f) PROJECT.—The Secretary shall establish at least 1 project under this section in each of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.**]**

(g) PROJECTS.—The Secretary may carry out projects under this section in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, with the goal of carrying out projects in each of the States of Delaware, New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

[(g)**]** *(h)* PROTECTION OF RESOURCES.—A project established under this section shall be carried out using such measures as are necessary to protect environmental, historic, and cultural resources.

[(h)**]** *(i)* REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, together with a recommendation concerning whether or not the program should be implemented on a national basis.

[(i)**]** *(j)* AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section **[**$40,000,000**]** *$50,000,000*.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 554. ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for a project for shoreline protection, Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, may carry out the project, at a total cost of **[**$20,000,000**]** *$27,000,000*.

* * * * * * *

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1990

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) * * *

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[Sec. 314. Operation and maintenance of hydroelectric facilities.]
Sec. 314. Operation and maintenance of navigation and hydroelectric facilities.

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 314. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.

[Activities currently performed by personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of hydroelectric power generating facilities at Corps of Engineers water resources projects are to be considered as inherently governmental functions and not commercial activities. This section does not prohibit contracting out major maintenance or other functions which are currently contracted out or studying services not directly connected with project maintenance and operations.]

SEC. 314. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION AND HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.

Activities currently performed by personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of navigation or hydroelectric power generating facilities, including all personnel under the direction of the Secretary in connection with the operation and maintenance of navigational infrastructure such as floodgates, locks, and dams, at Corps of Engineers water resources projects, are considered to be inherently governmental functions and not commercial activities. This section does not prohibit contracting out major maintenance or other functions that are currently contracted out or studying services not directly connected with project maintenance and operations.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

(division C of Public Law 111–8)

DIVISION C—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

* * * * * * *

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

* * * * * * *

SEC. 116. The [Colorado Department of Natural Resources is authorized] *Colorado Department of Natural Resources, or its assignee, is authorized* to perform modifications of the facility (Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado), and any required mitigation which results from implementation of the project: *Provided,* That in carrying out the reassignment of storage space provided for in this section, the Secretary shall collaborate with the Colorado Department of Natural Resources and local interests to determine costs to be repaid for storage that reflects the limited reliability of the resources and the capability of non-Federal interests to make use of the reallocated storage space in Chatfield Reservoir, Colorado.

* * * * * * *

MINORITY VIEWS

The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2010 must be viewed in the context of the extraordinary economic conditions that currently face the Nation. Although we strongly support investment in our national infrastructure, we have serious issues with the scope and timing of this bill.

The Obama stimulus bill of last year was supposed to put people to work and help us grow out of this recession; but it hasn't worked. The reason it hasn't worked is because only a small fraction of the money was spent on job producing investments. Americans were assured by the Administration that the Obama stimulus bill would halt the climbing unemployment rate at 8%. Today, the unemployment rate is close to 10%. This bill represents another empty promise to the taxpayers, because here is no money in the system to fund the projects this bill claims to move forward.

The national debt has grown at an alarming rate due to the economic downturn, the bank bailouts, and the economic stimulus. According to the Treasury Department, the U.S. debt will exceed $13.6 trillion this year. That is 93 percent of the expected gross domestic product, or GDP. By 2012, according to Bloomberg.com, the total U.S. debt will exceed the value of the nation's annual economic output. Financing that debt is taking an ever increasing portion of the Nation's wealth. This year, it will cost 32 percent of GDP to finance our debt, and this is while interest rates are low. When interest rates rise, as they eventually will, financing the debt will be even harder to manage. The effect of all of this is a further slowing of economic growth.

In the past, Republicans have been consistent advocates for Corps of Engineers projects, and this will one day continue. But now, times are different, and we must, unfortunately, delay even the authorization of good projects. Even wise investments in navigation and flood protection infrastructure should receive careful scrutiny right now.

Republicans support common sense approaches to protecting our environment and investments in water infrastructure. We believe that providing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers an opportunity to relieve the current authorization list of water infrastructure projects is prudent at this time.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2010 also contains some troubling provisions.

Section 2012 would repeal a provision of law that prohibits the Corps of Engineers from performing activities that compete directly with the private sector. While the intent of this provision is to ensure levee inspections are handled quickly by the most qualified entity, in many cases the Corps of Engineers, the language is overly broad and will cause unintended consequences. An amendment that was offered by the Minority was withdrawn at the request of

the majority that would have clarified the intent of Section 2012. The Chairman admitted at the Full Committee Markup on July 29, 2010 that this section was overly broad and he stated his intent to work with the Minority to correct this deficiency. To date, this has not happened.

Section 2013 requires the Corps of Engineers to assume the funds will be spent over an extended period rather than as efficiently as possible. If the Corps has to assume the funds will be spent over an extended period rather than as efficiently as possible, projects will cost more. The effect of this provision would be to cause alternative Benefit-Cost ratios for projects to be calculated with less favorable outcomes. It would apply to feasibility studies as well as budget documents. The provision diminishes further the likelihood that projects will get authorized or funded. This provision will impact all provisions in Title IV of WRDA 2010 and all studies currently underway.

We hope that we will soon see the day when we can work together to produce a WRDA bill with real promises attached. However, when faced with the partisan approach taken in this Act and the current economic conditions, the prospect of a successful WRDA bill certainly appears to be a hope for future years. For the reasons stated above, we cannot support a WRDA bill at this time.

JOHN L. MICA.

○