

Very often, the right thing to do is also the smart thing to do. And it is politics and politics alone that gets in the way. Were it not for the cynical politics in Washington, passing this bill would be a no-brainer.

The moral question that we have to ask ourselves is, Are we so focused on the next election that we can't focus on the next generation?

It is beyond nonsensical that there are some who have previously preached about the importance of lowering taxes, but they are getting ready to vote down a tax cut for middle- and working-class families.

I think it is important to underscore that point because I recognize the folks at home, when they hear words like "tax credit," "expanded child tax credit," they are engaged in their work; they may not readily know what we are talking about. It is a tax cut. That is what it is, a tax cut for middle- and working-class families. And when we passed it back in 2021, it was, in fact, the largest tax cut for middle- and working-class families in American history.

But now we have the same lawmakers who love to talk about the need to lower taxes on middle- and working-class Americans—an argument I hear often—they are getting ready to vote down this tax cut. So the next time that I hear them talking about the need to cut taxes, I am going to ask my colleagues: How did you vote today? How did you vote when you had an opportunity to provide tax relief for ordinary people?

Maybe the issue is not so much tax cuts; it is for whom. Is it for those who need it the least or those who can benefit from it the most?

The bipartisan tax relief bill, negotiated in good faith by my friend the senior Senator from Oregon, is legislation that will offer a helping hand to ordinary families because we know that when ordinary people thrive, the economy thrives. And the reason the economy thrives is because when people who do not have a lot of disposable income—or virtually no disposable income—when they get a little bit of relief, you know, they buy extravagant things, you know, like a coat for their kid for winter, some more food, an opportunity to get some afterschool enrichment. That is what I think about.

I think about a mom that I met in Columbus, GA, named Denise, who in the weeks after we passed the expanded child tax credit said to me: Senator, I am so grateful that you all got this done. She said that she used those extra dollars to help prepare her daughter to go back to school and to help take care of her household as she was transitioning between jobs. It was a win for her, a win for her daughter, a win for the American economy.

Let's be clear. The bill that we are taking up today would help reduce poverty for some 636,000 children in Georgia and their families.

If I am honest, it is the kind of work that spurred me, a pastor, to get in-

involved in politics in the first place. I put up with politics in order to do things like this. When we passed the expanded child tax credit, we literally cut child poverty 40 percent or more in America. But because we only did it for 6 months, we went back and doubled it. We can do better than that.

These dollars are going right back into the economy, helping small businesses and helping local economies to be stronger. We are helping families, helping businesses, helping our economy. Not only that, but we know that the smartest investment we can make is investing in our children. When we invest in our kids—especially in getting them out of poverty—we literally save them from the trauma, the actual trauma that poverty creates.

So I stand advocating, pushing, begging my colleagues to reconsider.

You know, I grew up in public housing. I wouldn't be standing here today if it were not for good Federal public policy. I worked hard. I put my shoes on every morning. I come from a family that emphasized a strong work ethic. But I needed all of that and good Federal public policy to be standing on this floor right now.

I am the beneficiary of Head Start, which, by the way, Project 2025 wants to go after. Head Start, which gives poor children access to literacy, sets the foundation for a good life.

In high school, another good Federal program called Upward Bound put me on a college campus every summer and every Saturday so I knew I belonged on college campuses. And then Pell grants and student loans ensured I could make my way through college.

The expanded child tax credit is part of that good public policy, strengthening ordinary people. It would strengthen their families and would strengthen the American economy.

The time to do that is now. The time now is not to focus on November but to focus on what we can do right now. Dr. King was right: The time to do right is always right and that time is right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

THOMAS R. CARPER WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2024

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 401, S. 4367, the Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4367) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which

had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024".

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

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

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Notice to Congress regarding WRDA implementation.
- Sec. 102. Prior guidance.
- Sec. 103. Ability to pay.
- Sec. 104. Federal interest determinations.
- Sec. 105. Annual report to Congress.
- Sec. 106. Processing timelines.
- Sec. 107. Services of volunteers.
- Sec. 108. Support of Army civil works missions.
- Sec. 109. Inland waterway projects.
- Sec. 110. Leveraging Federal infrastructure for increased water supply.
- Sec. 111. Outreach and access.
- Sec. 112. Model development.
- Sec. 113. Planning assistance for States.
- Sec. 114. Corps of Engineers Levee Owners Advisory Board.
- Sec. 115. Silver Jackets program.
- Sec. 116. Tribal partnership program.
- Sec. 117. Tribal project implementation pilot program.
- Sec. 118. Eligibility for inter-Tribal consortiums.
- Sec. 119. Sense of Congress relating to the management of recreation facilities.

TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

- Sec. 201. Authorization of proposed feasibility studies.
- Sec. 202. Vertical integration and acceleration of studies.
- Sec. 203. Expedited completion.
- Sec. 204. Expedited completion of other feasibility studies.
- Sec. 205. Alexandria to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana, feasibility study.
- Sec. 206. Craig Harbor, Alaska.
- Sec. 207. Sussex County, Delaware.
- Sec. 208. Forecast-informed reservoir operations in the Colorado River Basin.
- Sec. 209. Beaver Lake, Arkansas, reallocation study.
- Sec. 210. Gathright Dam, Virginia, study.
- Sec. 211. Delaware Inland Bays Watershed Study.
- Sec. 212. Upper Susquehanna River Basin comprehensive flood damage reduction feasibility study.
- Sec. 213. Kanawha River Basin.
- Sec. 214. Authorization of feasibility studies for projects from CAP authorities.
- Sec. 215. Port Fourchon Belle Pass channel, Louisiana.
- Sec. 216. Studies for modification of project purposes in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona.
- Sec. 217. Non-Federal interest preparation of water reallocation studies, North Dakota.
- Sec. 218. Technical correction, Walla Walla River.
- Sec. 219. Watershed and river basin assessments.
- Sec. 220. Independent peer review.
- Sec. 221. Ice jam prevention and mitigation.
- Sec. 222. Report on hurricane and storm damage risk reduction design guidelines.
- Sec. 223. Briefing on status of certain activities on the Missouri River.
- Sec. 224. Report on material contaminated by a hazardous substance and the civil works program.
- Sec. 225. Report on efforts to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species.

Sec. 226. J. Strom Thurmond Lake, Georgia.
 Sec. 227. Study on land valuation procedures for the Tribal Partnership Program.
 Sec. 228. Report to Congress on levee safety guidelines.
 Sec. 229. Public-private partnership user's guide.
 Sec. 230. Review of authorities and programs for alternative project delivery.
 Sec. 231. Report to Congress on emergency response expenditures.
 Sec. 232. Excess land report for certain projects in North Dakota.
 Sec. 233. GAO studies.
 Sec. 234. Prior reports.
 Sec. 235. Briefing on status of Cape Cod Canal Bridges, Massachusetts.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Deauthorizations.
 Sec. 302. Environmental infrastructure.
 Sec. 303. Pennsylvania environmental infrastructure.
 Sec. 304. Acequias irrigation systems.
 Sec. 305. Oregon environmental infrastructure.
 Sec. 306. Kentucky and West Virginia environmental infrastructure.
 Sec. 307. Lake Champlain Watershed, Vermont and New York.
 Sec. 308. Ohio and North Dakota.
 Sec. 309. Southern West Virginia.
 Sec. 310. Northern West Virginia.
 Sec. 311. Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.
 Sec. 312. Western rural water.
 Sec. 313. Continuing authorities programs.
 Sec. 314. Small project assistance.
 Sec. 315. Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin project, Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois.
 Sec. 316. Mamaroneck-Sheldrake Rivers, New York.
 Sec. 317. Lowell Creek Tunnel, Alaska.
 Sec. 318. Selma flood risk management and bank stabilization.
 Sec. 319. Illinois River basin restoration.
 Sec. 320. Hawaii environmental restoration.
 Sec. 321. Connecticut River Basin invasive species partnerships.
 Sec. 322. Expenses for control of aquatic plant growths and invasive species.
 Sec. 323. Corps of Engineers Asian carp prevention pilot program.
 Sec. 324. Extension for certain invasive species programs.
 Sec. 325. Storm damage prevention and reduction, coastal erosion, riverine erosion, and ice and glacial damage, Alaska.
 Sec. 326. Rehabilitation of Corps of Engineers constructed dams.
 Sec. 327. Ediz Hook Beach Erosion Control Project, Port Angeles, Washington.
 Sec. 328. Sense of Congress relating to certain Louisiana hurricane and coastal storm damage risk reduction projects.
 Sec. 329. Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery Program.
 Sec. 330. Bosque wildlife restoration project.
 Sec. 331. Expansion of temporary relocation assistance pilot program.
 Sec. 332. Wilson Lock floating guide wall.
 Sec. 333. Delaware Inland Bays and Delaware Bay Coast Coastal Storm Risk Management Study.
 Sec. 334. Upper Mississippi River Plan.
 Sec. 335. Rehabilitation of pump stations.
 Sec. 336. Navigation along the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.
 Sec. 337. Garrison Dam, North Dakota.
 Sec. 338. Sense of Congress relating to Missouri River priorities.
 Sec. 339. Soil moisture and snowpack monitoring.

Sec. 340. Contracts for water supply.
 Sec. 341. Rend Lake, Carlyle Lake, and Lake Shelbyville, Illinois.
 Sec. 342. Delaware Coastal System Program.
 Sec. 343. Maintenance of pile dike system.
 Sec. 344. Conveyances.
 Sec. 345. Emergency drought operations pilot program.
 Sec. 346. Rehabilitation of existing levees.
 Sec. 347. Non-Federal implementation pilot program.
 Sec. 348. Harmful algal bloom demonstration program.
 Sec. 349. Sense of Congress relating to Mobile Harbor, Alabama.
 Sec. 350. Sense of Congress relating to Port of Portland, Oregon.
 Sec. 351. Chattahoochee River Program.
 Sec. 352. Additional projects for underserved community harbors.
 Sec. 353. Winoski River tributary watershed.
 Sec. 354. Waco Lake, Texas.
 Sec. 355. Seminole Tribal claim extension.
 Sec. 356. Coastal erosion project, Barrow, Alaska.
 Sec. 357. Colebrook River Reservoir, Connecticut.
 Sec. 358. Sense of Congress relating to shallow draft dredging in the Chesapeake Bay.

TITLE IV—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 401. Project authorizations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. NOTICE TO CONGRESS REGARDING WRDA IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) **PLAN OF IMPLEMENTATION.**—
 (1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan for implementing this Act and the amendments made by this Act.
 (2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In developing the plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—
 (A) identify each provision of this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) that will require—
 (i) the development and issuance of guidance, including whether that guidance will be significant guidance;
 (ii) the development and issuance of a rule; or
 (iii) appropriations;
 (B) develop timelines for the issuance of—
 (i) any guidance described in subparagraph (A)(i); and
 (ii) each rule described in subparagraph (A)(ii); and
 (C) establish a process to disseminate information about this Act and the amendments made by this Act to each District and Division Office of the Corps of Engineers.
 (3) **TRANSMITTAL.**—On completion of the plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transmit the plan to—
 (A) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and
 (B) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.
 (b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PRIOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT LAWS.**—
 (1) **DEFINITION OF PRIOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT LAW.**—In this subsection, the term “prior water resources development law” means each of the following (including the amendments made by any of the following):
 (A) The Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–541; 114 Stat. 2572).
 (B) The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–114; 121 Stat. 1041).
 (C) The Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–121; 128 Stat. 1193).
 (D) The Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (Public Law 114–322; 130 Stat. 1628).
 (E) The America’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–270; 132 Stat. 3765).

(F) Division AA of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2615).

(G) Title LXXXI of division H of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117–263; 136 Stat. 3691).

(2) NOTICE.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written notice of the status of efforts by the Secretary to implement the prior water resources development laws.

(B) CONTENTS.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—As part of the notice under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall include a list describing each provision of a prior water resources development law that has not been fully implemented as of the date of submission of the notice.

(ii) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—For each provision included on the list under clause (i), the Secretary shall—

(I) establish a timeline for implementing the provision;

(II) provide a description of the status of the provision in the implementation process; and

(III) provide an explanation for the delay in implementing the provision.

(3) BRIEFINGS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the Chairs of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives determine that this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and prior water resources development laws are fully implemented, the Secretary shall provide to relevant congressional committees a briefing on the implementation of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and prior water resources development laws.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—A briefing under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) updates to the implementation plan under subsection (a); and

(ii) updates to the written notice under paragraph (2).

(c) **ADDITIONAL NOTICE PENDING ISSUANCE.**—Not later than 30 days before issuing any guidance, rule, notice in the Federal Register, or other documentation required to implement this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or a prior water resources development law (as defined in subsection (b)(1)), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written notice regarding the pending issuance.

(d) WRDA IMPLEMENTATION TEAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) **PRIOR WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT LAW.**—The term “prior water resources development law” has the meaning given the term in subsection (b)(1).

(B) **TEAM.**—The term “team” means the Water Resources Development Act implementation team established under paragraph (2).

(2) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish a Water Resources Development Act implementation team that shall consist of current employees of the Federal Government, including—

(A) not fewer than 2 employees in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works;

(B) not fewer than 2 employees at the headquarters of the Corps of Engineers; and

(C) a representative of each district and division of the Corps of Engineers.

(3) **DUTIES.**—The team shall be responsible for assisting with the implementation of this Act,

the amendments made by this Act, and prior water resources development laws, including—

(A) performing ongoing outreach to—
(i) Congress; and
(ii) employees and servicemembers stationed in districts and divisions of the Corps of Engineers to ensure that all Corps of Engineers employees are aware of and implementing provisions of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and prior water resources development laws, in a manner consistent with congressional intent;

(B) identifying any issues with implementation of a provision of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and prior water resources development laws at the district, division, or national level;

(C) resolving the issues identified under subparagraph (B), in consultation with Corps of Engineers leadership and the Secretary; and

(D) ensuring that any interpretation developed as a result of the process under subparagraph (C) is consistent with congressional intent for this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and prior water resources development laws.

SEC. 102. PRIOR GUIDANCE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue the guidance required pursuant to each of the following provisions:

(1) Section 1043(b)(9) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 113–121).

(2) Section 8136 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (10 U.S.C. 2667 note; Public Law 117–263).

SEC. 103. ABILITY TO PAY.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall expedite any guidance or rulemaking necessary to the implementation of section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) to address ability to pay.

(b) ABILITY TO PAY.—Section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) is amended by adding the end the following:

“(5) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives written notification of determinations made by the Secretary of the ability of non-Federal interests to pay under this subsection.

“(B) CONTENTS.—In preparing the written notification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall include, for each determination made by the Secretary—

“(i) the name of the non-Federal interest that submitted to the Secretary a request for a determination under this subsection;

“(ii) the name and location of the project; and

“(iii) the determination made by the Secretary and the reasons for the determination, including the adjusted share of the costs of the project of the non-Federal interest, if applicable.”.

(c) TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 203(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives written notification of determinations made by the Secretary of the ability of non-Federal interests to pay under this subsection.

“(B) CONTENTS.—In preparing the written notification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall include, for each determination made by the Secretary—

“(i) the name of the non-Federal interest that submitted to the Secretary a request for a determination under paragraph (1)(B)(ii);

“(ii) the name and location of the project; and

“(iii) the determination made by the Secretary and the reasons for the determination, including the adjusted share of the costs of the project of the non-Federal interest, if applicable.”.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL INTEREST DETERMINATIONS.

Section 905(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) IDENTIFICATION.—As part of the submission of a work plan to Congress pursuant to the joint explanatory statement for an annual appropriations Act or as part of the submission of a spend plan to Congress for a supplemental appropriations Act under which the Corps of Engineers receives funding, the Secretary shall identify the studies in the plan—

“(i) for which the Secretary plans to prepare a feasibility report under subsection (a) that will benefit—

“(I) an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)); or

“(II) a community other than a community described in subclause (I); and

“(ii) that are designated as a new start under the work plan.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—After identifying the studies under subparagraph (A) and subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall, with the consent of the applicable non-Federal interest for the study, first determine the Federal interest in carrying out the study and the projects that may be proposed in the study.

“(ii) FEASIBILITY COST SHARE AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may make a determination under clause (i) prior to the execution of a feasibility cost share agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest.

“(C) LIMITATION.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary may not make a determination under subparagraph (B) for more than 20 studies identified under subparagraph (A)(i)(II).

“(D) APPLICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii) and with the consent of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary may use the authority provided under this subsection for a study in a work plan submitted to Congress prior to the date of enactment of the Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024 if the study otherwise meets the requirements described in subparagraph (A).

“(ii) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (C) shall apply to the use of authority under clause (i).”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) shall be paid from the funding provided for the study in the applicable work plan described in that paragraph.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) POST-DETERMINATION WORK.—A study under this section shall continue after a determination under paragraph (1)(B)(i) without a new investment decision.”.

SEC. 105. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

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

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—After the publication of the annual report under subsection (f), if the proposal of a non-Federal interest submitted under subsection (b) was included by the Secretary in the appendix under subsection (c)(4), the Sec-

retary shall provide written notification to the non-Federal interest of such inclusion.

“(2) DEBRIEF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a non-Federal interest receives the written notification under paragraph (1), the non-Federal interest shall notify the Secretary that the non-Federal interest is requesting a debrief under this paragraph.

“(B) RESPONSE.—If a non-Federal interest requests a debrief under this paragraph, the Secretary shall provide the debrief to the non-Federal interest by not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the request for the debrief.

“(C) INCLUSIONS.—The debrief provided by the Secretary under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) an explanation of the reasons that the proposal was included in the appendix under subsection (c)(4); and

“(ii) a description of—

“(I) any revisions to the proposal that may allow the proposal to be included in a subsequent annual report, to the maximum extent practicable;

“(II) other existing authorities of the Secretary that may be used to address the need that prompted the proposal, if applicable; and

“(III) any other information that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(h) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the publication of the annual report under subsection (f), for each proposal included in that annual report or appendix, the Secretary shall notify each Member of Congress that represents the State in which that proposal will be located that the proposal was included the annual report or the appendix.”.

SEC. 106. PROCESSING TIMELINES.

Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall ensure that the public website for the “permit finder” of the Corps of Engineers accurately reflects the current status of projects for which a permit was, or is being, processed using amounts accepted under section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2352).

SEC. 107. SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS.

The seventeenth paragraph under the heading “GENERAL PROVISIONS” under the heading “CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY” in chapter IV of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983 (33 U.S.C. 569c), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The United States Army Chief of Engineers” and inserting the following:

“SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS

“SEC. 141. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of Engineers”.

(2) in subsection (a) (as so designated), in the second sentence, by striking “Such volunteers” and inserting the following:

“(b) TREATMENT.—Volunteers under subsection (a)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) RECOGNITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Chief of Engineers may recognize through an award or other appropriate means the service of volunteers under subsection (a).

“(2) PROCESS.—The Chief of Engineers shall establish a process to carry out paragraph (1).

“(3) LIMITATION.—The Chief of Engineers shall ensure that the recognition provided to a volunteer under paragraph (1) shall not be in the form of a cash award.”.

SEC. 108. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS MISSIONS.

Section 8159 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3740) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) West Virginia University to conduct academic research on flood resilience planning and

risk management, water resource-related emergency management, aquatic ecosystem restoration, water quality, siting and risk management for open- and closed-loop pumped hydropower energy storage, hydropower, and water resource-related recreation and management of resources for recreation in the State of West Virginia;

“(5) Delaware State University to conduct academic research on water resource ecology, water quality, aquatic ecosystem restoration, coastal restoration, and water resource-related emergency management in the State of Delaware, the Delaware River Basin, and the Chesapeake Bay watershed;

“(6) the University of Notre Dame to conduct academic research on hazard mitigation policies and practices in coastal communities, including through the incorporation of data analysis and the use of risk-based analytical frameworks for reviewing flood mitigation and hardening plans and for evaluating the design of new infrastructure; and

“(7) Mississippi State University to conduct academic research on technology to be used in water resources development infrastructure, analyses of the environment before and after a natural disaster, and geospatial data collection.”

SEC. 109. INLAND WATERWAY PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “65 percent of the costs” and inserting “75 percent of the costs”; and

(2) in the undesignated matter following paragraph (3), in the second sentence, by striking “35 percent of such costs” and inserting “25 percent of such costs”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply beginning on October 1, 2024, to any construction of a project for navigation on the inland waterways that is new or ongoing on or after that date.

(c) EXCEPTION.—In the case of an inland waterways project that receives funds under the heading “CONSTRUCTION” under the heading “CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY” in title III of division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (135 Stat. 1359) that will not complete construction, replacement, rehabilitation, and expansion with such funds—

(1) section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2212(a)) shall not apply; and

(2) any remaining costs shall be paid only from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 110. LEVERAGING FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INCREASED WATER SUPPLY.

Section 1118(i) of Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (43 U.S.C. 390b–2(i)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) CONTRIBUTED FUNDS FOR OTHER FEDERAL RESERVOIR PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to receive and expend funds from a non-Federal interest or a Federal agency that owns a Federal reservoir project described in subparagraph (B) to formulate, review, or revise operational documents pursuant to a proposal submitted in accordance with subsection (a).

“(B) FEDERAL RESERVOIR PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—A Federal reservoir project referred to in subparagraph (A) is a reservoir for which the Secretary is authorized to prescribe regulations for the use of storage allocated for flood control or navigation pursuant to section 7 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the ‘Flood Control Act of 1944’) (58 Stat. 890, chapter 665; 33 U.S.C. 709).”

SEC. 111. OUTREACH AND ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8117(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2281b(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ensuring that a potential non-Federal interest is aware of the roles, responsibilities, and financial commitments associated with a completed water resources development project prior to initiating a feasibility study (as defined in section 105(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(d))), including operations, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation responsibilities.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(i) develop and continue to make publicly available, through a publicly available existing website, information on the projects and studies within the jurisdiction of each district of the Corps of Engineers; and

“(ii) ensure that the information described in clause (i) is consistent and made publicly available in the same manner across all districts of the Corps of Engineers.”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

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

“(3) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall develop and issue guidance to ensure that the points of contacts established under paragraph (2)(B) are adequately fulfilling their obligations under that paragraph.”.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a briefing on the status of the implementation of section 8117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2281b), including the amendments made to that section by subsection (a), including—

(1) a plan for implementing any requirements under that section; and

(2) any potential barriers to implementing that section.

SEC. 112. MODEL DEVELOPMENT.

Section 8230 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3765) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) MODEL DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may partner with other Federal agencies, National Laboratories, and institutions of higher education to develop, update, and maintain hydrologic and climate-related models for use in water resources planning, including models to assess compound flooding that arises when 2 or more flood drivers occur simultaneously or in close succession, or are impacting the same region over time.

“(2) USE.—The Secretary may use models developed by the entities described in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 113. PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR STATES.

Section 22(a)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16(a)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting “and title research for abandoned structures” before the period at the end.

SEC. 114. CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEE OWNERS ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LEVEE SYSTEM OWNER-OPERATOR.—The term “Federal levee system owner-operator” means a non-Federal interest that owns and operates and maintains a levee system that was constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) OWNERS BOARD.—The term “Owners Board” means the Levee Owners Advisory Board established under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a Levee Owners Advisory Board.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Owners Board—

(A) shall be composed of—

(i) 11 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, who shall—

(I) represent various regions of the country, including not less than 1 Federal levee system owner-operator from each of the civil works divisions of the Corps of Engineers; and

(II) have the requisite experiential or technical knowledge to carry out the duties of the Owners Board described in subsection (d); and

(ii) a representative of the Corps of Engineers, to be designated by the Secretary, who shall serve as a nonvoting member; and

(B) may include a representative designated by the head of the Federal agency described in section 9002(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3301(1)), who shall serve as a nonvoting member.

(2) TERMS OF MEMBERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), a member of the Owners Board shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member of the Owners Board may be reappointed to the Owners Board, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(C) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Owners Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Owners Board shall appoint a chairperson from among the members of the Owners Board.

(d) DUTIES.—

(1) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Owners Board shall provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary and the Chief of Engineers on—

(A) the activities and actions, consistent with applicable statutory authorities, that should be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and Federal levee system owner-operators to improve flood risk management throughout the United States; and

(B) how to improve cooperation and communication between the Corps of Engineers and Federal levee system owner-operators.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Owners Board shall meet not less frequently than semiannually.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary, on behalf of the Owners Board, shall—

(A) submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that includes the recommendations provided under paragraph (1); and

(B) make those recommendations publicly available, including on a publicly available existing website.

(e) INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.—Any advice or recommendation made by the Owners Board pursuant to subsection (d)(1) shall reflect the independent judgment of the Owners Board.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) COMPENSATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the members of the Owners Board shall serve without compensation.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Owners Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) TREATMENT.—The members of the Owners Board shall not be considered to be Federal employees, and the meetings and reports of the Owners Board shall not be considered a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—The Owners Board shall not supplant the Committee on Levee Safety established by section 9003 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3302).

SEC. 115. SILVER JACKETS PROGRAM.

The Secretary shall continue the Silver Jackets program established by the Secretary pursuant to section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) and section 204 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5134).

SEC. 116. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

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

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) projects that improve emergency response capabilities and provide increased access to infrastructure that may be utilized in the event of a severe weather event or other natural disaster; and”;

(2) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary shall carry out not more than 5 projects described in paragraph (2).

“(2) PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1)(B), a project referred to in paragraph (1) is a project—

“(A) that is otherwise eligible and meets the requirements under this section; and

“(B) that is located—

“(i) along the Mid-Columbia River, Washington, Taneum Creek, Washington, or Similk Bay, Washington; or

“(ii) at Big Bend, Lake Oahe, Fort Randall, or Gavins Point Reservoirs, South Dakota.

“(3) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall carry out a project described in paragraph (2) in accordance with this section.

“(4) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection authorizes—

“(A) a project for the removal of a dam that otherwise is a project described in paragraph (2);

“(B) the study of the removal of a dam; or

“(C) the study of any Federal dam, including the study of power, flood control, or navigation replacement, or the implementation of any functional alteration to that dam, that is located along a body of water described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(B).”.

SEC. 117. TRIBAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PROJECT.—The term “eligible project” means a project or activity eligible to be carried out under the Tribal partnership program under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269).

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and implement a pilot program under which Indian Tribes may directly carry out eligible projects.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the pilot program under this section are—

(1) to authorize Tribal contracting to advance Tribal self-determination and provide economic opportunities for Indian Tribes; and

(2) to evaluate the technical, financial, and organizational efficiencies of Indian Tribes carrying out the design, execution, management, and construction of 1 or more eligible projects.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary shall—

(A) identify a total of not more than 5 eligible projects that have been authorized for construction;

(B) notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the identification of each eligible project under the pilot program under this section;

(C) in collaboration with the Indian Tribe, develop a detailed project management plan for each identified eligible project that outlines the scope, budget, design, and construction resource requirements necessary for the Indian Tribe to execute the project or a separable element of the eligible project;

(D) on the request of the Indian Tribe and in accordance with subsection (f)(2), enter into a project partnership agreement with the Indian Tribe for the Indian Tribe to provide full project management control for construction of the eligible project, or a separable element of the eligible project, in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary;

(E) following execution of the project partnership agreement, transfer to the Indian Tribe to carry out construction of the eligible project, or a separable element of the eligible project—

(i) if applicable, the balance of the unobligated amounts appropriated for the eligible project, except that the Secretary shall retain sufficient amounts for the Corps of Engineers to carry out any responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers relating to the eligible project and the pilot program under this section; and

(ii) additional amounts, as determined by the Secretary, from amounts made available to carry out this section, except that the total amount transferred to the Indian Tribe shall not exceed the updated estimate of the Federal share of the cost of construction, including any required design; and

(F) regularly monitor and audit each eligible project being constructed by an Indian Tribe under this section to ensure that the construction activities are carried out in compliance with the plans approved by the Secretary and that the construction costs are reasonable.

(2) DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.—Not later than 180 days after entering into an agreement under paragraph (1)(D), each Indian Tribe, to the maximum extent practicable, shall submit to the Secretary a detailed project schedule, based on estimated funding levels, that lists all deadlines for each milestone in the construction of the eligible project.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—On the request of an Indian Tribe, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to the Indian Tribe, if the Indian Tribe contracts with and compensates the Secretary for the technical assistance relating to—

(A) any study, engineering activity, and design activity for construction carried out by the Indian Tribe under this section; and

(B) expeditiously obtaining any permits necessary for the eligible project.

(e) COST SHARE.—Nothing in this section affects the cost-sharing requirement applicable on the day before the date of enactment of this Act to an eligible project carried out under this section.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE.—

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

(A) the metrics for measuring the success of the pilot program;

(B) a process for identifying future eligible projects to participate in the pilot program;

(C) measures to address the risks of an Indian Tribe constructing eligible projects under the pilot program, including which entity bears the risk for eligible projects that fail to meet Corps of Engineers standards for design or quality;

(D) the laws and regulations that an Indian Tribe must follow in carrying out an eligible project under the pilot program; and

(E) which entity bears the risk in the event that an eligible project carried out under the

pilot program fails to be carried out in accordance with the project authorization or this section.

(2) NEW PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may not enter into a project partnership agreement under this section until the date on which the Secretary issues the guidance under paragraph (1).

(g) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and make publicly available a report detailing the results of the pilot program under this section, including—

(A) a description of the progress of Indian Tribes in meeting milestones in detailed project schedules developed pursuant to subsection (d)(2); and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary concerning whether the pilot program or any component of the pilot program should be implemented on a national basis.

(2) UPDATE.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an update to the report under paragraph (1).

(3) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If the Secretary fails to submit a report by the required deadline under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a detailed explanation of why the deadline was missed and a projected date for submission of the report.

(h) ADMINISTRATION.—All laws and regulations that would apply to the Secretary if the Secretary were carrying out the eligible project shall apply to an Indian Tribe carrying out an eligible project under this section.

(i) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to commence an eligible project under this section terminates on December 31, 2029.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any amounts appropriated for a specific eligible project, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section, including the costs of administration of the Secretary, \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2029.

SEC. 118. ELIGIBILITY FOR INTER-TRIBAL CONSORTIUMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 221(b)(1) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(b)(1)) is amended by inserting “and an inter-tribal consortium (as defined in section 403 of the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act (25 U.S.C. 3202))” after “5304)).”.

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “the term” and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) INTER-TRIBAL CONSORTIUM.—The term ‘inter-tribal consortium’ has the meaning given the term in section 403 of the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act (25 U.S.C. 3202).

“(3) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘Tribal organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, inter-tribal consortiums, Tribal organizations,” after “Indian tribes”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, inter-tribal consortiums, or Tribal organizations” after “Indian tribes”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “flood hurricane” and inserting “flood or hurricane”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “, an inter-tribal consortium, or a Tribal organization” after “Indian tribe”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (E) (as redesignated by section 116(1)(B)), by inserting “, inter-tribal consortiums, Tribal organizations,” after “Indian tribes”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting “, inter-tribal consortium, or Tribal organization” after “Indian tribe” each place it appears.

SEC. 119. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE MANAGEMENT OF RECREATION FACILITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Corps of Engineers should have greater access to the revenue collected from the use of Corps of Engineers-managed facilities with recreational purposes;

(2) revenue collected from Corps of Engineers-managed facilities with recreational purposes should be available to the Corps of Engineers for necessary operation, maintenance, and improvement activities at the facility from which the revenue was derived;

(3) the districts of the Corps of Engineers should be provided with more authority to partner with non-Federal public entities and private nonprofit entities for the improvement and management of Corps of Engineers-managed facilities with recreational purposes; and

(4) legislation to address the issues described in paragraphs (1) through (3) should be considered by Congress.

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) YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA.—Project for flood risk management, Yavapai County, Arizona.

(2) EASTMAN LAKE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and water supply, including for conservation and recharge, Eastman Lake, Merced and Madera Counties, California.

(3) PINE FLAT DAM, CALIFORNIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, water supply, and recreation, Pine Flat Dam, Fresno County, California.

(4) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, including sea level rise, San Diego, California.

(5) SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including levee improvement, Sacramento River, Sacramento, California.

(6) SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, City of San Mateo, California.

(7) SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and water supply, Lower Cosumnes River, Sacramento County, California.

(8) COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.—Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Fountain Creek, Monument Creek, and T-Gap Levee, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

(9) PLYMOUTH, CONNECTICUT.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Plymouth, Connecticut.

(10) WINDHAM, CONNECTICUT.—Project for ecosystem restoration and recreation, Windham, Connecticut.

(11) ENFIELD, CONNECTICUT.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including restoring freshwater brook floodplain, Enfield, Connecticut.

(12) NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT.—Project for flood risk management, Newington, Connecticut.

(13) HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Hartford, Connecticut.

(14) FAIRFIELD, CONNECTICUT.—Project for flood risk management, Rooster River, Fairfield, Connecticut.

(15) MILTON, DELAWARE.—Project for flood risk management, Milton, Delaware.

(16) WILMINGTON, DELAWARE.—Project for coastal storm risk management, City of Wilmington, Delaware.

(17) TYBEE ISLAND, GEORGIA.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, including the potential for beneficial use of dredged material, Tybee Island, Georgia.

(18) HANAPEPE LEVEE, HAWAII.—Project for ecosystem restoration, flood risk management, and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, including Hanapepe Levee, Kauai County, Hawaii.

(19) KAUAI COUNTY, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Kauai County, Hawaii.

(20) HAWAI'I KAI, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management, Hawai'i Kai, Hawaii.

(21) MAUI, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Maui County, Hawaii.

(22) BUTTERFIELD CREEK, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood risk management, Butterfield Creek, Illinois, including the villages of Flossmoor, Matteson, Park Forest, and Richton Park.

(23) ROCKY RIPPLE, INDIANA.—Project for flood risk management, Rocky Ripple, Indiana.

(24) COFFEYVILLE, KANSAS.—Project for flood risk management, Coffeyville, Kansas.

(25) FULTON COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—Project for flood risk management, including bank stabilization, Fulton County, Kentucky.

(26) CUMBERLAND RIVER, CRITTENDEN COUNTY, LYON COUNTY, AND LIVINGSTON COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—Project for ecosystem restoration, including bank stabilization, Cumberland River, Crittenden County, Lyon County, and Livingston County, Kentucky.

(27) SCOTT COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—Project for ecosystem restoration, including water supply, Scott County, Kentucky.

(28) BULLSKIN CREEK AND SHELBY COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—Project for ecosystem restoration, including bank stabilization, Bullskin Creek and Shelby County, Kentucky.

(29) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN BARRIER, LOUISIANA.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Orleans Parish, St. Tammany Parish, and St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana.

(30) OCEAN CITY, MARYLAND.—Project for flood risk management, Ocean City, Maryland.

(31) BEAVERDAM CREEK, MARYLAND.—Project for flood risk management, Beaverdam Creek, Prince George's County, Maryland.

(32) OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, recreation, and ecosystem restoration, including shoreline stabilization along East Chop Drive, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts.

(33) TISBURY, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline stabilization along Beach Road Causeway, Tisbury, Massachusetts.

(34) OAK BLUFFS HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for coastal storm risk management and navigation, Oak Bluffs Harbor north and south jetties, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts.

(35) CONNECTICUT RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management along the Connecticut River, Massachusetts.

(36) MARYSVILLE, MICHIGAN.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline stabilization, City of Marysville, Michigan.

(37) CHEBOYGAN, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, Little Black River, City of Cheboygan, Michigan.

(38) KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Kalamazoo River Watershed and tributaries, City of Kalamazoo, Michigan.

(39) DEARBORN AND DEARBORN HEIGHTS, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, Dearborn and Dearborn Heights, Michigan.

(40) GRAND TRAVERSE BAY, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Grand Traverse Bay, Michigan.

(41) GRAND TRAVERSE COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Grand Traverse County, Michigan.

(42) BRIGHTON MILL POND, MICHIGAN.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Brighton Mill Pond, Michigan.

(43) LUDINGTON, MICHIGAN.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including feasibility of emergency shoreline protection, Ludington, Michigan.

(44) PAHRUMP, NEVADA.—Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and flood risk management, Pahrump, Nevada.

(45) ALLEGHENY RIVER, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Allegheny River, New York.

(46) TURTLE COVE, NEW YORK.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Turtle Cove, Pelham Bay Park, Bronx, New York.

(47) NILES, OHIO.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, City of Niles, Ohio.

(48) GENEVA-ON-THE-LAKE, OHIO.—Project for flood and coastal storm risk management, ecosystem restoration, recreation, and shoreline erosion protection, Geneva-on-the-Lake, Ohio.

(49) LITTLE KILLBUCK CREEK, OHIO.—Project for ecosystem restoration, including aquatic invasive species management, Little Killbuck Creek, Ohio.

(50) DEFIANCE, OHIO.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, recreation, and bank stabilization, Maumee, Auglaize, and Tiffin Rivers, Defiance, Ohio.

(51) DILLON LAKE, MUSKINGUM COUNTY, OHIO.—Project for ecosystem restoration, recreation, and shoreline erosion protection, Dillon Lake, Muskingum and Licking Counties, Ohio.

(52) JERUSALEM TOWNSHIP, OHIO.—Project for flood and coastal storm risk management and shoreline erosion protection, Jerusalem Township, Ohio.

(53) NINE MILE CREEK, CLEVELAND, OHIO.—Project for flood risk management, Nine Mile Creek, Cleveland, Ohio.

(54) COLD CREEK, OHIO.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Cold Creek, Erie County, Ohio.

(55) ALLEGHENY RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Allegheny River, Pennsylvania.

(56) PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and recreation, including shoreline stabilization, South Philadelphia Wetlands Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(57) GALVESTON BAY, TEXAS.—Project for navigation, Galveston Bay, Texas.

(58) WINOOSKI, VERMONT.—Project for flood risk management, Winooski River and tributaries, Winooski, Vermont.

(59) MT. ST. HELENS, WASHINGTON.—Project for navigation, Mt. St. Helens, Washington.

(60) GRAYS BAY, WASHINGTON.—Project for navigation, flood risk management, and ecosystem restoration, Grays Bay, Wahkiakum County, Washington.

(61) WIND, KLICKITAT, HOOD, DESCHUTES, ROCK CREEK, AND JOHN DAY TRIBUTARIES, WASHINGTON.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Wind, Klickitat, Hood, Deschutes, Rock Creek, and John Day tributaries, Washington.

(62) LA CROSSE, WISCONSIN.—Project for flood risk management, City of La Crosse, Wisconsin.

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

(1) **LUXAPALILA CREEK, ALABAMA.**—Modifications to the project for flood risk management, Luxapalila Creek, Alabama, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 307).

(2) **OSCEOLA HARBOR, ARKANSAS.**—Modifications to the project for navigation, Osceola Harbor, Arkansas, authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), to evaluate the expansion of the harbor.

(3) **SAVANNAH, 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) and modified by section 1401(6) of the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3839).

(4) **HAGAMAN CHUTE, LOUISIANA.**—Modifications to the project for navigation, including sediment management, Hagaman Chute, Louisiana.

(5) **MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OUACHITA RIVER, LOUISIANA.**—Modifications to the project for flood risk management, including bank stabilization, Ouachita River, Monroe to Caldwell Parish, Louisiana, authorized by the first section of the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534, chapter 569).

(6) **ST. MARYS RIVER, MICHIGAN.**—Modifications to the project for navigation, St. Marys River and tributaries, Michigan, for channel improvements.

(7) **MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO.**—Modifications to the project for flood risk management and water supply, Mosquito Creek Lake, Trumbull County, Ohio.

(8) **LITTLE CONEMAUGH, STONYCREEK, AND CONEMAUGH RIVERS, PENNSYLVANIA.**—Modifications to the project for ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood risk management, Little Conemaugh, Stonycreek, and Conemaugh rivers, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1936") (49 Stat. 1586, chapter 688; 50 Stat. 879; chapter 877).

(9) **CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.**—Modifications to the project for navigation, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1709), including improvements to address potential or actual changed conditions on that portion of the project that serves the North Charleston Terminal.

(10) **ADDICKS AND BARKER RESERVOIRS, TEXAS.**—Modifications to the project for flood risk management, Addicks and Barker Reservoirs, Texas.

(11) **MONONGAHELA RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.**—Modifications to the project for recreation, Monongahela River, West Virginia.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE, ST. MARYS RIVER, MICHIGAN.**—The cost of the study under subsection (b)(6) shall be shared in accordance with the cost share applicable to construction of the project for navigation, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, authorized by section 1149 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254; 121 Stat. 1131).

SEC. 202. VERTICAL INTEGRATION AND ACCELERATION OF STUDIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **DELEGATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall delegate the determination to grant an extension under subsection (c) to the Commander of the relevant Division if—

“(A) the final feasibility report for the study can be completed with an extension of not more than 1 year beyond the time period described in subsection (a)(1); or

“(B) the feasibility study requires an additional cost of not more than \$1,000,000 above the amount described in subsection (a)(2).

“(2) **GUIDANCE.**—If the Secretary determines that implementation guidance is necessary to implement this subsection, the Secretary shall issue such implementation guidance not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **DEFINITION OF DIVISION.**—In this section, the term ‘Division’ means each of the following Divisions of the Corps of Engineers:

“(1) The Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.

“(2) The Mississippi Valley Division.

“(3) The North Atlantic Division.

“(4) The Northwestern Division.

“(5) The Pacific Ocean Division.

“(6) The South Atlantic Division.

“(7) The South Pacific Division.

“(8) The Southwestern Division.”;

(b) **DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and issue implementation guidance that improves the implementation of section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c).

(2) **STANDARDIZED FORM.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall develop and provide to each Division (as defined in subsection (h) of section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c)) a standardized form to assist the Divisions in preparing a written request for an exception under subsection (c) of that section.

(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall submit a written copy of the implementation guidance developed under paragraph (1) to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives not less than 30 days before the date on which the Secretary makes that guidance publicly available.

SEC. 203. EXPEDITED COMPLETION.

(a) **FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study or general reevaluation report (as applicable) 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 food risk management, Upper Guyandotte River Basin, West Virginia.

(2) Project for flood risk management, Kanawha River Basin, West Virginia, Virginia, and North Carolina.

(3) Project for flood risk management, Cave Buttes Dam, Phoenix, Arizona.

(4) Project for flood risk management, McMicken Dam, Maricopa County, Arizona.

(5) Project for ecosystem restoration, Rio Salado, Phoenix, Arizona.

(6) Project for flood risk management, Lower San Joaquin River, San Joaquin Valley, California.

(7) Project for flood risk management, Stratford, Connecticut.

(8) Project for flood risk management, Waimea River, Kauai County, Hawaii.

(9) Modifications to the project for flood risk management, Cedar River, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, authorized by section 8201(b)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3750).

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

(11) Northeast Levee System portion of the project for flood control and other purposes, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1936") (49 Stat. 1573, chapter 688).

(12) Project for navigation, Menominee River, Menominee, Wisconsin.

(13) General reevaluation report for the project for flood risk management and other purposes, East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois.

(14) General reevaluation report for project for flood risk management, Green Brook, New Jersey.

(15) Project for ecosystem restoration, Imperial Streams Salton Sea, California.

(16) Modification of the project for navigation, Honolulu Deep Draft Harbor, Hawaii.

(17) Project for shoreline damage mitigation, Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana.

(18) Project for hurricane and coastal storm risk management, Dare County Beaches, North Carolina.

(19) Modification of the project for flood protection and recreation, Surry Mountain Lake, New Hampshire, including for consideration of low flow augmentation.

(20) Project for coastal storm risk management, Virginia Beach and vicinity, Virginia.

(21) Project for secondary water source identification, Washington Metropolitan Area, Washington, DC, Maryland, and Virginia.

(b) **STUDY REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a Chief's Report or Director's Report (as applicable) for each of the following projects for the project to be considered for authorization:

(1) Modification of the project for navigation, Norfolk Harbors and Channels, Anchorage F segment, Norfolk, Virginia.

(2) Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands, Florida.

(3) Project for ecosystem restoration, Claiborne and Millers Ferry Locks and Dam Fish Passage, Lower Alabama River, Alabama.

(4) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, Surf City, North Carolina.

(5) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, Nassau County Back Bays, New York.

(6) Project for flood risk management, Tar Pamico, North Carolina.

(7) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and South Florida Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program, Western Everglades Restoration Project, Florida.

(8) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, Ala Wai, Hawaii.

(9) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and South Florida Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program, Lake Okeechobee Watershed Restoration, Florida.

(10) Project for flood and coastal storm damage reduction, Miami-Dade County Back Bay, Florida.

(11) Project for navigation, Tampa Harbor, Florida.

(12) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, Akutan Harbor Navigational Improvements, Alaska.

(13) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana.

(14) Project for flood and coastal storm risk management, Puerto Rico Coastal Study, Puerto Rico.

(15) Project for coastal storm risk management, Baltimore, Maryland.

(16) Project for flood and storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana.

(17) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, Washington, DC.

(18) Project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona.

(19) Project for navigation, Oakland Harbor, Oakland, California.

(20) Project for water supply reallocation, Stockton Lake Reallocation Study, Missouri.

(21) Project for ecosystem restoration, Hatchie-Loosahatchie Mississippi River, Tennessee and Arkansas.

(22) Project for ecosystem restoration, Biscayne Bay and Southern Everglades, Florida, authorized by section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680).

(c) **PROJECTS.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the following projects:

(1) Project for flood control, Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia, authorized by section 580 of the Water Resources Development

Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790) and modified by section 340 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2612) and section 3170 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1154).

(2) Project for dam safety modifications, Bluestone Dam, West Virginia, authorized pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1936") (49 Stat. 1586, chapter 688).

(3) Project for flood risk management, Tulsa and West-Tulsa Levee System, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, authorized by section 401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2735).

(4) Project for flood risk management, Little Colorado River, Navajo County, Arizona.

(5) Project for flood risk management, Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona.

(6) Project for ecosystem restoration, Va Shly'AY Akimel, Maricopa Indian Reservation, Arizona.

(7) Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Quincy Bay, Illinois, Upper Mississippi River Restoration Program.

(8) Project for navigation, Matagorda Ship Channel Improvement Project, Port Lavaca, Texas, authorized by section 401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2734).

(9) Major maintenance on Laupahoehoe Harbor, Hawaii County, Hawaii.

(10) Project for flood risk management, Green Brook, New Jersey.

(11) Water control manual update for water supply and flood control, Theodore Roosevelt Dam, Globe, Arizona.

(12) Water control manual update for Oroville Dam, Butte County, California.

(13) Water control manual update for New Bullards Dam, Yuba County, California.

(14) Project for flood risk management, Morgan City, Louisiana.

(15) Project for hurricane and storm risk reduction, Upper Barataria Basin, Louisiana.

(16) Project for ecosystem restoration, Mid-Chesapeake Bay, Maryland.

(17) Project for navigation, Big Bay Harbor of Refuge, Michigan.

(18) Project for George W. Kuhn Headwaters Outfall, Michigan.

(19) The portion of the project for flood control and other purposes, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1936") (49 Stat. 1573, chapter 688), to bring the Northwest Levee System into compliance with current flood mitigation standards.

(20) Project for navigation, Seattle Harbor, Washington, authorized by section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3836), deepening the East Waterway at the Port of Seattle.

(21) Project for shoreline stabilization, Clarks-ville, Indiana.

(d) CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the following projects and studies:

(1) Projects for flood control under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) for the following areas:

(A) Ak Chin Levee, Pinal County, Arizona.

(B) McCormick Wash, Globe, Arizona.

(C) Rose and Palm Garden Washes, Douglas, Arizona.

(D) Lower Santa Cruz River, Arizona.

(2) Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), Corazon de los Tres Rios del Norte, Pima County, Arizona.

(3) Project for hurricane and storm damage reduction under section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426g), Stratford, Connecticut.

(4) Project modification for improvements to the environment, Surry Mountain Lake, New Hampshire, under section 1135 of the Water Re-

sources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a).

(e) TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the following projects and studies under the Tribal partnership program under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269):

(1) Maricopa (Ak Chin) Indian Reservation, Arizona.

(2) Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona.

(3) Navajo Nation, Bird Springs, Arizona.

(f) WATERSHED ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the watershed assessment for flood risk management, Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, authorized by section 1206 of Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1686) and section 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2687).

(g) EXPEDITED PROSPECTUS.—The Secretary shall prioritize the completion of the prospectus for the United States Moorings Facility, Portland, Oregon, required for authorization of funding from the revolving fund established by the first section of the Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1954 (33 U.S.C. 576).

SEC. 204. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF OTHER FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) CEDAR PORT NAVIGATION AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECT, BAYTOWN, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for navigation, Cedar Port Navigation and Improvement District Channel Deepening Project, Baytown, Texas, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

(b) LAKE OKEECHOBEE WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for ecosystem restoration, Lake Okeechobee Component A Reservoir, Everglades, Florida, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

(c) 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)).

(d) LA QUINTA EXPANSION PROJECT, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for navigation, La Quinta Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, Texas, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

SEC. 205. ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LOUISIANA, FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, navigation and ecosystem restoration, Rapides, Avoyelles, Point Coupee, Allen, Evangeline, St. Landry, Calcasieu, Jefferson Davis, Acadia, Lafayette, St. Martin, Iberville, Cameron, Vermilion, Iberia, and St. Mary Parishes, Louisiana.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The study authorized by subsection (a) shall be considered a continuation of the study authorized by the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives with respect to the study for flood risk management, Alexandria to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana, dated July 23, 1997.

SEC. 206. CRAIG HARBOR, ALASKA.

The cost of completing a general reevaluation report for the project for navigation, Craig Harbor, Alaska, authorized by section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1709) shall be at full Federal expense.

SEC. 207. SUSSEX COUNTY, DELAWARE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that consistent nourishments of Lewes

Beach, Delaware, are important for the safety and economic prosperity of Sussex County, Delaware.

(b) GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a general reevaluation report for the project for Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet, and Lewes Beach, Delaware.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The general reevaluation report under paragraph (1) shall include a determination of—

(A) the area that the project should include; and

(B) how section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i) should be applied with respect to the project.

SEC. 208. FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN.

Section 1222 of the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811; 134 Stat. 2661) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, 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 assesses the viability of forecast-informed reservoir operations at a reservoir in the Colorado River Basin.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION.—If the Secretary determines, and includes in the report under paragraph (1), that forecast-informed reservoir operations are viable at a reservoir in the Colorado River Basin, the Secretary is authorized to carry out forecast-informed reservoir operations at that reservoir, subject to the availability of appropriations.”.

SEC. 209. BEAVER LAKE, ARKANSAS, REALLOCATION STUDY.

The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a study for the reallocation of water supply storage, carried out in accordance with section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b), for the Beaver Water District, Beaver Lake, Arkansas.

SEC. 210. GATHRIGHT DAM, VIRGINIA, STUDY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study on the feasibility of modifying the project for flood risk management, Gathright Dam, Virginia, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 645, chapter 596), to include downstream recreation as a project purpose.

SEC. 211. DELAWARE INLAND BAYS WATERSHED STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to restore aquatic ecosystems in the Delaware Inland Bays Watershed.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct a comprehensive analysis of ecosystem restoration needs in the Delaware Inland Bays Watershed, including—

(i) saltmarsh restoration;

(ii) shoreline stabilization;

(iii) stormwater management; and

(iv) an identification of sources for the beneficial use of dredged materials; and

(B) recommend feasibility studies to address the needs identified under subparagraph (A).

(2) NATURAL OR NATURE-BASED FEATURES.—To the maximum extent practicable, a feasibility study that is recommended under paragraph (1)(B) shall consider the use of natural features or nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))).

(c) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out 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) other stakeholders, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) **USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use existing data provided to the Secretary by entities described in paragraph (1).

(d) **FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out a feasibility study for a project recommended under subsection (b)(1)(B).

(2) **CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary may not begin construction for a project recommended by a feasibility study described in paragraph (1) unless the project has been authorized by Congress.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the results of the study under subsection (a); and

(2) a description of actions taken under this section, including any feasibility studies under subsection (b)(1)(B).

SEC. 212. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, at the request of a non-Federal interest, complete a feasibility study for comprehensive flood damage reduction, Upper Susquehanna River Basin, New York.

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

(1) use, for purposes of meeting the requirements of a final feasibility study, information from the feasibility study completion report entitled “Upper Susquehanna River Basin, New York, Comprehensive Flood Damage Reduction” and dated January 2020; and

(2) re-evaluate project benefits, as determined using the framework described in the proposed rule of the Corps of Engineers entitled “Corps of Engineers Agency Specific Procedures To Implement the Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines for Federal Investments in Water Resources” (89 Fed. Reg. 12066 (February 15, 2024)), including a consideration of economically disadvantaged communities (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)).

SEC. 213. KANAWHA RIVER BASIN.

Section 1207 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1686) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary shall” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **PROJECTS AND SEPARABLE ELEMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for an authorized project or a separable element of an authorized project that is recommended as a result of a study carried out by the Secretary under subsection (a) benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)) in the State of West Virginia, the non-Federal share of the cost of the project or separable element of a project shall be 10 percent.”.

SEC. 214. AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES FOR PROJECTS FROM CAP AUTHORITIES.

(a) **CEDAR POINT SEAWALL, SCITUATE, MASSACHUSETTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may conduct a feasibility study for the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Cedar Point Seawall, Scituate, Massachusetts.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use any relevant infor-

mation from the project described in that paragraph that was carried out under section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426g).

(b) **JONES LEVEE, PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may conduct a feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, Jones Levee, Pierce County, Washington.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use any relevant information from the project described in that paragraph that was carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(c) **HATCH, NEW MEXICO.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may conduct a feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, Hatch, New Mexico.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use any relevant information from the project described in that paragraph that was carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(d) **FORT GEORGE INLET, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may conduct a feasibility study to modify the project for navigation, Fort George Inlet, Jacksonville, Florida, to include navigation improvements or shoreline erosion prevention or mitigation as a result of the project.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use any relevant information from the project described in that paragraph that was carried out under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 4261).

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

(a) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 203(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(a)(1)), the non-Federal interest for the project for navigation, Port Fourchon Belle Pass Channel, Louisiana, authorized by section 403(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2743) may, on written notification to the Secretary, and at the cost of the non-Federal interest, carry out a feasibility study to modify the project for deepening in accordance with section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231).

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—A modification recommended by a feasibility study under paragraph (1) shall be approved by the Secretary and authorized by Congress before construction.

(b) **PRIOR WRITTEN AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **PRIOR WRITTEN AGREEMENTS FOR SECTION 203.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall use the previous agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the feasibility study carried out under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231) that resulted in the project described in subsection (a)(1) in order to expedite the revised agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the feasibility study described in that subsection.

(2) **PRIOR WRITTEN AGREEMENTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—On the request of the non-Federal interest described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall use the previous agreement for technical assistance under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231) between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest in order to provide technical assistance to the non-Federal interest for the feasibility study under subsection (a)(1).

(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) review the feasibility study under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) if the Secretary determines that the proposed modifications are consistent with the authorized purposes of the project and the study meets the same legal and regulatory require-

ments of a Post Authorization Change Report that would be otherwise undertaken by the Secretary, submit to Congress the study for authorization of the modification.

SEC. 216. STUDIES FOR MODIFICATION OF PROJECT PURPOSES IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN IN ARIZONA.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall carry out a study of a project of the Corps of Engineers in the Colorado River Basin in the State of Arizona to determine whether to include water supply as a project purpose of that project if a request for such a study to modify the project purpose is made to the Secretary by—

(1) the non-Federal interest for the project; or
 (2) in the case of a project for which there is no non-Federal interest, the Governor of the State of Arizona.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall coordinate with relevant State and local authorities in carrying out this section.

(c) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—If, after carrying out a study under subsection (a) with respect to a project described in that subsection, the Secretary determines that water supply should be included as a project purpose for that project, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a recommendation for the modification of the project purpose of that project.

SEC. 217. NON-FEDERAL INTEREST PREPARATION OF WATER REALLOCATION STUDIES, NORTH DAKOTA.

Section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b) is amended by adding at the following:

“(f) **NON-FEDERAL INTEREST PREPARATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with this subsection, a non-Federal interest may carry out a water reallocation study at a reservoir project constructed by the Corps of Engineers and located in the State of North Dakota.

“(2) **SUBMISSION.**—On completion of the study under paragraph (1), the non-Federal interest shall submit to the Secretary the results of the study.

“(3) **GUIDELINES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue guidelines for the formulation of a water reallocation study carried out by a non-Federal interest under this subsection.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The guidelines under subparagraph (A) shall contain provisions that—

“(i) ensure that any water reallocation study with respect to which the Secretary submits an assessment under paragraph (6) complies with all of the requirements that would apply to a water reallocation study undertaken by the Secretary; and

“(ii) provide sufficient information for the formulation of the water reallocation studies, including processes and procedures related to reviews and assistance under paragraph (7).

“(4) **AGREEMENT.**—Before carrying out a water reallocation study under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the non-Federal interest shall enter into an agreement.

“(5) **REVIEW BY SECRETARY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall review each water reallocation study received under paragraph (2) for the purpose of determining whether or not the study, and the process under which the study was developed, comply with Federal laws and regulations applicable to water reallocation studies.

“(B) **TIMING.**—The Secretary may not submit to Congress an assessment of a water reallocation study under paragraph (1) until such time as the Secretary—

“(i) determines that the study complies with all of the requirements that would apply to a water reallocation study carried out by the Secretary; and

“(ii) completes all of the Federal analyses, reviews, and compliance processes under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), that would be required with respect to the proposed action if the Secretary had carried out the water reallocation study.

“(6) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of review of a water reallocation study under paragraph (5), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an assessment that—

“(A) describes—

“(i) the results of that review;

“(ii) based on the results of the water allocation study, any structural or operations changes at the reservoir project that would occur if the water reallocation is carried out; and

“(iii) based on the results of the water reallocation study, any effects to the authorized purposes of the reservoir project that would occur if the water reallocation is carried out; and

“(B) includes a determination by the Secretary of whether the modifications recommended under the study are those described in subsection (e).

“(7) REVIEW AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) REVIEW.—The Secretary may accept and expend funds provided by non-Federal interests to carry out the reviews and other activities that are the responsibility of the Secretary in carrying out this subsection.

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—At the request of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall provide to the non-Federal interest technical assistance relating to any aspect of a water reallocation study if the non-Federal interest contracts with the Secretary to pay all costs of providing that technical assistance.

“(C) IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that the use of funds accepted from a non-Federal interest will not affect the impartial decisionmaking of the Secretary, either substantively or procedurally.

“(D) SAVINGS PROVISION.—The provision of technical assistance by the Secretary under subparagraph (B)—

“(i) shall not be considered to be an approval or endorsement of the water reallocation study; and

“(ii) shall not affect the responsibilities of the Secretary under paragraphs (5) and (6).”.

SEC. 218. TECHNICAL CORRECTION, WALLA WALLA RIVER.

Section 8201(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3744) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (76) and inserting the following:

“(76) NURSERY REACH, WALLA WALLA RIVER, OREGON.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Nursery Reach, Walla Walla River, Oregon.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (92) through (94) as paragraphs (93) through (95), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (91) the following:

“(92) MILL CREEK, WALLA WALLA RIVER BASIN, WASHINGTON.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Mill Creek and Mill Creek Flood Control Zone District Channel, Washington.”.

SEC. 219. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

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

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) the Walla Walla River Basin; and

“(15) the San Francisco Bay Basin.”.

SEC. 220. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.

Section 2034(h)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2343(h)(2)) is

amended by striking “17 years” and inserting “22 years”.

SEC. 221. ICE JAM PREVENTION AND MITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on efforts by the Secretary to prevent and mitigate flood damages associated with ice jams.

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

(1) an assessment of the projects carried out pursuant to section 1150 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 701s note; Public Law 114-322), if applicable; and

(2) a description of—

(A) the challenges associated with preventing and mitigating ice jams;

(B) the potential measures that may prevent or mitigate ice jams, including the extent to which additional research and the development and deployment of technologies are necessary; and

(C) actions taken by the Secretary to provide non-Federal interests with technical assistance, guidance, or other information relating to ice jam events; and

(D) how the Secretary plans to conduct outreach and engagement with non-Federal interests and other relevant State and local agencies to facilitate an understanding of the circumstances in which ice jams could occur and the potential impacts to critical public infrastructure from ice jams.

SEC. 222. REPORT ON HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION DESIGN GUIDELINES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GUIDELINES.—The term “guidelines” means the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction Design Guidelines of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.—The term “Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System” means the project for hurricane-flood protection, Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that compares—

(1) the guidelines; and

(2) the construction methods used by the South Lafourche Levee District for the levees and flood control structures of the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System.

(c) INCLUSIONS.—The report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of—

(A) the guidelines;

(B) the construction methods used by the South Lafourche Levee District for levees and flood control structures of the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System; and

(C) any deviations identified between the guidelines and the construction methods described in subparagraph (B); and

(2) an analysis by the Secretary of geotechnical and other relevant data from the land adjacent to the levees and flood control structures constructed by the South Lafourche Levee District to determine the effectiveness of those structures.

SEC. 223. BRIEFING ON STATUS OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES ON THE MISSOURI RIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) that was reinitiated by the Secretary for the operation of the Missouri River

Mainstem Reservoir System, the operation and maintenance of the Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, the operation of the Kansas River Reservoir System, and the implementation of the Missouri River Recovery Management Plan is completed, the Secretary shall brief the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the outcomes of that consultation.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The briefing under subsection (a) shall include a discussion of—

(1) any biological opinions that result from the consultation, including any actions that the Secretary is required to undertake pursuant to such biological opinions; and

(2) any forthcoming requests from the Secretary to Congress to provide funding in order carry out the actions described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 224. REPORT ON MATERIAL CONTAMINATED BY A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE AND THE CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes the impact of material contaminated by a hazardous substance on the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) describe—

(A) with respect to water resources development projects—

(i) the applicable statutory authorities that require the removal of material contaminated by a hazardous substance; and

(ii) the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary and non-Federal interests for removing material contaminated by a hazardous substance; and

(B) any regulatory actions or decisions made by another Federal agency that impact—

(i) the removal of material contaminated by a hazardous substance; and

(ii) the ability of the Secretary to carry out the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers;

(2) discuss the impact of material contaminated by a hazardous substance on—

(A) the timely completion of construction of water resources development projects;

(B) the operation and maintenance of water resources development projects, including dredging activities of the Corps of Engineers to maintain authorized Federal depths at ports and along the inland waterways; and

(C) costs associated with carrying out the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers;

(3) include any other information that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to facilitate an understanding of the impact of material contaminated by a hazardous substance on the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers; and

(4) propose any legislative recommendations to address any issues identified in paragraphs (1) through (3).

SEC. 225. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO MONITOR, CONTROL, AND ERADICATE INVASIVE SPECIES.

(a) DEFINITION OF INVASIVE SPECIES.—In this section, the term “invasive species” has the meaning given the term in section 1 of Executive Order 13112 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to invasive species).

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct, and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the results of, an assessment of the efforts by the Secretary to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species at water resources development projects across the United States.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of—

(A) the statutory authorities and programs used by the Secretary to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species; and

(B) a geographically diverse sample of successful projects and activities carried out by the Secretary to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species;

(2) a discussion of—

(A) the impact of invasive species on the ability of the Secretary to carry out the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers, with a particular emphasis on impact of invasive species to the primary missions of the Corps of Engineers;

(B) the research conducted and techniques and technologies used by the Secretary consistent with the applicable statutory authorities described in paragraph (1)(A) to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species; and

(C) the extent to which the Secretary has partnered with States and units of local government to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species within the boundaries of those States or units of local government;

(3) an update on the status of the plan developed by the Secretary pursuant to section 1108(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (33 U.S.C. 2263a(c)); and

(4) recommendations, including legislative recommendations, to further the efforts of the Secretary to monitor, control, and eradicate invasive species.

SEC. 226. J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GEORGIA.

(a) **ENCROACHMENT RESOLUTION PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall prepare, and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, an encroachment resolution plan for a portion of the project for flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife management, J. Strom Thurmond Lake, Georgia and South Carolina, authorized by section 10 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 894, chapter 665).

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The encroachment resolution plan under paragraph (1) shall only apply to the portion of the J. Strom Thurmond Lake that is located within the State of Georgia.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Subject to subsection (c), the encroachment resolution plan under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the nature and number of encroachments;

(2) a description of the circumstances that contributed to the development of the encroachments;

(3) an assessment of the impact of the encroachments on operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a) for its authorized purposes;

(4) an analysis of alternatives to the removal of encroachments to mitigate any impacts identified in the assessment under paragraph (3);

(5) a description of any actions necessary or advisable to prevent further encroachments; and

(6) an estimate of the cost and timeline to carry out the plan, including actions described under paragraph (5).

(c) **RESTRICTION.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the encroachment resolution plan under subsection (a) shall minimize adverse impacts to private landowners while maintaining the functioning of the project described in that subsection for its authorized purposes.

(d) **NOTICE AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—

(1) **TO OWNERS.**—In preparing the encroachment resolution plan under subsection (a), not later than 30 days after the Secretary identifies an encroachment, the Secretary shall notify the owner of the encroachment.

(2) **TO PUBLIC.**—The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the

encroachment resolution plan under subsection (a) before the completion of the plan.

(e) **MORATORIUM.**—The Secretary shall not take action to compel removal of an encroachment covered by the encroachment resolution plan under subsection (a) unless Congress specifically authorizes such action.

(f) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—This section does not—

(1) grant any rights to the owner of an encroachment; or

(2) impose any liability on the United States for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a) for its authorized purposes.

SEC. 227. STUDY ON LAND VALUATION PROCEDURES FOR THE TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITION OF TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.**—In this section, the term “Tribal Partnership Program” means the Tribal Partnership Program established under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269).

(b) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall carry out, and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of, a study on appropriate procedures for determining the value of real estate and cost-share contributions for projects under the Tribal Partnership Program.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the procedures used for determining the valuation of real estate and contribution of real estate value to cost-share for projects under the Tribal Partnership Program, including consideration of cultural factors that are unique to the Tribal Partnership Program and land valuation;

(2) a description of any existing Federal authorities that the Secretary intends to use to implement policy changes that result from the evaluation under paragraph (1); and

(3) recommendations for any legislation that may be needed to revise land valuation or cost-share procedures for the Tribal Partnership Program pursuant to the evaluation under paragraph (1).

SEC. 228. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEVEE SAFETY GUIDELINES.

(a) **DEFINITION OF LEVEE SAFETY GUIDELINES.**—In this section, the term “levee safety guidelines” means the levee safety guidelines established under section 9005(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303a(c)).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with other applicable Federal agencies, shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the levee safety guidelines.

(c) **INCLUSIONS.**—The report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a description of—

(A) the levee safety guidelines;

(B) the process utilized to develop the levee safety guidelines; and

(C) the extent to which the levee safety guidelines are being used by Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies;

(2) an assessment of the requirement for the levee safety guidelines to be voluntary and a description of actions taken by the Secretary and other applicable Federal agencies to ensure that the guidelines are voluntary; and

(3) any recommendations of the Secretary, including the extent to which the levee safety guidelines should be revised.

SEC. 229. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP USER'S GUIDE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary

shall develop and make publicly available on an existing website of the Corps of Engineers a guide on the use of public-private partnerships for water resources development projects.

(b) **INCLUSIONS.**—In developing the guide under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include—

(1) a description of—

(A) applicable authorities and programs of the Secretary that allow for the use of public-private partnerships to carry out water resources development projects; and

(B) opportunities across the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers for the use of public-private partnerships, including at recreational facilities;

(2) a summary of prior public-private partnerships for water resources development projects, including lessons learned and best practices from those partnerships and projects;

(3) a discussion of—

(A) the roles and responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers and non-Federal interests when using a public-private partnership for a water resources development project, including the opportunities for risk-sharing; and

(B) the potential benefits associated with using a public-private partnership for a water resources development project, including the opportunities to accelerate funding as compared to the annual appropriations process; and

(4) a description of the process for executing a project partnership agreement for a water resources development project, including any unique considerations when using a public-private partnership.

(c) **FLEXIBILITY.**—The Secretary may satisfy the requirements of this section by modifying an existing partnership handbook in accordance with this section.

SEC. 230. REVIEW OF AUTHORITIES AND PROGRAMS FOR ALTERNATIVE PROJECT DELIVERY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall carry out a study of the authorities and programs of the Corps of Engineers that facilitate the use of alternative project delivery methods for water resources development projects, including public-private partnerships.

(b) **AUTHORITIES AND PROGRAMS INCLUDED.**—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the authorities and programs that are studied shall include any programs and authorities under—

(1) section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2232);

(2) section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b); and

(3) section 5014 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 113–121).

(c) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the findings of the study under subsection (a); and

(2) includes—

(A) an assessment of how each authority and program included in the study under subsection (a) has been used by the Secretary;

(B) a list of the water resources development projects that have been carried out pursuant to the authorities and programs included in the study under subsection (a);

(C) a discussion of the implementation challenges, if any, associated with the authorities and programs included in the study under subsection (a);

(D) a description of lessons learned and best practices identified by the Secretary from carrying out the authorities and programs included in the study under subsection (a); and

(E) any recommendations, including legislative recommendations, that result from the study under subsection (a).

SEC. 231. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON EMERGENCY RESPONSE EXPENDITURES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall conduct a review of emergency response expenditures from the emergency fund authorized by section 5(a) of the Act of August 18, 1941 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1941”) (55 Stat. 650, chapter 377; 33 U.S.C. 701n(a)) (referred to in this section as the “Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Account”) and from post-disaster supplemental appropriations Acts during the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(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 Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that includes the results of the review under subsection (a), including—

(1) for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023, a summary of—

(A) annual expenditures from the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Account;

(B) annual budget requests for that account; and

(C) any activities, including any reprogramming, that may have been required to cover any annual shortfall in that account;

(2) a description of the contributing factors that resulted in any annual variability in the amounts described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) and activities described in subparagraph (C) of that paragraph;

(3) an assessment and a description of future budget needs of the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Account based on trends observed and anticipated by the Secretary; and

(4) an assessment and a description of the use and impact of funds from post-disaster supplemental appropriations on emergency response activities.

SEC. 232. EXCESS LAND REPORT FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS IN NORTH DAKOTA.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that identifies any real property associated with the project of the Corps of Engineers at Lake Oahe, North Dakota, that the Secretary determines—

(1) is not needed to carry out the authorized purposes of the project; and

(2) may be transferred to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to support recreation opportunities for the Tribe, including, at a minimum—

(A) Walker Bottom Marina, Lake Oahe;

(B) Fort Yates Boat Ramp, Lake Oahe;

(C) Cannonball District, Lake Oahe; and

(D) any other recreation opportunities identified by the Tribe.

(b) *INCLUSION.*—If the Secretary determines that there is not any real property that may be transferred to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe as described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall include in the report required under that subsection—

(1) a list of the real property considered by the Secretary;

(2) an explanation of why the real property identified under paragraph (1) is needed to carry out the authorized purposes of the project described in subsection (a); and

(3) a description of how the Secretary has recently utilized the real property identified under paragraph (1) to carry out the authorized purpose of the project described in subsection (a).

SEC. 233. GAO STUDIES.

(a) *REVIEW OF THE ACCURACY OF PROJECT COST ESTIMATES.*—

(1) *REVIEW.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Com-

troller General of the United States (referred to in this section as the “Comptroller General”) shall initiate a review of the accuracy of the project cost estimates developed by the Corps of Engineers for completed and ongoing water resources development projects carried out by the Secretary.

(B) *REQUIREMENTS.*—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General shall determine the factors, if any, that impact the accuracy of the estimates described in that subparagraph, including—

(i) applicable statutory requirements, including—

(I) section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c); and

(II) section 905(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(b)); and

(ii) applicable guidance, regulations, and policies of the Corps of Engineers.

(C) *INCORPORATION OF PREVIOUS REPORT.*—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General may incorporate applicable information from the report carried out by the Comptroller General under section 8236(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3769).

(2) *REPORT.*—On completion of the review conducted under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the review and any recommendations that result from the review.

(b) *REPORT ON PROJECT LIFESPAN AND INDEMNIFICATION CLAUSE IN PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.*—

(1) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this subsection:

(A) *INDEMNIFICATION CLAUSE.*—The term “indemnification clause” means the indemnification clause required in project partnership agreements for water resources development projects under sections 101(e)(2) and 103(j)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(e)(2), 2213(j)(1)(A)).

(B) *OMRR&R.*—The term “OMRR&R”, with respect to a water resources development project, means operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation.

(2) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) there are significant concerns about whether—

(i) the indemnification clause, which was first applied in 1910 to flood control projects, should still be included in project partnership agreements prepared by the Corps of Engineers for water resources development projects; and

(ii) non-Federal interests for water resources development projects should be required to assume full responsibility for OMRR&R of water resources development projects in perpetuity;

(B) non-Federal interests have reported that the indemnification clause and OMRR&R requirements are a barrier to entering into project partnership agreements with the Corps of Engineers;

(C) critical water resources development projects are being delayed by years, or not pursued at all, due to the barriers described in subparagraph (B); and

(D) legal structures have changed since the indemnification clause was first applied and there may be more suitable tools available to address risk and liability issues.

(3) *ANALYSIS.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall conduct an analysis of the implications of—

(A) the indemnification clause; and

(B) the assumption of OMRR&R responsibilities by non-Federal interests in perpetuity for water resources development projects.

(4) *INCLUSIONS.*—The analysis under paragraph (3) shall include—

(A) a review of risk for the Federal Government and non-Federal interests with respect to

removing requirements for the indemnification clause;

(B) an assessment of whether the indemnification clause is still necessary given the changes in engineering, legal structures, and water resources development projects since 1910, with a focus on the quantity and types of claims and takings over time;

(C) an identification of States with State laws that prohibit those States from entering into agreements that include an indemnification clause;

(D) a comparison to other Federal agencies with respect to how those agencies approach indemnification and OMRR&R requirements in projects, if applicable;

(E) a review of indemnification and OMRR&R requirements for projects that States require with respect to agreements with cities and localities, if applicable;

(F) an analysis of the useful lifespan of water resources development projects, including any variations in that lifespan for different types of water resources development projects and how changing weather patterns and increased extreme weather events impact that lifespan;

(G) a review of situations in which non-Federal interests have been unable to meet OMRR&R requirements; and

(H) a review of policy alternatives to OMRR&R requirements, such as allowing extension, reevaluation, or deauthorization of water resources development projects.

(5) *REPORT.*—On completion of the analysis under paragraph (3), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(A) the results of the analysis; and

(B) any recommendations for changes needed to existing law or policy of the Corps of Engineers to address those results.

(c) *REVIEW OF CERTAIN PERMITS.*—

(1) *DEFINITION OF SECTION 408 PROGRAM.*—In this subsection, the term “section 408 program” means the program administered by the Secretary pursuant to section 14 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (commonly known as the “Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899”) (30 Stat. 1152, chapter 425; 33 U.S.C. 408).

(2) *REVIEW.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall initiate a review of the section 408 program.

(3) *REQUIREMENTS.*—The review by the Comptroller General under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) an identification of trends related to the number and types of permits applied for each year under the section 408 program;

(B) an evaluation of—

(i) the materials developed by the Secretary to educate potential applicants about—

(I) the section 408 program; and

(II) the process for applying for a permit under the section 408 program;

(ii) the public website of the Corps of Engineers that tracks the status of permits issued under the section 408 program, including whether the information provided by the website is updated in a timely manner;

(iii) the ability of the districts and divisions of the Corps of Engineers to consistently administer the section 408 program; and

(iv) the extent to which the Secretary carries out the process for issuing a permit under the section 408 program concurrently with the review required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), if applicable;

(C) a determination of the factors, if any, that impact the ability of the Secretary to adhere to the timelines required for reviewing and making a decision on an application for a permit under the section 408 program; and

(D) ways to expedite the review of applications for permits under the section 408 program, including the use of categorical permissions.

(4) **REPORT.**—On completion of the review under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the review and any recommendations that result from the review.

(d) **CORPS OF ENGINEERS MODERNIZATION STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall initiate an analysis of opportunities for the Corps of Engineers to modernize the civil works program through the use of technology, where appropriate, and the best available engineering practices.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—In conducting the analysis under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall include an assessment of the extent to which—

(A) existing engineering practices and technologies could be better utilized by the Corps of Engineers—

(i) to improve study, planning, and design efforts of the Corps of Engineers to further the benefits of water resources development projects of the Corps of Engineers;

(ii) to reduce delays of water resources development projects, including through the improvement of environmental review and permitting processes;

(iii) to provide cost savings over the lifecycle of a project, including through improved design processes or a reduction of operation and maintenance costs; and

(iv) to improve data collection and data sharing capabilities; and

(B) the Corps of Engineers—

(i) currently utilizes the engineering practices and technologies identified under subparagraph (A), including any challenges associated with acquisition and application;

(ii) has effective processes to share best practices associated with the engineering practices and technologies identified under subparagraph (A) among the districts, divisions, and headquarters of the Corps of Engineers; and

(iii) partners with National Laboratories, academic institutions, and other Federal agencies.

(3) **REPORT.**—On completion of the analysis under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the analysis and any recommendations that result from the analysis.

(e) **STUDY ON EASEMENTS RELATED TO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—

(1) **DEFINITION OF COVERED EASEMENT.**—In this subsection, the term “covered easement” has the meaning given the term in section 8235(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2002 (136 Stat. 3768).

(2) **STUDY ON EASEMENTS RELATED TO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall initiate an analysis of the use of covered easements that may be provided to the Secretary by non-Federal interests in relation to the construction, operation, or maintenance of a project for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, or ecosystem restoration.

(3) **SCOPE.**—In carrying out the analysis under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) review—

(i) the report submitted by the Secretary under section 8235(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2002 (136 Stat. 3768); and

(ii) the existing statutory, regulatory, and policy requirements and procedures relating to the use of covered easements; and

(B) assess—

(i) the minimum rights in property that are necessary to construct, operate, or maintain

projects for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, or ecosystem restoration;

(ii) whether increased use of covered easements in relation to projects described in clause (i) could promote greater participation from cooperating landowners in addressing local flooding or ecosystem restoration challenges;

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

(iv) the extent to which the Secretary should expand what is considered by the Secretary to be part of a series of estates deemed standard for construction, operation, or maintenance of a project for flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, or ecosystem restoration.

(4) **REPORT.**—On completion of the analysis under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the analysis, including any recommendations, including legislative recommendations, as a result of the analysis.

(f) **MODERNIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.**—

(1) **DEFINITION OF PROJECT STUDY.**—In this subsection, the term “project study” means a feasibility study for a project carried out pursuant to section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282).

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes the efforts of the Secretary to facilitate improved environmental review processes for project studies, including through the consideration of expanded use of categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, or programmatic environmental impact statements.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In completing the report under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) describe the actions the Secretary is taking or plans to take to implement the amendments to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) made by section 321 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (Public Law 118–5; 137 Stat. 38);

(B) describe the existing categorical exclusions most frequently used by the Secretary to streamline the environmental review of project studies;

(C) consider—

(i) whether the adoption of additional categorical exclusions, including those used by other Federal agencies, would facilitate the environmental review of project studies;

(ii) whether the adoption of new programmatic environmental impact statements would facilitate the environmental review of project studies; and

(iii) whether agreements with other Federal agencies would facilitate a more efficient process for the environmental review of project studies; and

(D) identify—

(i) any discrepancies or conflicts, as applicable, between the amendments to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) made by section 321 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (Public Law 118–5; 137 Stat. 38) and—

(I) section 2045 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348); and

(II) section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c); and

(ii) other issues, as applicable, relating to section 2045 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2348) that are impeding the implementation of that section consistent with congressional intent.

(g) **STUDY ON DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL SITE CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study that—

(A) assesses the costs and limitations of the construction of various types of dredged material disposal sites, with a particular focus on aquatic confined placement structures in the Lower Columbia River; and

(B) includes a comparison of—

(i) the operation and maintenance needs and costs associated with the availability of aquatic confined placement structures; and

(ii) the operation and maintenance needs and costs associated with the lack of availability of aquatic confined placement structures.

(2) **REPORT.**—On completion of the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study, and any recommendations that result from that study.

(h) **GAO STUDY ON DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDING FROM THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.**—

(1) **DEFINITION OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.**—In this subsection, the term “Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund” means the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established by section 9505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) **ANALYSIS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall initiate an analysis of the distribution of funding from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In conducting the analysis under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General shall assess—

(A) the implementation of provisions related to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2615) and the amendments made by that Act by the Corps of Engineers, including—

(i) changes to the budgetary treatment of funding from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; and

(ii) amendments to the definitions of the terms “donor ports”, “medium-sized donor parts”, and “energy transfer ports” under section 2106(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c(a)), including—

(I) the reliability of metrics, data for those metrics, and sources for that data used by the Corps of Engineers to determine if a port satisfies the requirements of 1 or more of those definitions; and

(II) the extent of the impact of cyclical dredging cycles for operations and maintenance activities and deep draft navigation construction projects on the ability of ports to meet the requirements of 1 or more of those definitions; and

(B) the amount of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund funding in the annual appropriations Acts enacted after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2615), including an analysis of—

(i) the allocation of funding to donor ports and energy transfer ports (as those terms are defined in section 2106(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238c(a))) and the use of that funding by those ports;

(ii) activities funded pursuant to section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238); and

(iii) challenges associated with expending the remaining balance of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

(4) **REPORT.**—On completion of the analysis under paragraph (2), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report describing

the findings of the analysis and any recommendations that result from that analysis.

SEC. 234. PRIOR REPORTS.

(a) **REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall prioritize the completion of the reports required pursuant to the following provisions:

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

(2) Section 1008(c) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2321b(c)).

(3) Section 164(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2668).

(4) Section 226(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2697).

(5) Section 503(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note; Public Law 116–260).

(6) Section 509(a)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note; Public Law 116–260).

(7) Section 8205(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3754).

(8) Section 8206(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3756).

(9) Section 8218 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3761).

(10) Section 8227(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3764).

(11) Section 8232(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3766).

(b) NOTICE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written notification of the status of each report described in subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—As part of the notification under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include for each report described in subsection (a)—

(A) a description of the status of the report; and

(B) if not completed, a timeline for the completion of the report.

SEC. 235. BRIEFING ON STATUS OF CAPE COD CANAL BRIDGES, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall brief the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the status of the project for the replacement of the Bourne and Sagamore Highway Bridges that cross the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The briefing under subsection (a) shall include discussion of—

(1) the current status of environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and expected timelines for completion;

(2) project timelines and relevant paths to move the project described in that subsection toward completion; and

(3) any issues that are impacting the delivery of the project described in that subsection.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NEVADA.**—The project for flood control, Truckee Meadows, Nevada, authorized by section 3(a)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4014) and section 7002(2) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1366) is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **SEATTLE HARBOR, WASHINGTON.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the portion of the project for navigation, Seattle Harbor, Washington, described in paragraph (2) is no longer authorized.

(2) **PORTION DESCRIBED.**—The portion of the project referred to in paragraph (1) is the ap-

proximately 74,490 square foot area of the Federal channel within the East Waterway—

(A) starting at a point on the United States pierhead line in the southwest corner of block 386 of plat of Seattle Tidelands, T. 24 N., R. 4 E, sec.18, Willamette Meridian;

(B) thence running N90°00'00"W along the projection of the south line of block 386, 206.58 feet to the centerline of the East Waterway;

(C) thence running N14°30'00"E along the centerline and parallel with the northwesterly line of block 386, 64.83 feet;

(D) thence running N33°32'59"E, 235.85 feet;

(E) thence running N39°55'22"E, 128.70 feet;

(F) thence running N14°30'00"E, parallel with the northwesterly line of block 386, 280.45 feet;

(G) thence running N90°00'00"E, 70.00 feet to the pierhead line and the northwesterly line of block 386; and

(H) thence running S14°30'00"W, 650.25 feet along the pierhead line and northwesterly line of block 386 to the point of beginning.

(c) **CHERRYFIELD DAM, MAINE.**—The project for flood control, Narraguagus River, Cherryfield Dam, Maine, authorized by, and constructed pursuant to, 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.

(d) **UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM.**—Section 2010 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1270; 136 Stat. 3796) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **NAVIGATION.**—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024, the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam is no longer authorized for navigation purposes.”.

(e) **EAST SAN PEDRO BAY, CALIFORNIA.**—The study for the project for ecosystem restoration, East San Pedro Bay, California, authorized by the resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, dated June 25, 1969, relating to the report of the Chief of Engineers for Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, Ballona Creek, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) **SOURIS RIVER BASIN, NORTH DAKOTA.**—The Talbott's Nursery portion, consisting of approximately 2,600 linear feet of levee, of stage 4 of the project for flood control, Souris River Basin, North Dakota, authorized by section 1124 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4243; 101 Stat. 1329–111), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) **MASARYKTOWN CANAL, FLORIDA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The portion of the project for the Four River Basins, Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1183) described in paragraph (2) is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **PORTION DESCRIBED.**—The portion of the project referred to in paragraph (1) is the Masaryktown Canal C–534, which spans approximately 5.5 miles from Hernando County, between Ayers Road and County Line Road east of United States Route 41, and continues south to Pasco County, discharging into Crews Lake.

SEC. 302. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **NEW PROJECTS.**—Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3808) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(406) **GLENDALE, ARIZONA.**—\$5,200,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, Glendale, Arizona.

“(407) **TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION, ARIZONA.**—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution), Tohono O'odham Nation, Arizona.

“(408) **FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA.**—\$4,800,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution), Flagstaff, Arizona.

“(409) **TUCSON, ARIZONA.**—\$30,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including recycled water systems), Tucson, Arizona.

“(410) **BAY-DELTA, CALIFORNIA.**—\$20,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, San Francisco Bay–Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta, California.

“(411) **INDIAN WELLS VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.**—\$5,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Indian Wells Valley, Kern County, California.

“(412) **OAKLAND–ALAMEDA ESTUARY, CALIFORNIA.**—\$5,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, Oakland–Alameda Estuary, Oakland and Alameda Counties, California.

“(413) **TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.**—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Tijuana River Valley Watershed, San Diego County, California.

“(414) **EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO.**—\$20,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure and stormwater management, El Paso County, Colorado.

“(415) **REHOBOTH BEACH, LEWES, DEWEY, BETHANY, SOUTH BETHANY, FENWICK ISLAND, DELAWARE.**—\$25,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Rehoboth Beach, Lewes, Dewey, Bethany, South Bethany, and Fenwick Island, Delaware.

“(416) **WILMINGTON, DELAWARE.**—\$25,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Wilmington, Delaware.

“(417) **PICKERING BEACH, KITTS HUMMOCK, BOWERS BEACH, SOUTH BOWERS BEACH, SLAUGHTER BEACH, PRIME HOOK BEACH, MILTON, MILFORD, DELAWARE.**—\$25,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Pickering Beach, Kitts Hummock, Bowers Beach, South Bowers Beach, Slaughter Beach, Prime Hook Beach, Milton, and Milford, Delaware.

“(418) **COASTAL GEORGIA.**—\$5,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), Glynn County, Chatham County, Bryan County, Effingham County, McIntosh County, and Camden County, Georgia.

“(419) **COLUMBUS, HENRY, AND CLAYTON COUNTIES, GEORGIA.**—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), Columbus, Henry, and Clayton Counties, Georgia.

“(420) **COBB COUNTY, GEORGIA.**—\$5,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Cobb County, Georgia.

“(421) **CALUMET CITY, ILLINOIS.**—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Calumet City, Illinois.

“(422) **WYANDOTTE COUNTY AND KANSAS CITY, KANSAS.**—\$35,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas.

“(423) **EASTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS.**—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including wastewater treatment plant outfalls), Easthampton, Massachusetts.

“(424) BYRAM, MISSISSIPPI.—\$7,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, Byram, Mississippi.

“(425) DIAMONDHEAD, MISSISSIPPI.—\$7,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure and drainage systems, Diamondhead, Mississippi.

“(426) HANCOCK COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—\$7,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, Hancock County, Mississippi.

“(427) MADISON, MISSISSIPPI.—\$7,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, Madison, Mississippi.

“(428) PEARL, MISSISSIPPI.—\$7,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), drainage systems, and water quality enhancement, Pearl, Mississippi.

“(429) NEW HAMPSHIRE.—\$20,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, New Hampshire.

“(430) CAPE MAY COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution), Cape May County, New Jersey.

“(431) NYE COUNTY, NEVADA.—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including water wellfield and pipeline in the Pahrump Valley), Nye County, Nevada.

“(432) STOREY COUNTY, NEVADA.—\$10,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution), Storey County, Nevada.

“(433) NEW ROCHELLE, NEW YORK.—\$20,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), New Rochelle, New York.

“(434) CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO.—\$5,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including combined sewer overflows), Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

“(435) BLOOMINGBURG, OHIO.—\$6,500,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution), Bloomingburg, Ohio.

“(436) CITY OF AKRON, OHIO.—\$5,500,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including drainage systems), City of Akron, Ohio.

“(437) EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO.—\$13,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including stormwater management), East Cleveland, Ohio.

“(438) ASHTABULA COUNTY, OHIO.—\$1,500,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including water supply and water quality enhancement), Ashtabula County, Ohio.

“(439) STRUTHERS, OHIO.—\$500,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure (including wastewater infrastructure, stormwater management, and sewer improvements), Struthers, Ohio.

“(440) STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA.—\$30,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure and water supply infrastructure (including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution), Stillwater, Oklahoma.

“(441) PENNSYLVANIA.—\$38,600,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, Pennsylvania.

“(442) CHESTERFIELD COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.—\$3,000,000 for water and wastewater in-

frastructure and other environmental infrastructure (including stormwater management), Chesterfield County, South Carolina.

“(443) TIPTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—\$35,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure and water supply infrastructure, including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution, Tipton County, Tennessee.

“(444) OHELLO, WASHINGTON.—\$14,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water supply and storage treatment, Othello, Washington.

“(445) COLLEGE PLACE, WASHINGTON.—\$5,000,000 for environmental infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, College Place, Washington.”

(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) ALABAMA.—Section 219(f)(274) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3808) is amended by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$85,000,000”.

(B) LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(93) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1259; 136 Stat. 3816) is amended by striking “Santa Clarita Valley” and inserting “Santa Clarita Valley”.

(C) KENT, DELAWARE.—Section 219(f)(313) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3810) is amended by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

(D) NEW CASTLE, DELAWARE.—Section 219(f)(314) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3810) is amended by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

(E) SUSSEX, DELAWARE.—Section 219(f)(315) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3810) is amended by striking “\$35,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”.

(F) EAST POINT, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(136) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1261; 136 Stat. 3817) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000”.

(G) MADISON COUNTY AND ST. CLAIR COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(55) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 114 Stat. 2763A–221; 136 Stat. 3817) is amended—

(i) by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$110,000,000”; and

(ii) by inserting “(including stormwater management)” after “wastewater assistance”.

(H) MONTGOMERY COUNTY AND CHRISTIAN COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(333) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3812) is amended—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “MONTGOMERY AND CHRISTIAN COUNTIES” and inserting “MONTGOMERY, CHRISTIAN, FAYETTE, SHELBY, JASPER, RICHLAND, CRAWFORD, AND LAWRENCE COUNTIES”; and

(ii) by striking “Montgomery County and Christian County” and inserting “Montgomery County, Christian County, Fayette County, Shelby County, Jasper County, Richland County, Crawford County, and Lawrence County”.

(I) WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(334) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3812) is amended—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “WILL COUNTY” and inserting “WILL AND GRUNDY COUNTIES”; and

(ii) by striking “Will County” and inserting “Will County and Grundy County”.

(J) LOWELL, MASSACHUSETTS.—Section 219(f)(339) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3812) is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$30,000,000”.

(K) MICHIGAN.—Section 219(f)(157) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1262) is amended, in the paragraph heading, by striking “COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS”.

(L) DESOTO COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 134 Stat. 2718) is amended by striking “\$130,000,000” and inserting “\$144,000,000”.

(M) JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(167) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1263; 136 Stat. 3818) is amended by striking “\$125,000,000” and inserting “\$139,000,000”.

(N) MADISON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(351) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$24,000,000”.

(O) MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(352) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$24,000,000”.

(P) RANKIN COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(354) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$24,000,000”.

(Q) CINCINNATI, OHIO.—Section 219(f)(206) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1265) is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$9,000,000”.

(R) MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA.—Section 219(f)(231) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1266; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(S) PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 219(f)(243) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 121 Stat. 1266) is amended—

(i) by striking “\$1,600,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(ii) by inserting “water supply and” before “wastewater”.

(T) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 136 Stat. 3818) is amended by striking “\$165,000,000” and inserting “\$232,000,000”.

(U) MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.—Section 219(f)(405) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3816) is amended by striking “\$4,500,000” and inserting “\$10,500,000”.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the non-Federal share of the cost of a project for which assistance is provided under this section shall be not less than 25 percent.

“(2) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project for which assistance is provided under this section benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)) shall be 10 percent.

“(3) ABILITY TO PAY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project for which assistance is provided under this section shall be subject to the ability of the non-Federal interest to pay.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—The ability of a non-Federal interest to pay shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary.

“(C) DEADLINE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024, the Secretary shall issue guidance on the procedures described in subparagraph (B).

“(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written notification of determinations made by the Secretary of the ability of non-Federal interests to pay under this section.

“(B) CONTENTS.—In preparing the written notification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall include, for each determination made by the Secretary—

“(i) the name of the non-Federal interest that submitted to the Secretary a request for a determination under paragraph (3)(B);

“(ii) the name and location of the project; and

“(iii) the determination made by the Secretary and the reasons for the determination, including the adjusted share of the costs of the project of the non-Federal interest, if applicable.”.

SEC. 303. PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 313 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; 136 Stat. 3821) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “south central”;

(2) by striking “south central” each place it appears;

(3) by striking subsections (c) and (h);

(4) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(5) in paragraph (2)(A) of subsection (c) (as redesignated), by striking “the SARCD Council and other”.

SEC. 304. ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEMS.

Section 1113 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4232; 110 Stat. 3719; 136 Stat. 3782) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “costs,” and all that follows through “except that” and inserting “costs, shall be as described in the second sentence of subsection (b) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3691)), except that”;

(B) by striking “measure benefitting” and inserting “measure (other than a reconnaissance study) benefitting”;

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “\$80,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”.

SEC. 305. OREGON ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8359 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3802) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “southwestern”;

(2) in each of subsections (a) and (b), by striking “southwestern” each place it appears;

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$90,000,000”; and

(4) by striking subsection (f).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NDAA.—The table of contents in section 2(b) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (136 Stat. 2430) is amended by striking the item relating to section 8359 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 8359. Oregon.”.

(2) WRDA.—The table of contents in section 8001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3694) is amended by striking

the item relating to section 8359 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 8359. Oregon.”.

SEC. 306. KENTUCKY AND WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Kentucky and West Virginia.

(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 Kentucky and West Virginia, 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) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with such assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each local cooperation agreement 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 local cooperation 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) LAND, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward the non-Federal share of project costs (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.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$75,000,000 to carry out this section, to be divided between the States described in subsection (a).

(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 to administer projects under this section.

SEC. 307. LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED, VERMONT AND NEW YORK.

Section 542(e)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2672) is amended by inserting “, or in the case of a critical restoration project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Pub-

lic Law 116-260)), 10 percent of the total costs of the project” after “project”.

SEC. 308. OHIO AND NORTH DAKOTA.

Section 594(d)(3)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 382) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “The Federal share may” and inserting the following: “(iii) FORM.—The Federal share may”;

(2) by striking the subparagraph designation and heading and all that follows through “The Federal share of” in the first sentence and inserting the following:

“(A) PROJECT COSTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Federal share of”;

(3) by inserting after clause (i) (as so designated) the following:

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project under this section benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116-260)) shall be 10 percent.”.

SEC. 309. SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 340 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856; 136 Stat. 3807) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Total project costs” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), total project costs”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116-260)), the Federal share of the total project costs under the applicable local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 90 percent.

“(C) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total project costs under this paragraph may be provided in the same form as described in section 571(e)(3)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 371).”;

(2) by striking subsection (e);

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

(4) in subsection (f) (as so redesignated), in the first sentence, by striking “\$140,000,000” and inserting “\$170,000,000”.

SEC. 310. NORTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 571 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 371; 121 Stat. 1257; 136 Stat. 3807) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the first sentence, by striking “The Federal share” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Federal share”;

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

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116-260)), the Federal share of the project costs under the applicable local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 90 percent.”;

(2) by striking subsection (g);

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

(4) in subsection (g) (as so redesignated), by striking “\$120,000,000” and inserting “\$150,000,000”.

SEC. 311. OHIO, PENNSYLVANIA, AND WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) IMPAIRED WATER.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “impaired water” means a stream of a watershed that is not, as of the date of an application under this section, achieving the designated use of the stream.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “impaired water” includes any stream identified by a State under section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)).

(2) RESTORATION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “restoration”, with respect to impaired water, means the restoration of the impaired water to such an extent that the stream could achieve its designated use over the greatest practical number of stream-miles, as determined using, if available, State-designated or Tribal-designated criteria.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “restoration” includes the removal of covered pollutants.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a pilot program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests for the restoration of impaired water impacted by acid mine drainage in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance under this section may be in the form of technical assistance and design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure to address acid mine drainage, including projects for centralized water treatment and related facilities.

(d) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The Secretary shall prioritize assistance under this section to a project that—

(1) addresses acid mine drainage from multiple sources impacting impaired waters; or

(2) includes a centralized water treatment system to reduce the acid mine drainage load in impaired waters.

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

(f) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, work with States, units of local government, and other relevant Federal agencies to secure any permits, variances, or approvals necessary to facilitate the completion of projects receiving assistance under this section.

(g) **COST-SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section shall be 25 percent, including provision of all land, easements, rights-of-way, and necessary relocations.

(h) **AGREEMENTS.**—Construction of a project under this section shall be initiated only after the non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary to pay—

(1) the non-Federal share of the costs of construction of a project carried out under this section; and

(2) 100 percent of any operation, maintenance, and replacement and rehabilitation costs of a project carried out under this section.

(i) **CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.**—The Secretary, with the consent of the non-Federal interest for a project carried out under this section, may receive or expend funds contributed by a non-profit entity for the project.

(j) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 312. WESTERN RURAL WATER.

Section 595(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 1836) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) **NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.**—The term ‘non-Federal interest’ includes an entity declared to be a political subdivision of the State of New Mexico.”.

SEC. 313. CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS.

(a) **REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS; CLEARING CHANNELS.**—Section 2 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 877, chapter 877; 33 U.S.C. 701g), is amended—

(1) by striking “\$7,500,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”; and

(2) by inserting “for preventing and mitigating flood damages associated with ice jams,” after “other debris,”; and

(3) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

(b) **EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION.**—Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$40,000,000”; and

(2) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

(c) **STORM AND HURRICANE RESTORATION AND IMPACT MINIMIZATION PROGRAM.**—Section 3(c) of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426g(c)), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$37,500,000” and inserting “\$45,000,000”; and

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

(d) **SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.**—Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “\$68,750,000” and inserting “\$85,000,000”; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

(e) **AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.**—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) is amended—

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

“(4) **DROUGHT RESILIENCE.**—A project under this section may include measures that enhance drought resilience through the restoration of wetlands or the removal of invasive species.”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”; and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking “\$62,500,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

(f) **PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT.**—Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), in the third sentence, by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$60,000,000”.

(g) **SHORE DAMAGE PREVENTION OR MITIGATION.**—Section 111(c) of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426i(c)) is amended by striking “\$12,500,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

(h) **SMALL RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.**—Section 107(b) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(b)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

(i) **REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT.**—Section 204(c)(1)(C) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

SEC. 314. SMALL PROJECT ASSISTANCE.

Section 165(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260) is amended by striking “2024” each place it appears and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 315. GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

After completion of construction of the project for ecosystem restoration, Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin project, Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois, authorized by section 401(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2740) and modified by section 402(a) of that Act (134 Stat. 2742) and section 8337 of the Water Resources Development Act of

2022 (136 Stat. 3793), the Federal share of operation and maintenance costs of the project shall be 90 percent.

SEC. 316. MAMARONECK-SHELDRAKE RIVERS, NEW YORK.

The non-Federal share of the cost of features of the project for flood risk management, Mamaroneck-Sheldrake Rivers, New York, authorized by section 1401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3837), benefiting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)) shall be 10 percent.

SEC. 317. LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, ALASKA.

Section 5032(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1205; 134 Stat. 2719) is amended by striking “20” and inserting “25”.

SEC. 318. SELMA FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND BANK STABILIZATION.

(a) **EXPEDITED REVIEW.**—The Secretary shall expedite the review of, and give due consideration to, the request from the City of Selma, Alabama, that the Secretary apply section 103(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(k)) to the project for flood risk management, Selma Flood Risk Management and Bank Stabilization, Alabama, authorized by section 8401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3839).

(b) **COST-SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project for flood risk management, Selma Flood Risk Management and Bank Stabilization, Alabama, authorized by section 8401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3839), shall be 10 percent.

SEC. 319. ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION.

Section 519(c)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2654; 121 Stat. 1221) is amended by striking “2010” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 320. HAWAII ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.

Section 444 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3747; 113 Stat. 286) is amended—

(1) by striking “and environmental restoration” and inserting “environmental restoration, and coastal storm risk management”; and

(2) by inserting “Hawaii,” after “Guam,”.

SEC. 321. CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN INVASIVE SPECIES PARTNERSHIPS.

Section 104(g)(2)(A) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(g)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting “the Connecticut River Basin,” after “the Ohio River Basin,”.

SEC. 322. EXPENSES FOR CONTROL OF AQUATIC PLANT GROWTHS AND INVASIVE SPECIES.

Section 104(d)(2)(A) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “50 percent” and inserting “35 percent”.

SEC. 323. CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASIAN CARP PREVENTION PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 509(a)(2)(C)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note; Public Law 116–260) is amended by striking “2024” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 324. EXTENSION FOR CERTAIN INVASIVE SPECIES PROGRAMS.

Section 104(b)(2)(A) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “each of fiscal years 2021 through 2024” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2025 through 2029”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “2028” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 325. STORM DAMAGE PREVENTION AND REDUCTION, COASTAL EROSION, RIVERINE EROSION, AND ICE AND GLACIAL DAMAGE, ALASKA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 8315 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3783) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “**riverine erosion**,” after “**coastal erosion**,”; and

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “**riverine erosion**,” after “**coastal erosion**.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of contents in section 2(b) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (136 Stat. 2429) is amended by striking the item relating to section 8315 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 8315. Storm damage prevention and reduction, coastal erosion, riverine erosion, and ice and glacial damage, Alaska.”.

(2) The table of contents in section 8001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3693) is amended by striking the item relating to section 8315 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 8315. Storm damage prevention and reduction, coastal erosion, riverine erosion, and ice and glacial damage, Alaska.”.

SEC. 326. REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED DAMS.

Section 1177 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 467f–2 note; Public Law 114–322) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **COST SHARING.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project for rehabilitation of a dam under this section, including the cost of any required study, shall be the same share assigned to the non-Federal interest for the cost of initial construction of that dam, including provision of all land, easements, rights-of-way, and necessary relocations.”;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(e) **COST LIMITATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **CERTAIN DAMS.**—The Secretary shall not expend more than \$100,000,000 under this section for the Waterbury Dam Spillway Project, Vermont.”.

(3) in subsection (f), by striking “fiscal years 2017 through 2026” and inserting “fiscal years 2025 through 2029”; and

(4) by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 327. EDIZ HOOK BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECT, PORT ANGELES, WASHINGTON.

The cost-share for operation and maintenance costs for the project for beach erosion control, Ediz Hook, Port Angeles, Washington, authorized by section 4 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 15), shall be in accordance with the cost-share described in section 101(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 221(b)(1)).

SEC. 328. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO CERTAIN LOUISIANA HURRICANE AND COASTAL STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that all efforts should be made to extend the scope of the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Morganza to the Gulf, Louisiana, authorized by section 7002(3) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1368), and the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Upper Barataria Basin, Louisiana, authorized by section 8401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3841), in order to connect the two projects and realize the benefits of continuous hurricane and coastal storm damage risk reduction from west of Houma in Gibson, Louisiana, to the connection with the Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System around New Orleans, Louisiana.

SEC. 329. CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY PROGRAM.

Section 704(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263 note; Public Law 99–662) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$120,000,000”.

SEC. 330. BOSQUE WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program to carry out appropriate planning, design, and construction measures for wildfire prevention and restoration in the Middle Rio Grande Bosque, including the removal of jetty jacks.

(b) **COST SHARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section shall be in accordance with sections 103 and 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213, 2215).

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)) shall be 10 percent.

(c) **REPEAL.**—Section 116 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (117 Stat. 1836), is repealed.

(d) **TREATMENT.**—The program authorized under subsection (a) shall be considered a continuation of the program authorized by section 116 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (117 Stat. 1836) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

SEC. 331. EXPANSION OF TEMPORARY RELOCATION ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 8154(g)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3735) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Norfolk, Virginia, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2738).”.

SEC. 332. WILSON LOCK FLOATING GUIDE WALL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—On the request of the relevant Federal entity, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, use all relevant authorities to expeditiously provide technical assistance, including engineering and design assistance, and cost estimation assistance to the relevant Federal entity in order to address the impacts to navigation along the Tennessee River at the Wilson Lock and Dam, Alabama.

(b) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to expend funding on the repair, replacement, or removal of a capital asset owned by the relevant Federal entity, including the Wilson Lock and Dam.

SEC. 333. DELAWARE INLAND BAYS AND DELAWARE BAY COAST COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY.**—The term “economically disadvantaged community” has the meaning given the term pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 116–260)).

(2) **STUDY.**—The term “study” means the Delaware Inland Bays and Delaware Bay Coastal Storm Risk Management Study, authorized by the resolution of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives dated October 1, 1986, and the resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate dated June 23, 1988.

(b) **STUDY, PROJECTS, AND SEPARABLE ELEMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary determines that the study will benefit 1 or more economically disadvantaged communities, the non-Federal share of the costs of carrying out the study, or project con-

struction or a separable element of a project authorized based on the study, shall be 10 percent.

(c) **COST SHARING AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary shall seek to expedite any amendments to any existing cost-share agreement for the study in accordance with this section.

SEC. 334. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PLAN.

Section 1103(e)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(4)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

SEC. 335. REHABILITATION OF PUMP STATIONS.

Notwithstanding the requirements of section 133 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2327a), for purposes of that section, each of the following shall be considered to be an eligible pump station (as defined in subsection (a) of that section) that meets the requirements described in subsection (b) of that section:

(1) The flood control pump station, Hockanum Road, Northampton, Massachusetts.

(2) Pointe Celeste Pump Station, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.

SEC. 336. NAVIGATION ALONG THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.

The Secretary shall, consistent with applicable statutory authorities—

(1) coordinate with the relevant stakeholders and communities in the State of Alabama and the State of Mississippi to address the dredging needs of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in those States; and

(2) ensure continued navigation at the locks and dams owned and operated by the Corps of Engineers located along the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

SEC. 337. GARRISON DAM, NORTH DAKOTA.

The Secretary shall expedite the review of, and give due consideration to, the request from the relevant Federal power marketing administration that the Secretary apply section 1203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 467n) to the project for dam safety at Garrison Dam, North Dakota.

SEC. 338. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MISSOURI RIVER PRIORITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should make publicly available, where appropriate, any data used and any decisions made by the Corps of Engineers relating to the operations of civil works projects within the Missouri River Basin in order to ensure transparency for the communities in that Basin.

SEC. 339. SOIL MOISTURE AND SNOWPACK MONITORING.

Section 511(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2753) is amended by striking “2025” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 340. CONTRACTS FOR WATER SUPPLY.

(a) **COPAN LAKE, OKLAHOMA.**—Section 8358(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3802) is amended by striking “more than 110 percent of the initial project investment cost per acre-foot of storage for the acre-feet of storage space sought under an agreement under paragraph (1)” and inserting “, for the acre-feet of storage space being sought under an agreement under paragraph (1), more than 110 percent of the contractual rate per acre-foot of storage in the most recent agreement of the City for water supply storage space at the project”.

(b) **STATE OF KANSAS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall amend the contracts described in paragraph (2) between the United States and the State of Kansas, relating to storage space for water supply, to change the method of calculation of the interest charges that began accruing on February 1, 1977, on the investment costs for the 198,350 acre-feet of future use storage space and on April 1, 1979, on 125,000 acre-feet of future use storage from compounding interest annually to charging simple interest annually on the principal amount, until—

(A) the State of Kansas informs the Secretary of the desire to convert the future use storage space to present use; and

(B) the principal amount plus the accumulated interest becomes payable pursuant to the terms of the contracts.

(2) **CONTRACTS DESCRIBED.**—The contracts referred to in paragraph (1) are the following contracts between the United States and the State of Kansas:

(A) Contract DACW41-74-C-0081, entered into on March 8, 1974, for the use by the State of Kansas of storage space for water supply in Milford Lake, Kansas.

(B) Contract DACW41-77-C-0003, entered into on December 10, 1976, for the use by the State of Kansas for water supply in Perry Lake, Kansas.

SEC. 341. REND LAKE, CARLYLE LAKE, AND LAKE SHELBYVILLE, ILLINOIS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a request from the Governor of Illinois to terminate a contract described in subsection (c), the Secretary shall amend the contract to release to the United States all rights of the State of Illinois to utilize water storage space in the reservoir project to which the contract applies.

(b) **RELIEF OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS.**—On execution of an amendment described in subsection (a), the State of Illinois shall be relieved of the obligation to pay the percentage of the annual operation and maintenance expense, the percentage of major replacement cost, and the percentage of major rehabilitation cost allocated to the water supply storage specified in the contract for the reservoir project to which the contract applies.

(c) **CONTRACTS.**—Subsection (a) applies to the following contracts between the United States and the State of Illinois:

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

(2) Contract DA-23-065-CIVENG-65-493, entered into on April 28, 1965, for utilization of storage space for water supply in Rend Lake, Illinois.

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

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

SEC. 342. DELAWARE COASTAL SYSTEM PROGRAM.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to provide for the collective planning and implementation of coastal storm risk management and hurricane and storm risk reduction projects in Delaware to provide greater efficiency and a more comprehensive approach to life safety and economic growth.

(b) **DESIGNATION.**—The following projects for coastal storm risk management and hurricane and storm risk reduction shall be known and designated as the “Delaware Coastal System Program” (referred to in this section as the “Program”):

(1) Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet and Lewes Beach, Delaware, authorized by section 101(a)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 276).

(2) Delaware Coast, Bethany Beach and South Bethany, Delaware, authorized by section 101(a)(15) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 276).

(3) Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware, authorized by section 101(b)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577).

(4) Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach, Delaware, authorized by section 101(b)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667).

(5) Indian River Inlet, Delaware.

(6) The project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Delaware Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River, Delaware, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2736) and modified by section 8327(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3788) and subsection (e).

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—The Secretary shall manage the projects described in subsection (b) as components of a single, comprehensive system, recognizing the interdependence of the projects.

(d) **COST-SHARE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of the cost of each of the projects described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (b) shall be 80 percent.

(e) **BROADKILL BEACH, DELAWARE.**—The project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Delaware Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River, Delaware, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2736) and modified by section 8327(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3788), is modified to include the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey—Broadkill Beach, Delaware, authorized by section 101(a)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 275).

SEC. 343. MAINTENANCE OF PILE DIKE SYSTEM.

The Secretary shall continue to maintain the pile dike system constructed by the Corps of Engineers for the purpose of navigation along the Lower Columbia River and Willamette River, Washington, at Federal expense.

SEC. 344. CONVEYANCES.

(a) **GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.**—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) **LIABILITY.**—

(A) **HOLD HARMLESS.**—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.

(B) **FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.**—The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out before the date of conveyance 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) **DILLARD ROAD, INDIANA.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary shall convey to the State of Indiana all right, title, and interest of the United States, together with any improvements on the land, in and to the property described in paragraph (2).

(2) **PROPERTY.**—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 11.85 acres of land and road easements associated with Dillard Road, including improvements on that land, located in Patoka Township, Crawford County, Indiana.

(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) **REVERSION.**—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this sub-

section is not used for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(c) **PORT OF SKAMANIA, WASHINGTON.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary shall convey to the Port of Skamania, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States, together with any improvements on the land, in and to the property described in paragraph (2).

(2) **PROPERTY.**—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 1.6 acres of land designated as “Lot I-2”, including any improvements on the land, located in North Bonneville, Washington, T. 2 N., R. 7 E., sec. 19, Willamette Meridian.

(3) **CONSIDERATION.**—The Port of Skamania, Washington, 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.

SEC. 345. EMERGENCY DROUGHT OPERATIONS PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITION OF COVERED PROJECT.**—In this section, the term “covered project” means a project—

(1) that is located in the State of California or the State of Arizona; and

(2)(A) of the Corps of Engineers for which water supply is an authorized purpose; or

(B) for which the Secretary develops a water control manual under section 7 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 890, chapter 665; 33 U.S.C. 709).

(b) **EMERGENCY OPERATION DURING DROUGHT.**—Consistent with other authorized project purposes and in coordination with the non-Federal interest, in operating a covered project during a drought emergency in the project area, the Secretary may carry out a pilot program to operate the covered project with water supply as the primary project purpose.

(c) **UPDATES.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may update the water control manual for a covered project to include drought operations and contingency plans.

(d) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) operations described in that subsection—

(A) are consistent with water management deviations and drought contingency plans in the water control manual for the covered project;

(B) impact only the flood pool managed by the Secretary; and

(C) shall not be carried out in the event of a forecast or anticipated flood or weather event that would require flood risk management to take precedence;

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary uses forecast-informed reservoir operations; and

(3) the covered project returns to the operations that were in place prior to the use of the authority provided under that subsection at a time determined by the Secretary, in coordination with the non-Federal interest.

(e) **CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.**—The Secretary may receive and expend funds contributed by a non-Federal interest to carry out activities under this section.

(f) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program carried out under this section.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—The Secretary shall include in the report under paragraph (1) a description of the activities of the Secretary that were carried out for each covered project and any lessons learned from carrying out those activities.

(g) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects, modifies, or changes the authorized purposes of a covered project;

(2) affects existing Corps of Engineers authorities, including authorities with respect to navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental protection and restoration;

(3) affects the ability of the Corps of Engineers to provide for temporary deviations;

(4) affects the application of a cost-share requirement under section 101, 102, or 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211, 2212, 2213);

(5) supersedes or modifies any written agreement between the Federal Government and a non-Federal interest that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(6) supersedes or modifies any amendment to an existing multistate water control plan for the Colorado River Basin, if applicable;

(7) affects any water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(8) preempts or affects any State water law or interstate compact governing water;

(9) affects existing water supply agreements between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest; or

(10) affects any obligation to comply with the provisions of any Federal or State environmental law, including—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); and

(C) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 346. REHABILITATION OF EXISTING LEVEES.

Section 3017(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3303a note; Public Law 113–121) is amended by striking “2028” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 347. NON-FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 113–121) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A)(i)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) in subclause (III), by striking “5” and inserting “15”; and

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “each of fiscal years 2019 through 2026” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2025 through 2029”.

(b) LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the pilot program under section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 113–121), the Secretary may include in the pilot program a project authorized to be implemented under, or in accordance with, title VII of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1270).

(2) **ELIGIBILITY.**—In the case of a project described in paragraph (1) for which the non-Federal interest has initiated construction in accordance with authorities governing the provision of in-kind contributions for the project, the Secretary shall take into account the value of any in-kind contributions provided by the non-Federal interest for the project prior to the date of execution of the project partnership agreement under section 1043(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note; Public Law 113–121) for purposes of determining the non-Federal share of the costs to complete construction of the project.

SEC. 348. HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 128(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note; Public Law 116–260) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) Lake Elsinore, California; and

“(16) Willamette River, Oregon.”.

SEC. 349. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MOBILE HARBOR, ALABAMA.

It is sense of Congress that the Secretary should, consistent with applicable statutory authorities, coordinate with relevant stakeholders in the State of Alabama to address the dredging and dredging material placement needs associated with the project for navigation, Mobile Harbor, Alabama, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5) and modified by section 309 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2704).

SEC. 350. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO PORT OF PORTLAND, OREGON.

It is sense of Congress that—

(1) the Port of Portland, Oregon, is the sole dredging operator of the federally authorized navigation channel in the Columbia River, which was authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbors Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1177);

(2) the Corps of Engineers should continue to provide operation and maintenance support for the Port of Portland, Oregon, including for dredging equipment;

(3) the pipeline dredge of the Port of Portland, known as the “Dredge Oregon”, was built in 1965, 58 years ago, while the average age of a dredging vessel in the United States is 25 years; and

(4) Congress commits to ensuring continued dredging for the Port of Portland.

SEC. 351. CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER PROGRAM.

Section 8144 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3724) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “2 years” and inserting “4 years”; and

(2) in subsection (j), by striking “3 years” and inserting “5 years”.

SEC. 352. ADDITIONAL PROJECTS FOR UNDERSERVED COMMUNITY HARBORS.

Section 8132 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2238e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and for purposes of contributing to ecosystem restoration” before the period at the end; and

(2) in subsection (h)(1), by striking “2026” and inserting “2029”.

SEC. 353. WINOOSKI RIVER TRIBUTARY WATERSHED.

Section 212(e)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(L) Winooski River tributary watershed, Vermont.”.

SEC. 354. WACO LAKE, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite the review of, and give due consideration to, the request from the City of Waco, Texas, that the Secretary apply section 147 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 701q–1) to the embankment adjacent to Waco Lake in Waco, Texas.

SEC. 355. SEMINOLE TRIBAL CLAIM EXTENSION.

Section 349 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2716) is amended in

the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2022” and inserting “2027”.

SEC. 356. COASTAL EROSION PROJECT, BARROW, ALASKA.

For purposes of implementing the coastal erosion project, Barrow, Alaska, the Secretary may consider the North Slope Borough to be in compliance with section 402(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 701b–12(a)) on adoption by the North Slope Borough Assembly of a floodplain management plan to reduce the impacts of future flood events in the immediate floodplain area of the project if that plan—

(1) is approved by the relevant Federal agency; and

(2) was developed in consultation with the relevant Federal agency and the Secretary.

SEC. 357. COLEBROOK RIVER RESERVOIR, CONNECTICUT.

(a) **CONTRACT TERMINATION REQUEST.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a request from the Metropolitan District of Hartford County, Connecticut, to terminate the contract described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall offer to amend the contract to release to the United States all rights of the Metropolitan District of Hartford, Connecticut, to utilize water storage space in the reservoir project to which the contract applies.

(2) **CONTRACT DESCRIBED.**—The contract referred to in paragraph (1) and subsection (b) is the contract between the United States and the Metropolitan District of Hartford County, Connecticut, numbered DA–19–016–CIVENG–65–203, with respect to the Colebrook River Reservoir in Connecticut.

(b) **RELIEF OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS.**—On execution of the amendment described in subsection (a)(1), the Metropolitan District of Hartford County, Connecticut, shall be relieved of the obligation to pay the percentage of the annual operation and maintenance expense, the percentage of major replacement cost, and the percentage of major rehabilitation cost allocated to the water supply storage specified in the contract described in subsection (a)(2) for the reservoir project to which the contract applies.

SEC. 358. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO SHALLOW DRAFT DREDGING IN THE CHESAPEAKE BAY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) shallow draft dredging in the Chesapeake Bay is critical for tourism, recreation, and the fishing industry and that additional dredging is needed; and

(2) the Secretary should, to the maximum extent practicable, use existing statutory authorities to address the dredging needs at small harbors and channels in the Chesapeake Bay.

TITLE IV—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

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.**—

| | | | |
|-------|---|---------------|---|
| 1. MD | Baltimore Harbor Anchorages and Channels, Sea Girt Loop | June 22, 2023 | Federal: \$47,956,500 Non-Federal: \$15,985,500 Total: \$63,942,000 |
|-------|---|---------------|---|

(2) **FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.**—

| | | | |
|-------|------------------|-------------|---|
| 1. KS | Manhattan Levees | May 6, 2024 | Federal: \$29,455,000 Non-Federal: \$15,860,000 Total: \$45,315,000 |
|-------|------------------|-------------|---|

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

| | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------|--|
| 1. RI | Rhode Island Coastline Storm Risk Management | September 28, 2023 | Federal: \$188,353,750 Non-Federal: \$101,421,250 Total: \$289,775,000 |
| 2. FL | St. Johns County, Ponte Vedra Beach, Coastal Storm Risk Management | April 18, 2024 | Federal: \$49,223,000 Non-Federal: \$89,097,000 Total: \$138,320,000 |

(4) NAVIGATION AND HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

| | | | |
|-------|---|--------------|--|
| 1. TX | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Brazoria and Matagorda Counties | June 2, 2023 | Federal: \$204,244,000 Inland Waterways Trust Fund: \$109,977,000 Total: \$314,221,000 |
|-------|---|--------------|--|

(5) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

| | | | |
|-------|---|-------------------|---|
| 1. MS | Memphis Metropolitan Stormwater–North DeSoto County | December 18, 2023 | Federal: \$44,295,000 Non-Federal: \$23,851,000 Total: \$68,146,000 |
|-------|---|-------------------|---|

(6) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.—

| | | | |
|-------|--|------------------|--|
| 1. NY | South Shore Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Oakwood Beach Coastal Storm Risk Management | February 6, 2024 | Federal: \$1,730,973,900 Non-Federal: \$363,228,100 Total: \$2,094,202,000 |
| 2. MO | University City Branch, River Des Peres | February 9, 2024 | Federal: \$9,094,000 Non-Federal: \$4,897,000 Total: \$13,990,000 |

Mrs. CAPITO. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; that the Carper-Capito substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 3224), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 4367), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I would like to talk about the bill here for a few minutes with my friend and the chair of our committee for which this bill is named, THOMAS R. CARPER.

The enactment of biennial water resources legislation over the last 10 years has been critical to meeting the Nation's water and infrastructure needs.

I am so pleased that the Senate just took the next step to continue that strong tradition by passing the bipartisan Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024. This bill was developed based on more than 1,000 requests submitted by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Following the unanimous approval of the bill by the Environment and Public Works Committee, Chairman CARPER and I endeavored to resolve a number of priorities from our colleagues.

The resolution of these priorities is reflected in the latest amendment in the nature of a substitute that was just approved by unanimous consent. I want to thank my colleagues who worked with us on this bill and supported our efforts to move the legislative process forward.

During the Environment and Public Works Committee's markup, I and a couple of my colleagues offered an

amendment to name this bill after my friend TOM CARPER.

The chairman and I worked together over the years to advance bills that improve all types of infrastructure. It is a fitting tribute to the decades of public service that this bill is named after him, and I would like to take a few moments to highlight some of the benefits of the legislation.

It authorizes critical water resources studies and projects across the country. These studies and projects will support navigation along our waterways and at our ports, protect communities from flooding, and improve our environment.

The bill avoids a one-size-fits-all solution and maintains important flexibilities, so that the corps and non-Federal partners can continue to address the unique water resources needs of all communities.

It also contains directives for the corps to develop comprehensive implementation plans for this bill and prior WRDAs. This will enable the corps to focus its energy and resources on fully implementing this WRDA and prior

WRDA provisions in order to better reflect the intent of Congress.

I also want to highlight some of the ways this bill will directly benefit my State of West Virginia. Almost 8 years ago, in June 2016, West Virginia experienced flooding at the highest levels, leading to tragic deaths and devastation. This bill provides support for future projects identified by the corps' feasibility study for flood risk management along the Kanawha River basin.

The legislation also increases the ability of the corps to carry out certain smaller projects for emergency streambank and shoreline protection, ecosystem restoration, and debris and obstruction removal, which are critical to many areas in my State.

The bill directs the corps to expedite feasibility studies for the Upper Guyandotte and Kanawha River basins, as well as to expedite projects in Milton and at the Bluestone Dam in Hinton.

This bill supports drinking and wastewater projects all across our State.

These are just some of the benefits from my home State, but the bill contains several similar wins for States all across the country.

I want to take a moment to thank both my staff and Chairman CARPER's staff, as well as the staff at the corps and the Senate legislative counsel, for their work on this bill and their continued efforts as we move to conference.

I also want to recognize the leadership of the EPW Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Chairman MARK KELLY and Ranking Member KEVIN CRAMER, for their and their staffs' dedication to this legislation.

Again, I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting this substitute amendment to the Thomas R. Carper—should I say that again?—Thomas R. Carper Water Resources Development Act of 2024.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I don't know if my colleague from West Virginia can tell how much I am blushing over here from her kind and generous comments and having offered in the Committee to name this bill after me.

One of the joys of serving here for almost 24 years has been the privilege of serving—as a native West Virginian to be able to serve—with Senator CAPITO, whose father, when my sister and I were born and were little kids living in West Virginia—her dad—was Governor of our State and went on, I think, to serve three terms maybe before he was finished. Maybe someday, another one of your relatives will be Governor of West Virginia.

You mentioned Hinton, and you mentioned Bluestone Dam. My family actually used to live in Hinton, and my dad taught my sister and me to fish at the Bluestone Dam. So those all bring back

just wonderful, wonderful memories. And this day on the floor and this conversation and your comments will stay with me for as long as I live. Thank you.

I rise today to discuss the Water Resources Development Act of 2024, otherwise known as WRDA, which just passed the Senate with unanimous consent—a cause for celebration. In light of this wonderful news, I want to take a few moments to discuss the importance of the legislation and how it will help make life better for people across our Nation, from coast to coast.

As our colleagues may recall, the biennial WRDA legislation is an opportunity for us to consider the policies, the projects, and the programs that are the purview of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I am a Navy guy. I spent a lot of years of my life in the Navy. I love the Navy, but I have huge respect for the Army, and especially the Army Corps of Engineers. For my own State and for States across the Nation—all 50 States—they do amazing work. On behalf of all of our colleagues, I want to say a special thank-you to the men and women of the Army Corps of Engineers.

It can't be overstated just how important the Army Corps' work is for communities across America. The corps is a principal steward of our Nation's water infrastructure. The men and women of the Army Corps work literally around the clock to protect millions of Americans against coastal and inland flooding.

Corps projects mitigate the impacts of climate change and extreme weather, while restoring critical ecosystems across America. The corps also operates and maintains some 25,000—that is 25,000—miles of inland waterways and navigation systems for our ports, which are the backbone of America's trade with countries around the globe.

In fact, some 99 percent of our overseas trade moves through the channels that the corps maintains. I am going to say that again: Some 99 percent of our overseas trade moves through channels that the corps maintains.

As a recovering Governor, I often say it is our responsibility as elected officials to create a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. I probably say that once a day. Maintaining our ports and maintaining our coastal waterways does just that.

The timely passage of WRDA every 2 years is essential to ensuring that corps projects can move forward. Fortunately, the Environment and Public Works Committee has maintained this 2-year cycle for the past decade now, and, God willing, we intend to continue this pattern with WRDA 2024. And with today's actions here on this floor today, I think we are moving in that direction.

Around this time last year, the Environment and Public Works Committee held its first hearing to kick off the legislative process for this bill. Since then, our committee has solicited

input from all 100 Senators and engaged with stakeholders who represent the diverse water infrastructure needs of communities across America.

Along with our staffs, Ranking Member SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO and I considered more than 1,200 WRDA requests—I will say that again: 1,200 WRDA requests—and engaged in extensive bipartisan negotiations.

As a result of this bipartisan process, our committee passed the Senate WRDA bill unanimously 2 months ago, and, today, the full Senate has passed the bill unanimously—cause for celebration.

As my colleagues have also oftentimes heard me say, I believe that bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. WRDA continues to be proof of that.

Now, I would like to take a moment to discuss what the Senate's WRDA bill does for communities across our Nation.

The bill authorizes water infrastructure projects and programs that will impact all 50 States. That includes 83 feasibility studies and 13 new or modified construction projects that address a wide range of challenges facing communities across America.

For example, in Hawaii, the bill authorizes a feasibility study for a project to help Maui recover from the devastation of last year's wildfires by enabling flood protection and ecosystem restoration efforts.

In Arizona, the Senate WRDA bill authorizes construction of a project in Maricopa County to protect and restore major wetlands. This project will help restore habitat and provide flood control to neighboring communities while improving water quality.

And in Texas, this bill authorizes the corps to study the expansion of ship channels and barge lanes in the Galveston Bay area. This includes channels that serve Port Houston, where expanded capacity could help maintain regional supply chains and support economic growth throughout our Nation.

This bill will also go a long way toward ensuring timely implementation of prior WRDA legislation. As we have heard in hearings in the Environment and Public Works Committee, over the last year, implementation of past WRDA reauthorizations has been taking a good deal longer than expected—in some cases, more than a decade.

In particular, the corps has significant work to do to implement the past three WRDA laws. Each of these laws significantly updated the corps' authorities to consider the impacts of climate change and extreme weather and to better support underserved and Tribal communities.

While the corps has made some important progress, there is much more that the corps needs to do to implement past reauthorizations.

And we don't have a lot of time to spare. In fact, we don't have any time to spare. The effects of climate change are all around us. Just this summer, as

you will recall, Hurricane Beryl became the earliest category 5 Atlantic hurricane on record, killing at least 36 Americans and leaving millions without power for days.

That is why WRDA 2024 directs the corps to develop and execute a plan to fully implement past reauthorizations, as soon as possible, in order to protect our communities.

In closing, let me take a moment and just thank the men and women whose incredible bipartisan work has gone into crafting and enabling the passage of this legislation.

I won't be able to mention everybody by name on Senator CAPITO's team or our team, but I want to mention at least a representative handful. I want to recognize Libby and Dan and Dom and Murphie and, especially, Adam.

And on our side of the aisle, on our team, I would especially like to recognize Linnea, Nicole, Cody, Jordan, Tara, John, and Courtney.

Lastly, I want to thank Deanna Edwards on the Senate legislative counsel staff and Dave Wethington and Amy Klein on the Corps of Engineers Congressional Affairs staff.

To each of these men and women, we just say how grateful we are for all of your hard work. And to each of you whose names I have just mentioned, to those that I haven't, our thanks of a grateful nation for what you have done. It really helped to further cement and strengthen across the country people's faith in our government.

Thankfully, the House of Representatives has also passed the WRDA by a vote of 359 to 13. That is a pretty strong vote. Now we begin the important work of resolving the differences between our bill and theirs.

And I want to thank and acknowledge our colleagues in the House for the good work that they have done. We look forward to continuing this work in the days to come to advance this critical legislation and, ultimately, to send it to the desk of the President for his signature.

Again, Senator CAPITO, to you, to your team, to everyone on our team who has worked on this, my colleagues on the Committee and off the Committee, thank you so much for your great work, thank you for letting me be your partner all these years. And I appreciate more than you know the kindness that you showed me today.

Thank you so much.

I yield the floor.

TAX RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES AND WORKERS ACT OF 2024—Motion to Proceed—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today, the HELP Committee held an off-the-floor markup to consider three Biden-Harris labor nominees, including a new term for current National Labor Relations Board, or NLRB, Chair Lauren

McFerran. Chair SANDERS directed this vote to take place without a public hearing or an opportunity to hear from the nominees directly.

Ms. McFerran has served as a member of the NLRB since 2014, and President Biden picked her as Chair in 2021. It has been 10 years since Ms. McFerran has testified before the HELP Committee.

Since the HELP majority decided to skip a hearing to prevent an examination of Ms. McFerran's troubling record, I am speaking about her nomination on the Senate floor.

When multiple Board seats are vacant, the Senate's longstanding practice is to fill Democrat and Republican vacancies on important, bipartisan Boards and Commissions in tandem, but last September, Democrats reconfirmed Gwynne Wilcox, a Democrat nominee, without a Republican counterpart even though there were multiple vacant seats. The Senate should have considered Joshua Ditelberg as a pairing with Wilcox, not with Ms. McFerran. It is bad faith that the majority would represent these nominations as a pairing to justify this process.

As to the substance of Ms. McFerran's nomination, the NLRB is required by Federal law to act as a neutral party in labor disputes between employees and employers, not favoring one party over the other, but under Ms. McFerran's leadership, the Board has weaponized its authority on behalf of Democrats' labor union supporters at the expense of workers.

For example, the Board has overturned 50 years of NLRB precedent by renewing card check during union elections, which exposes workers to intimidation tactics; condensed the time for union elections down to as little as 3 weeks after a petition is filed, depriving employees of a fair chance to hear from both sides and to make an informed decision about whether to unionize; and implemented new, burdensome regulations preventing workers from leaving their union if the union has become ineffective or too costly. It has prevented employers from disciplining employees on the picket line who use racist and hostile language against other employees and managers. The NLRB deems using racist and hostile language as "protected concerted activity."

The weaponization of NLRB under Ms. McFerran's leadership is deeply troubling. Her clear bias against employers' and workers' rights deserves accountability.

Republican members of the HELP Committee have repeatedly called on the chair to hold a public hearing to discuss these concerns directly with her. It is unacceptable that they will be denied this opportunity.

Nomination hearings are not just checking a box; they are a crucial part of Congress's responsibility to review nominees. Every Senator uses information revealed in hearings to decide how

he or she will vote on the floor. Unfortunately, shielding Democrat nominees from scrutiny has been the norm of the HELP Committee under Chair SANDERS.

Earlier this year, the chair decided to hold a closed-door committee vote on the renomination of Julie Su for Secretary of Labor. Since Ms. Su's first nomination attempt failed last year, concerns over her leadership of DOL have grown. HELP Committee members should have been able to raise these concerns with Ms. Su directly. Unfortunately, the chair blocked the public hearing from taking place.

Congress has a responsibility to rein in the executive branch and hold it accountable to the people and their elected representatives.

Last month, I introduced legislation requiring each Federal nominee to testify before the committee of jurisdiction prior to Senate confirmation. This bill should not be controversial to anyone. Frankly, it should be the standard.

The chair's refusal to have public hearings on important nominees is unacceptable. It undermines the committee's constitutional duty to advise and consent on Presidential nominees. The President and his nominees are not above accountability.

Given the serious concerns over Ms. McFerran's leadership and lack of accountability in the nomination process, I voted no on her nomination.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

TAX RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES AND WORKERS ACT OF 2024

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, with election politics front of mind, doomed-to-fail show votes have become an all too frequent occurrence in this Chamber. But there is no more obvious show vote than the one scheduled to happen today, immediately before the August recess.

In today's attempt to score political points, the Democrats are moving to a bill, H.R. 7024, that has been languishing for 6 months in the hopes of fabricating a narrative that Republicans don't support small business, children, or alleviating poverty. However, if my Democrat colleagues were serious about delivering relief to small businesses and working families, they would have worked out a solution with Senate Republicans in earnest on a pathway that would gain broad support from our Members.

While there are plenty of provisions in this bill that my colleagues and I support, the proponents have known since before it was released that Senate Republicans would need to change the bill in order to gain substantial bipartisan support.

It is now August, and it has been months since any real attempt at outreach or engagement has taken place, which suggests that my colleagues are not actually serious about passing a bill but are instead focused on election year messaging.