realities of our economy, skyrocketing energy and input costs, not enough workers, and more. A successful reorganization can leave both debtors and creditors better off.

At the same time, we just don't have certain data about some of these bankruptcy policy changes or their likely long-term effects. That is why these changes to our Bankruptcy Code should be temporary.

An additional 2 years of normal post-pandemic bankruptcy activity will give us a better understanding of the underlying policy issues and will help guide the future design of our bankruptcy system.

It is also worth noting that this bill did not go through regular order in the Judiciary Committee, so it did not benefit from robust oversight or legislative hearings. Americans are best served when Federal policy is made after careful and focused congressional deliberation, something that would have occurred in regular order.

The bill makes clarifications to small business bankruptcies that relate to eligibility, trustee responsibilities, and bankruptcy plan requirements. These would be permanent. The bill also makes accounting-related clarifications that will operate to improve the U.S. Trustee System Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of our committee, Mr. NEGUSE, for his leadership joining with the Senate, and I thank him for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

This is a fresh start. This is a new opportunity in important bipartisan, bicameral legislation that Mr. NEGUSE has nurtured and introduced and will ensure, under his leadership, that our bankruptcy system works for the entrepreneurs, small businesses, homeowners, and American families, who are the backbone of this country and of the communities where they live and work.

Having the privilege of having served on the Judiciary Committee for some time, I am reminded of the work that we have done, almost like a puzzle putting together a better matrix for the American people to be able to renew their lives even as they may have the necessity of filing for bankruptcy.

If there is one fundamental principle of American bankruptcy law, it is the promise of a fresh start, and the fresh start is quintessentially an American idea. It is a promise that even when your best efforts have failed, you are not a failure, and you will have a chance to get back up and try again. It is a promise that your debts will not destroy you.

Increasing the debt limit for small businesses electing to file for bankruptcy under subchapter V of chapter 11 to $7.5 million is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly thank Mr. NEGUSE because really small businesses across America have been raising this question, making the point that it is impossible for them to survive with the previous cap for individual chapter 11 filers of $2.75 million.

This legislation will provide much-needed certainty that the bankruptcy system will be responsive to hardworking Americans and their families trying to stay afloat in a world that can be turned upside down by global economic shocks.

Just as I started, again, the filing of bankruptcy should not cause one to never renew again. This legislation, with the leadership of Mr. NEGUSE, gives our American businesspersons, homeowners, and others a fresh start.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1715

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I will simply close by first thanking the distinguished chairwoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is always so articulate and I am grateful for her leadership and kind remarks.

I also thank Mr. CICILLINE, the chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, whose leadership was pivotal; and as I mentioned before, my Senate partners and Representative CLINE.

At the end of the day, I think we have a real opportunity today to honor American ingenuity, entrepreneurship, and innovation by providing our small businesses across the United States in Main Street after Main Street with the opportunity and the tools that they need to be able to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is a small step in that direction. It is bipartisan. It passed the Senate unanimously, and I certainly hope that it will pass this Chamber unanimously as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3823, the "Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment and Technical Corrections Act."

This important bipartisan, bicameral legislation introduced by my colleague, Congressman Neguse, will ensure that our bankruptcy system works for the entrepreneurs, small businesses, homeowners, and American families who are the backbone of this country and of the communities where they live and work.

If there is one foundational principle of American bankruptcy law, it is the promise of the "fresh start." The fresh start is a quintessentially American idea. It is the promise that even when your best efforts have failed, you will have a chance to get back up and try again. It is the promise that your debts will not destroy you.

By increasing the debt limit for small businesses electing to file for bankruptcy under subchapter V of Chapter 11 to $7.5 million, and for individual Chapter 13 filers to $2.75 million, this legislation will provide much-needed certainty that the bankruptcy system will be responsive to hardworking Americans and their families trying to stay afloat in a world that can get turned upside down by global economic shocks.

We all benefit from the fresh start. When it works as intended, it boosts economic growth, reduces unemployment, and encourages innovation and entrepreneurship. This legislation represents a major step toward ensuring that our bankruptcy system makes good on that promise.

I thank my colleagues, Representatives Neguse and Cline, for their leadership on this bill and for their work to ensure that small businesses and families have meaningful access to the bankruptcy process.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 3823.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3823.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2022

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7776) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7776

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

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

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

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

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

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. FEDERAL BREAKWATERS AND JETTIES.

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

(b) CLASSIFICATION OF ACTIVITY.—The Secretary may not classify any repair or maintenance activity of a Federal jetty or breakwater carried out under subsection (a) as major rehabilitation of such jetty or breakwater—

(1) if the Secretary determines that—

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

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

(2) if—

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

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

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

Section 5(a)(1) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure'' and all that follows through ''non-Federal sponsor.'' and inserting ''in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure or project damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature to the pre-storm level of protection, to the design level of protection, or, notwithstanding the authorized dimensions of the structure or project, to a level sufficient to meet the authorized purpose of such structure or project, whichever provides greater protection, when, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure or project for hurricane or shore protection, including to ensure the structure or project is functioning adequately to protect against projected changes in wave action or height or storm surge (including changes that result from relative sea level change over the useful life of the structure or project), subject to the condition that the Chief of Engineers may include modifications to the structure or project to address major deficiencies or implement nonstructural alternatives to the repair or restoration of the structure if requested by the non-Federal sponsor.''.

SEC. 103. SHORELINE AND RIVERINE RESTORATION.

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

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**FLOOD MITIGATION AND RIVERINE RESTORATION PROGRAM**'' and inserting ''**SHORELINE AND RIVERINE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

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

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

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

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

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

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

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

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''flood damages'' and inserting ''flood and hurricane and storm damages, including the use of natural features and nature-based features, as defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

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

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

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

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

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

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

(B) in paragraph (3)—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(6) in subsection (e)—

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

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

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

''(35) Maumee River, Ohio.''; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 105. REMOVAL OF MANMADE OBSTRUCTION TO AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out an aquatic ecosystem restoration project, at the request of a non-Federal interest and with the consent of the owner of a manmade obstruction, the Secretary shall determine whether the removal of such obstruction from the aquatic environment within the geographic scope of the project is necessary to meet the aquatic ecosystem restoration goals of the project.

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

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

(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—The authority contained in this section shall not apply to the Ice Harbor Lock and Dam, the Little Goose Lock and Dam, the Lower Granite Lock and Dam, and the Lower Monumental Lock and Dam on Snake River, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 21).

SEC. 106. NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING STUDY.

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

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

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

(2) best practices for coastal change mapping;

(3) how to most effectively—

(A) collect and analyze such advanced geospatial information;

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

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

(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

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

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

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

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

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

(D) demonstrate remote sensing tools for coastal mapping.

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

(e) PANEL.—

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

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

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

(B) coordinate the use of geospatial information and remote sensing tools, and the application of the best practices identified under the study, by Federal agencies; and

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

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

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

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

(2) any geographical areas recommended for additional study.

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

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

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

SEC. 108. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.

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

''(e) PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(5) TREATMENT.—

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

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

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

SEC. 109. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

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

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

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

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

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

(3) in subsection (f)—

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

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

(B) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

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

(b) OUTREACH AND ACCESS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(C) conduct regular outreach and engagement, including through hosting seminars and community information sessions, with local elected officials, community organizations, and previous and potential non-Federal interests, on opportunities to address local water resources challenges through the water resources development authorities of the Secretary;

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

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

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

SEC. 111. PROJECT PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

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

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

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

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

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

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

(a) STUDY.—

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

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

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

(B) identify opportunities to carry out managed aquifer recharge projects in areas that are experiencing, or have recently experienced, prolonged drought conditions, aquifer depletion, or water supply scarcity; and

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

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

(b) WORKING GROUP.—

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

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

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

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

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

(D) dams that provide recharge enhancement benefits;

(E) groundwater hydrology;

(F) conjunctive use water systems; and

(G) agricultural water resources, including the use of aquifers for irrigation purposes.

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

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

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

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

(D) assist Corps of Engineers offices at the headquarter, division, and district levels with raising awareness to non-Federal interests on the potential benefits of carrying out managed aquifer recharge projects; and

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

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

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

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

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

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

SEC. 113. FLOOD EASEMENT DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and maintain a database containing an inventory of—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(C) the Federal agency that holds the easement;

(D) any conditions of the easement, including—

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

(ii) any conservation requirements; and

(iii) any restoration requirements;

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

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

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

(c) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make the full database established under subsection (a) available to the public in searchable form, including on the internet.

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

SEC. 114. ASSESSMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEES.

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

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

(2) achieve greater flood resiliency; and

(3) restore hydrological and ecological connections with adjacent floodplains that achieve greater environmental benefits without undermining the objectives of paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

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

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

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

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

(D) the potential costs and benefits (including environmental benefits and implications for levee-protected communities located in a Special Flood Hazard Area) from modifying the applicable levee system to restore connections with adjacent floodplains.

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

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

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

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

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

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 115. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LEVEE INSPECTIONS.

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

SEC. 116. ASSESSMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

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

(1) any dam that is meeting its authorized purposes and that may be a priority for rehabilitation, environmental performance enhancements, or retrofits to add or replace power generation (at a powered or nonpowered dam), and the recommendations of the Secretary for addressing each such dam; and

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

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

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

SEC. 117. NATIONAL LOW-HEAD DAM INVENTORY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 118. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

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

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

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

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

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

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

''(i) assistance for planning to ameliorate flood hazards, to avoid repetitive flooding impacts, to anticipate, prepare, and adapt to changing climatic conditions and extreme weather events, and to withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruption due to flood hazards; and

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 119. TRIBAL LIAISON.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(6) training and tools to facilitate the ability of Corps of Engineers staff to effectively engage with Tribal communities in a culturally competent manner, especially in regards to lands of ancestral, historic, or cultural significance to a Tribal community, including burial sites; and

(7) such other issues identified by the Secretary.

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 120. TRIBAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

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

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

(b) CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, the Nez Perce Tribe, and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, shall revise and carry out the village development plan for the Dalles Dam to provide replacement villages for each Indian village submerged as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam and the John Day Dam.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF LAND.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) for any organization that—

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

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

''(ii) from a specific community; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) solicit information from stakeholders on potential projects that may require disposal of contaminated sediments in a confined aquatic disposal facility;

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

(3) provide an opportunity for public comment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) identification of methods to prioritize the use of dredged material to benefit water resources development projects in areas experiencing vulnerabilities to coastal land loss.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(3) EFFECT ON OTHER ENTITIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that expediting the review of a proposal for a mitigation bank through the use of funds accepted and expended under this subsection does not adversely affect the timeline for review (in the Corps of Engineers district in which the mitigation bank is to be located) of such proposals of other entities that have not contributed funds under this subsection.

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

''(5) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(C) a comprehensive list of the proposals for mitigation banks reviewed and approved using funds accepted under subsection (e) during the previous fiscal year, including a description of any effects of such subsection on the timelines for review of proposals of other entities that have not contributed funds under such subsection; and''.

SEC. 126. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, other Federal and State agencies, and the applicable non-Federal interest, shall coordinate efforts to remove or remediate contaminated sediments and legacy high-phosphorous sediments associated with the following water resources development projects:

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

(2) the project for navigation, Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oregon and Washington, in the vicinity of the Albina Turning Basin, River Mile 10, and the Post Office Bar, Portland Harbor, River Mile 2.

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

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

(5) The project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida Project, Central Everglades Restoration Plan, Florida, in the vicinity of Lake Okeechobee.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall jointly submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on efforts to remove or remediate contaminated sediments associated with the projects identified in subsection (a), including, if applicable, any specific recommendations for actions or agreements necessary to undertake such work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

''(A) Reserve component officers.

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

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

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

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

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

(c) OTHER TRANSACTIONAL AUTHORITY.—

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

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

(A) the dollar amount of the transaction; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) advance the use of natural features and nature-based features, as defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a));

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

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

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

SEC. 130. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

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

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

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

SEC. 131. CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.

Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) CAPACITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may work with or contract with an institution of higher education, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 132. RECORDS REGARDING MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS WHO PERFORM DUTY AT LAKE OKEECHOBEE, FLORIDA, DURING A HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM.

(a) SERVICE RECORDS.—The Secretary shall indicate in the service record of a member or employee of the Corps of Engineers who performs covered duty that such member or employee was exposed to microcystin in the line of duty.

(b) COVERED DUTY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered duty'' means duty performed—

(1) during a period when the Florida Department of Environmental Protection has determined that there is a concentration of microcystin of greater than 8 parts per billion in the waters of Lake Okeechobee resulting from a harmful algal bloom in such lake; and

(2) at or near any of the following structures:

(A) S–77.

(B) S–78.

(C) S–79.

(D) S–80.

(E) S–308.

SEC. 133. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET, LOUISIANA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) sections 7012(b) and 7013 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1280), together with the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234), authorize and direct the Secretary to close and restore the ecosystem adversely affected by the construction and operation of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, at full Federal expense; and

(2) the Secretary should quickly begin construction of such project using existing authorities.

SEC. 134. WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 5014 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''aquatic''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting ''ecosystem restoration,'' after ''flood damage reduction,''.

SEC. 135. APPLICABILITY.

None of the funds appropriated by title III of division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58) may be used to carry out this Act, or any amendments made by this Act.

TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(11) POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Project for recreational access, including enclosed swimming areas, Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, District of Columbia.

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

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

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

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

(16) TAMPA BACK BAY, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, including the use of natural features and nature-based features for protection and recreation, Tampa Back Bay, Florida.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(24) KENTUCKY RIVER AND NORTH FORK KENTUCKY RIVER, KENTUCKY.—Project for flood risk management on the Kentucky River and North Fork Kentucky River near Beattyville and Jackson, Kentucky.

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

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

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

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

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

(30) TOWN OF NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management between Whiting's and Falls ponds, North Attleborough, Massachusetts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(37) TITTABAWASSEE RIVER WATERSHED, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and related conservation benefits, Tittabawassee River, Chippewa River, Pine River, and Tobacco River, Midland County, Michigan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(63) EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management for economically disadvantaged communities, as defined by the Secretary pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note), along the United States-Mexico border, El Paso County, Texas.

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

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

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

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

(68) CEDAR ISLAND, VIRGINIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and navigation, Cedar Island, Virginia.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) SAVANNAH HARBOR, GEORGIA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Savannah Harbor Expansion Project, Georgia, authorized by section 7002(1) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1364; 132 Stat. 3839), without evaluation of additional deepening.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 202. EXPEDITED COMPLETION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577).

(2) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Florida, authorized by section 1001(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1051).

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

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

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

(2) Improvements to segment 1B of the navigation project for Houston Ship Channel Expansion Channel Improvement Project, Harris, Chambers, and Galveston Counties, Texas, authorized by section 401(1)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2734).

SEC. 203. EXPEDITED MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

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

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

(2) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LOUISIANA.—The study for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), is modified to authorize the Secretary to investigate increasing the scope of the project to provide protection against a 200-year storm event.

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

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

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

(4) LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NEW JERSEY.—The study for flood control, Lower Saddle River, New Jersey, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119), is modified to authorize the Secretary to review the previously authorized study and take into consideration changes in hydraulic and hydrologic circumstances and local economic development since the study was initially authorized.

SEC. 204. CORPS OF ENGINEERS RESERVOIR SEDIMENTATION ASSESSMENT.

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

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

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

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

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

(4) the identification of any potential effects of the sediment over the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act on the areas immediately upstream and downstream of the reservoir;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) estimate—

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

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

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

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

SEC. 206. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON DREDGE CAPACITY.

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

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

(A) the dredging needs to—

(i) construct deepenings or widenings at authorized but not constructed projects and the associated operations and maintenance needs of such projects; and

(ii) operate and maintain existing Federal navigation channels;

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

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

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

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

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

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

(A) the east coast region;

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

(C) the gulf coast region; and

(D) the Great Lakes region;

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

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

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

(8) any recommendations of the Secretary for adding additional domestic hopper and pipeline dredging capacity, including adding public and private dredging vessels to the domestic hopper and pipeline dredge fleet to efficiently service water resources development projects.

(b) OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide interested stakeholders, including representatives from the commercial dredging industry, with an opportunity to submit comments to the Secretary.

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

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

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

SEC. 207. MAINTENANCE DREDGING DATA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 209. OUACHITA RIVER WATERSHED, ARKANSAS AND LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a review of projects in the Ouachita River watershed, Arkansas and Louisiana, under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a).

SEC. 210. REPORT ON SANTA BARBARA STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CALIFORNIA.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report that provides an updated economic review of the remaining portions of the project for flood damage reduction, Santa Barbara streams, Lower Mission Creek, California, authorized by section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577), taking into consideration work already completed by the non-Federal interest.

SEC. 211. DISPOSITION STUDY ON SALINAS DAM AND RESERVOIR, CALIFORNIA.

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

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

(2) ensure that the study addresses any potential repairs or modifications to the project necessary to meet Federal and State dam safety requirements prior to transferring the project.

SEC. 212. EXCESS LANDS REPORT FOR WHITTIER NARROWS DAM, CALIFORNIA.

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

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

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

(b) LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Los Angeles County Drainage Area project'' means the project for flood control, Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, authorized by section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4611; 130 Stat. 1690).

SEC. 213. COLEBROOK RIVER RESERVOIR, CONNECTICUT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 214. COMPREHENSIVE CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA STUDY.

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

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

(1) is authorized to—

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

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

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

SEC. 215. STUDY ON SHELLFISH HABITAT AND SEAGRASS, FLORIDA CENTRAL GULF COAST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall carry out a study, and submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report, on projects and activities carried out through the Engineer Research and Development Center to restore shellfish habitat and seagrass in coastal estuaries in the Florida Central Gulf Coast.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with independent expert scientists and other regional stakeholders with relevant expertise and experience; and

(2) coordinate with Federal, State, and local agencies providing oversight for both short- and long-term monitoring of the projects and activities described in subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 216. NORTHERN ESTUARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FLORIDA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA PROJECT.—The term ''Central and Southern Florida Project'' has the meaning given that term in section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

(2) NORTHERN ESTUARIES.—The term ''northern estuaries'' means the Caloosahatchee Estuary, Charlotte Harbor, Indian River Lagoon, Lake Worth Lagoon, and St. Lucie River Estuary.

(3) SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''South Florida ecosystem'' means the area consisting of the land and water within the boundary of the South Florida Water Management District in effect on July 1, 1999.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''South Florida ecosystem'' includes—

(i) the Everglades;

(ii) the Florida Keys;

(iii) the contiguous near-shore coastal water of South Florida; and

(iv) Florida's Coral Reef.

(4) STUDY AREA.—The term ''study area'' means all lands and waters within—

(A) the northern estuaries;

(B) the South Florida ecosystem; and

(C) the study area boundaries of the Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program and the Coastal and Heartland Estuary Partnership, authorized pursuant to section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(b) PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall develop, in cooperation with the non-Federal sponsors of the Central and Southern Florida project and any relevant Federal, State, and Tribal agencies, a proposed comprehensive plan for the purpose of restoring, preserving, and protecting the northern estuaries.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall develop a proposed comprehensive plan that provides for ecosystem restoration within the northern estuaries, including the elimination of harmful discharges from Lake Okeechobee.

(3) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress for approval—

(A) the proposed comprehensive plan developed under this subsection; and

(B) recommendations for future feasibility studies within the study area for the ecosystem restoration of the northern estuaries.

(4) INTERIM REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the submission of the proposed comprehensive plan under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall submit to Congress an interim report on the development of the proposed comprehensive plan.

(5) ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND ANALYSES.—Notwithstanding the submission of the proposed comprehensive plan under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall continue to conduct such studies and analyses after the date of such submission as are necessary for the purpose of restoring, preserving, and protecting the northern estuaries.

(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the alteration or amendment of the schedule for completion of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.

SEC. 217. REPORT ON SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.

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

(1) Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan projects, as authorized by or pursuant to section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680; 121 U.S.C. 1269; 132 U.S.C. 3786);

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 218. REVIEW OF RECREATIONAL HAZARDS AT BUFORD DAM, LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GEORGIA.

The Secretary shall—

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

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

SEC. 219. REVIEW OF RECREATIONAL HAZARDS AT THE BANKS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall—

(1) carry out a review of potential threats to human life and safety from use of designated recreational areas at the banks of the Mississippi River, Louisiana; and

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

SEC. 220. HYDRAULIC EVALUATION OF UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS RIVER.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 221. DISPOSITION STUDY ON HYDROPOWER IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY, OREGON.

(a) DISPOSITION STUDY.—

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

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

(A) Willamette Valley hydropower project operations;

(B) other authorized purposes of such project;

(C) cost apportionments;

(D) dam safety;

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Willamette Valley hydropower project'' means the system of dams and reservoir projects authorized to generate hydropower and the power features that operate in conjunction with the main regulating dam facilities, including the Big Cliff, Dexter, and Foster re-regulating dams in the Willamette River Basin, Oregon, as authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1222; 62 Stat. 1178; 64 Stat. 177; 68 Stat. 1264; 74 Stat. 499; 100 Stat. 4144).

SEC. 222. HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL EXPANSION CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, TEXAS.

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

SEC. 223. SABINE–NECHES WATERWAY NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, TEXAS.

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

SEC. 224. NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VIRGINIA.

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

SEC. 225. COASTAL VIRGINIA, VIRGINIA.

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

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

SEC. 226. WESTERN INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY.

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

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

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

(3) increasing water supply; or

(4) aquatic ecosystem restoration.

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

(c) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—

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

(A) Federal, State, and local agencies;

(B) Indian Tribes;

(C) non-Federal interests; and

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

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

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

(B) incorporate—

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

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

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

(1) the results of the study; and

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

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

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

SEC. 227. REPORT ON SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report that describes and documents the use of contracts and subcontracts with Small Disadvantaged Businesses in carrying out the water resources development authorities of the Secretary.

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

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

SEC. 228. REPORT ON SOLAR ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

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

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

(A) include a description of the economic, environmental, and technical viability of installing and maintaining, or contracting with third parties to install and maintain, photovoltaic solar panels at covered projects;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 229. ASSESSMENT OF COASTAL FLOODING MITIGATION MODELING AND TESTING CAPACITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 230. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON EASEMENTS RELATED TO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

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

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

(1) the findings of the Secretary relating to—

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

(B) whether increased use of covered easements in relation to such projects could promote greater participation from cooperating landowners in addressing local flooding or environmental restoration challenges;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) is permanently recorded; and

(5) is enforceable under Federal and State law.

SEC. 231. ASSESSMENT OF FOREST, RANGELAND, AND WATERSHED RESTORATION SERVICES ON LANDS OWNED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

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

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

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

(C) a wilderness study area; or

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

SEC. 232. ELECTRONIC PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.

Section 2040(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Water Resources Development Act of 2016'' and inserting ''Water Resources Development Act of 2022''; and

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

''(2) REPORT ON ELECTRONIC SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and

Public Works of the Senate a quarterly report describing the status of the implementation of this section.''.

SEC. 233. REPORT ON CORROSION PREVENTION ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report that describes—

(1) the extent to which the Secretary has carried out section 1033 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2350);

(2) the extent to which the Secretary has incorporated corrosion prevention activities (as defined in such section) at water resources development projects constructed or maintained by the Secretary since the date of enactment of such section; and

(3) in instances where the Secretary has not incorporated corrosion prevention activities at such water resources development projects since such date, an explanation as to why such corrosion prevention activities have not been incorporated.

SEC. 234. GAO STUDIES ON MITIGATION.

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

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

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

(A) investigate the extent to which—

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

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

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

(iv) ongoing mitigation projects or activities are undertaken to mitigate for fish and wildlife losses from the operation and maintenance of a project (including periodic review and updating of such projects or activities);

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

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

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

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

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

(b) STUDY ON THE COMPENSATORY MITIGATION.—

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

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

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

(i) mitigation banks;

(ii) in-lieu fee programs; and

(iii) direct mitigation by permittees;

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) UPDATE.—In conjunction with the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall review and update the findings and recommendations, including a review of Federal agency compliance with such recommendations, in the report of the Comptroller General entitled, ''Corps of Engineers Does Not Have an Effective Oversight Approach to Ensure That Compensatory Mitigation Is Occurring'' and dated September 2005 (GAO–05–898).

SEC. 235. GAO STUDY ON WATERBORNE STATISTICS.

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

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

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

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

(B) the protection of proprietary information.

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

SEC. 236. GAO STUDY ON THE INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION INTO THE NATIONAL LEVEE DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of a study on the sharing of levee information and the integration of information into the National Levee Database by the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency in accordance with section 9004 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall—

(1) investigate the information sharing protocols and procedures between the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency regarding the construction of new Federal flood protection projects;

(2) analyze the timeliness of the integration of information relating to newly constructed flood protection projects into the National Levee Database;

(3) identify any delays between the construction of a new Federal flood protection project and when a policyholder of the National Flood Insurance Program would realize a premium discount due to the construction of a new Federal flood protection project; and

(4) determine whether current information sharing protocols are adversely impacting the ability of the Secretary to perform accurate benefit-cost analysis for future flood risk management activities.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

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

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

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

''(A) a lack of local support;

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

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

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

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

''(b) PROPOSED DEAUTHORIZATION LIST.—

''(1) PRELIMINARY LIST OF PROJECTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(3) PUBLIC COMMENT AND CONSULTATION.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 302. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

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

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) sea level rise;

''(8) coastal storm damage reduction; and

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

(2) in subsection (d)—

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

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

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

''(12) Mississippi River Watershed; and

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

SEC. 303. FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.

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

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

(2) in paragraph (2)—

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

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

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

SEC. 304. LAKES PROGRAM.

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

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

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

''(32) Baisley Pond, New York;

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

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

SEC. 305. INVASIVE SPECIES.

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

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

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

''(1) the Great Lakes;

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

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

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

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

''(6) Lake Okeechobee, Florida;

''(7) the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie Rivers, Florida;

''(8) Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia;

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

''(10) lakes and reservoirs in the State of Ohio;

''(11) Detroit Lake, Oregon; and

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

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

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

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

SEC. 306. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) NEW YORK HARBOR, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—The New York Harbor collection and removal of drift project authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1051; 88 Stat. 39; 104 Stat. 4615), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

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

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

(d) RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Rio Grande De Loiza, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), and deauthorized pursuant to section 6001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1345), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 307. ST. FRANCIS LAKE CONTROL STRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall set the ordinary high water mark for water impounded behind the St. Francis Lake Control Structure, authorized by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 538; 79 Stat. 1077), at 208 feet mean sea level.

(b) OPERATION BY PROJECT MANAGER.—In setting the ordinary high water mark under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that the project manager for the St. Francis Lake Control Structure may continue operating such structure in accordance with the instructions set forth in the document titled ''St. Francis Lake Control Structure Standing Instructions to the Project Manager'' and published in January 1982 by the Corps of Engineers, Memphis District.

SEC. 308. FRUITVALE AVENUE RAILROAD BRIDGE, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA.

Section 4017(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1175) is repealed.

SEC. 309. LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

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

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

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

(d) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

(3) COST SHARING.—

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

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

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

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

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

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

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

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

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

SEC. 310. DEAUTHORIZATION OF DESIGNATED PORTIONS OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CALIFORNIA.

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

(b) DEBRIS BASINS DESCRIBED.—The debris basins referred to in subsection (a) are the following debris basins operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District: Auburn Debris Basin, Bailey Debris Basin, Big Dalton Debris Basin, Blanchard Canyon Debris Basin, Blue Gum Canyon Debris Basin, Brand Canyon Debris Basin, Carter Debris Basin, Childs Canyon Debris Basin, Dunsmuir Canyon Debris Basin, Eagle Canyon Debris Basin, Eaton Walsh Debris Basin, Elmwood Canyon Debris Basin, Emerald East Debris Basin, Emerald West Debris Retention Inlet, Hay Debris Basin, Hillcrest Debris Basin, La Tuna Canyon Debris Basin, Little Dalton Debris Basin, Live Oak Debris Retention Inlet, Lopez Debris Retention Inlet, Lower Sunset Canyon Debris Basin, Marshall Canyon Debris Retention Inlet, Santa Anita Debris Basin, Sawpit Debris Basin, Schoolhouse Canyon Debris Basin, Shields Canyon Debris Basin, Sierra Madre Villa Debris Basin, Snover Canyon Debris Basin, Stough Canyon Debris Basin, Wilson Canyon Debris Basin, and Winery Canyon Debris Basin.

SEC. 311. MURRIETA CREEK, CALIFORNIA.

Section 103 of title I of appendix B of Public Law 106–377 (114 Stat. 1441A–65) (relating to the project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, Murrieta Creek, California), is amended—

(1) by striking ''$89,850,000'' and inserting ''$252,438,000'';

(2) by striking ''$57,735,000'' and inserting ''$162,511,500''; and

(3) by striking ''$32,115,000'' and inserting ''$89,926,500''.

SEC. 312. SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The portion of the project for flood protection on the Sacramento River, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 1, 1917 (chapter 144, 39 Stat. 949; 45 Stat. 539; 50 Stat. 849; 55 Stat. 647; 80 Stat. 1422), consisting of the portion of the American River North Levee, upstream of Arden Way, from G.P.S. coordinate 38.600948N 121.330599W to 38.592261N 121.334155W, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 313. SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and navigation, San Diego River and Mission Bay, San Diego County, California, authorized by the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 636; 134 Stat. 2705), is modified to change the authorized conveyance capacity of the project to a level determined appropriate by the Secretary based on the actual capacity of the project, which level may be further modified by the Secretary as necessary to account for sea level rise.

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE MANUAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal sponsor for the project described in subsection (a) shall prepare for review and approval by the Secretary a revised operation and maintenance manual for the project to implement the modification described in subsection (a).

(2) FUNDING.—The non-Federal sponsor shall provide to the Secretary funds sufficient to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary to review and approve the manual described in paragraph (1), and the Secretary may accept and expend such funds in the performance of such review and approval.

(c) EMERGENCY REPAIR AND RESTORATION ASSISTANCE.—Upon approval by the Secretary of the revised operation and maintenance manual required under subsection (b), and subject to compliance by the non-Federal sponsor with the requirements of such manual and with any other eligibility requirement established by the Secretary, the project described in subsection (a) shall be considered for assistance under section 5(a) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)).

SEC. 314. SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CALIFORNIA.

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

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

SEC. 315. COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN.

(a) STUDY OF FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

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

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

(b) FUNDS FOR COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY OBLIGATIONS.—

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

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

(A) the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate, by not later than 30 days

after the initiation of the call, a written notice of the action and a justification, including a description of the circumstances necessitating the call;

(B) upon a determination by the United States of the amount of compensation that shall be paid to Canada, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate a written notice specifying such amount and an explanation of how such amount was derived, which notification shall not delay or impede the flood risk management mission of the U.S. entity; and

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

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

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

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

SEC. 316. COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601(e)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2685; 121 Stat. 1269; 132 Stat. 3786) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''subparagraph (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (E)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking ''during each 5-year period, beginning with commencement of design of the Plan'' and inserting ''during each period of 5 fiscal years, beginning on October 1, 2022'';

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting ''for each project in the Plan'' before the period at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) ACCOUNTING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal sponsor a financial accounting of non-Federal contributions under clause (i)(I) for such fiscal year.

''(iv) LIMITATION.—In the case of an authorized project for which a project partnership agreement has not been executed and for which there is an agreement under subparagraph (B)(i)(III), the Secretary—

''(I) shall consider all expenditures and obligations incurred by the non-Federal sponsor for land and in-kind services for the project in determining the amount of any cash contribution required from the non-Federal sponsor to satisfy the cost-share requirements of this subsection; and

''(II) may only require any such cash contribution to be made at the end of each period of 5 fiscal years under clause (i).''.

(b) UPDATE.—The Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall revise the Master Agreement for the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, executed in 2009 pursuant to section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680), to reflect the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 317. PORT EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.

Section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1709) is amended, in row 4 (relating to the project for navigation, Port Everglades, Florida)—

(1) by striking ''$229,770,000'' and inserting ''$561,455,000'';

(2) by striking ''$107,233,000'' and inserting ''$361,302,000''; and

(3) by striking ''$337,003,000'' and inserting ''$922,757,000''.

SEC. 318. SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION TASK FORCE.

Section 528(f)(1)(J) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3771) is amended by striking ''2 representatives of the State of Florida,'' and inserting ''3 representatives of the State of Florida, including at least 1 representative of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and 1 representative of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission,''.

SEC. 319. LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, IDAHO.

Section 3057(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1120) is amended by striking ''$9,000,000'' and inserting ''$40,000,000''.

SEC. 320. CHICAGO SHORELINE PROTECTION.

The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Lake Michigan, Illinois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State line, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide 65 percent of the cost of the locally preferred plan, as described in the Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 14, 1994, for the construction of the following segments of the project:

(1) Shoreline revetment at Morgan Shoal.

(2) Shoreline revetment at Promontory Point.

SEC. 321. GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Section 402(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2742) is amended by striking ''80 percent'' and inserting ''90 percent''.

SEC. 322. SOUTHEAST DES MOINES LEVEE SYSTEM, IOWA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Des Moines, Iowa.

(2) FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT.—The term ''Flood Protection Project'' means the project on the Des Moines River for local flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 896).

(3) RED ROCK DAM PROJECT.—The term ''Red Rock Dam Project'' means the project for the Red Rock Dam on the Des Moines River for flood control and other purposes, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 896).

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—The Red Rock Dam Project and the Flood Protection Project shall be modified as follows, subject to a new or amended agreement between the Secretary and the City, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b):

(1) That portion of the Red Rock Dam Project consisting of the segment of levee from Station 15+88.8W to Station 77+43.7W shall be transferred to the Flood Protection Project.

(2) The relocated levee improvement constructed by the City, from Station 77+43.7W to approximately Station 20+00, shall be included in the Flood Protection Project.

(c) FEDERAL EASEMENT CONVEYANCES.—

(1) FLOOD PROTECTION EASEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to convey, without consideration, to the City the following easements to become part of the Flood Protection Project in accordance with subsection (b):

(A) Easements identified as Tracts 3215E–1, 3235E, and 3227E.

(B) Easements identified as Partial Tracts 3216E–2, 3216E–3, 3217E–1, and 3217E–2.

(2) ADDITIONAL EASEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to convey, without consideration, to the City or to the Des Moines Metropolitan Wastewater Reclamation Authority the following easements:

(A) Easements identified as Tracts 3200E, 3202E–1, 3202E–2, 3202E–4, 3203E–2, 3215E–3, 3216E–1, and 3216E–5.

(B) Easements identified as Partial Tracts 3216E–2, 3216E–3, 3217E–1, and 3217E–2.

(3) COSTS.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this subsection shall be responsible for all administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

SEC. 323. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT STUDY.

Section 213 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2684) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the comprehensive study carried out under subsection (a), and any feasibility study carried out under subsection (e), shall be 100 percent.''.

SEC. 324. LOWER MISSOURI RIVER STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out streambank erosion control evaluation and demonstration projects in the Lower Missouri River through contracts with non-Federal interests, including projects for streambank protection and stabilization.

(b) AREA.—The Secretary shall carry out demonstration projects under this section on the reach of the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the confluence of the Missouri River and the Mississippi River.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of the extent of streambank erosion on the Lower Missouri River; and

(2) develop new methods and techniques for streambank protection, research soil stability, and identify the causes of erosion.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the results of the demonstration projects carried out under this section, including any recommendations for methods to prevent and correct streambank erosion.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(f) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to enter into contracts under subsection (a) shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 325. MISSOURI RIVER INTERCEPTION-REARING COMPLEXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 129 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2643), and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to carry out the construction of an interception-rearing complex at each of Plowboy Bend A (River Mile: 174.5 to 173.2) and Pelican Bend B (River Mile: 15.8 to 13.4) on the Missouri River.

(b) ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION OF RISK.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Prior to construction of the interception-rearing complexes under subsection (a), the Secretary shall perform an

analysis to identify whether the interception-rearing complexes will—

(A) contribute to an increased risk of flooding to adjacent lands and properties, including local levees;

(B) affect the navigation channel, including crossflows, velocity, channel depth, and channel width;

(C) affect the harvesting of sand;

(D) affect ports and harbors; or

(E) contribute to bank erosion on adjacent private lands.

(2) MITIGATION.—The Secretary may not construct an interception-rearing complex under subsection (a) until the Secretary successfully mitigates any effects described in paragraph (1) with respect to such interception-rearing complex.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after completion of the construction of the interception-rearing complexes under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the extent to which the construction of such interception-rearing complexes affected the population recovery of pallid sturgeon in the Missouri River.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 129(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2643) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) submits the report required by section 318(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022;''.

SEC. 326. ARGENTINE, EAST BOTTOMS, FAIRFAX-JERSEY CREEK, AND NORTH KANSAS LEVEES UNITS, MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES AT KANSAS CITIES, MISSOURI AND KANSAS.

Notwithstanding section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213), the Federal share of the cost of the portion of the project for flood damage reduction, Argentine, East Bottoms, Fairfax-Jersey Creek, and North Kansas Levees units, Missouri River and tributaries at Kansas Cities, Missouri and Kansas, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1054), relating to the Fairfax-Jersey Creek Levee unit, shall be 80 percent.

SEC. 327. MISSOURI RIVER MITIGATION PROJECT, MISSOURI, KANSAS, IOWA, AND NEBRASKA.

Section 334 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 306) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) USE OF OTHER FUNDS.—Any acres acquired using Federal funds for purposes described in subsection (a) shall be considered toward the total number of acres required under such subsection, regardless of the source of the Federal funds.''.

SEC. 328. NORTHERN MISSOURI.

(a) NORTHERN MISSOURI DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Northern Missouri'' means the counties of Buchanan, Marion, Platte, and Clay, Missouri.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Northern Missouri.

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

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

(e) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

(3) COST SHARING.—

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

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

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

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

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

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

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

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

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

SEC. 329. ISRAEL RIVER, LANCASTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The project for flood control, Israel River, Lancaster, New Hampshire, carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 330. MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NEW MEXICO.

The non-Federal share of the cost of the project for flood risk management, Middle Rio Grande, Bernalillo to Belen, New Mexico, authorized by section 401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2735), shall be 25 percent.

SEC. 331. SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a water resources development project described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) fund, at full Federal expense, any incremental increase in cost to the project that results from a legal requirement to use a borrow source determined by the Secretary to be other than the least cost option; and

(2) exclude the cost described in paragraph (1) from the cost-benefit analysis for the project.

(b) WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—A water resources development project referred to in subsection (a) is any of the following:

(1) The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control, Carolina Beach and vicinity, North Carolina, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1182; 134 Stat. 2741).

(2) The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control, Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1182; 134 Stat. 2741).

SEC. 332. SOUTHWESTERN OREGON.

(a) SOUTHWESTERN OREGON DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Southwestern Oregon'' means the counties of Benton, Coos, Curry, Douglas, Lane, Linn, and Josephine, Oregon.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Southwestern Oregon.

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

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

(e) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

(3) COST SHARING.—

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

(i) shall be 75 percent; and

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

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

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

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

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

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

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSE.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

SEC. 333. JOHN P. MURTHA LOCKS AND DAM.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Locks and Dam 4, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), and commonly known as the ''Charleroi Locks and Dam'', shall be known and designated as the ''John P. Murtha Locks and Dam''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the locks and dam referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''John P. Murtha Locks and Dam''.

SEC. 334. WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TENNESSEE.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Wolf River Harbor, Tennessee, authorized by section 202 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 201; 49 Stat. 1034; 72 Stat. 308), is modified to reduce, in part, the authorized dimensions of the project, such that the remaining authorized dimensions are as follows:

(1) A 250-foot-wide, 9-foot-depth channel with a center line beginning at an approximate point of 35.139634, -90.062343 and extending approximately 1,300 feet to an approximate point of 35.142077, -90.059107.

(2) A 200-foot-wide, 9-foot-depth channel with a center line beginning at an approximate point of 35.142077, -90.059107 and extending approximately 1,800 feet to an approximate point of 35.1467861, -90.057003.

(3) A 250-foot-wide, 9-foot-depth channel with a center line beginning at an approximate point of 35.1467861, -90.057003 and extending approximately 5,550 feet to an approximate point of 35.160848, -90.050566.

SEC. 335. ADDICKS AND BARKER RESERVOIRS, TEXAS.

The Secretary is authorized to provide, pursuant to section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), information and advice to non-Federal interests on the removal of sediment obstructing inflow channels to the Addicks and Barker Reservoirs, authorized pursuant to the project for Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries, Texas, under section 3a of the Act of August 11, 1939 (chapter 699, 53 Stat. 1414; 68 Stat. 1258).

SEC. 336. NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TEXAS.

The project for ecosystem restoration and storm damage reduction, North Padre Island, Corpus Christi Bay, Texas, authorized under section 556 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 353), shall not be eligible for repair and restoration assistance under section 5(a) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)).

SEC. 337. CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 571 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 371) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) DEFINITION OF CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA.—In this section, the term 'central West Virginia' means the counties of Lewis, Upshur, Randolph, Hardy, Hampshire, Morgan, Berkeley, Jefferson, Hancock, Ohio, Marshall, Wetzel, Tyler, Pleasants, Wood, Doddridge, Monongalia, Marion, Harrison, Taylor, Barbour, Preston, Tucker, Mineral, Grant, Brooke, and Ritchie, West Virginia.''.

SEC. 338. PUGET SOUND, WASHINGTON.

In carrying out the project for ecosystem restoration, Puget Sound, Washington, authorized by section 1401(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1713), the Secretary shall consider the removal and replacement of the Highway 101 causeway and bridges at the Duckabush River Estuary site to be a project feature, and not a relocation, and the Federal share of the costs of such removal and replacement shall be 65 percent.

SEC. 339. WATER LEVEL MANAGEMENT PILOT PROJECT ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot project on water level management, as part of the operations and maintenance of the 9-foot channel projects of the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System, to help redress the degrading influences of prolonged inundation or sedimentation on such projects, and to improve the quality and quantity of habitat available for fish and wildlife.

(b) CONDITIONS ON DRAWDOWNS.—In carrying out the pilot project under subsection (a), the Secretary shall carry out routine and systemic water level drawdowns of the pools created by the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System locks and dams, including drawdowns during the growing season, when—

(1) hydrologic conditions allow the Secretary to carry out a drawdown within applicable dam operating plans; or

(2) hydrologic conditions allow the Secretary to carry out a drawdown and sufficient funds are available to the Secretary to carry out any additional activities that may be required to ensure that the drawdown does not adversely affect navigation.

(c) COORDINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—

(1) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall use existing coordination and consultation processes to regularly consult with other relevant Federal agencies and States regarding the planning and assessment of water level management actions implemented under this section.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Prior to carrying out any water level management plan pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall provide notice to the public and to navigation interests and other interested stakeholders.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System'' has the meaning given that term in section 8001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 652 note).

SEC. 340. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

Section 2010 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1270; 132 Stat. 3812) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not recommend deauthorization of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam pursuant to the disposition study carried out under subsection (d) unless the Secretary identifies a willing and capable non-Federal public entity to assume ownership of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam.

''(g) MODIFICATION.—The Secretary is authorized to investigate the feasibility of modifying, prior to deauthorizing, the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam to add ecosystem restoration, including the prevention and control of invasive species, water supply, and recreation as authorized purposes.''.

SEC. 341. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BENEFITS AND COSTS.

Section 152(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2213a(a)) is amended by striking ''a flood risk management project that incidentally generates seismic safety benefits in regions'' and inserting ''a flood risk management or coastal storm risk management project in a region''.

SEC. 342. DEBRIS REMOVAL.

Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a), is amended by striking ''or recreation'' and inserting ''ecosystem restoration, or recreation''.

SEC. 343. GENERAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) LEVEE SAFETY INITIATIVE.—Section 9005(g)(2)(E)(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303a(g)(2)(E)(i)) is amended by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2026''.

(b) TRANSFER OF EXCESS CREDIT.—Section 1020 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2223) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''10 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on December 31, 2026''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(B), by striking ''10 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''December 31, 2026''.

(c) REHABILITATION OF EXISTING LEVEES.—Section 3017(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3303a note) is amended by striking ''the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''December 31, 2026''.

(d) INVASIVE SPECIES IN ALPINE LAKES PILOT PROJECT.—Section 507(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (16 U.S.C. 4701 note) is amended by striking ''2024'' and inserting ''2026''.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL BANKS.—Section 309(e) of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 3957(e)) is amended by striking ''10'' and inserting ''12''.

SEC. 344. CONVEYANCES.

(a) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property or easement to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) SARDIS LAKE, PANOLA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to convey to the City of Sardis, Mississippi, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed is the approximately 1,064 acres of lying in the eastern half of Sections 12 and 13, T 8 S, R 6 W and the western half of Section 18 and the western half of Section 7, T 8 S, R 5 W, in Panola County, Mississippi, and being more particularly described as follows: Begin at the southeast corner of said Section 13, run thence from said point of beginning, along the south line of said Section 13, run westerly, 2,723 feet; thence run N 27°39′53″ W, for 1,898 feet; thence run north 2,434 feet; thence run east, 1,006 feet, more or less, to a point on the easterly edge of Mississippi State Highway No. 315; thence run along said easterly edge of highway, northerly, for 633 feet; thence leaving said easterly edge of highway, run N 62°00′ E, for 200 feet; thence N 07°00′ E, for 1,350 feet; thence N 07°00′ W, for 800 feet; thence N 37°30′ W for 800 feet; thence N 10°00′ W for 350 feet; thence N 11°00′ E, for 350 feet; thence N 43°30′ E for 250 feet; thence N 88°00′ E for 200 feet; thence S 64°00′ E for 350 feet; thence S 25°30′ E, for 650 feet, more or less, to the intersection of the east line of the western half of the eastern half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the aforesaid Section 12, T 8 S, R 6 W and the 235-foot contour; thence run along said 235-foot contour, 6,392 feet; thence leaving said 235-foot contour, southerly 1,762 feet, more or less, to a point on the south line of Section 7; thence S 00°28′49″ E, 2,664.97 feet, more or less, to a point on the south line of the northwest quarter of said Section 18; thence along said south line, easterly for 100 feet, more or less to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of said Section 18; thence leaving said south line of said northwest quarter, along the east line of said southwest quarter, S 00°06′20″ E, run 2,280 feet, more or less, to the southerly edge of an existing power line right-of-way; thence leaving said east line of said southwest quarter, along said southerly edge of said power line right-of-way, northwesterly, 300 feet, more or less, to the easterly edge of the existing 4–H Club Road; thence leaving said southerly edge of said power line right-of-way, along said easterly edge of said road, southeasterly, 420 feet, more or less, to the south line of said southwest quarter; thence leaving said easterly edge of said road, along said south line of southwest quarter, westerly, 2,635 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, LESS AND EXCEPT the following prescribed parcel: Beginning at a point N 00°45′48″ W, 302.15 feet and west, 130.14 feet from the southeast corner of said Section 13, T 8 S, R 6 W, and running thence S 04°35′58″ W, 200.00 feet to a point on the north side of a road; running thence with the north side of said road, N 83°51′ W, for 64.84 feet; thence N 72°26′44″ W, 59.48 feet; thence N 60°31′37″ W, 61.71 feet; thence N 63°35′08″ W, 51.07 feet; thence N 06°47′17″ W, 142.81 feet to a point; running thence S 85°24′02″ E, 254.37 feet to the point of beginning, containing 1.00 acre, more or less.

(3) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reserve and retain from the conveyance under this subsection such easements, rights-of-way, and other interests that the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to ensure the continued operation of the Sardis Lake project, authorized by section 6 of the Act of May 15, 1928 (chapter 569, 45 Stat. 536).

(B) FLOODING; LIABILITY.—In addition to any easements, rights-of-way, and other interests reserved an retained under subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

(i) shall retain the right to flood land for downstream flood control purposes on—

(I) the land located east of Blackjack Road and below 301.0 feet above sea level; and

(II) the land located west of Blackjack Road and below 224.0 feet above sea level; and

(ii) shall not be liable for any reasonable damage resulting from any flooding of land pursuant to clause (i).

(4) DEED.—The Secretary shall—

(A) convey the property under this section by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States; and

(B) ensure that such deed includes a permanent restriction that all future building of above-ground structures on the land conveyed under this subsection shall be restricted to areas lying at or above 301.0 feet above sea level.

(5) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Sardis, Mississippi, shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(6) NOTICE AND REPORTING.—After conveying property under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the City of Sardis, Mississippi—

(A) weekly reports describing—

(i) the water level of Sardis Lake, as in effect on the date of submission of the report;

(ii) any applicable forecasts of that water level; and

(iii) any other information that may affect land conveyed under this subsection; and

(B) a timely notice of any anticipated flooding of a portion of the land conveyed under this subsection.

(c) ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to convey to the City of Tulsa-Rogers County Port Authority, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 176 acres of Federal land located on the following 3 parcels in Rogers County, Oklahoma:

(A) Parcel 1 consists of U.S. tract 119 (partial), U.S. tract 123, U.S. tract 120, U.S. tract 125, and U.S. tract 118 (partial).

(B) Parcel 2 consists of U.S. tract 124 (partial) and U.S. tract 128 (partial).

(C) Parcel 3 consists of U.S. tract 128 (partial).

(3) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary shall reserve and retain from any conveyance under this subsection such easements, rights-of-way, and other interests that the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to ensure the continued operation of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation project (including Newt Graham Lock and Dam 18) authorized under the comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin by the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1218; 60 Stat. 634; 60 Stat. 647; 101 Stat. 1329–112; 117 Stat. 1842).

(4) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(5) CONSIDERATION.—The City of Tulsa-Rogers County Port Authority shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) REGIONAL CORPS OF ENGINEERS OFFICE, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—At such time as new facilities are available to be used as the office for the Galveston District of the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary shall convey to the Port of Corpus Christi, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The property referred to in paragraph (1) is the land known as Tract 100 and Tract 101, including improvements on that land, in Corpus Christi, Texas, and described as follows:

(A) TRACT 100.—The 1.89 acres, more or less, as conveyed by the Nueces County Navigation District No. 1 of Nueces County, Texas, to the United States by instrument dated October 16, 1928, and recorded at Volume 193, pages 1 and 2, in the Deed Records of Nueces County, Texas.

(B) TRACT 101.—The 0.53 acres as conveyed by the City of Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Texas, to the United States by instrument dated September 24, 1971, and recorded at Volume 318, pages 523 and 524, in the Deed Records of Nueces County, Texas.

(C) IMPROVEMENTS.—

(i) Main Building (RPUID AO–C–3516), constructed January 9, 1974.

(ii) Garage, vehicle with 5 bays (RPUID AO–C–3517), constructed January 9, 1985.

(iii) Bulkhead, Upper (RPUID AO–C–2658), constructed January 1, 1941.

(iv) Bulkhead, Lower (RPUID AO–C–3520), constructed January 1, 1933.

(v) Bulkhead Fence (RPUID AO–C–3521), constructed January 9, 1985.

(vi) Bulkhead Fence (RPUID AO–C–3522), constructed January 9, 1985.

(3) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—The Port of Corpus Christi shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property (including improvements) conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 345. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) NEW PROJECTS.—Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1258) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(274) CHANDLER, ARIZONA.—$18,750,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Chandler, Arizona.

''(275) PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA.—$40,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Pinal County, Arizona.

''(276) TEMPE, ARIZONA.—$37,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and groundwater recharge, for the City of Tempe, Arizona.

''(277) BELL GARDENS, CALIFORNIA.—$12,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in the city of Bell Gardens, California.

''(278) CALIMESA, CALIFORNIA.—$3,500,000 for stormwater management and water supply infrastructure, including groundwater recharge and water recycling, in the city of Calimesa, California.

''(279) COMPTON CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—$6,165,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in the vicinity of Compton Creek, city of Compton, California.

''(280) DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA.—$100,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Downey, California.

''(281) LOMITA, CALIFORNIA.—$4,716,600 for stormwater management infrastructure in the city of Lomita, California.

''(282) EAST SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$70,000,000 for water and wastewater

infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in East County, San Diego County, California.

''(283) EASTERN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$25,000,000 for the planning, design, and construction of water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, for the cities of Azusa, Baldwin Park, Covina, Duarte, El Monte, Glendora, Industry, Irwindale, La Puente, La Verne, Monrovia, San Dimas, and West Covina, and for Avocado Heights, Bassett, and Valinda, California.

''(284) ESCONDIDO CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—$34,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the vicinity of Escondido Creek, city of Escondido, California.

''(285) FONTANA, CALIFORNIA.—$16,000,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in the city of Fontana, California.

''(286) HEALDSBURG, CALIFORNIA.—$23,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in the city of Healdsburg, California.

''(287) INLAND EMPIRE, CALIFORNIA.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Riverside County and San Bernardino County, California.

''(288) MARIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$28,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Marin County, California.

''(289) MAYWOOD, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the city of Maywood, California.

''(290) MONTEREY PENINSULA, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, and water supply, on the Monterey Peninsula, California.

''(291) NORTH RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including coastal flooding resilience measures for such infrastructure, in North Richmond, California.

''(292) ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA.—$40,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling and water supply, in the city of Ontario, California.

''(293) PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Paramount, California.

''(294) PETALUMA, CALIFORNIA.—$13,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water recycling, in the city of Petaluma, California.

''(295) RIALTO, CALIFORNIA.—$27,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the city of Rialto, California.

''(296) RINCON RESERVATION, CALIFORNIA.—$38,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure on the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians reservation, California.

''(297) SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CALIFORNIA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water protection and development, including flooding resilience measures for such infrastructure, in Contra Costa County, San Joaquin County, Solano County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County, California.

''(298) SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.—$270,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water recycling, at the San Francisco International Airport, California.

''(299) SAN JOAQUIN AND STANISLAUS, CALIFORNIA.—$200,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and water supply, in San Joaquin County and Stanislaus County, California.

''(300) SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA.—$19,400,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, in the city of Santa Rosa California.

''(301) SIERRA MADRE, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, and water supply, including earthquake resilience measures for such infrastructure and water supply, in the city of Sierra Madre, California.

''(302) SMITH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—$25,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Howonquet Village and Resort and Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, Smith River, California.

''(303) TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA.—$100,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including groundwater recharge and water supply, in the city of Torrance, California.

''(304) WESTERN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$15,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the cities of Pinole, San Pablo, and Richmond, and in El Sobrante, California.

''(305) HEBRON, CONNECTICUT.—$3,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Hebron, Connecticut.

''(306) NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT.—$16,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the town of Bozrah and the City of Norwich, Connecticut.

''(307) WINDHAM, CONNECTICUT.—$18,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Windham, Connecticut.

''(308) NEW CASTLE, DELAWARE.—$35,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in New Castle County, Delaware.

''(309) WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Washington, District of Columbia.

''(310) LONGBOAT KEY, FLORIDA.—$12,750,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Longboat Key, Florida.

''(311) MARTIN, ST. LUCIE, AND PALM BEACH COUNTIES, FLORIDA.—$100,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, to improve water quality in the St. Lucie River, Indian River Lagoon, and Lake Worth Lagoon in Martin County, St. Lucie County, and Palm Beach County, Florida.

''(312) POLK COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Polk County, Florida.

''(313) OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$20,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Okeechobee County, Florida.

''(314) ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and water supply, in Orange County, Florida.

''(315) GUAM.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Guam.

''(316) COUNTY OF HAWAI'I, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the County of Hawai'i, Hawaii.

''(317) HONOLULU, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii.

''(318) KAUA'I, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the County of Kaua'i, Hawaii.

''(319) MAUI, HAWAII.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the County of Maui, Hawaii.

''(320) DIXMOOR, ILLINOIS.—$15,000,000 for water and water supply infrastructure in the village of Dixmoor, Illinois.

''(321) FOREST PARK, ILLINOIS.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the village of Forest Park, Illinois.

''(322) LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Lake County, Illinois.

''(323) LEMONT, ILLINOIS.—$3,135,000 for water infrastructure in the village of Lemont, Illinois.

''(324) LOCKPORT, ILLINOIS.—$6,550,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Lockport, Illinois.

''(325) MONTGOMERY AND CHRISTIAN COUNTIES, ILLINOIS.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Montgomery County and Christian County, Illinois.

''(326) WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Will County, Illinois.

''(327) ORLEANS PARISH, LOUISIANA.—$100,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Orleans Parish, Louisiana.

''(328) FITCHBURG, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Fitchburg, Massachusetts.

''(329) HAVERHILL, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Haverhill, Massachusetts.

''(330) LAWRENCE, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Lawrence, Massachusetts.

''(331) LOWELL, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Lowell, Massachusetts.

''(332) METHUEN, MASSACHUSETTS.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Methuen, Massachusetts.

''(333) BOONSBORO, MARYLAND.—$5,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the town of Boonsboro, Maryland.

''(334) BRUNSWICK, MARYLAND.—$15,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Brunswick, Maryland.

''(335) CASCADE CHARTER TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN.—$7,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Cascade Charter Township, Michigan.

''(336) MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—$40,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Macomb County, Michigan.

''(337) NORTHFIELD, MINNESOTA.—$33,450,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Northfield, Minnesota.

''(338) CENTERTOWN, MISSOURI.—$15,900,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the village of Centertown, Missouri.

''(339) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of St. Louis, Missouri.

''(340) ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in St. Louis County, Missouri.

''(341) MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Meridian, Mississippi.

''(342) OXFORD, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the City of Oxford, Mississippi.

''(343) MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Manchester, New Hampshire.

''(344) BAYONNE, NEW JERSEY.—$825,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Bayonne, New Jersey.

''(345) CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY.—$119,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Camden, New Jersey.

''(346) ESSEX AND SUSSEX COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Essex County and Sussex County, New Jersey.

''(347) FLEMINGTON, NEW JERSEY.—$4,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the Borough of Flemington, New Jersey.

''(348) JEFFERSON, NEW JERSEY.—$90,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Jefferson Township, New Jersey.

''(349) KEARNY, NEW JERSEY.—$69,900,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the town of Kearny, New Jersey.

''(350) LONG HILL, NEW JERSEY.—$7,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Long Hill Township, New Jersey.

''(351) MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Morris County, New Jersey.

''(352) PASSAIC, NEW JERSEY.—$1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Passaic County, New Jersey.

''(353) PHILLIPSBURG, NEW JERSEY.—$2,600,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

''(354) RAHWAY, NEW JERSEY.—$3,250,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Rahway, New Jersey.

''(355) ROSELLE, NEW JERSEY.—$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the Borough of Roselle, New Jersey.

''(356) SOUTH ORANGE VILLAGE, NEW JERSEY.—$7,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the Township of South Orange Village, New Jersey.

''(357) SUMMIT, NEW JERSEY.—$1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Summit, New Jersey.

''(358) WARREN, NEW JERSEY.—$4,550,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Warren Township, New Jersey.

''(359) ESPAÑOLA, NEW MEXICO.—$21,995,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Española, New Mexico.

''(360) FARMINGTON, NEW MEXICO.—$15,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Farmington, New Mexico.

''(361) MORA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.—$2,874,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Mora County, New Mexico.

''(362) SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO.—$20,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation, in the city of Santa Fe, New Mexico.

''(363) CLARKSTOWN, NEW YORK.—$14,600,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Clarkstown, New York.

''(364) GENESEE, NEW YORK.—$85,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water supply, in Genesee County, New York.

''(365) QUEENS, NEW YORK.—$119,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in Queens, New York.

''(366) YORKTOWN, NEW YORK.—$40,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Yorktown, New York.

''(367) BRUNSWICK, OHIO.—$4,510,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Brunswick, Ohio.

''(368) BROOKINGS, OREGON.—$2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the City of Brookings and the Port of Brookings Harbor, Oregon.

''(369) MONROE, OREGON.—$6,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Monroe, Oregon.

''(370) NEWPORT, OREGON.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and water storage, in the city of Newport, Oregon.

''(371) LANE COUNTY, OREGON.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and storage, distribution, and treatment systems, in Lane County, Oregon.

''(372) PALMYRA, PENNSYLVANIA.—$36,300,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Palmyra Township, Pennsylvania.

''(373) PIKE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$10,000,000 for water and stormwater management infrastructure, including water supply, in Pike County, Pennsylvania.

''(374) PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA.—$20,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

''(375) POCONO, PENNSYLVANIA.—$22,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Pocono Township, Pennsylvania.

''(376) WESTFALL, PENNSYLVANIA.—$16,880,000 for wastewater infrastructure in Westfall Township, Pennsylvania.

''(377) WHITEHALL, PENNSYLVANIA.—$6,000,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in Whitehall Township and South Whitehall Township, Pennsylvania.

''(378) BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$7,462,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in Beaufort County, South Carolina.

''(379) CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$25,583,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Charleston, South Carolina.

''(380) MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$7,822,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.

''(381) PORTLAND, TENNESSEE.—$1,850,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Portland, Tennessee.

''(382) SMITH COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—$19,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Smith County, Tennessee.

''(383) TROUSDALE, MACON, AND SUMNER COUNTIES, TENNESSEE.—$178,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Trousdale County, Macon County, and Sumner County, Tennessee.

''(384) VIRGIN ISLANDS.—$1,584,000 for wastewater infrastructure in the United States Virgin Islands.

''(385) BONNEY LAKE, WASHINGTON.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Bonney Lake, Washington.

''(386) BURIEN, WASHINGTON.—$5,000,000 for stormwater management infrastructure in the city of Burien, Washington.

''(387) ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON.—$3,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Ellensburg, Washington.

''(388) NORTH BEND, WASHINGTON.—$30,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of North Bend, Washington.

''(389) PORT ANGELES, WASHINGTON.—$7,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the City and Port of Port Angeles, Washington.

''(390) SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON.—$56,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Snohomish County, Washington.

''(391) WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE.—$200,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, water supply, and conservation, in Chelan County, King County, Kittitas County, Pierce County, Snohomish County, Skagit County, and Whatcom County, Washington.

''(392) MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.—$4,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), in the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.''.

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the project modifications described in this subsection are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(2) MODIFICATIONS.—

(A) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1840; 134 Stat. 2718) is amended by striking ''Suburban''.

(B) LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(93) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1840; 121 Stat. 1259) is amended—

(i) by striking ''$3,000,000'' and inserting ''$103,000,000'';

(ii) by striking ''wastewater and water related infrastructure,'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management,''; and

(iii) by inserting ''Dominguez Channel, Santa Clarita Valley,'' after ''La Habra Heights,''.

(C) BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO.—Section 219(f)(109) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–220) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for water supply infrastructure'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water supply''.

(D) CHARLOTTE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(121) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$3,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$33,000,000 for wastewater and''.

(E) MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(128) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$6,250,000 for'' and inserting ''$190,250,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including''.

(F) ALBANY, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(130) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$4,000,000 for a storm drainage system,'' and inserting ''$109,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows),''.

(G) ATLANTA, GEORGIA.—Section 219(e)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''.

(H) EAST POINT, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(136) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336;

121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$15,000,000 for stormwater management and other''.

(I) COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(54) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–220) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$100,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and other''.

(J) CALUMET REGION, INDIANA.—Section 219(f)(12)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 117 Stat. 1843; 121 Stat. 1225) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$125,000,000''.

(K) BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(f)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–220; 121 Stat. 1226) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000'' and inserting ''$90,000,000''.

(L) SOUTH CENTRAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(f)(153) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1262) is amended by striking ''$2,500,000'' and inserting ''$12,500,000''.

(M) ST. CHARLES, ST. BERNARD, PLAQUEMINES, ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST. JAMES, AND ASSUMPTION PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—

(i) ST. CHARLES, ST. BERNARD, AND PLAQUEMINES PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(c)(33) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–219) is amended by striking ''Water and wastewater infrastructure'' and inserting ''Water supply and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater infrastructure''.

(ii) ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST. JAMES, AND ASSUMPTION PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—Section 219(c)(34) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–219) is amended—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''BAPTIST AND ST. JAMES'' and inserting ''BAPTIST, ST. JAMES, AND ASSUMPTION''; and

(II) by striking ''Baptist and St. James'' and inserting ''Baptist, St. James, and Assumption''.

(iii) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.—Section 219(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1192) is amended—

(I) by striking the ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16);

(II) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting a semicolon; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(18) $70,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(33); and

''(19) $36,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(34).''.

(N) MICHIGAN COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS.—Section 219(f)(157) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1262) is amended by striking ''correction of combined sewer overflows'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including correction of combined sewer overflows)''.

(O) ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 219(f)(66)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–221; 121 Stat. 1240) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000 for'' and inserting ''$30,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and other''.

(P) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 114 Stat. 2763A–220; 117 Stat. 1838; 130 Stat. 1677; 132 Stat. 3818; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended by striking ''$110,000,000'' and inserting ''$165,000,000''.

(Q) EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA.—Section 219(f)(10)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 121 Stat. 1255) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$52,000,000''.

(3) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the operation of section 6001(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016), any project included on a list published by the Secretary pursuant to such section the authorization for which is amended by this subsection remains authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 346. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL PROJECTS.

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the project modifications described in this section are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(b) PROJECTS.—

(1) CHESAPEAKE BAY.—Section 510(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3759; 121 Stat. 1202; 128 Stat. 1317) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''infrastructure and'' before ''resource protection'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) wastewater treatment and related facilities;

''(F) water supply and related facilities;''.

(2) NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.—Section 552(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3780) is amended—

(A) by striking ''design and construction assistance'' and inserting ''design, repair, replacement, and construction assistance''; and

(B) by striking ''treatment, and distribution facilities'' and inserting ''treatment, stormwater management, and water distribution facilities''.

(3) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 566 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3786; 113 Stat. 352) is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting ''**SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA AND LOWER DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.**'';

(B) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and the Lower Delaware River Basin'' after ''southeastern Pennsylvania'';

(C) in subsection (b), by striking ''southeastern Pennsylvania, including projects for waste water treatment and related facilities,'' and inserting ''southeastern Pennsylvania and the Lower Delaware River Basin, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities (including sewer overflow infrastructure improvements and other stormwater management),'';

(D) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) AREAS DEFINED.—In this section:

''(1) LOWER DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.—The term 'Lower Delaware River Basin' means the Schuylkill Valley, Upper Estuary, Lower Estuary, and Delaware Bay subwatersheds of the Delaware River Basin in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey and Delaware.

''(2) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.—The term 'southeastern Pennsylvania' means Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery Counties, Pennsylvania.''; and

(E) in subsection (h), by striking ''to carry out this section $25,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000 to provide assistance under this section to non-Federal interests in southeastern Pennsylvania, and $20,000,000 to provide assistance under this section to non-Federal interests in the Lower Delaware River Basin''.

(4) FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FLORIDA.—Section 109 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–554, appendix D, 114 Stat. 2763A–222; 121 Stat. 1217) is amended, in subsection (f), by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

(5) NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA.—Section 569(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 368; 121 Stat. 1232) is amended by striking ''$54,000,000'' and inserting ''$80,000,000''.

(6) MISSISSIPPI.—Section 592 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 379; 117 Stat. 1837; 121 Stat. 1233; 123 Stat. 2851) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''and surface water resource protection and development'' and inserting ''surface water resource protection and development, stormwater management, and drainage systems''; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking ''$200,000,000'' and inserting ''$300,000,000''.

(7) LAKE TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA.—Section 108(g) of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 2942) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(8) CENTRAL NEW MEXICO.—Section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 380; 119 Stat. 2255) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''Colfax,'' before ''Sandoval'';

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting ''water reuse,'' after ''conservation,''; and

(C) in subsection (h), by striking ''$50,000,000'' and inserting ''$100,000,000''.

(9) SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 313(g)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845; 109 Stat. 407; 110 Stat. 3723; 113 Stat. 310; 117 Stat. 142; 121 Stat. 1146; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended by striking ''$400,000,000'' and inserting ''$410,000,000''.

(10) OHIO AND NORTH DAKOTA.—Section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 381; 119 Stat. 2261; 121 Stat. 1140; 121 Stat. 1944) is amended in subsection (h), by striking ''$240,000,000'' and inserting ''$250,000,000''.

(11) TEXAS.—Section 5138 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1250) is amended, in subsection (g), by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$80,000,000''.

(12) LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VERMONT AND NEW YORK.—Section 542 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2671; 121 Stat. 1150; 134 Stat. 2652) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by striking ''planning'' and inserting ''clean water infrastructure planning, design, and construction''; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking ''$32,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(13) WESTERN RURAL WATER.—Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 139; 117 Stat. 142; 117 Stat. 1836; 118 Stat. 440; 121 Stat. 1219; 123 Stat. 2851; 128 Stat. 1316; 130 Stat. 1681; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended—

(A) in subsection (i)(1), by striking ''$435,000,000'' and inserting ''$800,000,000''; and

(B) in subsection (i)(2), by striking ''$150,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the operation of section 6001(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016), any project included on a list published by the Secretary pursuant to such section the authorization for which is amended by this section remains authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 347. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON LEASE AGREEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that the lease agreement for land and water areas within the Prado Flood Control Basin Project Area entered into between the Secretary and the City of Corona, California, for operations of the Corona Municipal Airport (Recreation Lease No. DACW09–1–67–60), is a valid lease of land at a water resources development project under section 4 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 460d).

SEC. 348. FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES.

Section 103(k)(4)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(k)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2032''.

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 401. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'' submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports or decision documents designated in this section:

(1) NAVIGATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AK	Elim Subsistence Harbor Study, Elim	March 12, 2021	Federal: $74,905,000 Non-Federal: $1,896,000 Total: $76,801,000
2. CA	Port of Long Beach Deep Draft Navigation, Los Angeles County	October 14, 2021 and May 31, 2022	Federal: $73,533,500 Non-Federal: $74,995,500 Total: $148,529,000
3. GA	Brunswick Harbor Modifications, Glynn County	March 11, 2022	Federal: $10,774,500 Non-Federal: $3,594,500 Total: $14,369,000
4. WA	Tacoma Harbor Navigation Improvement Project	May 26, 2022	Federal: $120,701,000 Non-Federal: $174,627,000 Total: $295,328,000

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. AL	Selma Flood Risk Management and Bank Stabilization	October 7, 2021	Federal: $15,533,100 Non-Federal: $8,363,900 Total: $23,897,000
2. AL	Valley Creek Flood Risk Management, Bessemer and Birmingham	October 29, 2021	Federal: $17,725,000 Non-Federal: $9,586,000 Total: $27,311,000
3. CA	Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, Woodland and Vicinity	June 21, 2021	Federal: $215,152,000 Non-Federal: $115,851,000 Total: $331,003,000
4. NE	Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes	January 24, 2022	Federal: $91,491,400 Non-Federal: $52,156,300 Total: $143,647,700

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
5. OR	Portland Metro Levee System	August 20, 2021	Federal: $77,111,100 Non-Federal: $41,521,300 Total: $118,632,400

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CT	Fairfield and New Haven Counties Coastal Storm Risk Management	January 19, 2021	Federal: $92,937,000 Non-Federal: $50,043,000 Total: $142,980,000
2. FL	Florida Keys, Monroe County, Coastal Storm Risk Management	September 24, 2021	Federal: $1,513,531,000 Non-Federal: $814,978,000 Total: $2,328,509,000
3. FL	Pinellas County, Treasure Island and Long Key Segments, Coastal Storm Risk Management	October 29, 2021	Initial Federal: $8,627,000 Initial Non-Federal: $5,332,000 Total: $13,959,000 Renourishment Federal: $92,000,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: $101,690,000 Renourishment Total: $193,690,000
4. LA	Upper Barataria Basin Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction	January 28, 2022	Federal: $1,005,001,000 Non-Federal: $541,155,000 Total: $1,546,156,000
5. PR	San Juan Metropolitan Area Coastal Storm Risk Management	September 16, 2021	Federal: $245,418,000 Non-Federal: $131,333,000 Total: $376,751,000
6. SC	Folly Beach, Coastal Storm Risk Management	October 26, 2021	Initial Federal: $45,490,000 Initial Non-Federal: $5,054,000 Total: $50,544,000 Renourishment Federal: $164,424,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: $26,767,000 Renourishment Total: $191,191,000

(4) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. TX	Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration	September 16, 2021	Federal: $19,237,894,000 Non-Federal: $11,668,393,000 Total: $30,906,287,000

(5) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CA	Prado Basin Ecosystem Restoration, San Bernardino, Riverside and Orange Counties	April 22, 2021	Federal: $33,976,000 Non-Federal: $18,294,000 Total: $52,270,000
2. KY	Three Forks of Beargrass Creek Ecosystem Restoration, Louisville	May 24, 2022	Federal: $72,138,000 Non-Federal: $48,998,000 Total: $121,136,000

(6) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
1. DC	Washington, D.C. and Vicinity Flood Risk Management	July 22, 2021	Federal: $17,740,000 Non-Federal: $0 Total: $17,740,000
2. LA	Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity	December 16, 2021	Federal: $807,000,000 Non-Federal: $434,000,000 Total: $1,241,000,000
3. LA	West Bank and Vicinity	December 17, 2021	Federal: $431,000,000 Non-Federal: $232,000,000 Total: $663,000,000
4. WA	Howard A. Hanson Dam, Water Supply and Ecosystem Restoration	May 19, 2022	Federal: $815,207,000 Non-Federal: $39,979,000 Total: $855,185,000

TITLE V—COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN RESTORATION

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM.—The term ''continuing authority program'' has the meaning given that term in section 7001(c)(1)(D)(iii) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d(c)(1)(D)(iii)).

(2) COVERED STATE.—The term ''covered State'' means the State of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, or Washington.

(3) COVERED TRIBE.—The term ''covered Tribe'' means an Indian Tribe that has treaty land or treaty rights in relationship to the Columbia River Basin in a covered State.

(4) LOWER SNAKE RIVER DAMS.—The term ''Lower Snake River Dams'' means the dams on the Lower Snake River authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 21).

(5) TASK FORCE.—The term ''Task Force'' means the Columbia River Basin Task Force established under section 503.

(6) TRUST.—The term ''Trust'' means the Columbia River Basin Trust established under section 502.

SEC. 502. COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN TRUST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a committee to be known as the Columbia River Basin Trust.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Trust shall be composed of the following:

(1) 8 members appointed by the Secretary, which shall represent equally the various interests of the public in the Columbia River Basin, including representatives of—

(A) agriculture groups;

(B) environmental or conservation organizations;

(C) the hydroelectric power industry;

(D) recreation user groups;

(E) marine transportation groups; and

(F) other appropriate interests, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) 4 representatives of each covered State, including at least 1 member of each applicable State government, appointed by the Secretary on the recommendation of the Governor of the applicable State.

(3) 1 representative of each covered Tribe, appointed by the Secretary on the recommendation of the applicable Tribe.

SEC. 503. COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a task force, to be known as the Columbia River Basin Task Force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Task Force shall be composed of—

(1) a representative of the Corps of Engineers, who shall serve as Chairperson;

(2) a representative of the Department of Agriculture;

(3) a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation;

(4) a representative of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(5) a representative of the National Marine Fisheries Service;

(6) a representative of the Bonneville Power Administration; and

(7) each member of the Trust.

(c) DUTIES.—The Task Force shall—

(1) meet not less frequently than 4 times each year;

(2) establish procedures for the preparation and approval of the restoration plan under subsection (e), which shall include a requirement that any final restoration plan be approved by at least 2/3 of the members of the Task Force; and

(3) prepare the restoration plan in accordance with subsection (e), including—

(A) reviewing restoration projects that may be included in the restoration plan; and

(B) developing recommendations to be included in the restoration plan.

(d) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Task Force a

report containing the results of an assessment, carried out at full Federal expense, of water resources needs in the Columbia River Basin, including an assessment of—

(A) the effects of the Lower Snake River Dams on the Federal, State, and regional economies;

(B) the effects in the Columbia River Basin of the Lower Snake River Dams on—

(i) recreation;

(ii) hydropower generation and associated carbon emissions reductions;

(iii) water supplies;

(iv) flood control;

(v) marine transportation;

(vi) fish and wildlife, particularly anadromous salmonids and other species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(vii) down-river water quality, including temperature, sedimentation, and dissolved oxygen; and

(viii) Tribal treaty rights and culturally or historically significant Tribal lands;

(C) non-breaching alternatives for increasing fish passage and salmon recovery; and

(D) other issues, as requested by the Task Force.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the Task Force;

(B) the Governor of each covered State; and

(C) the government of each covered Tribe.

(e) RESTORATION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Secretary transmits the report under subsection (d), the Task Force shall prepare, at full Federal expense, a restoration plan for the Columbia River Basin, based on the results of the assessment contained in the report.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The Task Force shall include in the restoration plan—

(A) a description of the overall goals of the restoration plan;

(B) recommendations for restoration projects in the Columbia River Basin, which may address any of—

(i) salmon recovery in the Columbia River Basin;

(ii) water quality and water supply improvements along the Snake River System;

(iii) low-carbon emission transportation and shipping routes;

(iv) Tribal treaty rights, and the protection of Tribal historical and cultural resources throughout the Columbia River Basin;

(v) Federal, State, and regional economies;

(vi) recreation and tourism;

(vii) hydropower generation and associated carbon emissions reductions; and

(viii) flood control; and

(C) recommendations for any other appropriate actions that may help achieve the goals of the restoration plan.

(3) REVISION OF PLAN.—The Task Force may, on an annual basis, revise the restoration plan.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Before finalizing the restoration plan, including any revision of the restoration plan, the Task Force shall make a proposed restoration plan available for public review and comment.

(5) TRANSMITTAL OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall transmit the final restoration plan, including any finalized revision of the restoration plan, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and to each Member of Congress from a covered State.

(f) CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Task Force, shall identify critical restoration projects included in the final restoration plan transmitted under subsection (e)(5) that may be carried out in accordance with the criteria for projects carried out under a continuing authority program.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out a critical restoration project identified under paragraph (1) after entering into an agreement with an appropriate non-Federal interest in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) and this section.

(3) TRIBAL PROJECTS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that not less than 30 percent of the funds made available for critical restoration projects identified under paragraph (1) shall be used exclusively for projects that are—

(A) within the boundary of an Indian reservation; or

(B) administered by an Indian Tribe.

(4) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A non-Federal cost share shall be required to carry out any project under this subsection that does not primarily benefit the Federal Government, as determined by the Task Force.

(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project under this subsection for which the Task Force requires a non-Federal cost share under subparagraph (A) shall be 65 percent, except that such Federal share shall not exceed $10,000,000 for any project.

(C) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 50 percent of the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project described in subparagraph (B) may be provided in the form of services, materials, or other in-kind contributions.

(ii) REQUIRED NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—For any project described in subparagraph (B), the non-Federal interest shall—

(I) provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations;

(II) pay all operation, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation costs; and

(III) hold the United States harmless from all claims arising from the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project.

(iii) CREDIT.—For purposes of clause (i), the Secretary shall credit the non-Federal interest for contributions provided under clause (ii)(I).

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to modify, deauthorize, or remove any of the Lower Snake River Dams.

SEC. 504. ADMINISTRATION.

Nothing in this title diminishes or affects—

(1) any water right of an Indian Tribe;

(2) any fishing right of an Indian Tribe;

(3) any other right of an Indian Tribe;

(4) any treaty right that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(5) any external boundary of an Indian reservation of an Indian Tribe;

(6) any authority of the State that relates to the protection, regulation, or management of fish, terrestrial wildlife, and cultural and archaeological resources; or

(7) any authority of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, or the head of any other Federal agency under a law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (formerly known as the ''National Historic Preservation Act'' (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.));

(B) the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.);

(C) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(D) the Act entitled ''An Act for the protection of the bald eagle'', approved June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);

(E) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(F) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(G) the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

(H) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(I) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(J) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(K) the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.).

TITLE VI—DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 601. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7776, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this will be the fifth consecutive 2-year authorization of the Water Resources Development Act since 2014, a tradition revived by our former chair, Bill Shuster.

I am grateful for the partnership of Ranking Member SAM GRAVES, Subcommittee Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, and Subcommittee Ranking Member DAVID ROUZER for all their work in developing this historic Water Resources Development Act.

This legislation builds on the successes of previous water bills, moving projects from feasibility to construction. This 2-year cycle is critical to addressing future water resource needs of our Nation.

This bill authorizes construction of 18 reports of the Chief of Engineers that were studied and transmitted to Congress since the last water bill was signed into law. These Chief's reports represent thoroughly vetted, locally driven projects with highly engaged cost-share partners. Corps projects

cover a myriad of purposes from navigation, flood control, levees, ecosystem restoration, that will benefit communities all across the United States of America.

The bill also authorizes 72 new feasibility studies and directs the Corps to expedite the completion of 14 ongoing studies. It is critical that we keep our infrastructure in this Nation up-to-date with new challenges—with severe weather events, sea level rise, and other things—and deal with the challenges that communities across this country endure.

For two decades, I spent two decades—actually, I started longer than that—Bud Shuster in 1996—trying to free up the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. That is a tax paid by shippers, which ultimately is passed on to consumers on the value of imported goods which have been impounded for years, totaling nearly $10 billion, while our harbors need dredging, jetties need rebuilding. We finally got that done in 2020. That was historic.

It gives the Corps more resources on the harbor side, which means they can devote a little more of their allocation to the inland waterways and to their other 40-some-odd billion dollars of backlog of critical projects across the country.

It will meet the challenge of climate change by rebuilding these navigation jetties and breakwaters to new heights and dimensions necessary for sea level rise and extreme weather. It will study the impact of coastal storms on inland flooding—which is a particular concern of the ranking member—address future water supplies in the arid West, which is a particular concern of all of us in the West, but particularly those further south and the chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, 21st century challenges should have 21st century solutions. The Corps has been hamstrung in their ability. We have worked with other Members who have heard similar concerns. We included a solution in this bill that will allow the Corps to be the innovation expert they need to be to address our Nation's ongoing new challenges.

I am also proud it will continue building upon efforts to provide equitable project outcomes and flexibility for communities with affordability concerns. It will address the needs of economically disadvantaged minority rural Tribal communities in an affordable manner.

In particular, the bill creates a Tribal liaison position within each Corps' district office. The Corps often fails to consult meaningfully with the Tribes. Tribal leaders will have a direct line of communication now into the regional office and back to the national office to get consultation, technical assistance, and information to them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO and Representative STANTON for their tireless work advocating for our Tribal communities.

For the first time in over a decade, it significantly expands the Corps' environmental infrastructure authorities to assist more communities in addressing drinking water and wastewater needs. We need major work in these areas. Communities all across America—red, blue, whatever—are suffering, and we need these tools to help them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman NAPOLITANO for her effort to help the Corps with flexibility and additional authorities that will help them meet future water supply needs of the arid regions of this Nation. We are rationing the Colorado River for the first time in history this year. Her input and advocacy also brought many of the environmental justice provisions to this bill—support for Tribal communities. She has been a tireless advocate for meeting the needs of her district and her State and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank SAM GRAVES—I couldn't have asked for a better partner working on this bill—for his steadfast support which has made it possible. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) for his support and wise input on the bill before us today. Their input brought in critical perspectives.

We had the subcommittee vice chair from Georgia, Representative BOURDEAUX, who brought recreational safety concerns at local dams to our attention. We had the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS), who supported a watershed-wide study of the Chattahoochee River.

I thank the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. KAHELE), who was an ardent advocate of native Hawaiians and ensuring their participation in activities. I thank the gentleman for giving us new perspectives on that. Representative Newman of Illinois worked hard for all the Great Lakes.

Representative CARTER came to the table with fresh policy and project ideas to help Louisiana deal with natural disasters, sea level rise, and severe weather events.

Mr. Speaker, this is essential legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 7776, the Water Resources Development Act of 2022, or WRDA 2022.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago we advanced this bipartisan legislation out of committee by voice vote, and I am proud to continue the bipartisan tradition of passing a WRDA bill every 2 years—as the chairman pointed out—something we have done since 2014.

I thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chair NAPOLITANO, and Ranking Member ROUZER for all of their hard work and support in getting this legislation across the finish line here in the House.

WRDA 2022 authorizes water infrastructure projects and policies that are critical to local communities, but also provides far-reaching benefits to both the region and our national economy.

With the current supply chain crisis and surging inflation our country faces, it is more important than ever that Congress continues to support our Nation's water infrastructure that keeps our economy moving and protects our communities.

WRDA 2022 supports American competitiveness and our economy by ensuring the reliability and the effectiveness of our Nation's ports and inland waterways to move American goods and products to those who need them.

This legislation also boosts flood production for our local communities, such as those in Missouri's Sixth District, which is my own district.

In Missouri, we are at a crossroads of the largest rivers in the country—the Missouri River and the Mississippi River. These rivers are an invaluable natural resource that provide drinking water, irrigation, and transportation; however, they can also be the source of some very devastating flooding.

My constituents are still working to recover and rebuild their homes, farms, businesses, and their communities after devastating flooding that occurred in 2019.

I know all too well the consequences when water resources are mismanaged, which is why WRDA 2022 is going to ensure that the Corps remains focused on its core missions and priorities and activities like flood control and navigation.

To do this, this bill contains assistance for meeting levee inspection requirements, it examines ways to control erosion on our rivers, and it supports Missouri flood control projects.

These and other provisions in WRDA 2022 are going to provide benefits not only to Missourians, but citizens all across the country who depend on water resources and infrastructure in their daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everybody for their support in developing this legislation, and that includes staff on both sides of the aisle.

Specifically, on my team, I acknowledge the work of my staff director, Paul Sass, for his leadership of the Republican staff on this bill, and many other important bills for that matter, over the last 3½ years.

At the end of this week, Paul will be leaving the committee after more than 20 years of public service on Capitol Hill—and all of that time working for me in my personal office or on my committee staff. I thank him for his dedication and his guidance and friendship over the last two decades. He has a lot to be proud of as he moves forward onto the next chapter of his career. He can look back and be proud of all that he has done. I wish him and his family nothing but the best.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's legislation, WRDA

2022, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of organizations that support H.R. 7776, totaling 51 very diverse organizations. I am certain there are more.

ORGANIZATIONS/LETTERS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7776, THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2022

Alabama Rivers Alliance, American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), American Canoe Association, American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC), American Rivers, American Shore and Beach Preservation Association (ASBPA), American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), American Soybean Association (ASA), American Waterways Operators (AWO), American Whitewater, Appalachian Mountain Club, Associated General Contractors of American (AGC), Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA), Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, California Outdoors, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, City Council of the City of Newport, Oregon.

Fairfax Water, Florida Ports Council (FPC), Idaho Rivers United, International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE), Interstate Council on Water Policy (ICWP), Iowa Confluence Water Trails, Laborer's International Union of North America (LIUNA), Lake Carriers' Association, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG), Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Michigan United Conversation Clubs, Multnomah County Drainage District (MCDD), National Association of Flood & Stormwater Management Agencies (NAFSMA), National Audubon Society, National Grain and Feed Association (NGFA).

National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), National Water Supply Alliance (NWSA), National Wildlife Federation, Outdoor Alliance, Pacific Northwest Waterways Association (PNWA), Port of Long Beach, Port of Portland, Portland Cement Association (PCA), Public Power Council (PPC), Rafting Magazine, The Nature Conservancy, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership (TRCP), Trout Unlimited, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United Association of Union Plumbers and Pipefitters (UA), Waterways Council, Inc. (WCI), Wild Salmon Center.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), who is the chair of the subcommittee.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DEFAZIO for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my chair, PETER DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, and the subcommittee's ranking member, my friend, Mr. ROUZER, and bring to the floor H.R. 7776, the Water Resources Development Act of 2022.

The Water Resources Development Act is our legislative commitment to investing in and protecting our communities from flooding events, restoring our environment and ecosystems, and keeping our Nation's competitiveness by supporting our ports and harbors.

Through the biennial enactment of WRDA legislation, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has addressed local, regional, and national needs through authorization of new U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects, studies, and policies that benefit every corner of the Nation.

We held four hearings in preparation for this bill, including a Member Day hearing. We had a formal process to receive legislative, policy, and project ideas from Members which resulted in 1,500 ideas submitted to us by Members, so that is quite an accomplishment for our staff to go through. I thank all Members for engaging with the committee on this bill and advocating for the needs of their districts. We were able to incorporate most of the requests from Members into the bill.

I am particularly thankful that we were able to make a commitment in this WRDA—thank God, the fifth WRDA—to address the needs of Tribal and disadvantaged communities. The bill requires the Army Corps of Engineers to improve outreach to these communities by creating liaison programs in each Corps district region across the country. That is new.

WRDA includes provisions to develop technical assistance programs that provide guidance to Tribal communities on water resource projects, identify opportunities and challenges on existing Corps projects, and provide planning assistance for future projects. The bill gives Corps personnel the training and tools to effectively address issues on Tribal lands of ancestral, historic, and cultural significance, including burial grounds.

WRDA also continues the effort we started over 10 years ago to improve water supply at Corps dams by addressing managed aquifer replenishment so that dams can hold water for recharge to local groundwater basins. The bill addresses the buildup and removal of sediment in reservoirs to improve operations and capacity of dams. The bill requires the Corps to take a particular focus on infrastructure in the West, to evaluate opportunities to improve water management, water supply, and address the impacts of climate change.

Section 116 of the bill continues Congress' goal of improving dam safety by assessing the status of all dams maintained by the Corps and determining the needs for rehabilitation, retrofit, or removal.

Section 128 of the bill is bipartisan legislation my good friend, Ranking Member ROUZER, and I introduced titled H.R. 7762, the Army Corps of Engineers Military Personnel Augmentation Act. It amends an outdated 1956 law which is prohibitive against current soldiers who have the technical skills to provide engineering support to the civil works mission of the Army Corps.

In 1956 there were not a lot of NCOs with advanced degrees, so it was presumed that only commissioned officers would be properly trained to handle civil works responsibilities. However, since that time and the development of the professional Army, there are many NCOs, National Guard officers, and warrant officers with advanced engineering and technical skills, and it no longer makes sense to exclude them from positions in civil works. This change is supported by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers, and the National Guard Association of the United States.

The bill also provides for hundreds of local concerns throughout the country. I am proud that this bill transfers the authorization of 31 debris basins in my region to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. These debris basins are locally owned and have been successfully operated and maintained by the County of Los Angeles for decades. This provision will formalize the current operations of these debris basins.

WRDA also includes authorization for the development of storm water, sewer, and ecosystem restoration projects in the San Gabriel Valley and greater Los Angeles County. This will improve flood protection and boost local water supply at the same time by investing in spreading grounds, dam infrastructure, and treatment operations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the many people who have helped this bill become a reality. I thank the leadership at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Assistant Secretary Connor and Lieutenant General Spellmon—and their incredible staff who have worked through over 1,000 submissions that we received for WRDA 2022.

I am very fortunate to have some of the best water leaders in the country in my district and southern California who provided valuable input for this bill, including Colonel Julie Balten and David Van Dorpe of the Los Angeles District.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7776.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), who is a member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Chair NAPOLITANO, and Ranking Member GRAVES for their leadership and work to ensure the Water Resources Development Act, also known as WRDA for short, continues to be both bipartisan and biennial.

Because of this commitment, before the House today is H.R. 7776, the Water Resources Development Act of 2022. I am pleased to be a part of this continuing bipartisan tradition of passing a WRDA every 2 years. Just 3 weeks ago this bill passed out of the committee by voice vote.

The legislation is a product resulting from the input of many Members of Congress. It is an example of what can be achieved when Congress comes together to find solutions for their constituents and the American public.

WRDA bills provide congressional direction to the Army Corps of Engineers on the allocations of dollars for water

resource projects and policy across the Nation. This legislation authorizes a number of Chief's Reports and studies, as well as new environmental infrastructure projects for the first time since 2007.

In my home State of North Carolina, we rely on a significant amount of coastal and inland waterway infrastructure and resources. These bring us many benefits, but our communities can also face devastating consequences from flooding of inland waterways as a result.

WRDA 2022 will help our communities address these risks by directing the Corps to improve management of our Nation's coastal mapping projects which provide information to States and local communities so they can better respond to extreme weather events. This program and other provisions in this year's legislation will provide improved flood control and storm damage reduction for constituents and stakeholders all across the country.

I am pleased to be a part of this bipartisan effort, and, again, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Chair NAPOLITANO for working across the aisle with us on this critical commonsense legislation.

I also want to take a quick moment to thank Paul Sass, staff director for the minority of the committee who will soon be leaving for other opportunities. He has provided many years of service and hard work for the people of Missouri, Ranking Member GRAVES, myself, and all the members of the T & I Committee. I thank Paul for his great counsel and all the work he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, may I ask as to how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. BOURDEAUX).

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022. I am grateful for Chairs DEFAZIO and NAPOLITANO and Ranking Members GRAVES and ROUZER as well as the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee staff for working with my office and me to ensure that some key needs for Georgia were met.

My district specifically is home to Lake Lanier and the Buford Dam, which are critical resources in the Chattahoochee River Basin. The Chattahoochee River supplies 70 percent of metro Atlanta's drinking water, and it is hard to overstate how essential the lake and river are to the metro area. The river is also a key source of water for farmers and agriculture throughout the State. But according to the Chattahoochee Riverkeeper, more than 1,000 miles of waterway within the watershed do not meet water quality standards.

This bill would authorize a watershed-based study for the Chattahoochee River Basin which will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to assess the water resource needs of the basin, including ecosystem protection and restoration, flood risk management, watershed protection, water supply, and drought preparedness.

This bill also includes my important legislation, Lake Lanier and Upper Chattahoochee River Safety Act, which would direct the Army Corps to carry out a review of potential threats to human life and safety from the use of the river. Unfortunately, there are parts of the river that are extremely dangerous, and during a release of water from Buford Dam, the Chattahoochee can rise as much as 11 feet in 1 minute. Based on the findings of this review, the bill would authorize the Corps to take measures necessary to make the river safer and minimize or eliminate some of these hazards.

Finally, I am proud to see Lake Lanier included as a focus area in the previously authorized harmful algal bloom demonstration program which will allow the Corps to work with local stakeholders to research tools for freshwater HABs detection, prevention, and management which is critical to protecting the drinking water of millions of people.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today delivers for my constituents and the people of Georgia. It delivers for the people of this country. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), who is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Water Resources and Development Act.

WRDA authorizes projects designed to improve the Nation's water resources infrastructure, including ports and harbors, inland waterway navigation, and flood and storm protection.

I am thankful to Chairman DEFAZIO for working with me to ensure priorities of my district made it into the final language, and for the leadership of Ranking Member GRAVES as we fought for community-driven water solutions. WRDA is a testament to our ability to still pass critical legislation and still work in a bipartisan fashion to deliver results to the American people. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 7776.

Finally, let me add my voice to those recognizing Paul Sass, who is ending his 20-year career on Capitol Hill at the end of the week as the Republican staff director. Since coming to the T&I Committee with Ranking Member GRAVES, Paul has dedicated countless hours to improving, investing in, and securing our Nation's infrastructure. He has not only been a valuable asset to the Graves staff, but he has been a resource to my staff as well and helped lead the committee's commitment to a safe and efficient transportation system.

I thank Paul for his years of public service, and I wish him all the best in his next chapter.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, a big thank you to Representatives DEFAZIO, NAPOLITANO, GRAVES, ROUZER, and their incredible staff who put together the Water Resources Development Act of 2022.

There is always talk about congressional dysfunction, and that is certainly true in the Senate, not here in the House of Representatives. This is the fifth consecutive biennial WRDA that the House has brought to the floor since 2014.

The Water Resources Development Act provides key provisions for Solano and Yolo Counties, the bay area, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and all of California's Third Congressional District.

Specifically, the Water Resources Development Act directs the Army Corps of Engineers to examine the economic and national security benefits of dredging the Mare Island Strait channel which has not been studied since 1999. This is the first step in my ongoing efforts to increase Federal investment into Mare Island and its ship repair facilities for the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard, including the $13 million private investment announced by the Mare Island Dry Dock Company.

It also authorizes $50 million for environmentally friendly infrastructure projects in the five counties comprising the California Delta. Furthermore, it provides construction and authorizes construction for the Lower Cache Creek flood risk management project with the city of Woodland. It doubles Federal funding to $50 million to support restoration efforts at the Lake Tahoe basin. It requires the Army Corps to use more dredged sediment for beneficial use and to restore the San Francisco Bay Area wetlands instead of just dumping the dredged sediment in the open ocean.

It authorizes the Army Corps' national levee safety initiative to help manage flood risk across the entire Nation, including more than 200 miles of the Sacramento River which I currently represent.

It makes the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta a new focus area for the Corps in its effort to combat invasive species. Finally, it directs the Army Corps to complete long-overdue recommendations to Congress on finally making water supply a purpose of all Army Corps reservoirs and related infrastructure, which is a critical change for Western States like California facing more frequent and severe droughts due to climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the chairs, the ranking members, and my colleagues from both parties to get this timely legislation to

President Biden's desk for signature by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

□ 1745

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri, Ranking Member GRAVES, for yielding me time to speak on the 2022 Water Resources Development Act.

As someone who has seen firsthand the impact WRDA has had on Americans and our communities, I am greatly honored to have worked on this year's legislation.

A major priority for southeast Texas, the Texas Coastal Spine, is authorized in this legislation. This must-do project to protect our home State from hurricane storm surge and flooding will make millions of Texans, as well as our State's most important economic hubs, where a huge percentage of our Nation's gasoline and strategic fuels are manufactured, much safer.

Additionally, this bill expedites vital projects at the Port of Houston and the Sabine-Neches Waterway, the busiest port in the country and where more military equipment is shipped than any other waterway respectively.

We need to get this bill across the finish line. And I thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES, as well as Subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO and Ranking Member ROUZER and their staffs for everyone's hard work on this bill.

I also take a moment to thank Paul Sass, the departing Republican staff director, for his many years of service on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Paul's commitment to mission and dedication to public service have improved, not only our committee, but the Congress as a whole. And I wish him the absolute best of luck with all of his future endeavors.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. KAHELE).

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the fiscal year 2022 Water Resources and Development Act, legislation which will invest in America's ports, harbors, and inland waterways, as well as build more climate-resilient communities.

For the first time ever, WRDA includes Section 219 environmental infrastructure projects for the State of Hawaii, which will ensure that Maui, Kauai, Hawaii and Honolulu County are able to address wastewater infrastructure and confront these challenges head-on today, because the cost of waiting is too great.

This WRDA will also, for the first time ever, include a provision that will enable NHOs, or Native Hawaiian Organizations, to waive local cost-sharing requirements of up to $200,000 for critical environmental projects, which will open the doors to new environmental restoration projects and career opportunities in every county. This provision will help to provide more parity between indigenous communities, and I applaud its inclusion in this bill.

I am proud to support this bipartisan effort to invest in our ports and harbors, build more resilient communities, and support our indigenous brothers and sisters across the country.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the chairs and the ranking members for their work on this piece of legislation and, specifically, helping to combat some injustices.

Injustice number one is this bill works to prohibit once and for all, finally getting rid of all the toxic discharges out of Lake Okeechobee into what we call our northern estuaries in Florida. That is fixing injustice number one.

Injustice number two that this bill specifically addresses is, with those toxic, poisonous waters there are Corps of Engineers personnel that are working on top of those, sometimes for 8 or 10 hours a day, for weeks or months on end. And it actually requires that a letter be put in the file of those military personnel denoting their exposure to this so if something happens to them down the road they don't have to fight like so many of our servicemembers have to fight to get the appropriate care.

So I thank them for their work in helping to fix injustices in this specific piece of legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I again inquire as to the remaining time just to check here. We are tight on time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in Louisiana, we know the awesome power of the water. We also know that it is the lifeblood of our Nation's economy and environment.

The Army Corps of Engineers is the Federal department that most supports water management, ecosystem restoration, and flood control, critical issues in my region.

The Water Resources Development Act is the mechanism Congress uses for these authorizations, and it is a critical policy for my district. As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I am proud to have worked to include important updates for my district in WRDA, such as instructing the Corps of Engineers to continue paused ecosystem restoration on the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet; authorizing $136 million for St. John, St. Bernard, St. James, St. Charles, and Plaquemines Parishes for comprehensive treatment facilities and water infrastructure.

And on a personal note, the final version included my amendment to improve safety features along the banks of the Mississippi River, an important move after the recent tragic drowning of three children in Algiers in my district.

As we work to untangle supply chains and navigate climate change, we can't delay critical water management projects. I urge the favorable passage of the WRDA act, H.R. 7776.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership and ranking member for allowing all the amendments and the language included in this bill.

WRDA has always been key for infrastructure development projects in all our States and territories, and this year's bill will not be the exception. This has been a cornerstone in the process of Puerto Rico's recovery, and this legislation enables it to continue to do so.

This bill includes the reauthorization of three major flood risk management projects in Puerto Rico: Rio Guanajibo in Mayaguez, Rio Nigua in Salinas, and Rio Grande de Loiza in Gurabo, that had waited for funding, in some cases, for over a decade, to the point that the original authorizations had to be withdrawn and new validation studies required.

The projects had later received funding for at least their initial stages after passage of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, but needed this reauthorization so their development can continue with the planning and design, the allocated funding is protected from loss, and updated project needs can be addressed in the future so they can move on construction.

So by advancing this legislation containing these provisions, this House demonstrates its commitment to our communities. I look forward for the approval of this bill. And again, I thank all the staff and leadership and the ranking member for allowing all these amendments.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has done some extraordinary work for her district and Florida on this bill.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I congratulate him on this incredible work product and a remarkable career.

I rise today in support of H.R. 7776, the Water Resources Development Act. This bill will advance the economic interests of South Florida.

After more than 20 years of work, the Port Everglades deepening and widening project will enable safe passage of next-generation cruise and cargo ships, and it is estimated to create 1,500 good, permanent jobs when it is finished.

This bill authorizes an additional $269 million in Federal funding for Port

Everglades to complete the project, protect our coral reefs from disruption, and begin construction on an overdue new Coast Guard station.

I came to Congress as a young mom, and I remember telling my children about the potential effects of climate change. Now, in 2022, we know that the perils of a warming planet are no longer just predictions.

We have over 1,000 miles of levees and canals, 150 water control structures, and 16 major pump stations providing flood protection for 11 million residents in central and South Florida alone.

A 2009 study identified 18 water control structures in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties alone that are within 6 inches of failure.

I urge passage of this important bill, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS).

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey exposed how unprepared our infrastructure and flood mitigation efforts were for one of the most strategically important regions in the Nation.

Aside from the emotional and psychological toll Harvey inflicted on my community, it is estimated that Harvey cost $125 billion in damages.

Instead of continually spending money on the back end of tragedies that experts agree cost infinitely more, I am proud the Federal Government is authorizing investments in flood mitigation and prevention that will help deter another Harvey-like scenario.

I am also pleased that language in section 325 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance related to non-Federal interests and the removal of sediment obstructing inflow channels to Addicks and Barker Reservoirs.

In addition to the statutory changes for sediment removal, I am proud to support the authorization of $19.2 billion for the Texas coastal protection and restoration project.

The Port of Houston is home to the largest petrochemical manufacturing complex in the Americas; 42 percent of the specialty chemical feedstocks, 27 percent of the gas, and 60 percent of the jet aviation fuel are all produced in the region. It is good to see government working for the people.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this year's Water Resources Development Act, which includes funding for several critical priorities for my State and my district.

I am very proud to share that this bill authorizes funding to help the city of Newport replace its woefully outdated and dangerous Big Creek Dam. This dam holds the city's water supply; sits right above the city; could completely wipe out the city in an earthquake.

Funding is also designated for wastewater treatment and dredging along the Oregon coast, particularly in our areas that are facing a lot of issues with the Pacific Ocean.

I really appreciate the opportunity to present on this report and urge its passage.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this legislation that includes my language to secure additional funds for the Staten Island seawall to protect my constituents from a future hurricane.

In October, it will be 10 years since Hurricane Sandy devastated parts of New York City. Particularly hard-hit was my borough of Staten Island, where 24 lives were lost, hundreds of families were displaced, and thousands of homes were damaged.

Since the project's approval in 2013, bureaucratic red tape resulted in costly redesigns and repeated delays. This vital flood mitigation project is long overdue, and I made a commitment that when I came to Congress I would get it back on track.

In February, the city and Federal Governments came to an agreement on the radiation clean-up in Great Kills Park, which will allow for construction on the project's levee, floodwall, and tide gate.

This fall, the contract for the first phase is expected to be issued so we can break ground on the drainage portion in South Beach and finally begin this long-awaited project that is critical to the livelihoods of my constituents, and will help reduce flood insurance costs.

Today, we will ensure that the project will be fully funded through this bill. I thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I give great accolades to the chairman for his years of service.

This bill, H.R. 7776, deals with water resources infrastructure, makes communities more resilient, and helps indigenous minority communities, but urban areas as well.

The first longstanding impact that we have had in Texas over the years, one of the big ones was Hurricane Ike; 195 dead, 143 miles per hour and, of course, $38 billion. It was, in fact, the seventh most expensive hurricane.

We have continued with the devastation through Hurricane Harvey. This helps us with the Ike Dike and the coastal spine. We are saving lives and helping people.

I support this bill because we can live on the Gulf Coast.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7776, the "Water Resources Development Act of 2022."

This is the bill costal regions await because it outlines what critical infrastructure projects will be funded by or in part by the federal government.

I rise to speak on behalf of the city of Houston, which was shortchanged by the General Land Office of Houston, which has not received a single dollar out of $4.3 billion in Hurricane Harvey funding appropriated by this body for flood mitigation.

Houston experienced 25 percent of the damage caused by Hurricane Harvey which occurred in the city of Houston and twenty-five percent occurred in Harris County.

Harris County did receive its Hurricane Harvey Flood mitigation funding, while Houston did not receive funding for the billions in damage caused by flood water.

As the Member of Congress representing the 18th Congressional District of Texas, a senior member of the House Homeland Security Committee, and the person who led the successful effort in the House of Representatives to secure the federal disaster funding needed to mitigate and recover from the epic damage caused by Hurricane Harvey, I address this body to say if this has happened to the fourth largest city in the Nation, it can happen to any community.

When Congress appropriates, there should be no light between our decision and the expending of disaster mitigation funding.

The funds provided to insure that the same level of damage given the same factors are not repeated in the future.

Because of the inexplicable decision by the Texas General Land Office (GLO) refusing to award to the City of Houston or Harris County any of the nearly $1 billion in funding for flood mitigation projects from the $4.2 billion grant it received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development are not ready for another storm of the size and intensity of Hurricane Harvey.

I requested that the Department of Housing and Urban Development review the propriety and legality of the action and Texas GLO and suspend it from distribution any of $4.2 billion tranche, until after HUD completes its review.

The review should include a determination of whether the decision of the Texas GLO complies with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Department's regulations.

HUD found that there was nothing it could do because of the agreement that the Trump Administration entered into with the State of Texas.

It is impossible to justify the decision not to award a single dollar out of the $1 billion funding tranche to the City of Houston and Harris County, which are the economic hub of Texas and the southwest United States, and which accounts for 16.3 percent of the state population and more than 44 percent of the population directly affected by Hurricane Harvey.

Hurricane Harvey did not impact all jurisdictions equally. Houston has experienced 5 major flood events in 5 years, with Harris County as the only county affected by disasters in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2019. The cost per-capita of damage in the City of Houston is much greater than in rural areas because of the infrastructure and density of residential and business structures.

The Texas GLO appears to have forgotten or disregarded the damage to Houston and Harris County as a result of Hurricane Harvey, which dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

To put in perspective the devastation wrought by Hurricane Harvey, the volume of water that fell on Houston and other affected areas of Texas and Louisiana could fill more

than 24,000 Astrodomes or supply the water for the raging Niagara Falls for 15 days.

Houston received more than 50 inches of rainfall and whole sections of Houston, Beaumont, Bayou City, Port Arthur, and other cities were underwater for days.

More than 13,000 people were rescued in the Houston area and more than 30,000 persons were forced out of their homes due to the storm. In just the first three days of the storm, more than 49,000 homes that had suffered flood damage and more than 1,000 homes were completely destroyed in the storm. The cost of removing debris dwarfed the $70 million spent by Houston removing debris after Hurricane Ike in 2008.

Given these facts, it is irrational and unconscionable that Texas GLO awarded nearly $1 billion in U.S. Housing and Urban Development funds to other local governments in 46 Southeast Texas counties but none to the City of Houston.

I am in support of this bill because it renews America's commitment to our environment by funding U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to carry out critical infrastructure projects, especially in our Nation's coastal areas and waterways. It also prioritizes climate change in the research and implementation of the Corps' work.

H.R. 7776 will implement long-overdue modernization of the Corps' procedures and ensure that the economic benefits associated with a revitalized infrastructure are specifically advancing disadvantaged groups. Section 224 of this legislation mandates a report on the distribution of funds to Small Disadvantaged Businesses.

Those businesses include the thousands of small companies owned by people of color and indigenous people. This legislation gives us the opportunity to recenter our Nation's infrastructure development around black and brown business owners who have been perpetually left behind.

I am pleased that this legislation requires a report to Congress by the Secretary of the Army—who oversees the Army Corps of Engineers—that specifies the amount of contract and subcontract dollars awarded by the Corps to ''small and disadvantaged businesses''.

I hope to work with the Senate to further reinforce the Army Corps, putting in place reliable strong programs and outreach for use of MWBE in this work.

The programs for economic assistance and inclusion of MWBE by the Army Corps in these infrastructure programs must be done. MWBE and stopping flooding work together.

This transparency will help ensure that small businesses owned by people of color are given a fair opportunity to compete for contract and subcontract dollars in water projects. Furthermore, the report will enable Congress to hold the Corps accountable if the share of dollars to small disadvantaged businesses is inadequate.

Projects to research and mitigate flooding are critical to my constituents in Houston, as flood waters present a perpetual risk to my district and the surrounding community. Levees, bayous, reservoirs, and watersheds must all be maintained and reinforced to protect Houston from flood risks. Minority-owned businesses, who face these perpetual risks, must be included in the contracts to protect our communities from those risks.

In 2017, when Hurricane Harvey wreaked havoc on Houston and the entire coast of Texas, it caused more than $125 billion dollars in damage and killed 68 Texans.

As time passes, hurricanes become more intense as our planet warms. Funding the Corps' projects will not only help protect communities in Houston by reducing flooding, but also by lessening America's carbon footprint. That will make these natural disasters less likely to occur.

H.R. 7776 funds projects in Houston like the removing of sediment from the Addicks and Barker reservoirs, restoring our coastal regions, and expanding the Houston Ship Channel. These are critical to the economic viability and well-being of millions of people in South Texas.

It is time for Congress to act to save lives and protect our communities. This funding will dually promote a greener America while also working to lift marginalized groups. In doing both, we make our Nation a more prosperous and equitable place.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. And the time for the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ).

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Water Resources Development Act to improve our ports and harbors, inland waterway navigation, flood and storm protection, and other pieces of water resources infrastructure, all with a focus on locally driven projects rather than a nationwide partisan wish list.

This bill is an example of supporting real infrastructure, and it goes to prove that if we focus on real infrastructure, Congress can come together in a bipartisan manner.

This legislation has a lot of wins for South Florida. In it, we get provisions to expedite projects to protect Miami-Dade County and Monroe County from future storm damage. The flooding this past weekend in Miami underscored the importance of these projects for our region, particularly as we begin hurricane season.

We also doubled funding levels for the Florida Keys Water Quality Improvement Project to expand sanitary sewer systems in the Keys.

Overall, this legislation will be greatly beneficial to South Florida. It is incredible what we can accomplish when we put political hackery to the side and focus on the real needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this year's WRDA.

□ 1800

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill is very important and includes important hurricane protection for the Upper Barataria area, which is going to help Jefferson, St. Charles, and Lafourche Parishes, all the way up to Ascension Parish. If this had been in place when Hurricane Ida made landfall, we would have had fundamentally different conditions.

It is going to make higher, stronger levees. In the New Orleans area, $3 billion in new investments there, which we worked on with Congressman CARTER and Congressman SCALISE.

It clarifies the cost-share for the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, something that never should have been in contention.

It helps to manage water on the Mississippi River, expedites the Comite project, and makes tens of millions of dollars in additional authorizations for water and wastewater in the capital, river, and bayou regions.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people who helped with this legislation. One of them is Paul Sass, and I thank Paul for his nearly 20 years of service to this House and to this committee. Had he not been around working on many of these bills, it simply would not have happened, and I appreciate it. Having worked with the ranking member for some period of time, I couldn't imagine working 20 years with him. Amazing.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Ranking Member SAM GRAVES for his hard work on this. I thank Chairman DEFAZIO, Tim Petty, Leslie Parker, and Melissa Beaumont for their work on this important legislation.

This is all about making investments of millions of dollars before disasters happen in order to prevent billions of dollars in disaster recovery and loss of life.

Lastly, I thank Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chair NAPOLITANO, as well as Ranking Member ROUZER, for their hard work on this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, maintaining and improving our ports, waterways, and water infrastructure is critically important to the 14th District of Texas, as well as to our great State and Nation. Our families, our businesses, and the critical infrastructure along the upper Texas Gulf Coast will benefit from WRDA 2022.

Of particular importance to Texas, and the Nation, quite frankly, is a coastal spine. I have heard it several ways. It will mitigate the impact of major hurricanes and other significant water events in and around Galveston Bay, just south of the Houston Ship Channel, and all the families and the vast petrochemical industry that surrounds it.

In September 2008, Texas 14 was slammed by Hurricane Ike along a track similar to the deadly 1900 Storm of Galveston that cost 5,000 to 8,000 lives and billions of dollars in damage.

The damage from Ike, and the even more catastrophic Hurricane Harvey, could have been reduced significantly by the proposed coastal barrier that we call the Ike Dike. After years and years of pushing for this vital barrier system, I am proud that it is included in WRDA 2022.

While this bill does not reflect all the priorities we might prefer, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. I, too, add my order of thanks to both sides. This has been a great task, a great staff we have.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Tonight, I join my colleagues in support of this year's Water Resources Development Act. While it may not be readily apparent, the threat of storm damage and floods remains front and center, despite the prolonged drought across the Western United States.

In the wake of wildfires, mudslides will bring vegetation down from mountainsides into our public waterways. With fewer but more intense storms seen this year, the risk of flash floods has increased.

Now, as with many bipartisan bills, there are policies and provisions that I believe are missing from this measure. That work is not done. I will continue to push for more control over project construction to be given to local water agencies; more up-front inclusion of Tribes so we can avoid ruining their cultural and burial sites, literally crushing skulls while working on levees—this is about basic respect; and for the Army Corps and EPA to work with our constituents, rather than against them, such as penalties for when farmers plow their fields or change crops.

Indeed, we need to keep this conversation going, but I appreciate the legislation and the direction we are going.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7776, or WRDA 2022, is a very good bipartisan piece of legislation that will improve flood control infrastructure. It is going to improve ports, harbors, and inland waterways all across the country.

This bill provides the support and the investment in our country's water infrastructure needed to keep our supply chain moving and boost the competitiveness of the American economy.

When it comes right down to it, this bill is a projects bill that was pulled together based off requests from Members from all across the country in the House on both sides of the aisle, and there isn't a single line in this bill that cannot be attributed to an individual Member request.

I again thank my colleagues and the members of the committee for coming together to develop this bipartisan legislation. Again, I thank the chairman for his work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Most of what we do here would not be possible without the hard work of staff, so I would like to take a moment specifically to thank the staff of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment that took the lead in developing WRDA 2022 and ensuring that Members' priorities and national priorities were included: Ryan Seiger, the staff director of the subcommittee, who worked to enact more of WRDA than any other staffer on Capitol Hill; Alexa Williams; Logan Ferree; Michael Bauman. On the minority side: Ryan Hambleton, the minority staff director; Leslie Parker; Tim Petty; and Melissa Beaumont. Without them and their work, we would not be here today.

Paul Sass has already been thanked a number of times, but I congratulate him on his 20 years on the Hill and wish him well in his next endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, nearly 80 percent of our traded goods rely on American ports, harbors, and inland waterways to reach consumers.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to support our waterways and ecosystems, improve our defenses against floods and extreme weather, and create good-paying jobs along the way—and that's what the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (WRDA) will do.

Specifically, this bill authorizes the construction of 16 new projects and 72 feasibility studies approved by the Corps of Engineers and expedites the completion of 15 ongoing investigations. The bill also includes a water resource initiative that is very important to my constituents and the many residents of North Texas.

The White Rock Lake is a 1,015-acre city lake located outside of Dallas. The lake is one of the most heavily-used parks in the Dallas Parks system. It is home to the Dallas Arboretum, the White Rock Lake Museum, the Bath House Cultural Center, a large boat ramp and fishing pier, over nine miles of hiking and biking trails, a dog park, a picnic area, and pavilions. White Rock Lake has experienced an accumulation of sediment since it was last dredged in 1998, reducing the overall capacity of the lake, with reductions in both its water quality and recreational use. And with the pandemic increasing the already heavy usage rate of the lake, the need to dredge it has never been more urgent.

The goals of the White Rock Lake dredging project included in the WRDA are to remove sediment from the shoreline to improve maintenance, improve water quality to minimize negative impacts to aquatic habitat and other environmentally sensitive areas, and restore the depth of the lake to enhance watersport recreation.

The bill also authorizes $19.2 billion in funding to restore and protect Texas' coastline. The project is one of the largest in the history of the Corps of Engineers and includes improvements that reduce risks to public health and the economy, restore critical ecosystems, advance coastal resiliency, and help prepare the state for future damaging weather events.

I want to commend Chairman DEFAZIO and Subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO for their perseverance in developing this bipartisan bill and getting it to the House floor for a vote.

I strongly support the passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 and encourage my colleagues to pass a bill that is essential to America's economic competitiveness and helps improve the quality of our waterways for all our constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7776, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SOAP BOX DERBY RACES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on June 18, 2022, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to