Calendar No. 72

106TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 507

[Report No. 106–34]

A BILL

To provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

MARCH 23, 1999

Reported with an amendment

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 72

106TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 507

[Report No. 106–34]

To provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 2, 1999

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BENNETT, and Mrs. BOXER) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

MARCH 23, 1999

Reported by Mr. CHAFEE, with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

~~SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.~~

~~(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Development Act of 1999".~~

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

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

~~TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS~~

~~Sec. 101. Project authorizations.~~
~~Sec. 102. Project modifications.~~
~~Sec. 103. Project deauthorizations.~~
~~Sec. 104. Studies.~~

~~TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS~~

~~Sec. 201. Flood hazard mitigation and riverine ecosystem restoration program.~~
~~Sec. 202. Shore protection.~~
~~Sec. 203. Small flood control authority.~~
~~Sec. 204. Use of non-Federal funds for compiling and disseminating information on floods and flood damages.~~
~~Sec. 205. Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration.~~
~~Sec. 206. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.~~
~~Sec. 207. Beneficial uses of dredged material.~~
~~Sec. 208. Voluntary contributions by States and political subdivisions.~~
~~Sec. 209. Recreation user fees.~~
~~Sec. 210. Water resources development studies for the Pacific region.~~
~~Sec. 211. Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers enhancement project.~~
~~Sec. 212. Outer Continental Shelf.~~
~~Sec. 213. Environmental dredging.~~
~~Sec. 214. Benefit of primary flood damages avoided included in benefit-cost analysis.~~
~~Sec. 215. Control of aquatic plant growth.~~
~~Sec. 216. Environmental infrastructure.~~
~~Sec. 217. Watershed management, restoration, and development.~~
~~Sec. 218. Lakes program.~~
~~Sec. 219. Sediments decontamination policy.~~
~~Sec. 220. Disposal of dredged material on beaches.~~
~~Sec. 221. Fish and wildlife mitigation.~~
~~Sec. 222. Reimbursement of non-Federal interest.~~
~~Sec. 223. National Contaminated Sediment Task Force.~~
~~Sec. 224. Great Lakes basin program.~~
~~Sec. 225. Projects for improvement of the environment.~~
~~Sec. 226. Water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation.~~

~~Sec. 227. Irrigation diversion protection and fisheries enhancement assistance.~~
~~Sec. 228. Small storm damage reduction projects.~~
~~Sec. 229. Shore damage prevention or mitigation.~~

~~TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS~~

~~Sec. 301. Dredging of salt ponds in the State of Rhode Island.~~
~~Sec. 302. Upper Susquehanna River basin, Pennsylvania and New York.~~
~~Sec. 303. Small flood control projects.~~
~~Sec. 304. Small navigation projects.~~
~~Sec. 305. Streambank protection projects.~~
~~Sec. 306. Aquatic ecosystem restoration, Springfield, Oregon.~~
~~Sec. 307. Guilford and New Haven, Connecticut.~~
~~Sec. 308. Francis Bland Floodway Ditch.~~
~~Sec. 309. Caloosahatchee River basin, Florida.~~
~~Sec. 310. Cumberland, Maryland, flood project mitigation.~~
~~Sec. 311. City of Miami Beach, Florida.~~
~~Sec. 312. Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.~~
~~Sec. 313. Upper Mississippi River and Illinois waterway system navigation modernization.~~
~~Sec. 314. Upper Mississippi River management.~~
~~Sec. 315. Research and development program for Columbia and Snake Rivers salmon survival.~~
~~Sec. 316. Nine Mile Run habitat restoration, Pennsylvania.~~
~~Sec. 317. Larkspur Ferry Channel, California.~~
~~Sec. 318. Comprehensive Flood Impact-Response Modeling System.~~
~~Sec. 319. Study regarding innovative financing for small and medium-sized ports.~~
~~Sec. 320. Candy Lake project, Osage County, Oklahoma.~~
~~Sec. 321. Salcha River and Piledriver Slough, Fairbanks, Alaska.~~
~~Sec. 322. Eyak River, Cordova, Alaska.~~
~~Sec. 323. North Padre Island storm damage reduction and environmental restoration project.~~
~~Sec. 324. Kanopolis Lake, Kansas.~~
~~Sec. 325. New York City watershed.~~
~~Sec. 326. City of Charlevoix reimbursement, Michigan.~~
~~Sec. 327. Hamilton Dam flood control project, Michigan.~~
~~Sec. 328. Holes Creek flood control project, Ohio.~~
~~Sec. 329. Overflow management facility, Rhode Island.~~

~~SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.~~

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

~~TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS~~

~~SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.~~

~~(a) PROJECTS WITH CHIEF'S REPORTS.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:~~

~~(1) SAND POINT HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Sand Point Harbor, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $11,760,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,964,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,796,000.~~

~~(2) RIO SALADO (SALT RIVER), ARIZONA.—The project for environmental restoration, Rio Salado (Salt River), Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 20, 1998, at a total cost of $88,048,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $56,355,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $31,693,000.~~

~~(3) TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, ARIZONA.—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Tucson drainage area,~~

~~Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 20, 1998, at a total cost of $29,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $16,768,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,132,000.~~

~~(4) AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction described as the Folsom Stepped Release Plan in the Corps of Engineers Supplemental Information Report for the American River Watershed Project, California, dated March 1996, at a total cost of $505,400,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $329,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $176,100,000.~~

~~(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—~~

~~(i) IN GENERAL.—Implementation of the measures by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be undertaken after completion of the levee stabilization and strengthening and flood warning features authorized by section 101(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3662).~~

~~(ii) FOLSOM DAM AND RESERVOIR.—The Secretary may undertake measures at the Folsom Dam and Reservoir authorized under subparagraph (A) only after reviewing the design of such measures to determine if modifications are necessary to account for changed hydrologic conditions and any other changed conditions in the project area, including operational and construction impacts that have occurred since completion of the report referred to in subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall conduct the review and develop the modifications to the Folsom Dam and Reservoir with the full participation of the Secretary of the Interior.~~

~~(iii) REMAINING DOWNSTREAM ELEMENTS.—~~

~~(I) IN GENERAL.—Implementation of the remaining downstream elements authorized pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be undertaken only after the Secretary, in consultation with affected Federal, State, regional, and local entities, has reviewed~~

~~the elements to determine if modifications are necessary to address changes in the hydrologic conditions, any other changed conditions in the project area that have occurred since completion of the report referred to in subparagraph (A) and any design modifications for the Folsom Dam and Reservoir made by the Secretary in implementing the measures referred to in clause (ii), and has issued a report on the review.~~

~~(II) PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES.—The review shall be prepared in accordance with the economic and environmental principles and guidelines for water and related land resources implementation studies, and no construction may be initiated unless the Secretary determines that the remaining downstream elements are technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.~~

~~(5) LLAGAS CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—The project for completion of the remaining reaches of the Natural Resources Conservation Service flood control~~

~~project at Llagas Creek, California, undertaken pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1005), substantially in accordance with the requirements of local cooperation as specified in section 4 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1004) at a total cost of $45,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $21,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal share of $23,200,000.~~

~~(6) SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $65,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $24,300,000.~~

~~(7) UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Construction of the locally preferred plan for flood damage reduction and recreation, Upper Guadalupe River, California, described as the Bypass Channel Plan of the Chief of Engineers dated August 19, 1998, at a total cost of $137,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $44,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $93,600,000.~~

~~(8) YUBA RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Yuba River Basin, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 25, 1998, at a total cost of $26,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $17,350,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,250,000.~~

~~(9) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE: DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-BROADKILL BEACH, DELAWARE.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, Delaware Bay coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Broadkill Beach, Delaware, Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 17, 1998, at a total cost of $9,049,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,674,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,375,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $538,200, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $349,800 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $188,400.~~

~~(10) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE: DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-PORT MAHON, DELAWARE.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for ecosystem restoration and shore protection, Delaware Bay coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Port Mahon, Delaware: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 1998, at a total cost of $7,644,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,969,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,675,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $234,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $152,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $82,000.~~

~~(11) HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER STORAGE AND RECOVERY PROJECT, FLORIDA.—The project for aquifer storage and recovery described in the Corps of Engineers Central and Southern Florida Water Supply Study, Florida, dated April 1989, and in House Document 369, dated July 30, 1968, at a total cost of $27,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $13,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,500,000.~~

~~(12) INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Notwithstanding section 1001(a) of the Water Re-~~

~~sources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)), the project for shoreline protection, Indian River County, Florida, authorized by section 501(a) of that Act (100 Stat. 4134), shall remain authorized for construction through December 31, 2002.~~

~~(13) LIDO KEY BEACH, SARASOTA, FLORIDA.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for shore protection at Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1819) and deauthorized by operation of section 1001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary at a total cost of $5,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,380,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,820,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $602,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $391,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $211,000.~~

~~(14) TAMPA HARBOR-BIG BEND CHANNEL, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Tampa Har-~~

~~bor-Big Bend Channel, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $12,356,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,235,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,121,000.~~

~~(15) BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GEORGIA.—The project for navigation, Brunswick Harbor, Georgia: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $50,717,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $32,966,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,751,000.~~

~~(16) BEARGRASS CREEK, KENTUCKY.—The project for flood damage reduction, Beargrass Creek, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 12, 1998, at a total cost of $11,172,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,262,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,910,000.~~

~~(17) AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH WATERSHED.—The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 23, 1996, at a total cost of $112,900,000, with an estimated Federal~~

~~cost of $73,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $39,500,000.~~

~~(18) BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor Anchorages and Channels, Maryland and Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 8, 1998, at a total cost of $28,430,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,430,000.~~

~~(19) RED LAKE RIVER AT CROOKSTON, MINNESOTA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Red Lake River at Crookston, Minnesota: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 20, 1998, at a total cost of $8,950,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,720,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,230,000.~~

~~(20) NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NEW JERSEY.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and shore protection, New Jersey coastline, Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 1998, at a total cost of~~

~~$56,503,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $36,727,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $19,776,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $2,000,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,300,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $700,000.~~

~~(21) PARK RIVER, NORTH DAKOTA.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the condition stated in subparagraph (B), the project for flood control, Park River, Grafton, North Dakota, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4121) and deauthorized under section 1001(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a), at a total cost of $28,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $18,265,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,835,000.~~

~~(B) CONDITION.—No construction may be initiated unless the Secretary determines through a general reevaluation report using current data, that the project is technically~~

~~sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.~~

~~(22) SALT CREEK, GRAHAM, TEXAS.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, Salt Creek, Graham, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $10,080,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,560,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,520,000.~~

~~(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO A FINAL REPORT.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers as approved by the Secretary, if the report of the Chief is completed not later than December 31, 1999:~~

~~(1) NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Nome Harbor Improvements, Alaska, at a total cost of $24,608,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of $19,660,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of $4,948,000.~~

~~(2) SEWARD HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska, at a total cost of $12,240,000, with an estimated first Federal~~

~~cost of $4,364,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of $7,876,000.~~

~~(3) HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLAND RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.—The project for environmental restoration at Hamilton Airfield, California, at a total cost of $55,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,800,000.~~

~~(4) OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation and environmental restoration, Oakland, California, at a total cost of $214,340,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $143,450,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $70,890,000.~~

~~(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of $42,310,000.~~

~~(5) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE: DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-ROOSEVELT INLET-LEWES BEACH, DELAWARE.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation mitigation, shore protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay~~

~~coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Roosevelt Inlet-Lewes Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of $3,393,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,620,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $773,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $196,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $152,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $44,000.~~

~~(6) DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, BETHANY BEACH/SOUTH BETHANY BEACH, DELAWARE.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, Delaware Coast from Cape Henelopen to Fenwick Island, Bethany Beach/South Bethany Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of $22,205,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $14,433,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,772,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of~~

~~$1,584,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,030,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $554,000.~~

~~(7) JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Jacksonville Harbor, Florida, at a total cost of $26,116,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,129,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $16,987,000.~~

~~(8) LITTLE TALBOT ISLAND, DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage prevention and shore protection, Little Talbot Island, Duval County, Florida, at a total cost of $5,915,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,839,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,076,000.~~

~~(9) PONCE DE LEON INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation and recreation, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, at a total cost of $5,454,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,988,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,466,000.~~

~~(10) SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GEORGIA.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may carry out the~~

~~project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia, substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers, with such modifications as the Secretary deems appropriate, at a total cost of $230,174,000 (of which amount a portion is authorized for implementation of the mitigation plan), with an estimated Federal cost of $145,160,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $85,014,000.~~

~~(B) CONDITIONS.—The project authorized by subparagraph (A) may be carried out only after—~~

~~(i) the Secretary, in consultation with affected Federal, State, regional, and local entities, has reviewed and approved an Environmental Impact Statement that includes—~~

~~(I) an analysis of the impacts of project depth alternatives ranging from 42 feet through 48 feet, and~~

~~(II) a selected plan for navigation and associated mitigation plan as required by section 906(a) of the Water~~

~~Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283); and~~

~~(ii) the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, with the Secretary, have approved the selected plan and have determined that the mitigation plan adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the project.~~

~~(C) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—The mitigation plan shall be implemented in advance of or concurrently with construction of the project.~~

~~(11) TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI AND KANSAS CITY, KANSAS.—The project for flood damage reduction, Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas, at a total cost of $42,875,000 with an estimated Federal cost of $25,596,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,279,000.~~

~~(12) LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NEW JERSEY.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation mitigation, ecosystem restoration, shore~~

~~protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey, at a total cost of $15,952,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,118,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,834,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $1,114,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $897,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $217,000.~~

~~(13) NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR, BRIGANTINE ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, New Jersey Shore protection, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor, Brigantine Island, New Jersey, at a total cost of $4,970,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,230,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,740,000.~~

~~(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period~~

~~at an estimated average annual cost of $465,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $302,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $163,000.~~

~~(14) MEMPHIS HARBOR, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the project for navigation, Memphis Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4145) and deauthorized under section 1001(a) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)) is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.~~

~~(B) CONDITION.—No construction may be initiated unless the Secretary determines through a general reevaluation report using current data, that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.~~

~~(15) HOWARD HANSON DAM, WASHINGTON.—The project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Howard Hanson Dam, Washington, at a total cost of $75,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost~~

~~of $36,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $38,700,000.~~

~~SEC. 102. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.~~

~~(a) PROJECTS WITH REPORTS.—~~

~~(1) SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, San Lorenzo River, California, authorized by section 101(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3663), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include as a part of the project streambank erosion control measures to be undertaken substantially in accordance with the report entitled "Bank Stabilization Concept, Laurel Street Extension", dated April 23, 1998, at a total cost of $4,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,600,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,400,000.~~

~~(2) WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood control, Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(a)(19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665) is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project in accordance with the Corps of Engineers report dated June 29, 1998, at a total cost of $17,039,000, with an estimated Federal cost~~

~~of $9,730,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,309,000.~~

~~(3) ABSECON ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—The project for Absecon Island, New Jersey, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668) is amended to authorize the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interests for all work performed, consistent with the authorized project.~~

~~(4) ARTHUR KILL, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Arthur Kill, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098) and modified by section 301(b)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $276,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $183,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $93,600,000.~~

~~(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local~~

~~service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of $38,900,000.~~

~~(5) WAURIKA LAKE, OKLAHOMA, WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES.—The requirement for the Waurika Project Master Conservancy District to repay the $2,900,000 in costs (including interest) resulting from the October 1991 settlement of the claim of the Travelers Insurance Company before the United States Claims Court related to construction of the water conveyance facilities authorized by the first section of Public Law 88–253 (77 Stat. 841) is waived.~~

~~(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO REPORTS.—The following projects are modified as follows, except that no funds may be obligated to carry out work under such modifications until completion of a final report by the Chief of Engineers, as approved by the Secretary, finding that such work is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, as applicable:~~

~~(1) THORNTON RESERVOIR, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The Thornton Reservoir project, an element of the project for flood control, Chicagoland Underflow Plan, Illinois, authorized by section 3(a)(5) of the Water~~

~~Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include additional permanent flood control storage attributable to the Thorn Creek Reservoir project, Little Calumet River Watershed, Illinois, approved under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).~~

~~(B) COST SHARING.—Costs for the Thornton Reservoir project shall be shared in accordance with section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).~~

~~(C) TRANSITIONAL STORAGE.—The Secretary of Agriculture may cooperate with non-Federal interests to provide, on a transitional basis, flood control storage for the Thorn Creek Reservoir project in the west lobe of the Thornton quarry.~~

~~(D) CREDITING.—The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share of the Thornton Reservoir project all design and construction costs incurred by the non-Federal interests before the date of enactment of this Act.~~

~~(E) REEVALUATION REPORT.—The Secretary shall determine the credits authorized by~~

~~subparagraph (D) that are integral to the Thornton Reservoir project and the current total project costs based on a limited reevaluation report.~~

~~(2) WELLS HARBOR, WELLS, MAINE.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480), is modified to authorize the Secretary to realign the channel and anchorage areas based on a harbor design capacity of 150 craft.~~

~~(B) DEAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN PORTIONS.—The following portions of the project are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:~~

~~(i) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,992.00, E394,831.00, thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 14.8 seconds west 10.38 feet to a point N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds west 991.76 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence~~

~~running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.8 seconds east 994.93 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(ii) The portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 51 degrees 58 minutes 32.7 seconds west 15.49 feet to a point N177,768.53, E394,324.76, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.5 seconds west 672.87 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 25.4 seconds east 684.70 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(iii) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 78 de-~~

~~grees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 15.7 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,816.13, E394,126.26, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 21.4 seconds east 9.98 feet to a point N176,814.09, E394,136.03, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 29.1 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(iv) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 30.3 seconds east 10.03 feet to a point N176,724.31, E394,566.79, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.4~~

~~seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(C) REDESIGNATIONS.—The following portions of the project shall be redesignated as part of the 6-foot anchorage:~~

~~(i) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 40.8 seconds west 94.65 feet to a point N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.4 seconds west 962.83 feet to a point N177,038.40, E394,530.10, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 90.00 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds east 991.76 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(ii) The portion of the 10-foot inner harbor settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 30.5~~

~~seconds west 160.00 feet to a point N177,052.69, E394,461.58, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 45.4 seconds west 299.99 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 160 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(iii) The portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N178,102.26, E394,751.83, thence running south 51 degrees 59 minutes 42.1 seconds west 526.51 feet to a point N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.6 seconds west 511.83 feet to a point N177,277.01, E394,232.52, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 80.00 feet to a point N177,260.68, E394,310.84, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 24.8 seconds east 482.54 feet to a point~~

~~N177,733.07, E394,409.30, thence running north 51 degrees 59 minutes 41.0 seconds east 402.63 feet to a point N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 27.6 seconds east 123.89 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(D) REALIGNMENT.—The 6-foot anchorage area described in subparagraph (C)(iii) shall be realigned to include the area located south of the inner harbor settling basin in existence on the date of enactment of this Act beginning at a point with coordinates N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds west 160.00 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 11 degrees 47 minutes 03.8 seconds west 45 feet to a point N176,714.97, E394,391.15, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds 160.00 feet to a point N176,682.31, E394,547.78, thence running north 11 degrees 47 minutes 03.8 seconds east 45 feet to the point of origin.~~

~~(E) RELOCATION.—The Secretary may relocate the settling basin feature of the project to the outer harbor between the jetties.~~

~~(3) NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NEW JERSEY.—The project for navigation, New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, Port Jersey, New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $103,267,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $76,909,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $26,358,000.~~

~~(c) BEAVER LAKE, ARKANSAS, WATER SUPPLY STORAGE REALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall reallocate approximately 31,000 additional acre-feet at Beaver Lake, Arkansas, to water supply storage at no cost to the Beaver Water District or the Carroll-Boone Water District, except that at no time shall the bottom of the conservation pool be at an elevation that is less than 1,076 feet, NGVD.~~

~~(d) TOLCHESTER CHANNEL S-TURN, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.—The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), is~~

~~modified to direct the Secretary to straighten the Tolchester Channel S-turn as part of project maintenance.~~

~~(e) TROPICANA WASH AND FLAMINGO WASH, NEVADA.—Any Federal costs associated with the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, Nevada, authorized by section 101(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), incurred by the non-Federal interest to accelerate or modify construction of the project, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, shall be considered to be eligible for reimbursement by the Secretary.~~

~~(f) REDIVERSION PROJECT, COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The rediversion project, Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731) and modified by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1992 (105 Stat. 517), is modified to authorize the Secretary to pay the State of South Carolina not more than $3,750,000, if the State enters into an agreement with the Secretary providing that the State shall perform all future operation of the St. Stephen, South Carolina, fish lift (including associated studies to assess the efficacy of the fish lift).~~

~~(2) CONTENTS.—The agreement shall specify the terms and conditions under which payment will be made and the rights of, and remedies available to, the Secretary to recover all or a portion of the payment if the State suspends or terminates operation of the fish lift or fails to perform the operation in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.~~

~~(3) MAINTENANCE.—Maintenance of the fish lift shall remain a Federal responsibility.~~

~~(g) TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TEXAS.—The project for flood control and navigation, Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091), is modified to add environmental restoration as a project purpose.~~

~~(h) BEACH EROSION CONTROL AND HURRICANE PROTECTION, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.—~~

~~(1) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—In any fiscal year that the Corps of Engineers does not receive appropriations sufficient to meet expected project expenditures for that year, the Secretary shall accept from the city of Virginia Beach, Virginia, for purposes of the project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 501(a) of the Water Resources~~

~~Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4136), such funds as the city may advance for the project.~~

~~(2) REPAYMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall repay, without interest, the amount of any advance made under paragraph (1), from appropriations that may be provided by Congress for river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects.~~

~~(i) ELIZABETH RIVER, CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the date of enactment of this Act, the city of Chesapeake, Virginia, shall not be obligated to make the annual cash contribution required under paragraph 1(9) of the Local Cooperation Agreement dated December 12, 1978, between the Government and the city for the project for navigation, southern branch of Elizabeth River, Chesapeake, Virginia.~~

~~(j) PAYMENT OPTION, MOOREFIELD, WEST VIRGINIA.—The Secretary may permit the non-Federal interests for the project for flood control, Moorefield, West Virginia, to pay without interest the remaining non-Federal cost over a period not to exceed 30 years, to be determined by the Secretary.~~

~~(k) MIAMI DADE AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL LAND RETENTION PLAN AND SOUTH BISCAYNE, FLORIDA.—Section 528(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development~~

~~Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3768) is amended by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(D) CREDIT AND REIMBURSEMENT OF PAST AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may afford credit to or reimburse the non-Federal sponsors (using funds authorized by subparagraph (C)) for the reasonable costs of any work that has been performed or will be performed in connection with a study or activity meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) if—~~

~~"(i) the Secretary determines that—~~

~~"(I) the work performed by the non-Federal sponsors will substantially expedite completion of a critical restoration project; and~~

~~"(II) the work is necessary for a critical restoration project; and~~

~~"(ii) the credit or reimbursement is granted pursuant to a project-specific agreement that prescribes the terms and conditions of the credit or reimbursement.".~~

~~(l) LAKE MICHIGAN, ILLINOIS.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Lake Michigan, Illinois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State line, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664), is modified to provide for reimbursement for additional project work undertaken by the non-Federal interest.~~

~~(2) CREDIT OR REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall credit or reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of project costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in designing, constructing, or reconstructing reach 2F (700 feet south of Fullerton Avenue and 500 feet north of Fullerton Avenue), reach 3M (Meigs Field), and segments 7 and 8 of reach 4 (43rd Street to 57th Street), if the non-Federal interest carries out the work in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary, at an estimated total cost of $83,300,000.~~

~~(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of project costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in reconstructing the revetment structures protecting Solidarity Drive in Chicago, Illinois, be-~~

~~fore the signing of the project cooperation agreement, at an estimated total cost of $7,600,000.~~

~~(m) MEASUREMENTS OF LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSIONS, ILLINOIS.—Section 1142(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4253) is amended by striking "$250,000 per fiscal year for each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1986" and inserting "a total of $1,250,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003".~~

~~(n) PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, DUBUQUE, IOWA.—The project for navigation at Dubuque, Iowa, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 482), is modified to authorize the development of a wetland demonstration area of approximately 1.5 acres to be developed and operated by the Dubuque County Historical Society or a successor nonprofit organization.~~

~~(o) LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE.—The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share work performed in the project area of the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Mississippi River, Louisiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4117).~~

~~(p) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—The project for environmental infrastructure, Jackson County, Mississippi, authorized by section 219(c)(5) of the Water Re-~~

~~sources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) and modified by section 504 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757), is modified to direct the Secretary to provide a credit, not to exceed $5,000,000, against the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the costs incurred by the Jackson County Board of Supervisors since February 8, 1994, in constructing the project, if the Secretary determines that such costs are for work that the Secretary determines was compatible with and integral to the project.~~

~~(q) RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary shall convey to the State of South Carolina all right, title, and interest of the United States in the parcels of land described in subparagraph (B) that are currently being managed by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes for the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, South Carolina, project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1966 and modified by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.~~

~~(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The parcels of land to be conveyed are described in Exhibits A, F, and H of Army Lease No. DACW21–1–93–0910 and associated supplemental agreements or are designated in red in Exhibit A of Army License No. DACW21–3–85–1904, excluding all designated parcels in the license that are below elevation 346 feet mean sea level or that are less than 300 feet measured horizontally from the top of the power pool.~~

~~(B) MANAGEMENT OF EXCLUDED PARCELS.—Management of the excluded parcels shall continue in accordance with the terms of Army License No. DACW21–3–85–1904 until the Secretary and the State enter into an agreement under subparagraph (F).~~

~~(C) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary, with the cost of the survey borne by the State.~~

~~(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The State shall be responsible for all costs, including real estate transaction and environmental compliance costs, associated with the conveyance.~~

~~(4) PERPETUAL STATUS.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—All land conveyed under this paragraph shall be retained in public ownership and shall be managed in perpetuity for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary.~~

~~(B) REVERSION.—If any parcel of land is not managed for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in accordance with the plan, title to the parcel shall revert to the United States.~~

~~(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.~~

~~(6) FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION AGREEMENT.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may pay the State of South Carolina not more than $4,850,000 subject to the Secretary and the State entering into a binding agreement for the State to manage for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in perpetuity the lands conveyed under this paragraph and excluded parcels designated in Exhibit A of Army License No. DACW21–3–85–1904.~~

~~(B) FAILURE OF PERFORMANCE.—The agreement shall specify the terms and conditions under which payment will be made and the rights of, and remedies available to, the Federal Government to recover all or a portion of the payment if the State fails to manage any parcel in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.~~

~~(r) LAND CONVEYANCE, CLARKSTON, WASHINGTON.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Port of Clarkston, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of the land described in the Department of the Army lease No. DACW68–1–97–22, consisting of approximately 31 acres, the exact boundaries of which shall be determined by the Secretary and the Port of Clarkston.~~

~~(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—The Secretary may convey to the Port of Clarkston, Washington, at fair market value as determined by the Secretary, such additional land located in the vicinity of Clarkston, Washington, as the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the Columbia River Project and appropriate for conveyance.~~

~~(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyances made under subsections (a) and (b) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, including a requirement that the Port of Clarkston pay all administrative costs associated with the conveyances, including the cost of land surveys and appraisals and costs associated with compliance with applicable environmental laws (including regulations).~~

~~(4) USE OF LAND.—The Port of Clarkston shall be required to pay the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of any land conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) that is not retained in public ownership or is used for other than public park or recreation purposes, except that the Secretary shall have a right of reverter to reclaim possession and title to any such land.~~

~~(s) WHITE RIVER, INDIANA.—The project for flood control, Indianapolis on West Fork of the White River, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1586, chapter 688), as modified by section 323 of the Water Resources~~

~~Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake the riverfront alterations described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Plan, dated February 1994, for the Canal Development (Upper Canal feature) and the Beveridge Paper feature, at a total cost not to exceed $25,000,000, of which $12,500,000 is the estimated Federal cost and $12,500,000 is the estimated non-Federal cost, except that no such alterations may be undertaken unless the Secretary determines that the alterations authorized by this subsection, in combination with the alterations undertaken under section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), are economically justified.~~

~~(t) FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.—The project for hurricane-flood protection, Fox Point, Providence, Rhode Island, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 306) is modified to direct the Secretary to undertake the necessary repairs to the barrier, as identified in the Condition Survey and Technical Assessment dated April 1998 with Supplement dated August 1998, at a total cost of $3,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,950,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,050,000.~~

~~SEC. 103. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.~~

~~(a) BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—The portion of the project for navigation, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), consisting of a 2.4-acre anchorage area 9 feet deep and an adjacent 0.60-acre anchorage area 6 feet deep, located on the west side of Johnsons River, Connecticut, is not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act.~~

~~(b) BASS HARBOR, MAINE.—~~

~~(1) DEAUTHORIZATION.—The portions of the project for navigation, Bass Harbor, Maine, authorized on May 7, 1962, under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) described in paragraph (2) are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act.~~

~~(2) DESCRIPTION.—The portions of the project referred to in paragraph (1) are described as follows:~~

~~(A) Beginning at a bend in the project, N149040.00, E538505.00, thence running easterly about 50.00 feet along the northern limit of the project to a point, N149061.55, E538550.11, thence running southerly about 642.08 feet to a point, N148477.64, E538817.18, thence running southwesterly about 156.27 feet to a point on the westerly~~

~~limit of the project, N148348.50, E538737.02, thence running northerly about 149.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to a bend in the project, N148489.22, E538768.09, thence running northwesterly about 610.39 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.~~

~~(B) Beginning at a point on the westerly limit of the project, N148118.55, E538689.05, thence running southeasterly about 91.92 feet to a point, N148041.43, E538739.07, thence running southerly about 65.00 feet to a point, N147977.86, E538725.51, thence running southwesterly about 91.92 feet to a point on the westerly limit of the project, N147927.84, E538648.39, thence running northerly about 195.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.~~

~~(c) BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The project for navigation, Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the Act of July 25, 1912 (37 Stat. 201, chapter 253), is not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act.~~

~~(d) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—Section 364 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110~~

~~Stat. 3731) is amended by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:~~

~~"(9) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The project for navigation, East Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 657).".~~

~~SEC. 104. STUDIES.~~

~~(a) CADDO LEVEE, RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, ARIZONA, LOUISIANA, OKLAHOMA, AND TEXAS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking a project for flood control, Caddo Levee, Red River Below Denison Dam, Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, including incorporating the existing levee, along Twelve Mile Bayou from its juncture with the existing Red River Below Denison Dam Levee approximately 26 miles upstream to its terminus at high ground in the vicinity of Black Bayou, Louisiana.~~

~~(b) FIELDS LANDING CHANNEL, HUMBOLDT HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary—~~

~~(1) shall conduct a study for the project for navigation, Fields Landing Channel, Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California, to a depth of minus 35 feet~~

~~(MLLW), and for that purpose may use any feasibility report prepared by the non-Federal sponsor under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231) for which reimbursement of the Federal share of the study is authorized subject to the availability of appropriations; and~~

~~(2) may carry out the project under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.~~

~~(c) STRAWBERRY CREEK, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of restoring Strawberry Creek, Berkeley, California, and the Federal interest in environmental restoration, conservation of fish and wildlife resources, recreation, and water quality.~~

~~(d) WEST SIDE STORM WATER RETENTION FACILITY, CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to construct the West Side Storm Water Retention Facility in the city of Lancaster, California.~~

~~(e) APALACHICOLA RIVER, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for the purpose of identifying—~~

~~(1) alternatives for the management of material dredged in connection with operation and maintenance of the Apalachicola River Navigation Project; and~~

~~(2) alternatives that reduce the requirements for such dredging.~~

~~(f) BROWARD COUNTY, SAND BYPASSING AT PORT EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a sand bypassing project at the Port Everglades Inlet, Florida.~~

~~(g) CITY OF DESTIN-NORIEGA POINT BREAKWATER, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of—~~

~~(1) restoring Noriega Point, Florida, to serve as a breakwater for Destin Harbor; and~~

~~(2) including Noriega Point as part of the East Pass, Florida, navigation project.~~

~~(h) GATEWAY TRIANGLE REDEVELOPMENT AREA, FLORIDA.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to reduce the flooding problems in the vicinity of Gateway Triangle Redevelopment Area, Florida.~~

~~(2) STUDIES AND REPORTS.—The study shall include a review and consideration of studies and reports completed by the non-Federal interests.~~

~~(i) CITY OF PLANT CITY, FLORIDA.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a flood control project in the city of Plant City, Florida.~~

~~(2) STUDIES AND REPORTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall review and consider studies and reports completed by the non-Federal interests.~~

~~(j) GOOSE CREEK WATERSHED, OAKLEY, IDAHO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking flood damage reduction, water conservation, ground water recharge, ecosystem restoration, and related purposes along the Goose Creek watershed near Oakley, Idaho.~~

~~(k) ACADIANA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of assuming operations and maintenance for the Acadiana Navigation Channel located in Iberia and Vermillion Parishes, Louisiana.~~

~~(l) CAMERON PARISH WEST OF CALCASIEU RIVER, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a storm damage reduction and~~

~~ecosystem restoration project for Cameron Parish west of Calcasieu River, Louisiana.~~

~~(m) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL, COASTAL LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of using dredged material from maintenance activities at Federal navigation projects in coastal Louisiana to benefit coastal areas in the State.~~

~~(n) CONTRABAND BAYOU NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of assuming the maintenance at Contraband Bayou, Calcasieu River Ship Canal, Louisiana.~~

~~(o) GOLDEN MEADOW LOCK, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of converting the Golden Meadow floodgate into a navigation lock to be included in the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection Project, Louisiana.~~

~~(p) GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION, CHIEF MENTEUR TO SABINE RIVER, LOUISIANA.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking ecosystem restoration and protection measures along~~

~~the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Chef Menteur to Sabine River, Louisiana.~~

~~(2) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The study shall address saltwater intrusion, tidal scour, erosion, and other water resources related problems in that area.~~

~~(q) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LOUISIANA, AND VICINITY, ST. CHARLES PARISH PUMPS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the Lake Pontchartrain Hurricane Protection Project to include the St. Charles Parish Pumps and the modification of the seawall fronting protection along Lake Pontchartrain in Orleans Parish, from New Basin Canal on the west to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal on the east.~~

~~(r) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY SEAWALL RESTORATION, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking structural modifications of that portion of the seawall fronting protection along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain in Orleans Parish, Louisiana, extending approximately 5 miles from the new basin Canal on the west to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal on the east as a part of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Protection Project,~~

~~authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077).~~

~~(s) DETROIT RIVER, MICHIGAN, GREENWAY CORRIDOR STUDY.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a project for shoreline protection, frontal erosion, and associated purposes in the Detroit River shoreline area from the Belle Isle Bridge to the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit, Michigan.~~

~~(2) POTENTIAL MODIFICATIONS.—As a part of the study, the Secretary shall review potential project modifications to any existing Corps projects within the same area.~~

~~(t) ST. CLAIR SHORES FLOOD CONTROL, MICHIGAN.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a flood control project at St. Clair Shores, Michigan.~~

~~(u) WOODTICK PENINSULA, MICHIGAN, AND TOLEDO HARBOR, OHIO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing dredged material from Toledo Harbor, Ohio, to provide erosion reduction, navigation, and ecosystem restoration at Woodtick Peninsula, Michigan.~~

~~(v) TUNICA LAKE WEIR, MISSISSIPPI.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing an outlet weir at Tunica Lake, Tunica County, Mississippi, and Lee County, Arkansas, for the purpose of stabilizing water levels in the Lake.~~

~~(2) ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall include as a part of the economic analysis the benefits derived from recreation uses at the Lake and economic benefits associated with restoration of fish and wildlife habitat.~~

~~(w) PROTECTIVE FACILITIES FOR THE ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, RIVERFRONT AREA.—~~

~~(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the optimal plan to protect facilities that are located on the Mississippi River riverfront within the boundaries of St. Louis, Missouri.~~

~~(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall—~~

~~(A) evaluate alternatives to offer safety and security to facilities; and~~

~~(B) use state-of-the-art techniques to best evaluate the current situation, probable solutions, and estimated costs.~~

~~(3) REPORT.—Not later than April 15, 1999, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.~~

~~(x) YELLOWSTONE RIVER, MONTANA.—~~

~~(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Yellowstone River from Gardiner, Montana to the confluence of the Missouri River to determine the hydrologic, biological, and socioeconomic cumulative impacts on the river.~~

~~(2) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall conduct the study in consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States Geological Survey, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service and with the full participation of the State of Montana and tribal and local entities, and provide for public participation.~~

~~(3) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study.~~

~~(y) LAS VEGAS VALLEY, NEVADA.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of water resources located in the Las Vegas Valley, Nevada.~~

~~(2) OBJECTIVES.—The study shall identify problems and opportunities related to ecosystem restoration, water quality, particularly the quality of surface runoff, water supply, and flood control.~~

~~(z) OSWEGO RIVER BASIN, NEW YORK.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a flood forecasting system within the Oswego River basin, New York.~~

~~(aa) PORT OF NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY NAVIGATION STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY.—~~

~~(1) NAVIGATION STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of navigation needs at the Port of New York-New Jersey (including the South Brooklyn Marine and Red Hook Container Terminals, Staten Island, and adjacent areas) to address improvements, including deepening of existing channels to depths of 50 feet or greater, that are required to provide economically efficient and environmentally sound navigation to meet current and future requirements.~~

~~(2) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the New York Harbor, printed in the House Management Plan of the Harbor Estuary~~

~~Program, and other pertinent reports concerning the New York Harbor Region and the Port of New York-New Jersey, to determine the Federal interest in advancing harbor environmental restoration.~~

~~(3) REPORT.—The Secretary may use funds from the ongoing navigation study for New York and New Jersey Harbor to complete a reconnaissance report for environmental restoration by December 31, 1999. The navigation study to deepen New York and New Jersey Harbor shall consider beneficial use of dredged material.~~

~~(bb) BANK STABILIZATION, MISSOURI RIVER, NORTH DAKOTA.—~~

~~(1) STUDY.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of bank stabilization on the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe in North Dakota.~~

~~(B) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall study—~~

~~(i) options for stabilizing the erosion sites on the banks of the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe identified in the report developed by the~~

~~North Dakota State Water Commission, dated December 1997, including stabilization through nontraditional measures;~~

~~(ii) the cumulative impact of bank stabilization measures between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe on fish and wildlife habitat and the potential impact of additional stabilization measures, including the impact of nontraditional stabilization measures;~~

~~(iii) the current and future effects, including economic and fish and wildlife habitat effects, that bank erosion is having on creating the delta at the beginning of Lake Oahe; and~~

~~(iv) the impact of taking no additional measures to stabilize the banks of the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe.~~

~~(C) INTERESTED PARTIES.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, seek the participation and views of interested Federal, State, and local agencies, landowners, conservation organizations, and other persons.~~

~~(D) REPORT.—~~

~~(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall report to Congress on the results of the study not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.~~

~~(ii) STATUS.—If the Secretary cannot complete the study and report to Congress by the day that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, by that day, report to Congress on the status of the study and report, including an estimate of the date of completion.~~

~~(2) EFFECT ON EXISTING PROJECTS.—This subsection does not preclude the Secretary from establishing or carrying out a stabilization project that is authorized by law.~~

~~(cc) CLEVELAND HARBOR, CLEVELAND, OHIO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking repairs and related navigation improvements at Dike 14, Cleveland, Ohio.~~

~~(dd) EAST LAKE, VERMILLION AND CHAGRIN, OHIO.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking~~

~~flood damage reduction at East Lake, Vermillion and Chagrin, Ohio.~~

~~(2) ICE RETENTION STRUCTURE.—In conducting the study, the Secretary may consider construction of an ice retention structure as a potential means of providing flood damage reduction.~~

~~(ee) TOUSSAINT RIVER, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OHIO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking navigation improvements at Toussaint River, Carroll Township, Ohio.~~

~~(ff) SANTEE DELTA WETLAND HABITAT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive study of the ecosystem in the Santee Delta focus area of South Carolina to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to enhance the wetland habitat in the area.~~

~~(gg) WACCAMAW RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a flood control project for the Waccamaw River in Horry County, South Carolina.~~

~~(hh) UPPER SUSQUEHANNA-LACKAWANNA, PENNSYLVANIA, WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND RESTORATION STUDY.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a comprehensive flood plain management and watershed restoration project for the Upper Susquehanna-Lackawanna Watershed, Pennsylvania.~~

~~(2) GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall use a geographic information system.~~

~~(3) PLANS.—The study shall formulate plans for comprehensive flood plain management and environmental restoration.~~

~~(4) CREDITING.—Non-Federal interests may receive credit for in-kind services and materials that contribute to the study. The Secretary may credit non-Corps Federal assistance provided to the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of study costs to the maximum extent authorized by law.~~

~~(ii) NIOBRARA RIVER AND MISSOURI RIVER SEDIMENTATION STUDY, SOUTH DAKOTA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the Niobrara River watershed and the operations of Fort Randall Dam and Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River to determine the feasibility of alleviating the bank erosion, sedimentation, and related~~

~~problems in the lower Niobrara River and the Missouri River below Fort Randall Dam.~~

~~(jj) SANTA CLARA RIVER, UTAH.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to alleviate damage caused by flooding, bank erosion, and sedimentation along the watershed of the Santa Clara River, Utah, above the Gunlock Reservoir.~~

~~(2) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of watershed conditions and water quality, as related to flooding and bank erosion, along the Santa Clara River in the vicinity of the town of Gunlock, Utah.~~

~~(kk) AGAT SMALL BOAT HARBOR, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking the repair and reconstruction of Agat Small Boat Harbor, Guam, including the repair of existing shore protection measures and construction or a revetment of the breakwater seawall.~~

~~(ll) APRA HARBOR SEAWALL, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to repair, upgrade, and extend the seawall protecting Apra Harbor, Guam, and to ensure continued access to the harbor via Route 11B.~~

~~(mm) APRA HARBOR FUEL PIERS, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to upgrade the piers and fuel transmission lines at the fuel piers in the Apra Harbor, Guam, and measures to provide for erosion control and protection against storm damage.~~

~~(nn) MAINTENANCE DREDGING OF HARBOR PIERS, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of Federal maintenance of areas adjacent to piers at harbors in Guam, including Apra Harbor, Agat Harbor, and Agana Marina.~~

~~(oo) ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCES STUDY.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct a study of the water supply needs of States that are not currently eligible for assistance under title XVI of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.).~~

~~(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study shall—~~

~~(A) identify the water supply needs (including potable, commercial, industrial, recreational and agricultural needs) of each State described in paragraph (1) through 2020, making use of such State, regional, and local plans, studies, and reports as are available;~~

~~(B) evaluate the feasibility of various alternative water source technologies such as reuse and reclamation of wastewater and stormwater (including indirect potable reuse), aquifer storage and recovery, and desalination to meet the anticipated water supply needs of the States; and~~

~~(C) assess how alternative water sources technologies can be utilized to meet the identified needs.~~

~~(3) REPORT.—The Administrator shall report to Congress on the results of the study not more than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.~~

~~TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS~~

~~SEC. 201. FLOOD HAZARD MITIGATION AND RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—~~

~~(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may carry out a program to reduce flood hazards and restore the natural functions and values of riverine ecosystems throughout the United States.~~

~~(2) STUDIES.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall conduct studies to identify appropriate flood damage reduction, conservation, and~~

~~restoration measures and may design and implement watershed management and restoration projects.~~

~~(3) PARTICIPATION.—The studies and projects carried out under the program shall be conducted, to the extent practicable, with the full participation of the appropriate Federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Commerce.~~

~~(4) NONSTRUCTURAL APPROACHES.—The studies and projects shall, to the extent practicable, emphasize nonstructural approaches to preventing or reducing flood damages.~~

~~(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—~~

~~(1) STUDIES.—The cost of studies conducted under subsection (a) shall be shared in accordance with section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 Stat. 2215).~~

~~(2) PROJECTS.—The non-Federal interests shall pay 35 percent of the cost of any project carried out under this section.~~

~~(3) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal interests shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and~~

~~relocations necessary for the projects. The value of the land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations shall be credited toward the payment required under this subsection.~~

~~(4) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—The non-Federal interests shall be responsible for all costs associated with operating, maintaining, replacing, repairing, and rehabilitating all projects carried out under this section.~~

~~(c) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may implement a project under this section if the Secretary determines that the project—~~

~~(A) will significantly reduce potential flood damages;~~

~~(B) will improve the quality of the environment; and~~

~~(C) is justified considering all costs and beneficial outputs of the project.~~

~~(2) SELECTION CRITERIA; POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—~~

~~(A) develop criteria for selecting and rating the projects to be carried out as part of the program authorized by this section; and~~

~~(B) establish policies and procedures for carrying out the studies and projects undertaken under this section.~~

~~(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may not implement a project under this section until—~~

~~(1) the Secretary provides 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 describing the project and the determinations made under subsection (c); and~~

~~(2) a period of 21 calendar days has expired following the date on which the notification was received by the Committees.~~

~~(e) PRIORITY AREAS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall examine the potential for flood damage reductions at appropriate locations, including—~~

~~(1) Le May, Missouri;~~

~~(2) the upper Delaware River basin, New York;~~

~~(3) Tillamook County, Oregon;~~

~~(4) Providence County, Rhode Island; and~~

~~(5) Willamette River basin, Oregon.~~

~~(f) PER-PROJECT LIMITATION.—Not more than $25,000,000 in Army Civil Works appropriations may be~~

~~expended on any single project undertaken under this section.~~

~~(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 and 2001.~~

~~(2) PROGRAM FUNDING LEVELS.—All studies and projects undertaken under this authority from Army Civil Works appropriations shall be fully funded within the program funding levels provided in this subsection.~~

~~SEC. 202. SHORE PROTECTION.~~

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

~~(1) by striking "Costs of constructing" and inserting the following:~~

~~"(1) CONSTRUCTION.—Costs of constructing"; and~~

~~(2) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(2) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—In the case of a project authorized for construction after December 31, 1999, or for which a feasibility study is completed after that date, the non-Federal cost of the periodic nourishment of projects or measures for~~

~~shore protection or beach erosion control shall be 50 percent, except that—~~

~~"(A) all costs assigned to benefits to privately owned shores (where use of such shores is limited to private interests) or to prevention of losses of private land shall be borne by non-Federal interests; and~~

~~"(B) all costs assigned to the protection of federally owned shores shall be borne by the United States.".~~

~~SEC. 203. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY.~~

~~Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended—~~

~~(1) in the first sentence, by striking "construction of small projects" and inserting "implementation of small structural and nonstructural projects"; and~~

~~(2) in the third sentence, by striking "$5,000,000" and inserting "$7,000,000".~~

~~SEC. 204. USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS FOR COMPILING AND DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON FLOODS AND FLOOD DAMAGES.~~

~~Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(b)) is amended in the third sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", but~~

~~the Secretary of the Army may accept funds voluntarily contributed by such entities for the purpose of expanding the scope of the services requested by the entities''.~~

~~SEC. 205. EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.~~

~~Subparagraphs (B) and (C)(i) of section 528(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3769) are amended by striking ''1999'' and inserting ''2000''.~~

~~SEC. 206. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.~~

~~Section 206(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330(c)) is amended—~~

~~(1) by striking ''Construction'' and inserting the following:~~

~~''(1) IN GENERAL.—Construction''; and~~

~~(2) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~''(2) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.''.~~

~~SEC. 207. BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL.~~

~~Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) is amended by adding at the end the following:~~

~~''(g) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.''.~~

~~SEC. 208. VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS BY STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.~~

~~Section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), is amended by inserting ''or environmental restoration'' after ''flood control''.~~

~~SEC. 209. RECREATION USER FEES.~~

~~(a) WITHHOLDING OF AMOUNTS.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal years 1999 through 2002, the Secretary may withhold from the special account established under section 4(i)(1)(A) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i)(1)(A)) 100 percent of the amount of receipts above a baseline of $34,000,000 per each fiscal year received from fees imposed at recreation sites under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Army under section 4(b) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(b)).~~

~~(2) USE.—The amounts withheld shall be retained by the Secretary and shall be available, without further Act of appropriation, for expenditure by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (b).~~

~~(3) AVAILABILITY.—The amounts withheld shall remain available until September 30, 2005.~~

~~(b) USE OF AMOUNTS WITHHELD.—In order to increase the quality of the visitor experience at public recreational areas and to enhance the protection of resources, the amounts withheld under subsection (a) may be used only for—~~

~~(1) repair and maintenance projects (including projects relating to health and safety);~~

~~(2) interpretation;~~

~~(3) signage;~~

~~(4) habitat or facility enhancement;~~

~~(5) resource preservation;~~

~~(6) annual operation (including fee collection);~~

~~(7) maintenance; and~~

~~(8) law enforcement related to public use.~~

~~(c) AVAILABILITY.—Each amount withheld by the Secretary shall be available for expenditure, without further Act of appropriation, at the specific project from which the amount, above baseline, is collected.~~

~~SEC. 210. WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT STUDIES FOR THE PACIFIC REGION.~~

~~Section 444 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3747) is amended by striking "interest of navigation" and inserting "interests of water resources development (including navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration)".~~

~~SEC. 211. MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.~~

~~(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:~~

~~(1) MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term "middle Mississippi River" means the reach of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River (river mile 0, upper Mississippi River) to the mouth of the Missouri River (river mile 195).~~

~~(2) MISSOURI RIVER.—The term "Missouri River" means the main stem and floodplain of the Missouri River (including reservoirs) from its confluence with the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Missouri, to its headwaters near Three Forks, Montana.~~

~~(3) PROJECT.—The term "project" means the project authorized by this section.~~

~~(b) PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—~~

~~(1) PLAN.—~~

~~(A) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act,~~

~~the Secretary shall develop a plan for a project to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat of the Missouri River and the middle Mississippi River.~~

~~(B) ACTIVITIES.—~~

~~(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall provide for such activities as are necessary to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat without adversely affecting—~~

~~(I) the water-related needs of the region surrounding the Missouri River and the middle Mississippi River, including flood control, navigation, recreation, and enhancement of water supply; and~~

~~(II) private property rights.~~

~~(ii) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The plan shall include—~~

~~(I) modification and improvement of navigation training structures to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat;~~

~~(II) modification and creation of side channels to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat;~~

~~(III) restoration and creation of island fish and wildlife habitat;~~

~~(IV) creation of riverine fish and wildlife habitat;~~

~~(V) establishment of criteria for prioritizing the type and sequencing of activities based on cost-effectiveness and likelihood of success; and~~

~~(VI) physical and biological monitoring for evaluating the success of the project, to be performed by the River Studies Center of the United States Geological Survey in Columbia, Missouri.~~

~~(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—Using funds made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall carry out the activities described in the plan.~~

~~(B) USE OF EXISTING AUTHORITY FOR UNCONSTRUCTED FEATURES OF THE PROJECT.—Using funds made available to the Secretary under other law, the Secretary shall design and construct any feature of the project that may be carried out using the authority of~~

~~the Secretary to modify an authorized project, if the Secretary determines that the design and construction will—~~

~~(i) accelerate the completion of activities to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat of the Missouri River or the middle Mississippi River; and~~

~~(ii) be compatible with the project purposes described in this section.~~

~~(c) INTEGRATION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the activities described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall integrate the activities with other Federal, State, and tribal activities.~~

~~(2) NEW AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section confers any new regulatory authority on any Federal or non-Federal entity that carries out any activity authorized by this section.~~

~~(d) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In developing and carrying out the plan and the activities described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall provide for public review and comment in accordance with applicable Federal law, including—~~

~~(1) providing advance notice of meetings;~~

~~(2) providing adequate opportunity for public input and comment;~~

~~(3) maintaining appropriate records; and~~

~~(4) compiling a record of the proceedings of meetings.~~

~~(e) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the activities described in subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).~~

~~(f) COST SHARING.—~~

~~(1) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent.~~

~~(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any 1 activity described in subsection (b) shall not exceed $5,000,000.~~

~~(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The operation and maintenance of the project shall be a non-Federal responsibility.~~

~~(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out activities under this section $30,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 and 2001.~~

~~SEC. 212. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.~~

~~(a) SAND, GRAVEL, AND SHELL.—Section 8(k)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(k)(2)(B)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: "or any other non-Federal interest subject to an agreement entered into under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b)".~~

~~(b) REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOCAL INTERESTS.—Any amounts paid by non-Federal interests for beach erosion control, hurricane protection, shore protection, or storm damage reduction projects as a result of an assessment under section 8(k) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(k)) shall be fully reimbursed.~~

~~SEC. 213. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.~~

~~Section 312(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1272(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(6) Snake Creek, Bixby, Oklahoma.".~~

~~SEC. 214. BENEFIT OF PRIMARY FLOOD DAMAGES AVOIDED INCLUDED IN BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS.~~

~~Section 308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2318) is amended—~~

~~(1) in the heading of subsection (a), by striking "BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS" and inserting "ELE-~~

~~MENTS EXCLUDED FROM COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS'';~~

~~(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively;~~

~~(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:~~

~~''(b) ELEMENTS INCLUDED IN COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—The Secretary shall include primary flood damages avoided in the benefit base for justifying Federal nonstructural flood damage reduction projects.'';~~ ~~and~~

~~(4) in the first sentence of subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking ''(b)'' and inserting ''(d)''.~~

~~SEC. 215. CONTROL OF AQUATIC PLANT GROWTH.~~

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

~~(1) by inserting ''Arundo dona,'' after ''waterhyacinth,'';~~ ~~and~~

~~(2) by inserting ''tarmarix'' after ''melaleuca''.~~

~~SEC. 216. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.~~

~~Section 219(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) is amended by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(19) LAKE TAHOE, CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA.—Regional water system for Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada.~~

~~"(20) LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.—Fox Field Industrial Corridor water facilities, Lancaster, California.~~

~~"(21) SAN RAMON, CALIFORNIA.—San Ramon Valley recycled water project, San Ramon, California.".~~

~~SEC. 217. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, RESTORATION, AND DEVELOPMENT.~~

~~Section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3756) is amended—~~

~~(1) in subsection (d)—~~

~~(A) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:~~

~~"(10) Regional Atlanta Watershed, Atlanta, Georgia, and Lake Lanier of Forsyth and Hall Counties, Georgia.";~~ ~~and~~

~~(B) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(14) Clear Lake watershed, California.~~

~~"(15) Fresno Slough watershed, California.~~

~~"(16) Hayward Marsh, Southern San Francisco Bay watershed, California.~~

~~"(17) Kaweah River watershed, California.~~

~~"(18) Lake Tahoe watershed, California and Nevada.~~

~~"(19) Malibu Creek watershed, California.~~

~~"(20) Truckee River basin, Nevada.~~

~~"(21) Walker River basin, Nevada.~~

~~"(22) Bronx River watershed, New York.~~

~~"(23) Catawba River watershed, North Carolina.";~~

~~(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and~~

~~(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:~~

~~"(e) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project undertaken under this section, with the consent of the affected local government, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity.".~~

~~SEC. 218. LAKES PROGRAM.~~

~~Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148) is amended—~~

~~(1) in paragraph (15), by striking "and" at the end;~~

~~(2) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end; and~~

~~(3) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(17) Clear Lake, Lake County, California, removal of silt and aquatic growth and development of a sustainable weed and algae management program;~~

~~"(18) Flints Pond, Hollis, New Hampshire, removal of excessive aquatic vegetation; and~~

~~"(19) Osgood Pond, Milford, New Hampshire, removal of excessive aquatic vegetation.".~~

~~SEC. 219. SEDIMENTS DECONTAMINATION POLICY.~~

~~Section 405 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2239 note; Public Law 102–580) is amended—~~

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

~~"(4) PRACTICAL END-USE PRODUCTS.—Technologies selected for demonstration at the pilot scale shall result in practical end-use products.~~

~~"(5) ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall assist the project to ensure expeditious completion by providing sufficient quantities of contaminated dredged material to conduct the full-scale demonstrations to stated capacity."; and~~

~~(2) in subsection (c), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section a total of $22,000,000 to complete technology testing,~~

~~technology commercialization, and the development of full scale processing facilities within the New York/New Jersey Harbor.''.~~

~~SEC. 220. DISPOSAL OF DREDGED MATERIAL ON BEACHES.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 145 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 426j) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''50'' and inserting ''35''.~~

~~(b) GREAT LAKES BASIN.—The Secretary shall work with the State of Ohio, other Great Lakes States, and political subdivisions of the States to fully implement and maximize beneficial reuse of dredged material as provided under section 145 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 426j).~~

~~SEC. 221. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.~~

~~Section 906(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(e)) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''Not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share of such first costs may be in kind, including a facility, supply, or service that is necessary to carry out the enhancement project.''.~~

~~SEC. 222. REIMBURSEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.~~

~~Section 211(e)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(e)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''subject to amounts being made~~

available in advance in appropriations Acts'' and inserting ''subject to the availability of appropriations''.

SEC. 223. NATIONAL CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT TASK FORCE.

(a) DEFINITION OF TASK FORCE.—In this section, the term ''Task Force'' means the National Contaminated Sediment Task Force established by section 502 of the National Contaminated Sediment Assessment and Management Act (33 U.S.C. 1271 note; Public Law 102–580).

(b) CONVENING.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall convene the Task Force not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORTING ON REMEDIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Task Force shall submit to Congress a report on the status of remedial actions at aquatic sites in the areas described in paragraph (2).

(2) AREAS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall address remedial actions in—

(A) areas of probable concern identified in the survey of data regarding aquatic sediment quality required by section 503(a) of the National Contaminated Sediment Assessment and Management Act (33 U.S.C. 1271);

~~(B) areas of concern within the Great Lakes, as identified under section 118(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(f));~~

~~(C) estuaries of national significance identified under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330);~~

~~(D) areas for which remedial action has been authorized under any of the Water Resources Development Acts; and~~

~~(E) as appropriate, any other areas where sediment contamination is identified by the Task Force.~~

~~(3) ACTIVITIES.—Remedial actions subject to reporting under this subsection include remedial actions under—~~

~~(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) or other Federal or State law containing environmental remediation authority;~~

~~(B) any of the Water Resources Development Acts;~~

~~(C) section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344); or~~

~~(D) section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151, chapter 425).~~

~~(4) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall provide, with respect to each remedial action described in the report, a description of—~~

~~(A) the authorities and sources of funding for conducting the remedial action;~~

~~(B) the nature and sources of the sediment contamination, including volume and concentration, where appropriate;~~

~~(C) the testing conducted to determine the nature and extent of sediment contamination and to determine whether the remedial action is necessary;~~

~~(D) the action levels or other factors used to determine that the remedial action is necessary;~~

~~(E) the nature of the remedial action planned or undertaken, including the levels of protection of public health and the environment to be achieved by the remedial action;~~

~~(F) the ultimate disposition of any material dredged as part of the remedial action;~~

~~(G) the status of projects and the obstacles or barriers to prompt conduct of the remedial action; and~~

~~(H) contacts and sources of further information concerning the remedial action.~~

~~SEC. 224. GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM.~~

~~(a) STRATEGIC PLANS.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall report to Congress on a plan for programs of the Corps of Engineers in the Great Lakes basin.~~

~~(2) CONTENTS.—The plan shall include details of the projected environmental and navigational projects in the Great Lakes basin, including—~~

~~(A) navigational maintenance and operations for commercial and recreational vessels;~~

~~(B) environmental restoration activities;~~

~~(C) water level maintenance activities;~~

~~(D) technical and planning assistance to States and remedial action planning committees;~~

~~(E) sediment transport analysis, sediment management planning, and activities to support prevention of excess sediment loadings;~~

~~(F) flood damage reduction and shoreline erosion prevention;~~

~~(G) all other activities of the Corps of Engineers; and~~

~~(H) an analysis of factors limiting use of programs and authorities of the Corps of Engineers in existence on the date of enactment of this Act in the Great Lakes basin, including the need for new or modified authorities.~~

~~(b) GREAT LAKES BIOHYDROLOGICAL INFORMATION.—~~

~~(1) INVENTORY.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall request each Federal agency that may possess information relevant to the Great Lakes biohydrological system to provide an inventory of all such information in the possession of the agency.~~

~~(B) RELEVANT INFORMATION.—For the purpose of subparagraph (A), relevant information includes information on—~~

~~(i) ground and surface water hydrology;~~

~~(ii) natural and altered tributary dynamics;~~

~~(iii) biological aspects of the system influenced by and influencing water quantity and water movement;~~

~~(iv) meteorological projections and weather impacts on Great Lakes water levels; and~~

~~(v) other Great Lakes biohydrological system data relevant to sustainable water use management.~~

~~(2) REPORT.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the States, Indian tribes, and Federal agencies, and after requesting information from the provinces and the federal government of Canada, shall—~~

~~(i) compile the inventories of information;~~

~~(ii) analyze the information for consistency and gaps; and~~

~~(iii) submit to Congress, the International Joint Commission, and the Great Lakes States a report that includes rec-~~

~~ommendations on ways to improve the information base on the biohydrological dynamics of the Great Lakes ecosystem as a whole, so as to support environmentally sound decisions regarding diversions and consumptive uses of Great Lakes water.~~

~~(B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The recommendations in the report under subparagraph (A) shall include recommendations relating to the resources and funds necessary for implementing improvement of the information base.~~

~~(C) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the report under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation, and other relevant agencies as appropriate, shall consider and report on the status of the issues described and recommendations made in—~~

~~(i) the Report of the International Joint Commission to the Governments of the United States and Canada under the 1977 reference issued in 1985; and~~

~~(ii) the 1993 Report of the International Joint Commission to the Govern-~~

~~ments of Canada and the United States on Methods of Alleviating Adverse Consequences of Fluctuating Water Levels in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Basin.~~

~~(c) GREAT LAKES RECREATIONAL BOATING.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, using information and studies in existence on the date of enactment of this Act to the maximum extent practicable, and in cooperation with the Great Lakes States, submit to Congress a report detailing the economic benefits of recreational boating in the Great Lakes basin, particularly at harbors benefiting from operation and maintenance projects of the Corps of Engineers.~~

~~(d) COOPERATION.—In undertaking activities under this section, the Secretary shall—~~

~~(1) encourage public participation; and~~

~~(2) cooperate, and, as appropriate, collaborate, with Great Lakes States, tribal governments, and Canadian federal, provincial, tribal governments.~~

~~(e) WATER USE ACTIVITIES AND POLICIES.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the Great Lakes States to develop interstate guidelines to improve the consistency and efficiency of State-level water use activities and policies in the Great Lakes basin.~~

~~(f) COST SHARING.—The Secretary may seek and accept funds from non-Federal entities to be used to pay up to 25 percent of the cost of carrying out subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e).~~

~~SEC. 225. PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT.~~

~~Section 1135(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(c)) is amended—~~

~~(1) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:~~

~~"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary"; and~~

~~(2) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(2) CONTROL OF SEA LAMPREY.—Congress finds that—~~

~~"(A) the Great Lakes navigation system has been instrumental in the spread of sea lamprey and the associated impacts to its fishery; and~~

~~"(B) the use of the authority under this subsection for control of sea lamprey at any Great Lakes basin location is appropriate.".~~

~~SEC. 226. WATER QUALITY, ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE, FLOOD CONTROL, AND NAVIGATION.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may investigate, study, evaluate, and report on—~~

~~(1) water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation in the western Lake Erie watershed, including the watersheds of the Maumee River, Ottawa River, and Portage River in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan; and~~

~~(2) measures to improve water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation in the western Lake Erie basin.~~

~~(b) COOPERATION.—In carrying out studies and investigations under subsection (a), the Secretary shall cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations to ensure full consideration of all views and requirements of all interrelated programs that those agencies may develop independently or in coordination with the Corps of Engineers.~~

~~SEC. 227. IRRIGATION DIVERSION PROTECTION AND FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT ASSISTANCE.~~

~~The Secretary may provide technical planning and design assistance to non-Federal interests and may con-~~

~~duct other site-specific studies to formulate and evaluate fish screens, fish passages devices, and other measures to decrease the incidence of juvenile and adult fish inadvertently entering into irrigation systems. Measures shall be developed in cooperation with Federal and State resource agencies and not impair the continued withdrawal of water for irrigation purposes. In providing such assistance priority shall be given based on the objectives of the Endangered Species Act, cost-effectiveness, and the potential for reducing fish mortality. Non-Federal interests shall agree by contract to contribute 50 percent of the cost of such assistance. Not more than one-half of such non-Federal contribution may be made by the provision of services, materials, supplies, or other in-kind services. No construction activities are authorized by this section. Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall report to Congress on fish mortality caused by irrigation water intake devices, appropriate measures to reduce mortality, the extent to which such measures are currently being employed in the arid States, the construction costs associated with such measures, and the appropriate Federal role, if any, to encourage the use of such measures.~~

~~SEC. 228. SMALL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.~~

~~Section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended by striking "$2,000,000" and inserting "$3,000,000".~~

~~SEC. 229. SHORE DAMAGE PREVENTION OR MITIGATION.~~

~~Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426(i)) is amended—~~

~~(1) in the first sentence, by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary";~~

~~(2) in the second sentence, by striking "The costs" and inserting the following:~~

~~"(b) COST SHARING.—The costs";~~

~~(3) in the third sentence—~~

~~(A) by striking "No such" and inserting the following:~~

~~"(c) REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION.—No such"; and~~

~~(B) by striking "$2,000,000" and inserting "$5,000,000"; and~~

~~(4) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(d) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall—~~

~~"(1) coordinate the implementation of the measures under this section with other Federal and non-Federal shore protection projects in the same geographic area; and~~

~~"(2) to the extent practicable, combine mitigation projects with other shore protection projects in the same area into a comprehensive regional project.".~~

~~TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS~~

~~SEC. 301. DREDGING OF SALT PONDS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND.~~

~~The Secretary may acquire for the State of Rhode Island a dredge and associated equipment with the capacity to dredge approximately 100 cubic yards per hour for use by the State in dredging salt ponds in the State.~~

~~SEC. 302. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK.~~

~~Section 567(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3787) is amended by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(3) The Chemung River watershed, New York, at an estimated Federal cost of $5,000,000.".~~

~~SEC. 303. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.~~

~~Section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668) is amended—~~

~~(1) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (22) as paragraphs (16) through (23), respectively;~~

~~(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:~~

~~"(15) REPAUPO CREEK AND DELAWARE RIVER, GLOUCESTER COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for tidegate and levee improvements for Repaupo Creek and the Delaware River, Gloucester County, New Jersey."; and~~

~~(3) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~"(24) IRONDEQUOIT CREEK, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Irondequoit Creek watershed, New York.~~

~~"(25) TIOGA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood control, Tioga River and Cowanesque River and their tributaries, Tioga County, Pennsylvania.".~~

~~SEC. 304. SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.~~

~~Section 104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3669) is amended—~~

~~(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (12) as paragraphs (10) through (13), respectively; and~~

~~(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:~~

~~"(9) FORTESCUE INLET, DELAWARE BAY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for navigation for Fortescue Inlet, Delaware Bay, New Jersey.".~~

~~SEC. 305. STREAMBANK PROTECTION PROJECTS.~~

~~(a) ARCTIC OCEAN, BARROW, ALASKA.—The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), carry out storm damage reduction and coastal erosion measures at the town of Barrow, Alaska.~~

~~(b) SAGINAW RIVER, BAY CITY, MICHIGAN.—The Secretary may construct appropriate control structures in areas along the Saginaw River in the city of Bay City, Michigan, under authority of section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 Stat. 701r).~~

~~(c) YELLOWSTONE RIVER, BILLINGS, MONTANA.—The streambank protection project at Coulson Park, along the Yellowstone River, Billings, Montana, shall be eligible for assistance under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r).~~

~~(d) MONONGAHELA RIVER, POINT MARION, PENNSYLVANIA.—The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), carry out streambank erosion control measures along the Monongahela River at the borough of Point Marion, Pennsylvania.~~

~~SEC. 306. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, SPRINGFIELD, OREGON.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—Under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 Stat. 2309a) or~~

~~other applicable authority, the Secretary shall conduct measures to address water quality, water flows and fish habitat restoration in the historic Springfield, Oregon, millrace through the reconfiguration of the existing millpond, if the Secretary determines that harmful impacts have occurred as the result of a previously constructed flood control project by the Corps of Engineers.~~

~~(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share, excluding lands, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations, shall be 25 percent.~~

~~(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,500,000.~~

~~SEC. 307. GUILFORD AND NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.~~

~~The Secretary shall expeditiously complete the activities authorized under section 346 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4858), including activities associated with Sluice Creek in Guilford, Connecticut, and Lighthouse Point Park in New Haven, Connecticut.~~

~~SEC. 308. FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH.~~

~~(a) REDESIGNATION.—The project for flood control, Eight Mile Creek, Paragould, Arkansas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4112) and known as "Eight Mile Creek,~~

~~Paragould, Arkansas'', shall be known and designated as the ''Francis Bland Floodway Ditch''.~~

~~(b) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the project and creek referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Francis Bland Floodway Ditch.~~

~~SEC. 309. CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.~~

~~Section 528(e)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3770) is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including potential land acquisition in the Caloosahatchee River basin or other areas''.~~

~~SEC. 310. CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND, FLOOD PROJECT MITIGATION.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and other purposes, Cumberland, Maryland, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the ''Flood Control Act of 1936'') (49 Stat. 1574, chapter 688), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake, as a separate part of the project, restoration of the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal substantially in accordance with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park, Cumberland, Maryland, Rewatering Design Analysis, dated February 1998, at a total cost of $15,000,000,~~

with an estimated Federal cost of $9,750,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,250,000.

(b) IN-KIND SERVICES.—The non-Federal interest for the restoration project under subsection (a)—

(1) may provide all or a portion of the non-Federal share of project costs in the form of in-kind services; and

(2) shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of project costs for design and construction work performed by the non-Federal interest before execution of a project cooperation agreement and for land, easements, and rights-of-way required for the restoration and acquired by the non-Federal interest before execution of such an agreement.

(c) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The operation and maintenance of the restoration project under subsection (a) shall be the full responsibility of the National Park Service.

SEC. 311. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA.

Section 5(b)(3)(C)(i) of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426h), is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", including the city of Miami Beach, Florida".

~~SEC. 312. SARDIS RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept from the State of Oklahoma or an agent of the State an amount, as determined under subsection (b), as prepayment of 100 percent of the water supply cost obligation of the State under Contract No. DACW56–74–JC–0314 for water supply storage at Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.~~

~~(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—The amount to be paid by the State of Oklahoma under subsection (a) shall be subject to adjustment in accordance with accepted discount purchase methods for Government properties as determined by an independent accounting firm designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.~~

~~(c) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section shall otherwise affect any of the rights or obligations of the parties to the contract referred to in subsection (a).~~

~~SEC. 313. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION MODERNIZATION.~~

~~(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—~~

~~(1) exports are necessary to ensure job creation and an improved standard of living for the people of the United States;~~

~~(2) the ability of producers of goods in the United States to compete in the international marketplace depends on a modern and efficient transportation network;~~

~~(3) a modern and efficient waterway system is a transportation option necessary to provide United States shippers a safe, reliable, and competitive means to win foreign markets in an increasingly competitive international marketplace;~~

~~(4) the need to modernize is heightened because the United States is at risk of losing its competitive edge as a result of the priority that foreign competitors are placing on modernizing their own waterway systems;~~

~~(5) growing export demand projected over the coming decades will force greater demands on the waterway system of the United States and increase the cost to the economy if the system proves inadequate to satisfy growing export opportunities;~~

~~(6) the locks and dams on the upper Mississippi River and Illinois River waterway system were built in the 1930s and have some of the highest average delays to commercial tows in the country;~~

~~(7) inland barges carry freight at the lowest unit cost while offering an alternative to truck and rail transportation that is environmentally sound, is energy efficient, is safe, causes little congestion, produces little air or noise pollution, and has minimal social impact; and~~

~~(8) it should be the policy of the Corps of Engineers to pursue aggressively modernization of the waterway system authorized by Congress to promote the relative competitive position of the United States in the international marketplace.~~

~~(b) PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.—In accordance with the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study, the Secretary shall proceed immediately to prepare engineering design, plans, and specifications for extension of locks 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 on the Mississippi River and the LaGrange and Peoria Locks on the Illinois River, to provide lock chambers 110 feet in width and 1,200 feet in length, so that construction can proceed immediately upon completion of studies and authorization of projects by Congress.~~

~~SEC. 314. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MANAGEMENT.~~

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

~~(1) in subsection (e)—~~

~~(A) by striking "(e)" and all that follows through the end of paragraph (2) and inserting the following:~~

~~"(e) UNDERTAKINGS.—~~

~~"(1) IN GENERAL.—~~

~~"(A) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, is authorized to undertake—~~

~~"(i) a program for the planning, construction, and evaluation of measures for fish and wildlife habitat rehabilitation and enhancement; and~~

~~"(ii) implementation of a program of long-term resource monitoring, computerized data inventory and analysis, and applied research.~~

~~"(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECTS.—Each project carried out under subparagraph (A)(i) shall—~~

~~"(i) to the maximum extent practicable, simulate natural river processes;~~

~~"(ii) include an outreach and education component; and~~

~~"(iii) on completion of the assessment under subparagraph (D), address identified habitat and natural resource needs.~~

~~"(C) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall cre-~~

~~ate an independent technical advisory committee to review projects, monitoring plans, and habitat and natural resource needs assessments.~~

~~"(D) HABITAT AND NATURAL RESOURCE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—~~

~~"(i) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to undertake a systemic, river reach, and pool scale assessment of habitat and natural resource needs to serve as a blueprint to guide habitat rehabilitation and long-term resource monitoring.~~

~~"(ii) DATA.—The habitat and natural resource needs assessment shall, to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence at the time of the assessment.~~

~~"(iii) TIMING.—The Secretary shall complete a habitat and natural resource needs assessment not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph.~~

~~"(2) REPORTS.—On December 31, 2005, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that—~~

~~"(A) contains an evaluation of the programs described in paragraph (1);~~

~~"(B) describes the accomplishments of each program;~~

~~"(C) includes results of a habitat and natural resource needs assessment; and~~

~~"(D) identifies any needed adjustments in the authorization under paragraph (1) or the authorized appropriations under paragraphs (3), (4), and (5).";~~

~~(B) in paragraph (3)—~~

~~(i) by striking "paragraph (1)(A)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(i)"; and~~

~~(ii) by striking "Secretary not to exceed" and all that follows and inserting "Secretary not to exceed $22,750,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.";~~

~~(C) in paragraph (4)—~~

~~(i) by striking "paragraph (1)(B)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(ii)"; and~~

~~(ii) by striking "$7,680,000" and all that follows and inserting "$10,420,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.";~~

~~(D) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:~~

~~"(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out paragraph (1)(C) not to exceed $350,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.~~

~~"(6) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—~~

~~"(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, may transfer appropriated amounts between the programs under clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) and paragraph (1)(C).~~

~~"(B) APPORTIONMENT OF COSTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(D), the Secretary may apportion the costs equally between the programs authorized by paragraph (1)(A)."; and~~

~~(E) in paragraph (7)—~~

~~(i) in subparagraph (A)—~~

~~(I) by inserting "(i)" after "paragraph (1)(A)"; and~~

~~(II) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and, in~~

~~the case of any project requiring non-Federal cost sharing, the non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent'';~~ ~~and~~

~~(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''paragraphs (1)(B) and (1)(C) of this subsection'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)(ii)'';~~

~~(2) in subsection (f)(2)—~~

~~(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''(A)'';~~ ~~and~~

~~(B) by striking subparagraph (B);~~ ~~and~~

~~(3) by adding at the end the following:~~

~~''(k) ST. LOUIS AREA URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT.—The Secretary shall investigate and, if appropriate, carry out restoration of urban wildlife habitat, with a special emphasis on the establishment of greenways in the St. Louis, Missouri, area and surrounding communities.''.~~

~~SEC. 315. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVERS SALMON SURVIVAL.~~

~~Section 511 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3301 note; Public Law 104–303) is amended by striking subsection (a) and all that follows and inserting the following:~~

~~"(a) SALMON SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES.—~~

~~"(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary shall accelerate ongoing research and development activities, and may carry out or participate in additional research and development activities, for the purpose of developing innovative methods and technologies for improving the survival of salmon, especially salmon in the Columbia/Snake River Basin.~~

~~"(2) ACCELERATED ACTIVITIES.—Accelerated research and development activities referred to in paragraph (1) may include research and development related to—~~

~~"(A) impacts from water resources projects and other impacts on salmon life cycles;~~

~~"(B) juvenile and adult salmon passage;~~

~~"(C) light and sound guidance systems;~~

~~"(D) surface-oriented collector systems;~~

~~"(E) transportation mechanisms; and~~

~~"(F) dissolved gas monitoring and abatement.~~

~~"(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Additional research and development activities referred to in~~

~~paragraph (1) may include research and development related to—~~

~~"(A) studies of juvenile salmon survival in spawning and rearing areas;~~

~~"(B) estuary and near-ocean juvenile and adult salmon survival;~~

~~"(C) impacts on salmon life cycles from sources other than water resources projects;~~

~~"(D) cryopreservation of fish gametes and formation of a germ plasm repository for threatened and endangered populations of native fish; and~~

~~"(E) other innovative technologies and actions intended to improve fish survival, including the survival of resident fish.~~

~~"(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate any activities carried out under this subsection with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, affected Indian tribes, and the Northwest Power Planning Council.~~

~~"(5) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the research and development activities carried out under this subsection, including any recommendations of the Sec-~~

~~retary concerning the research and development activities.~~

~~"(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 to carry out research and development activities under paragraph (3).~~

~~"(b) ADVANCED TURBINE DEVELOPMENT.—~~

~~"(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary shall accelerate efforts toward developing and installing in Corps of Engineers-operated dams innovative, efficient, and environmentally safe hydropower turbines, including design of fish-friendly turbines, for use on the Columbia/Snake River hydrosystem.~~

~~"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $35,000,000 to carry out this subsection.~~

~~"(c) MANAGEMENT OF PREDATION ON COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SYSTEM NATIVE FISHES.—~~

~~"(1) NESTING AVIAN PREDATORS.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, and consistent with a management plan to be developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary shall carry out methods to reduce nesting populations of avian pred-~~

~~ators on dredge spoil islands in the Columbia River under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.~~

~~"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 to carry out research and development activities under this subsection.~~

~~"(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—Nothing in this section affects the authority of the Secretary to implement the results of the research and development carried out under this section or any other law.".~~

~~SEC. 316. NINE MILE RUN HABITAT RESTORATION, PENNSYLVANIA.~~

~~The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share such costs as are incurred by the non-Federal interests in preparing environmental and other preconstruction documentation for the habitat restoration project, Nine Mile Run, Pennsylvania, if the Secretary determines that the documentation is integral to the project.~~

~~SEC. 317. LARKSPUR FERRY CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.~~

~~The Secretary shall work with the Secretary of Transportation on a proposed solution to carry out the project to maintain the Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California, authorized by section 601(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148).~~

~~SEC. 318. COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD IMPACT-RESPONSE MODELING SYSTEM.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may study and implement a Comprehensive Flood Impact-Response Modeling System for the Coralville Reservoir and the Iowa River watershed, Iowa.~~

~~(b) STUDY.—The study shall include—~~

~~(1) an evaluation of the combined hydrologic, geomorphic, environmental, economic, social, and recreational impacts of operating strategies within the watershed;~~

~~(2) creation of an integrated, dynamic flood impact model; and~~

~~(3) the development of a rapid response system to be used during flood and emergency situations.~~

~~(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit a report to Congress on the results of the study and modeling system and such recommendations as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.~~

~~(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated a total of $2,250,000 to carry out this section.~~

~~SEC. 319. STUDY REGARDING INNOVATIVE FINANCING FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED PORTS.~~

~~(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and analysis of various alternatives for innovative financing of future construction, operation, and maintenance of projects in small and medium-sized ports.~~

~~(b) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days 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 Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the results of the study and any related legislative recommendations for consideration by Congress.~~

~~SEC. 320. CANDY LAKE PROJECT, OSAGE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.~~

~~(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:~~

~~(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The term "fair market value" means the amount for which a willing buyer would purchase and a willing seller would sell a parcel of land, as determined by a qualified, independent land appraiser.~~

~~(2) PREVIOUS OWNER OF LAND.—The term "previous owner of land" means a person (including a corporation) that conveyed, or a descendant of a deceased individual who conveyed, land to the Corps~~

~~of Engineers for use in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.~~

~~(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army.~~

~~(b) LAND CONVEYANCES.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey, in accordance with this section, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land acquired by the United States for the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.~~

~~(2) PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.—~~

~~(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall give a previous owner of land first option to purchase the land described in paragraph (1).~~

~~(B) APPLICATION.—~~

~~(i) IN GENERAL.—A previous owner of land that desires to purchase the land described in paragraph (1) that was owned by the previous owner of land, or by the individual from whom the previous owner of land is descended, shall file an application to purchase the land with the Secretary not later than 180 days after the official date of notice to the previous owner of land under subsection (c).~~

~~(ii) FIRST TO FILE HAS FIRST OPTION.—If more than 1 application is filed for a parcel of land described in paragraph (1), first options to purchase the parcel of land shall be allotted in the order in which applications for the parcel of land were filed.~~

~~(C) IDENTIFICATION OF PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, identify each previous owner of land.~~

~~(D) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for land conveyed under this subsection shall be the fair market value of the land.~~

~~(3) DISPOSAL.—Any land described in paragraph (1) for which an application has not been filed under paragraph (2)(B) within the applicable time period shall be disposed of in accordance with law.~~

~~(4) EXTINGUISHMENT OF EASEMENTS.—All flowage easements acquired by the United States for use in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma, are extinguished.~~

~~(c) NOTICE.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify—~~

~~(A) each person identified as a previous owner of land under subsection (b)(2)(C), not later than 90 days after identification, by United States mail; and~~

~~(B) the general public, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, by publication in the Federal Register.~~

~~(2) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—Notice under this subsection shall include—~~

~~(A) a copy of this section;~~

~~(B) information sufficient to separately identify each parcel of land subject to this section; and~~

~~(C) specification of the fair market value of each parcel of land subject to this section.~~

~~(3) OFFICIAL DATE OF NOTICE.—The official date of notice under this subsection shall be the later of—~~

~~(A) the date on which actual notice is mailed; or~~

~~(B) the date of publication of the notice in the Federal Register.~~

~~SEC. 321. SALCHA RIVER AND PILEDRIVER SLOUGH, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA.~~

~~The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), carry out flood damage reduction measures along the lower Salcha River and on Piledriver Slough, from its headwaters at the mouth of the Salcha River to the Chena Lakes Flood Control Project, in the vicinity of Fairbanks, Alaska, to protect against surface water flooding.~~

~~SEC. 322. EYAK RIVER, CORDOVA, ALASKA.~~

~~The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), carry out flood damage reduction measures along the Eyak River at the town of Cordova, Alaska.~~

~~SEC. 323. NORTH PADRE ISLAND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECT.~~

~~The Secretary shall carry out a project for ecosystem restoration and storm damage reduction at North Padre Island, Corpus Christi Bay, Texas, at a total estimated cost of $30,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $10,500,000, if the Secretary finds that the work is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.~~

~~**SEC. 324. KANOPOLIS LAKE, KANSAS.**~~

~~(a) WATER SUPPLY.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with the State of Kansas or another non-Federal interest, shall complete a water supply reallocation study at the project for flood control, Kanopolis Lake, Kansas, as a basis on which the Secretary shall enter into negotiations with the State of Kansas or another non-Federal interest for the terms and conditions of a reallocation of the water supply.~~

~~(2) OPTIONS.—The negotiations for storage reallocation shall include the following options for evaluation by all parties:~~

~~(A) Financial terms of storage reallocation.~~

~~(B) Protection of future Federal water releases from Kanopolis Dam, consistent with State water law, to ensure that the benefits expected from releases are provided.~~

~~(C) Potential establishment of a water assurance district consistent with other such districts established by the State of Kansas.~~

~~(D) Protection of existing project purposes at Kanopolis Dam to include flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.~~

~~(b) IN-KIND CREDIT.—~~

~~(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may negotiate a credit for a portion of the financial repayment to the Federal Government for work performed by the State of Kansas, or another non-Federal interest, on land adjacent or in close proximity to the project, if the work provides a benefit to the project.~~

~~(2) WORK INCLUDED.—The work for which credit may be granted may include watershed protection and enhancement, including wetland construction and ecosystem restoration.~~

~~SEC. 325. NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.~~

~~Section 552(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3780) is amended by striking "for the project to be carried out with such assistance" and inserting ", or a public entity designated by the State director, to carry out the project with such assistance, subject to the project's meeting the certification requirement of subsection (c)(1)".~~

~~SEC. 326. CITY OF CHARLEVOIX REIMBURSEMENT, MICHIGAN.~~

~~The Secretary shall review and, if consistent with authorized project purposes, reimburse the city of Charlevoix, Michigan, for the Federal share of costs associated with construction of the new revetment connection~~

~~to the Federal navigation project at Charlevoix Harbor, Michigan.~~

~~SEC. 327. HAMILTON DAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, MICHIGAN.~~

~~The Secretary may construct the Hamilton Dam flood control project, Michigan, under authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).~~

~~SEC. 328. HOLES CREEK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, OHIO.~~

~~(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the non-Federal share of project costs for the project for flood control, Holes Creek, Ohio, shall not exceed the sum of—~~

~~(1) the total amount projected as the non-Federal share as of September 30, 1996, in the Project Cooperation Agreement executed on that date; and~~

~~(2) 100 percent of the amount of any increases in the cost of the locally preferred plan over the cost estimated in the Project Cooperation Agreement.~~

~~(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest any amount paid by the non-Federal interest in excess of the non-Federal share.~~

~~**SEC. 329. OVERFLOW MANAGEMENT FACILITY, RHODE ISLAND.**~~

~~Section 585(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3791) is amended by striking "river" and inserting "sewer".~~

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Development Act of 1999".

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

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

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. Project authorizations.
Sec. 102. Project modifications.
Sec. 103. Project deauthorizations.
Sec. 104. Studies.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Flood hazard mitigation and riverine ecosystem restoration program.
Sec. 202. Shore protection.
Sec. 203. Small flood control authority.
Sec. 204. Use of non-Federal funds for compiling and disseminating information on floods and flood damages.
Sec. 205. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 206. Beneficial uses of dredged material.
Sec. 207. Voluntary contributions by States and political subdivisions.
Sec. 208. Recreation user fees.
Sec. 209. Water resources development studies for the Pacific region.
Sec. 210. Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers enhancement project.
Sec. 211. Outer Continental Shelf.
Sec. 212. Environmental dredging.
Sec. 213. Benefit of primary flood damages avoided included in benefit-cost analysis.
Sec. 214. Control of aquatic plant growth.
Sec. 215. Environmental infrastructure.
Sec. 216. Watershed management, restoration, and development.
Sec. 217. Lakes program.
Sec. 218. Sediments decontamination policy.
Sec. 219. Disposal of dredged material on beaches.
Sec. 220. Fish and wildlife mitigation.
Sec. 221. Reimbursement of non-Federal interest.

Sec. 222. National Contaminated Sediment Task Force.
Sec. 223. Great Lakes basin program.
Sec. 224. Projects for improvement of the environment.
Sec. 225. Water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation.
Sec. 226. Irrigation diversion protection and fisheries enhancement assistance.
Sec. 227. Small storm damage reduction projects.
Sec. 228. Shore damage prevention or mitigation.
Sec. 229. Atlantic coast of New York.
Sec. 230. Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies for contaminated sediments.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Dredging of salt ponds in the State of Rhode Island.
Sec. 302. Upper Susquehanna River basin, Pennsylvania and New York.
Sec. 303. Small flood control projects.
Sec. 304. Small navigation projects.
Sec. 305. Streambank protection projects.
Sec. 306. Aquatic ecosystem restoration, Springfield, Oregon.
Sec. 307. Guilford and New Haven, Connecticut.
Sec. 308. Francis Bland Floodway Ditch.
Sec. 309. Caloosahatchee River basin, Florida.
Sec. 310. Cumberland, Maryland, flood project mitigation.
Sec. 311. City of Miami Beach, Florida.
Sec. 312. Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.
Sec. 313. Upper Mississippi River and Illinois waterway system navigation modernization.
Sec. 314. Upper Mississippi River management.
Sec. 315. Research and development program for Columbia and Snake Rivers salmon survival.
Sec. 316. Nine Mile Run habitat restoration, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 317. Larkspur Ferry Channel, California.
Sec. 318. Comprehensive Flood Impact-Response Modeling System.
Sec. 319. Study regarding innovative financing for small and medium-sized ports.
Sec. 320. Candy Lake project, Osage County, Oklahoma.
Sec. 321. Salcha River and Piledriver Slough, Fairbanks, Alaska.
Sec. 322. Eyak River, Cordova, Alaska.
Sec. 323. North Padre Island storm damage reduction and environmental restoration project.
Sec. 324. Kanopolis Lake, Kansas.
Sec. 325. New York City watershed.
Sec. 326. City of Charlevoix reimbursement, Michigan.
Sec. 327. Hamilton Dam flood control project, Michigan.
Sec. 328. Holes Creek flood control project, Ohio.
Sec. 329. Overflow management facility, Rhode Island.
Sec. 330. Anacostia River aquatic ecosystem restoration, District of Columbia and Maryland.
Sec. 331. Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

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

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) PROJECTS WITH CHIEF'S REPORTS.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:

(1) SAND POINT HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Sand Point Harbor, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $11,760,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,964,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,796,000.

(2) RIO SALADO (SALT RIVER), ARIZONA.—The project for environmental restoration, Rio Salado (Salt River), Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 20, 1998, at a total cost of $88,048,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $56,355,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $31,693,000.

(3) TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, ARIZONA.—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Tucson drainage area, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 20, 1998, at a total cost of $29,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $16,768,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,132,000.

(4) AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction described as the Folsom Stepped Release Plan in the Corps of Engineers Supplemental Information Report for the American River Watershed Project, California, dated March 1996, at a total cost of $505,400,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $329,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $176,100,000.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Implementation of the measures by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be undertaken after completion of the levee stabilization and strengthening and flood warning features authorized by section 101(a)(1) of the Water

Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3662).

(ii) FOLSOM DAM AND RESERVOIR.—The Secretary may undertake measures at the Folsom Dam and Reservoir authorized under subparagraph (A) only after reviewing the design of such measures to determine if modifications are necessary to account for changed hydrologic conditions and any other changed conditions in the project area, including operational and construction impacts that have occurred since completion of the report referred to in subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall conduct the review and develop the modifications to the Folsom Dam and Reservoir with the full participation of the Secretary of the Interior.

(iii) REMAINING DOWNSTREAM ELEMENTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Implementation of the remaining downstream elements authorized pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be undertaken only after the Secretary, in consultation

with affected Federal, State, regional, and local entities, has reviewed the elements to determine if modifications are necessary to address changes in the hydrologic conditions, any other changed conditions in the project area that have occurred since completion of the report referred to in subparagraph (A) and any design modifications for the Folsom Dam and Reservoir made by the Secretary in implementing the measures referred to in clause (ii), and has issued a report on the review.

(II) PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES.—The review shall be prepared in accordance with the economic and environmental principles and guidelines for water and related land resources implementation studies, and no construction may be initiated unless the Secretary determines that the remaining downstream elements are technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

(5) LLAGAS CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—The project for completion of the remaining reaches of the Natural Resources Conservation Service flood control project at Llagas Creek, California, undertaken pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1005), substantially in accordance with the requirements of local cooperation as specified in section 4 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1004) at a total cost of $45,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $21,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $23,200,000.

(6) SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $65,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $24,300,000.

(7) UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Construction of the locally preferred plan for flood damage reduction and recreation, Upper Guadalupe River, California, described as the Bypass Channel Plan of the Chief of Engineers dated August 19, 1998, at a total cost of $137,600,000, with an estimated

Federal cost of $44,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $93,600,000.

(8) YUBA RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Yuba River Basin, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 25, 1998, at a total cost of $26,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $17,350,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,250,000.

(9) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE: DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-BROADKILL BEACH, DELAWARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, Delaware Bay coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Broadkill Beach, Delaware, Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 17, 1998, at a total cost of $9,049,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,674,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,375,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $538,200, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $349,800 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $188,400.

(10) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE: DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-PORT MAHON, DELAWARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for ecosystem restoration and shore protection, Delaware Bay coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Port Mahon, Delaware: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 1998, at a total cost of $7,644,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,969,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,675,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $234,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $152,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $82,000.

(11) HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER STORAGE AND RECOVERY PROJECT, FLORIDA.—The project for aquifer storage and recovery described in the Corps of Engineers Central and Southern Florida Water Supply Study, Florida, dated April 1989, and in House Document 369, dated July 30, 1968, at a total cost of $27,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $13,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,500,000.

(12) INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Notwithstanding section 1001(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)), the project for shoreline protection, Indian River County, Florida, authorized by section 501(a) of that Act (100 Stat. 4134), shall remain authorized for construction through December 31, 2002.

(13) LIDO KEY BEACH, SARASOTA, FLORIDA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for shore protection at Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1819) and deauthorized by operation of section 1001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary at a total cost of $5,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,380,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,820,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $602,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $391,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $211,000.

(14) TAMPA HARBOR-BIG BEND CHANNEL, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Tampa Harbor-Big Bend Channel, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $12,356,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,235,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,121,000.

(15) BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GEORGIA.—The project for navigation, Brunswick Harbor, Georgia: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $50,717,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $32,966,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,751,000.

(16) BEARGRASS CREEK, KENTUCKY.—The project for flood damage reduction, Beargrass Creek, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 12, 1998, at a total cost of $11,172,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,262,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,910,000.

(17) AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH WATERSHED.—The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 23, 1996, at a total cost

of $112,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $73,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $39,500,000.

(18) BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor Anchorages and Channels, Maryland and Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 8, 1998, at a total cost of $28,430,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,430,000.

(19) RED LAKE RIVER AT CROOKSTON, MINNESOTA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Red Lake River at Crookston, Minnesota: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 20, 1998, at a total cost of $8,950,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,720,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,230,000.

(20) NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and shore protection, New Jersey coastline, Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September

28, 1998, at a total cost of $56,503,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $36,727,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $19,776,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $2,000,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,300,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $700,000.

(21) PARK RIVER, NORTH DAKOTA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the condition stated in subparagraph (B), the project for flood control, Park River, Grafton, North Dakota, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4121) and deauthorized under section 1001(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a), at a total cost of $28,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $18,265,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,835,000.

(B) CONDITION.—No construction may be initiated unless the Secretary determines through a general reevaluation report using current data, that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

(22) SALT CREEK, GRAHAM, TEXAS.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, Salt Creek, Graham, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $10,080,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,560,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,520,000.

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO A FINAL REPORT.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers as approved by the Secretary, if a favorable report of the Chief is completed not later than December 31, 1999:

(1) NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Nome Harbor Improvements, Alaska, at a total cost of $24,608,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of $19,660,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of $4,948,000.

(2) SEWARD HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska, at a total cost of $12,240,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of $4,364,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of $7,876,000.

(3) HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLAND RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.—The project for environmental restoration at Hamilton Airfield, California, at a total cost of $55,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,800,000.

(4) OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation and environmental restoration, Oakland, California, at a total cost of $214,340,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $143,450,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $70,890,000.

(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of $42,310,000.

(5) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE: DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY-ROOSEVELT INLET-LEWES BEACH, DELAWARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation mitigation, shore protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Roosevelt Inlet-Lewes Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of

$3,393,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,620,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $773,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $196,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $152,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $44,000.

(6) DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, BETHANY BEACH/SOUTH BETHANY BEACH, DELAWARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, Delaware Coast from Cape Henelopen to Fenwick Island, Bethany Beach/South Bethany Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of $22,205,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $14,433,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,772,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $1,584,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $1,030,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $554,000.

(7) JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Jacksonville Harbor, Florida, at a total cost of $26,116,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,129,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $16,987,000.

(8) LITTLE TALBOT ISLAND, DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage prevention and shore protection, Little Talbot Island, Duval County, Florida, at a total cost of $5,915,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,839,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,076,000.

(9) PONCE DE LEON INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation and recreation, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, at a total cost of $5,454,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,988,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,466,000.

(10) SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GEORGIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may carry out the project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion, Georgia, substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in a

final report of the Chief of Engineers, with such modifications as the Secretary deems appropriate, at a total cost of $230,174,000 (of which amount a portion is authorized for implementation of the mitigation plan), with an estimated Federal cost of $145,160,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $85,014,000.

(B) CONDITIONS.—The project authorized by subparagraph (A) may be carried out only after—

(i) the Secretary, in consultation with affected Federal, State, regional, and local entities, has reviewed and approved an Environmental Impact Statement that includes—

(I) an analysis of the impacts of project depth alternatives ranging from 42 feet through 48 feet; and

(II) a selected plan for navigation and associated mitigation plan as required by section 906(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283); and

(ii) the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Adminis-

trator of the Environmental Protection Agency, with the Secretary, have approved the selected plan and have determined that the mitigation plan adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the project.

(C) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—The mitigation plan shall be implemented in advance of or concurrently with construction of the project.

(11) TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI AND KANSAS CITY, KANSAS.—The project for flood damage reduction, Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas, at a total cost of $42,875,000 with an estimated Federal cost of $25,596,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,279,000.

(12) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, OAKWOOD BEACH, NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay coastline, Oakwood Beach, New Jersey, at a total cost of $3,380,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,197,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,183,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $90,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $58,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $32,000.

(13) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, REEDS BEACH AND PIERCES POINT, NEW JERSEY.—The project for environmental restoration, Delaware Bay coastline, Reeds Beach and Pierces Point, New Jersey, at a total cost of $4,057,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,637,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,420,000.

(14) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS AND VICINITY, NEW JERSEY.—The project for environmental restoration, Delaware Bay coastline, Villas and vicinity, New Jersey, at a total cost of $7,520,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,888,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,632,000.

(15) LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation mitigation, ecosystem restoration, shore protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May

Point, New Jersey, at a total cost of $15,952,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,118,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,834,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $1,114,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $897,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $217,000.

(16) NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR, BRIGANTINE ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, New Jersey Shore protection, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor, Brigantine Island, New Jersey, at a total cost of $4,970,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,230,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,740,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $465,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $302,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $163,000.

(17) COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Columbia River channel deepening, Oregon and Washington, at a total cost of $182,423,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $106,132,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $76,291,000.

(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of $1,200,000.

(18) MEMPHIS HARBOR, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the project for navigation, Memphis Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4145) and deauthorized under section 1001(a) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)) is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(B) CONDITION.—No construction may be initiated unless the Secretary determines through a general reevaluation report using current data,

that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

(19) JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TEXAS.—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas, at a total cost of $20,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $8,300,000.

(20) HOWARD HANSON DAM, WASHINGTON.—The project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Howard Hanson Dam, Washington, at a total cost of $75,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $36,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $38,700,000.

SEC. 102. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) PROJECTS WITH REPORTS.—

(1) SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, San Lorenzo River, California, authorized by section 101(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3663), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include as a part of the project streambank erosion control measures to be undertaken substantially in accordance with the report entitled "Bank Stabilization Concept, Laurel Street Extension", dated April 23, 1998, at a

total cost of $4,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $2,600,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,400,000.

(2) ST. JOHNS COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FLORIDA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, St. Johns County, Florida, authorized by section 501(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4133) is modified to authorize the Secretary to include navigation mitigation as a purpose of the project in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated November 18, 1998, at a total cost of $16,086,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,949,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,137,000.

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of $8,137,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $6,550,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $1,587,000.

(3) WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood control, Wood River, Grand Is-

land, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(a)(19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665) is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project in accordance with the Corps of Engineers report dated June 29, 1998, at a total cost of $17,039,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,730,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,309,000.

(4) ABSECON ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—The project for Absecon Island, New Jersey, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668) is amended to authorize the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interests for all work performed, consistent with the authorized project.

(5) ARTHUR KILL, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Arthur Kill, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098) and modified by section 301(b)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of

$276,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $183,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $93,600,000.

(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of $38,900,000.

(6) WAURIKA LAKE, OKLAHOMA, WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES.—The requirement for the Waurika Project Master Conservancy District to repay the $2,900,000 in costs (including interest) resulting from the October 1991 settlement of the claim of the Travelers Insurance Company before the United States Claims Court related to construction of the water conveyance facilities authorized by the first section of Public Law 88–253 (77 Stat. 841) is waived.

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO REPORTS.—The following projects are modified as follows, except that no funds may be obligated to carry out work under such modifications until completion of a final report by the Chief of Engineers, as approved by the Secretary, finding that such work is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, as applicable:

(1) THORNTON RESERVOIR, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Thornton Reservoir project, an element of the project for flood control, Chicagoland Underflow Plan, Illinois, authorized by section 3(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include additional permanent flood control storage attributable to the Natural Resources Conservation Service Thornton Reservoir (Structure 84), Little Calumet River Watershed, Illinois, approved under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(B) COST SHARING.—Costs for the Thornton Reservoir project shall be shared in accordance with section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

(C) TRANSITIONAL STORAGE.—The Secretary of Agriculture may cooperate with non-Federal interests to provide, on a transitional basis, flood control storage for the Natural Resources Conservation Service Thornton Reservoir (Structure 84) project in the west lobe of the Thornton quarry.

(D) CREDITING.—The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share of the Thornton Reservoir project all design and construction costs incurred by the non-Federal interests before the date of enactment of this Act.

(E) REEVALUATION REPORT.—The Secretary shall determine the credits authorized by subparagraph (D) that are integral to the Thornton Reservoir project and the current total project costs based on a limited reevaluation report.

(2) WELLS HARBOR, WELLS, MAINE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Wells Harbor, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480), is modified to authorize the Secretary to realign the channel and anchorage areas based on a harbor design capacity of 150 craft.

(B) DEAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN PORTIONS.—The following portions of the project are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(i) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,992.00, E394,831.00,

thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 14.8 seconds west 10.38 feet to a point N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds west 991.76 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.8 seconds east 994.93 feet to the point of origin.

(ii) The portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 51 degrees 58 minutes 32.7 seconds west 15.49 feet to a point N177,768.53, E394,324.76, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.5 seconds west 672.87 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 25.4 seconds east 684.70 feet to the point of origin.

(iii) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 15.7 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,816.13, E394,126.26, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 21.4 seconds east 9.98 feet to a point N176,814.09, E394,136.03, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 29.1 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(iv) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 30.3 seconds east 10.03 feet to a point N176,724.31,

E394,566.79, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.4 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(C) REDESIGNATIONS.—The following portions of the project shall be redesignated as part of the 6-foot anchorage:

(i) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 40.8 seconds west 94.65 feet to a point N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.4 seconds west 962.83 feet to a point N177,038.40, E394,530.10, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 90.00 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds east 991.76 feet to the point of origin.

(ii) The portion of the 10-foot inner harbor settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 30.5 seconds

west 160.00 feet to a point N177,052.69, E394,461.58, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 45.4 seconds west 299.99 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 160 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(iii) The portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N178,102.26, E394,751.83, thence running south 51 degrees 59 minutes 42.1 seconds west 526.51 feet to a point N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.6 seconds west 511.83 feet to a point N177,277.01, E394,232.52, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 80.00 feet to a point N177,260.68, E394,310.84, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 24.8 seconds east 482.54 feet to a point N177,733.07, E394,409.30, thence running north 51 degrees 59 minutes 41.0 seconds east 402.63 feet to a point

N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 27.6 seconds east 123.89 feet to the point of origin.

(D) REALIGNMENT.—The 6-foot anchorage area described in subparagraph (C)(iii) shall be realigned to include the area located south of the inner harbor settling basin in existence on the date of enactment of this Act beginning at a point with coordinates N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds west 160.00 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 11 degrees 47 minutes 03.8 seconds west 45 feet to a point N176,714.97, E394,391.15, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds 160.00 feet to a point N176,682.31, E394,547.78, thence running north 11 degrees 47 minutes 03.8 seconds east 45 feet to the point of origin.

(E) RELOCATION.—The Secretary may relocate the settling basin feature of the project to the outer harbor between the jetties.

(3) NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, New York Harbor and adjacent channels, Port Jersey, New Jersey, authorized by section 201(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4091), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of $102,545,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $76,909,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $25,636,000.

(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of $722,000.

(c) BEAVER LAKE, ARKANSAS, WATER SUPPLY STORAGE REALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall reallocate approximately 31,000 additional acre-feet at Beaver Lake, Arkansas, to water supply storage at no cost to the Beaver Water District or the Carroll-Boone Water District, except that at no time shall the bottom of the conservation pool be at an elevation that is less than 1,076 feet, NGVD.

(d) TOLCHESTER CHANNEL S-TURN, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.—The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), is modified

to direct the Secretary to straighten the Tolchester Channel S-turn as part of project maintenance.

(e) TROPICANA WASH AND FLAMINGO WASH, NEVADA.—Any Federal costs associated with the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, Nevada, authorized by section 101(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), incurred by the non-Federal interest to accelerate or modify construction of the project, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, shall be considered to be eligible for reimbursement by the Secretary.

(f) REDIVERSION PROJECT, COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The rediversion project, Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731) and modified by title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1992 (105 Stat. 517), is modified to authorize the Secretary to pay the State of South Carolina not more than $3,750,000, if the State enters into an agreement with the Secretary providing that the State shall perform all future operation of the St. Stephen, South Carolina, fish lift (including associated studies to assess the efficacy of the fish lift).

(2) CONTENTS.—The agreement shall specify the terms and conditions under which payment will be made and the rights of, and remedies available to, the Secretary to recover all or a portion of the payment if the State suspends or terminates operation of the fish lift or fails to perform the operation in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(3) MAINTENANCE.—Maintenance of the fish lift shall remain a Federal responsibility.

(g) TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TEXAS.—The project for flood control and navigation, Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091), is modified to add environmental restoration as a project purpose.

(h) BEACH EROSION CONTROL AND HURRICANE PROTECTION, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.—

(1) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—In any fiscal year that the Corps of Engineers does not receive appropriations sufficient to meet expected project expenditures for that year, the Secretary shall accept from the city of Virginia Beach, Virginia, for purposes of the project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 501(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of

1986 (100 Stat. 4136), such funds as the city may advance for the project.

(2) REPAYMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall repay, without interest, the amount of any advance made under paragraph (1), from appropriations that may be provided by Congress for river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects.

(i) ELIZABETH RIVER, CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the date of enactment of this Act, the city of Chesapeake, Virginia, shall not be obligated to make the annual cash contribution required under paragraph 1(9) of the Local Cooperation Agreement dated December 12, 1978, between the Government and the city for the project for navigation, southern branch of Elizabeth River, Chesapeake, Virginia.

(j) PAYMENT OPTION, MOOREFIELD, WEST VIRGINIA.—The Secretary may permit the non-Federal interests for the project for flood control, Moorefield, West Virginia, to pay without interest the remaining non-Federal cost over a period not to exceed 30 years, to be determined by the Secretary.

(k) MIAMI DADE AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL LAND RETENTION PLAN AND SOUTH BISCAYNE, FLORIDA.—Section 528(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of

1996 (110 Stat. 3768) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) CREDIT AND REIMBURSEMENT OF PAST AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may afford credit to or reimburse the non-Federal sponsors (using funds authorized by subparagraph (C)) for the reasonable costs of any work that has been performed or will be performed in connection with a study or activity meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) if—

"(i) the Secretary determines that—

"(I) the work performed by the non-Federal sponsors will substantially expedite completion of a critical restoration project; and

"(II) the work is necessary for a critical restoration project; and

"(ii) the credit or reimbursement is granted pursuant to a project-specific agreement that prescribes the terms and conditions of the credit or reimbursement.".

(l) LAKE MICHIGAN, ILLINOIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Lake Michigan, Il-

linois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State line, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3664), is modified to provide for reimbursement for additional project work undertaken by the non-Federal interest.

(2) CREDIT OR REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall credit or reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of project costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in designing, constructing, or reconstructing reach 2F (700 feet south of Fullerton Avenue and 500 feet north of Fullerton Avenue), reach 3M (Meigs Field), and segments 7 and 8 of reach 4 (43rd Street to 57th Street), if the non-Federal interest carries out the work in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary, at an estimated total cost of $83,300,000.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of project costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in reconstructing the revetment structures protecting Solidarity Drive in Chicago, Illinois, before the signing of the project cooperation agreement, at an estimated total cost of $7,600,000.

(m) MEASUREMENTS OF LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSIONS, ILLINOIS.—Section 1142(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4253) is amended by striking "$250,000 per fiscal year for each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1986" and inserting "a total of $1,250,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003".

(n) PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, DUBUQUE, IOWA.—The project for navigation at Dubuque, Iowa, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 482), is modified to authorize the development of a wetland demonstration area of approximately 1.5 acres to be developed and operated by the Dubuque County Historical Society or a successor nonprofit organization.

(o) LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE.—The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share work performed in the project area of the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Mississippi River, Louisiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4117).

(p) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—The project for environmental infrastructure, Jackson County, Mississippi, authorized by section 219(c)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) and modified by section 504 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757), is modified to direct the Secretary to pro-

vide a credit, not to exceed $5,000,000, against the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the costs incurred by the Jackson County Board of Supervisors since February 8, 1994, in constructing the project, if the Secretary determines that such costs are for work that the Secretary determines was compatible with and integral to the project.

(q) RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary shall convey to the State of South Carolina all right, title, and interest of the United States in the parcels of land described in subparagraph (B) that are currently being managed by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes for the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake, South Carolina, project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1966 and modified by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The parcels of land to be conveyed are described in Exhibits A, F, and H of Army Lease No. DACW21–1–93–0910 and associated supplemental agreements or are designated in red in Exhibit A of Army License No.

DACW21–3–85–1904, excluding all designated parcels in the license that are below elevation 346 feet mean sea level or that are less than 300 feet measured horizontally from the top of the power pool.

(B) MANAGEMENT OF EXCLUDED PARCELS.—Management of the excluded parcels shall continue in accordance with the terms of Army License No. DACW21–3–85–1904 until the Secretary and the State enter into an agreement under subparagraph (F).

(C) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary, with the cost of the survey borne by the State.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The State shall be responsible for all costs, including real estate transaction and environmental compliance costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) PERPETUAL STATUS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—All land conveyed under this paragraph shall be retained in public ownership and shall be managed in perpetuity for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary.

(B) REVERSION.—If any parcel of land is not managed for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in accordance with the plan, title to the parcel shall revert to the United States.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(6) FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may pay the State of South Carolina not more than $4,850,000 subject to the Secretary and the State entering into a binding agreement for the State to manage for fish and wildlife mitigation purposes in perpetuity the lands conveyed under this paragraph and excluded parcels designated in Exhibit A of Army License No. DACW21–3–85–1904.

(B) FAILURE OF PERFORMANCE.—The agreement shall specify the terms and conditions under which payment will be made and the rights of, and remedies available to, the Federal Government to recover all or a portion of the

payment if the State fails to manage any parcel in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(r) LAND CONVEYANCE, CLARKSTON, WASHINGTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Port of Clarkston, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of the land described in the Department of the Army lease No. DACW68–1–97–22, consisting of approximately 31 acres, the exact boundaries of which shall be determined by the Secretary and the Port of Clarkston.

(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—The Secretary may convey to the Port of Clarkston, Washington, such additional land located in the vicinity of Clarkston, Washington, as the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the Columbia River Project and appropriate for conveyance.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyances made under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, including a requirement that the Port of Clarkston pay all administrative costs associated with the conveyances, including the cost of land surveys and appraisals and costs associated with compli-

ance with applicable environmental laws (including regulations).

(4) USE OF LAND.—The Port of Clarkston shall be required to pay the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of any land conveyed pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) that is not retained in public ownership and used for public park or recreation purposes, except that the Secretary shall have a right of reverter to reclaim possession and title to any such land.

(s) WHITE RIVER, INDIANA.—The project for flood control, Indianapolis on West Fork of the White River, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1586, chapter 688), as modified by section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake the riverfront alterations described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Plan, dated February 1994, for the Canal Development (Upper Canal feature) and the Beveridge Paper feature, at a total cost not to exceed $25,000,000, of which $12,500,000 is the estimated Federal cost and $12,500,000 is the estimated non-Federal cost, except that no such alterations may be under-

taken unless the Secretary determines that the alterations authorized by this subsection, in combination with the alterations undertaken under section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), are economically justified.

(t) FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.—The project for hurricane-flood protection, Fox Point, Providence, Rhode Island, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 306) is modified to direct the Secretary to undertake the necessary repairs to the barrier, as identified in the Condition Survey and Technical Assessment dated April 1998 with Supplement dated August 1998, at a total cost of $3,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $1,950,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,050,000.

SEC. 103. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—The portion of the project for navigation, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), consisting of a 2.4-acre anchorage area 9 feet deep and an adjacent 0.60-acre anchorage area 6 feet deep, located on the west side of Johnsons River, Connecticut, is not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) BASS HARBOR, MAINE.—

(1) DEAUTHORIZATION.—The portions of the project for navigation, Bass Harbor, Maine, authorized on May 7, 1962, under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) described in paragraph (2) are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DESCRIPTION.—The portions of the project referred to in paragraph (1) are described as follows:

(A) Beginning at a bend in the project, N149040.00, E538505.00, thence running easterly about 50.00 feet along the northern limit of the project to a point, N149061.55, E538550.11, thence running southerly about 642.08 feet to a point, N148477.64, E538817.18, thence running southwesterly about 156.27 feet to a point on the westerly limit of the project, N148348.50, E538737.02, thence running northerly about 149.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to a bend in the project, N148489.22, E538768.09, thence running northwesterly about 610.39 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.

(B) Beginning at a point on the westerly limit of the project, N148118.55, E538689.05, thence running southeasterly about 91.92 feet to

a point, N148041.43, E538739.07, thence running southerly about 65.00 feet to a point, N147977.86, E538725.51, thence running southwesterly about 91.92 feet to a point on the westerly limit of the project, N147927.84, E538648.39, thence running northerly about 195.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.

(c) BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The project for navigation, Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the Act of July 25, 1912 (37 Stat. 201, chapter 253), is not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—Section 364 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3731) is amended by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

"(9) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The project for navigation, East Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 657).".

SEC. 104. STUDIES.

(a) CADDO LEVEE, RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, ARIZONA, LOUISIANA, OKLAHOMA, AND TEXAS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking a project for flood control, Caddo Levee, Red River Below Denison Dam, Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, including incorporating the existing levee, along Twelve Mile Bayou from its juncture with the existing Red River Below Denison Dam Levee approximately 26 miles upstream to its terminus at high ground in the vicinity of Black Bayou, Louisiana.

(b) FIELDS LANDING CHANNEL, HUMBOLDT HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary—

(1) shall conduct a study for the project for navigation, Fields Landing Channel, Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California, to a depth of minus 35 feet (MLLW), and for that purpose may use any feasibility report prepared by the non-Federal sponsor under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231) for which reimbursement of the Federal share of the study is authorized subject to the availability of appropriations; and

(2) may carry out the project under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(c) STRAWBERRY CREEK, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of restoring Strawberry Creek, Berkeley, California, and the Federal interest in environmental restoration, conservation of fish and wildlife resources, recreation, and water quality.

(d) WEST SIDE STORM WATER RETENTION FACILITY, CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to construct the West Side Storm Water Retention Facility in the city of Lancaster, California.

(e) APALACHICOLA RIVER, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for the purpose of identifying—

(1) alternatives for the management of material dredged in connection with operation and maintenance of the Apalachicola River Navigation Project; and

(2) alternatives that reduce the requirements for such dredging.

(f) BROWARD COUNTY, SAND BYPASSING AT PORT EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a sand bypassing project at the Port Everglades Inlet, Florida.

(g) CITY OF DESTIN-NORIEGA POINT BREAKWATER, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of—

(1) restoring Noriega Point, Florida, to serve as a breakwater for Destin Harbor; and

(2) including Noriega Point as part of the East Pass, Florida, navigation project.

(h) GATEWAY TRIANGLE REDEVELOPMENT AREA, FLORIDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to reduce the flooding problems in the vicinity of Gateway Triangle Redevelopment Area, Florida.

(2) STUDIES AND REPORTS.—The study shall include a review and consideration of studies and reports completed by the non-Federal interests.

(i) CITY OF PLANT CITY, FLORIDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a flood control project in the city of Plant City, Florida.

(2) STUDIES AND REPORTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall review and consider studies and reports completed by the non-Federal interests.

(j) GOOSE CREEK WATERSHED, OAKLEY, IDAHO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking flood damage reduction, water conservation, ground water recharge, ecosystem restoration, and related purposes along the Goose Creek watershed near Oakley, Idaho.

(k) LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, IDAHO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of restoring and repairing the Lava Rock Little Wood River Containment System to prevent flooding in the city of Gooding, Idaho.

(l) SNAKE RIVER AND PAYETTE RIVER, IDAHO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a flood control project along the Snake River and Payette River, in the vicinity of Payette, Idaho.

(m) ACADIANA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of assuming operations and maintenance for the Acadiana Navigation Channel located in Iberia and Vermillion Parishes, Louisiana.

(n) CAMERON PARISH WEST OF CALCASIEU RIVER, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration project for Cameron Parish west of Calcasieu River, Louisiana.

(o) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL, COASTAL LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of using dredged material from maintenance activities at Federal navigation projects in coastal Louisiana to benefit coastal areas in the State.

(p) CONTRABAND BAYOU NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of assuming the maintenance at Contraband Bayou, Calcasieu River Ship Canal, Louisiana.

(q) GOLDEN MEADOW LOCK, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of converting the Golden Meadow floodgate into a navigation lock to be included in the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection Project, Louisiana.

(r) GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION, CHEF MENTEUR TO SABINE RIVER, LOUISIANA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking ecosystem restoration and protection measures along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Chef Menteur to Sabine River, Louisiana.

(2) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The study shall address saltwater intrusion, tidal scour, erosion,

and other water resources related problems in that area.

(s) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LOUISIANA, AND VICINITY, ST. CHARLES PARISH PUMPS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of modifying the Lake Pontchartrain Hurricane Protection Project to include the St. Charles Parish Pumps and the modification of the seawall fronting protection along Lake Pontchartrain in Orleans Parish, from New Basin Canal on the west to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal on the east.

(t) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY SEAWALL RESTORATION, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking structural modifications of that portion of the seawall fronting protection along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain in Orleans Parish, Louisiana, extending approximately 5 miles from the new basin Canal on the west to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal on the east as a part of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Protection Project, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077).

(u) DETROIT RIVER, MICHIGAN, GREENWAY CORRIDOR STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a project for

shoreline protection, frontal erosion, and associated purposes in the Detroit River shoreline area from the Belle Isle Bridge to the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit, Michigan.

(2) POTENTIAL MODIFICATIONS.—As a part of the study, the Secretary shall review potential project modifications to any existing Corps projects within the same area.

(v) ST. CLAIR SHORES FLOOD CONTROL, MICHIGAN.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a flood control project at St. Clair Shores, Michigan.

(w) WOODTICK PENINSULA, MICHIGAN, AND TOLEDO HARBOR, OHIO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of utilizing dredged material from Toledo Harbor, Ohio, to provide erosion reduction, navigation, and ecosystem restoration at Woodtick Peninsula, Michigan.

(x) TUNICA LAKE WEIR, MISSISSIPPI.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing an outlet weir at Tunica Lake, Tunica County, Mississippi, and Lee County, Arkansas, for the purpose of stabilizing water levels in the Lake.

(2) ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall include as a part of the economic analysis the benefits derived from recreation uses at the Lake and economic benefits associated with restoration of fish and wildlife habitat.

(y) PROTECTIVE FACILITIES FOR THE ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, RIVERFRONT AREA.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the optimal plan to protect facilities that are located on the Mississippi River riverfront within the boundaries of St. Louis, Missouri.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall—

(A) evaluate alternatives to offer safety and security to facilities; and

(B) use state-of-the-art techniques to best evaluate the current situation, probable solutions, and estimated costs.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than April 15, 1999, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

(z) YELLOWSTONE RIVER, MONTANA.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Yellowstone River from Gardiner, Montana to the confluence of the Missouri

River to determine the hydrologic, biological, and socioeconomic cumulative impacts on the river.

(2) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall conduct the study in consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States Geological Survey, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service and with the full participation of the State of Montana and tribal and local entities, and provide for public participation.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study.

(aa) LAS VEGAS VALLEY, NEVADA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of water resources located in the Las Vegas Valley, Nevada.

(2) OBJECTIVES.—The study shall identify problems and opportunities related to ecosystem restoration, water quality, particularly the quality of surface runoff, water supply, and flood control.

(bb) OSWEGO RIVER BASIN, NEW YORK.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a flood forecasting system within the Oswego River basin, New York.

(cc) PORT OF NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY NAVIGATION STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY.—

(1) NAVIGATION STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of navigation needs at the Port of New York-New Jersey (including the South Brooklyn Marine and Red Hook Container Terminals, Staten Island, and adjacent areas) to address improvements, including deepening of existing channels to depths of 50 feet or greater, that are required to provide economically efficient and environmentally sound navigation to meet current and future requirements.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the New York Harbor, printed in the House Management Plan of the Harbor Estuary Program, and other pertinent reports concerning the New York Harbor Region and the Port of New York-New Jersey, to determine the Federal interest in advancing harbor environmental restoration.

(3) REPORT.—The Secretary may use funds from the ongoing navigation study for New York and New Jersey Harbor to complete a reconnaissance report for environmental restoration by December 31,

1999. The navigation study to deepen New York and New Jersey Harbor shall consider beneficial use of dredged material.

(dd) BANK STABILIZATION, MISSOURI RIVER, NORTH DAKOTA.—

(1) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of bank stabilization on the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe in North Dakota.

(B) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall study—

(i) options for stabilizing the erosion sites on the banks of the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe identified in the report developed by the North Dakota State Water Commission, dated December 1997, including stabilization through nontraditional measures;

(ii) the cumulative impact of bank stabilization measures between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe on fish and wildlife habitat and the potential impact of additional stabilization measures, including the

impact of nontraditional stabilization measures;

(iii) the current and future effects, including economic and fish and wildlife habitat effects, that bank erosion is having on creating the delta at the beginning of Lake Oahe; and

(iv) the impact of taking no additional measures to stabilize the banks of the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe.

(C) INTERESTED PARTIES.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, seek the participation and views of interested Federal, State, and local agencies, landowners, conservation organizations, and other persons.

(D) REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall report to Congress on the results of the study not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) STATUS.—If the Secretary cannot complete the study and report to Congress by the day that is 1 year after the date of

enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, by that day, report to Congress on the status of the study and report, including an estimate of the date of completion.

(2) EFFECT ON EXISTING PROJECTS.—This subsection does not preclude the Secretary from establishing or carrying out a stabilization project that is authorized by law.

(ee) CLEVELAND HARBOR, CLEVELAND, OHIO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking repairs and related navigation improvements at Dike 14, Cleveland, Ohio.

(ff) EAST LAKE, VERMILLION AND CHAGRIN, OHIO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking flood damage reduction at East Lake, Vermillion and Chagrin, Ohio.

(2) ICE RETENTION STRUCTURE.—In conducting the study, the Secretary may consider construction of an ice retention structure as a potential means of providing flood damage reduction.

(gg) TOUSSAINT RIVER, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OHIO.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking navigation improvements at Toussaint River, Carroll Township, Ohio.

(hh) SANTEE DELTA WETLAND HABITAT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive study of the ecosystem in the Santee Delta focus area of South Carolina to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to enhance the wetland habitat in the area.

(ii) WACCAMAW RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a flood control project for the Waccamaw River in Horry County, South Carolina.

(jj) UPPER SUSQUEHANNA-LACKAWANNA, PENNSYLVANIA, WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND RESTORATION STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a comprehensive flood plain management and watershed restoration project for the Upper Susquehanna-Lackawanna Watershed, Pennsylvania.

(2) GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall use a geographic information system.

(3) PLANS.—The study shall formulate plans for comprehensive flood plain management and environmental restoration.

(4) CREDITING.—Non-Federal interests may receive credit for in-kind services and materials that contribute to the study. The Secretary may credit non-Corps Federal assistance provided to the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of study costs to the maximum extent authorized by law.

(kk) NIOBRARA RIVER AND MISSOURI RIVER SEDIMENTATION STUDY, SOUTH DAKOTA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the Niobrara River watershed and the operations of Fort Randall Dam and Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River to determine the feasibility of alleviating the bank erosion, sedimentation, and related problems in the lower Niobrara River and the Missouri River below Fort Randall Dam.

(ll) SANTA CLARA RIVER, UTAH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to alleviate damage caused by flooding, bank erosion, and sedimentation along the watershed of the Santa Clara River, Utah, above the Gunlock Reservoir.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of watershed conditions and water quality, as related to flooding and bank erosion, along the

Santa Clara River in the vicinity of the town of Gunlock, Utah.

(mm) AGAT SMALL BOAT HARBOR, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking the repair and reconstruction of Agat Small Boat Harbor, Guam, including the repair of existing shore protection measures and construction or a revetment of the breakwater seawall.

(nn) APRA HARBOR SEAWALL, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to repair, upgrade, and extend the seawall protecting Apra Harbor, Guam, and to ensure continued access to the harbor via Route 11B.

(oo) APRA HARBOR FUEL PIERS, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to upgrade the piers and fuel transmission lines at the fuel piers in the Apra Harbor, Guam, and measures to provide for erosion control and protection against storm damage.

(pp) MAINTENANCE DREDGING OF HARBOR PIERS, GUAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of Federal maintenance of areas adjacent to piers at harbors in Guam, including Apra Harbor, Agat Harbor, and Agana Marina.

(qq) ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCES STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct a study of the water supply needs of States that are not currently eligible for assistance under title XVI of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study shall—

(A) identify the water supply needs (including potable, commercial, industrial, recreational and agricultural needs) of each State described in paragraph (1) through 2020, making use of such State, regional, and local plans, studies, and reports as are available;

(B) evaluate the feasibility of various alternative water source technologies such as reuse and reclamation of wastewater and stormwater (including indirect potable reuse), aquifer storage and recovery, and desalination to meet the anticipated water supply needs of the States; and

(C) assess how alternative water sources technologies can be utilized to meet the identified needs.

(3) REPORT.—The Administrator shall report to Congress on the results of the study not more than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. FLOOD HAZARD MITIGATION AND RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may carry out a program to reduce flood hazards and restore the natural functions and values of riverine ecosystems throughout the United States.

(2) STUDIES.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall conduct studies to identify appropriate flood damage reduction, conservation, and restoration measures and may design and implement watershed management and restoration projects.

(3) PARTICIPATION.—The studies and projects carried out under the program shall be conducted, to the extent practicable, with the full participation of the appropriate Federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Commerce.

(4) NONSTRUCTURAL APPROACHES.—The studies and projects shall, to the extent practicable, emphasize nonstructural approaches to preventing or reducing flood damages.

(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) STUDIES.—The cost of studies conducted under subsection (a) shall be shared in accordance with section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 Stat. 2215).

(2) PROJECTS.—The non-Federal interests shall pay 35 percent of the cost of any project carried out under this section.

(3) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal interests shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations necessary for the projects. The value of the land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations shall be credited toward the payment required under this subsection.

(4) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—The non-Federal interests shall be responsible for all costs associated with operating, maintaining, replacing, repairing, and rehabilitating all projects carried out under this section.

(c) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may implement a project under this section if the Secretary determines that the project—

(A) will significantly reduce potential flood damages;

(B) will improve the quality of the environment; and

(C) is justified considering all costs and beneficial outputs of the project.

(2) SELECTION CRITERIA; POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) develop criteria for selecting and rating the projects to be carried out as part of the program authorized by this section; and

(B) establish policies and procedures for carrying out the studies and projects undertaken under this section.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may not implement a project under this section until—

(1) the Secretary provides 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

describing the project and the determinations made under subsection (c); and

(2) a period of 21 calendar days has expired following the date on which the notification was received by the Committees.

(e) PRIORITY AREAS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall examine the potential for flood damage reductions at appropriate locations, including—

(1) Le May, Missouri;

(2) the upper Delaware River basin, New York;

(3) Mill Creek, Cincinnati, Ohio;

(4) Tillamook County, Oregon;

(5) Willamette River basin, Oregon; and

(6) Providence County, Rhode Island.

(f) PER-PROJECT LIMITATION.—Not more than $25,000,000 in Army Civil Works appropriations may be expended on any single project undertaken under this section.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

(2) PROGRAM FUNDING LEVELS.—All studies and projects undertaken under this authority from Army Civil Works appropriations shall be fully fund-

ed within the program funding levels provided in this subsection.

SEC. 202. SHORE PROTECTION.

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

(1) by striking "Costs of constructing" and inserting the following:

"(1) CONSTRUCTION.—Costs of constructing"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—In the case of a project authorized for construction after December 31, 1999, or for which a feasibility study is completed after that date, the non-Federal cost of the periodic nourishment of projects or measures for shore protection or beach erosion control shall be 50 percent, except that—

"(A) all costs assigned to benefits to privately owned shores (where use of such shores is limited to private interests) or to prevention of losses of private land shall be borne by non-Federal interests; and

"(B) all costs assigned to the protection of federally owned shores shall be borne by the United States.".

SEC. 203. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "construction of small projects" and inserting "implementation of small structural and nonstructural projects"; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking "$5,000,000" and inserting "$7,000,000".

SEC. 204. USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS FOR COMPILING AND DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON FLOODS AND FLOOD DAMAGES.

Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(b)) is amended in the third sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", but the Secretary of the Army may accept funds voluntarily contributed by such entities for the purpose of expanding the scope of the services requested by the entities".

SEC. 205. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

Section 206(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "Construction" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Construction"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42

U.S.C. 1962d–5b), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.".

SEC. 206. BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL.

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), for any project carried out under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.".

SEC. 207. VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS BY STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

Section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), is amended by inserting "or environmental restoration" after "flood control".

SEC. 208. RECREATION USER FEES.

(a) WITHHOLDING OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal years 1999 through 2002, the Secretary may withhold from the special account established under section 4(i)(1)(A) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i)(1)(A)) 100 percent of the

amount of receipts above a baseline of $34,000,000 per each fiscal year received from fees imposed at recreation sites under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Army under section 4(b) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(b)).

(2) USE.—The amounts withheld shall be retained by the Secretary and shall be available, without further Act of appropriation, for expenditure by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (b).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The amounts withheld shall remain available until September 30, 2005.

(b) USE OF AMOUNTS WITHHELD.—In order to increase the quality of the visitor experience at public recreational areas and to enhance the protection of resources, the amounts withheld under subsection (a) may be used only for—

(1) repair and maintenance projects (including projects relating to health and safety);

(2) interpretation;

(3) signage;

(4) habitat or facility enhancement;

(5) resource preservation;

(6) annual operation (including fee collection);

(7) maintenance; and

(8) law enforcement related to public use.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Each amount withheld by the Secretary shall be available for expenditure, without further Act of appropriation, at the specific project from which the amount, above baseline, is collected.

SEC. 209. WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT STUDIES FOR THE PACIFIC REGION.

Section 444 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3747) is amended by striking "interest of navigation" and inserting "interests of water resources development (including navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration)".

SEC. 210. MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term "middle Mississippi River" means the reach of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River (river mile 0, upper Mississippi River) to the mouth of the Missouri River (river mile 195).

(2) MISSOURI RIVER.—The term "Missouri River" means the main stem and floodplain of the Missouri River (including reservoirs) from its confluence with the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Missouri, to its headwaters near Three Forks, Montana.

(3) PROJECT.—The term "project" means the project authorized by this section.

(b) PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(1) PLAN.—

(A) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan for a project to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat of the Missouri River and the middle Mississippi River.

(B) ACTIVITIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall provide for such activities as are necessary to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat without adversely affecting—

(I) the water-related needs of the region surrounding the Missouri River and the middle Mississippi River, including flood control, navigation, recreation, and enhancement of water supply; and

(II) private property rights.

(ii) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The plan shall include—

(I) modification and improvement of navigation training structures to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat;

(II) modification and creation of side channels to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat;

(III) restoration and creation of island fish and wildlife habitat;

(IV) creation of riverine fish and wildlife habitat;

(V) establishment of criteria for prioritizing the type and sequencing of activities based on cost-effectiveness and likelihood of success; and

(VI) physical and biological monitoring for evaluating the success of the project, to be performed by the River Studies Center of the United States Geological Survey in Columbia, Missouri.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Using funds made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall carry out the activities described in the plan.

(B) USE OF EXISTING AUTHORITY FOR UNCONSTRUCTED FEATURES OF THE PROJECT.—Using funds made available to the Secretary under other law, the Secretary shall design and construct any feature of the project that may be carried out using the authority of the Secretary to modify an authorized project, if the Secretary determines that the design and construction will—

(i) accelerate the completion of activities to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat of the Missouri River or the middle Mississippi River; and

(ii) be compatible with the project purposes described in this section.

(c) INTEGRATION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the activities described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall integrate the activities with other Federal, State, and tribal activities.

(2) NEW AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section confers any new regulatory authority on any Federal or non-Federal entity that carries out any activity authorized by this section.

(d) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In developing and carrying out the plan and the activities described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall provide for public review and comment in accordance with applicable Federal law, including—

(1) providing advance notice of meetings;

(2) providing adequate opportunity for public input and comment;

(3) maintaining appropriate records; and

(4) compiling a record of the proceedings of meetings.

(e) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the activities described in subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(f) COST SHARING.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any 1 activity described in subsection (b) shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The operation and maintenance of the project shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out activities under this section $30,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

SEC. 211. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.

(a) SAND, GRAVEL, AND SHELL.—Section 8(k)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(k)(2)(B)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: "or any other non-Federal interest subject to an agreement entered into under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b)".

(b) REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOCAL INTERESTS.—Any amounts paid by non-Federal interests for beach erosion control, hurricane protection, shore protection, or storm damage reduction projects as a result of an assessment under section 8(k) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(k)) shall be fully reimbursed.

SEC. 212. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

Section 312(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1272(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(6) Snake Creek, Bixby, Oklahoma.

"(7) Willamette River, Oregon.".

SEC. 213. BENEFIT OF PRIMARY FLOOD DAMAGES AVOIDED INCLUDED IN BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS.

Section 308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2318) is amended—

(1) in the heading of subsection (a), by striking "BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS" and inserting "ELEMENTS EXCLUDED FROM COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS";

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) ELEMENTS INCLUDED IN COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—The Secretary shall include primary flood damages avoided in the benefit base for justifying Federal nonstructural flood damage reduction projects."; and

(4) in the first sentence of subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking "(b)" and inserting "(d)".

SEC. 214. CONTROL OF AQUATIC PLANT GROWTH.

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

(1) by inserting "Arundo dona," after "waterhyacinth,"; and

(2) by inserting "tarmarix" after "melaleuca".

SEC. 215. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 219(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(19) LAKE TAHOE, CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA.—Regional water system for Lake Tahoe, California and Nevada.

"(20) LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.—Fox Field Industrial Corridor water facilities, Lancaster, California.

"(21) SAN RAMON, CALIFORNIA.—San Ramon Valley recycled water project, San Ramon, California.".

SEC. 216. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, RESTORATION, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3756) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (10) and inserting the following:

"(10) Regional Atlanta Watershed, Atlanta, Georgia, and Lake Lanier of Forsyth and Hall Counties, Georgia."; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(14) Clear Lake watershed, California.

"(15) Fresno Slough watershed, California.

"(16) Hayward Marsh, Southern San Francisco Bay watershed, California.

"(17) Kaweah River watershed, California.

"(18) Lake Tahoe watershed, California and Nevada.

"(19) Malibu Creek watershed, California.

"(20) Truckee River basin, Nevada.

"(21) Walker River basin, Nevada.

"(22) Bronx River watershed, New York.

"(23) Catawba River watershed, North Carolina.";

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

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

"(e) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project undertaken under this section, with the consent of the affected local government, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity.".

SEC. 217. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (15), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(17) Clear Lake, Lake County, California, removal of silt and aquatic growth and development of a sustainable weed and algae management program;

"(18) Flints Pond, Hollis, New Hampshire, removal of excessive aquatic vegetation; and

"(19) Osgood Pond, Milford, New Hampshire, removal of excessive aquatic vegetation.".

SEC. 218. SEDIMENTS DECONTAMINATION POLICY.

Section 405 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2239 note; Public Law 102–580) is amended—

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

"(4) PRACTICAL END-USE PRODUCTS.—Technologies selected for demonstration at the pilot scale shall result in practical end-use products.

"(5) ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall assist the project to ensure expeditious completion by providing sufficient quantities of contaminated dredged material to conduct the full-scale demonstrations to stated capacity."; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section a total of $22,000,000 to complete technology testing, technology commercialization, and the development of full scale processing facilities within the New York/New Jersey Harbor.".

SEC. 219. DISPOSAL OF DREDGED MATERIAL ON BEACHES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 145 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 426j) is amended in the first sentence by striking "50" and inserting "35".

(b) GREAT LAKES BASIN.—The Secretary shall work with the State of Ohio, other Great Lakes States, and political subdivisions of the States to fully implement and maximize beneficial reuse of dredged material as provided under section 145 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 426j).

SEC. 220. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.

Section 906(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(e)) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "Not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share of such first costs may be in kind, including a facility, supply, or service that is necessary to carry out the enhancement project.".

SEC. 221. REIMBURSEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.

Section 211(e)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b–13(e)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "subject to amounts being made available in advance in appropriations Acts" and inserting "subject to the availability of appropriations".

SEC. 222. NATIONAL CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT TASK FORCE.

(a) DEFINITION OF TASK FORCE.—In this section, the term "Task Force" means the National Contaminated Sediment Task Force established by section 502 of the National Contaminated Sediment Assessment and Management Act (33 U.S.C. 1271 note; Public Law 102–580).

(b) CONVENING.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall convene the Task Force not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORTING ON REMEDIAL ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Task Force shall submit to Congress a report on the status of remedial actions at aquatic sites in the areas described in paragraph (2).

(2) AREAS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall address remedial actions in—

(A) areas of probable concern identified in the survey of data regarding aquatic sediment

quality required by section 503(a) of the National Contaminated Sediment Assessment and Management Act (33 U.S.C. 1271);

(B) areas of concern within the Great Lakes, as identified under section 118(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(f));

(C) estuaries of national significance identified under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330);

(D) areas for which remedial action has been authorized under any of the Water Resources Development Acts; and

(E) as appropriate, any other areas where sediment contamination is identified by the Task Force.

(3) ACTIVITIES.—Remedial actions subject to reporting under this subsection include remedial actions under—

(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) or other Federal or State law containing environmental remediation authority;

(B) any of the Water Resources Development Acts;

(C) section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344); or

(D) section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151, chapter 425).

(4) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall provide, with respect to each remedial action described in the report, a description of—

(A) the authorities and sources of funding for conducting the remedial action;

(B) the nature and sources of the sediment contamination, including volume and concentration, where appropriate;

(C) the testing conducted to determine the nature and extent of sediment contamination and to determine whether the remedial action is necessary;

(D) the action levels or other factors used to determine that the remedial action is necessary;

(E) the nature of the remedial action planned or undertaken, including the levels of protection of public health and the environment to be achieved by the remedial action;

(F) the ultimate disposition of any material dredged as part of the remedial action;

(G) the status of projects and the obstacles or barriers to prompt conduct of the remedial action; and

(H) contacts and sources of further information concerning the remedial action.

SEC. 223. GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM.

(a) STRATEGIC PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall report to Congress on a plan for programs of the Corps of Engineers in the Great Lakes basin.

(2) CONTENTS.—The plan shall include details of the projected environmental and navigational projects in the Great Lakes basin, including—

(A) navigational maintenance and operations for commercial and recreational vessels;

(B) environmental restoration activities;

(C) water level maintenance activities;

(D) technical and planning assistance to States and remedial action planning committees;

(E) sediment transport analysis, sediment management planning, and activities to support prevention of excess sediment loadings;

(F) flood damage reduction and shoreline erosion prevention;

(G) all other activities of the Corps of Engineers; and

(H) an analysis of factors limiting use of programs and authorities of the Corps of Engineers in existence on the date of enactment of this Act in the Great Lakes basin, including the need for new or modified authorities.

(b) GREAT LAKES BIOHYDROLOGICAL INFORMATION.—

(1) INVENTORY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall request each Federal agency that may possess information relevant to the Great Lakes biohydrological system to provide an inventory of all such information in the possession of the agency.

(B) RELEVANT INFORMATION.—For the purpose of subparagraph (A), relevant information includes information on—

(i) ground and surface water hydrology;

(ii) natural and altered tributary dynamics;

(iii) biological aspects of the system influenced by and influencing water quantity and water movement;

(iv) meteorological projections and weather impacts on Great Lakes water levels; and

(v) other Great Lakes biohydrological system data relevant to sustainable water use management.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the States, Indian tribes, and Federal agencies, and after requesting information from the provinces and the federal government of Canada, shall—

(i) compile the inventories of information;

(ii) analyze the information for consistency and gaps; and

(iii) submit to Congress, the International Joint Commission, and the Great Lakes States a report that includes recommendations on ways to improve the information base on the biohydrological dynamics of the Great Lakes ecosystem as a whole, so as to support environmentally sound decisions regarding diversions and consumptive uses of Great Lakes water.

(B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The recommendations in the report under subparagraph (A) shall include recommendations relating to the resources and funds necessary for implementing improvement of the information base.

(C) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the report under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation, and other relevant agencies as appropriate, shall consider and report on the status of the issues described and recommendations made in—

(i) the Report of the International Joint Commission to the Governments of the United States and Canada under the 1977 reference issued in 1985; and

(ii) the 1993 Report of the International Joint Commission to the Governments of Canada and the United States on Methods of Alleviating Adverse Consequences of Fluctuating Water Levels in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Basin.

(c) GREAT LAKES RECREATIONAL BOATING.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, using information and studies in existence on the date of enactment of this Act to the maximum extent practicable, and in cooperation with the Great Lakes States, submit to Congress a report detailing the economic benefits of recreational boating in the Great Lakes basin, particularly at harbors benefiting from operation and maintenance projects of the Corps of Engineers.

(d) COOPERATION.—In undertaking activities under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) encourage public participation; and

(2) cooperate, and, as appropriate, collaborate, with Great Lakes States, tribal governments, and Canadian federal, provincial, tribal governments.

(e) WATER USE ACTIVITIES AND POLICIES.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the Great Lakes States to develop interstate guidelines to improve the con-

sistency and efficiency of State-level water use activities and policies in the Great Lakes basin.

(f) COST SHARING.—The Secretary may seek and accept funds from non-Federal entities to be used to pay up to 25 percent of the cost of carrying out subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e).

SEC. 224. PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

Section 1135(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) CONTROL OF SEA LAMPREY.—Congress finds that—

"(A) the Great Lakes navigation system has been instrumental in the spread of sea lamprey and the associated impacts to its fishery; and

"(B) the use of the authority under this subsection for control of sea lamprey at any Great Lakes basin location is appropriate.".

SEC. 225. WATER QUALITY, ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE, FLOOD CONTROL, AND NAVIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may investigate, study, evaluate, and report on—

(1) water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation in the western Lake Erie watershed, including the watersheds of the Maumee River, Ottawa River, and Portage River in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan; and

(2) measures to improve water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation in the western Lake Erie basin.

(b) COOPERATION.—In carrying out studies and investigations under subsection (a), the Secretary shall cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations to ensure full consideration of all views and requirements of all interrelated programs that those agencies may develop independently or in coordination with the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 226. IRRIGATION DIVERSION PROTECTION AND FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary may provide technical planning and design assistance to non-Federal interests and may conduct

other site-specific studies to formulate and evaluate fish screens, fish passages devices, and other measures to decrease the incidence of juvenile and adult fish inadvertently entering into irrigation systems. Measures shall be developed in cooperation with Federal and State resource agencies and not impair the continued withdrawal of water for irrigation purposes. In providing such assistance priority shall be given based on the objectives of the Endangered Species Act, cost-effectiveness, and the potential for reducing fish mortality. Non-Federal interests shall agree by contract to contribute 50 percent of the cost of such assistance. Not more than one-half of such non-Federal contribution may be made by the provision of services, materials, supplies, or other in-kind services. No construction activities are authorized by this section. Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall report to Congress on fish mortality caused by irrigation water intake devices, appropriate measures to reduce mortality, the extent to which such measures are currently being employed in the arid States, the construction costs associated with such measures, and the appropriate Federal role, if any, to encourage the use of such measures.

SEC. 227. SMALL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.

Section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended by striking "$2,000,000" and inserting "$3,000,000".

SEC. 228. SHORE DAMAGE PREVENTION OR MITIGATION.

Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (33 U.S.C. 426(i)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary";

(2) in the second sentence, by striking "The costs" and inserting the following:

"(b) COST SHARING.—The costs";

(3) in the third sentence—

(A) by striking "No such" and inserting the following:

"(c) REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION.—No such"; and

(B) by striking "$2,000,000" and inserting "$5,000,000"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall—

"(1) coordinate the implementation of the measures under this section with other Federal and non-Federal shore protection projects in the same geographic area; and

"(2) to the extent practicable, combine mitigation projects with other shore protection projects in the same area into a comprehensive regional project.".

SEC. 229. ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK.

Section 404(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4863) is amended by striking "$1,400,000 for each of fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997" and inserting "$2,500,000".

SEC. 230. ACCELERATED ADOPTION OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS.

Section 8 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2314) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

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

"(b) ACCELERATED ADOPTION OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR MANAGEMENT OF CONTAMINATED SEDIMENTS.—

"(1) TEST PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall approve an appropriate number of projects to test, under actual field conditions, innovative technologies for environmentally sound management of contaminated sediments.

"(2) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary may approve an appropriate number of projects to demonstrate innovative technologies that have been pilot tested under paragraph (1).

"(3) CONDUCT OF PROJECTS.—Each pilot project under paragraph (1) and demonstration project under paragraph (2) shall be conducted by a university with proven expertise in the research and development of contaminated sediment treatment technologies and innovative applications using waste materials.".

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. DREDGING OF SALT PONDS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND.

The Secretary may acquire for the State of Rhode Island a dredge and associated equipment with the capacity to dredge approximately 100 cubic yards per hour for use by the State in dredging salt ponds in the State.

SEC. 302. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK.

Section 567(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3787) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The Chemung River watershed, New York, at an estimated Federal cost of $5,000,000.".

SEC. 303. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

Section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (22) as paragraphs (16) through (23), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

"(15) REPAUPO CREEK AND DELAWARE RIVER, GLOUCESTER COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for tidegate and levee improvements for Repaupo Creek and the Delaware River, Gloucester County, New Jersey."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(24) IRONDEQUOIT CREEK, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Irondequoit Creek watershed, New York.

"(25) TIOGA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood control, Tioga River and Cowanesque River and their tributaries, Tioga County, Pennsylvania.".

SEC. 304. SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

Section 104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3669) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (12) as paragraphs (11) through (14), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

"(9) FORTESCUE INLET, DELAWARE BAY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for navigation for Fortescue Inlet, Delaware Bay, New Jersey.

"(10) BRADDOCK BAY, GREECE, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Braddock Bay, Greece, New York.".

SEC. 305. STREAMBANK PROTECTION PROJECTS.

(a) ARCTIC OCEAN, BARROW, ALASKA.—The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), carry out storm damage reduction and coastal erosion measures at the town of Barrow, Alaska.

(b) SAGINAW RIVER, BAY CITY, MICHIGAN.—The Secretary may construct appropriate control structures in areas along the Saginaw River in the city of Bay City, Michigan, under authority of section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 Stat. 701r).

(c) YELLOWSTONE RIVER, BILLINGS, MONTANA.—The streambank protection project at Coulson Park, along the Yellowstone River, Billings, Montana, shall be eligible for

assistance under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r).

(d) MONONGAHELA RIVER, POINT MARION, PENNSYLVANIA.—The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r), carry out streambank erosion control measures along the Monongahela River at the borough of Point Marion, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 306. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, SPRINGFIELD, OREGON.

Under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), the Secretary shall conduct measures to address water quality, water flows, and fish habitat restoration in the historic Springfield, Oregon, millrace through the reconfiguration of the existing millpond, if the Secretary determines that harmful impacts have occurred as the result of a previously constructed flood control project by the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 307. GUILFORD AND NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.

The Secretary shall expeditiously complete the activities authorized under section 346 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4858), including activities associated with Sluice Creek in Guilford, Connecticut, and Lighthouse Point Park in New Haven, Connecticut.

SEC. 308. FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The project for flood control, Eight Mile Creek, Paragould, Arkansas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4112) and known as "Eight Mile Creek, Paragould, Arkansas", shall be known and designated as the "Francis Bland Floodway Ditch".

(b) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the project and creek referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Francis Bland Floodway Ditch.

SEC. 309. CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.

Section 528(e)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3770) is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", including potential land acquisition in the Caloosahatchee River basin or other areas".

SEC. 310. CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND, FLOOD PROJECT MITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and other purposes, Cumberland, Maryland, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1936") (49 Stat. 1574, chapter 688), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake, as a separate part of the project, restoration of the historic

Chesapeake and Ohio Canal substantially in accordance with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park, Cumberland, Maryland, Rewatering Design Analysis, dated February 1998, at a total cost of $15,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,750,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,250,000.

(b) IN-KIND SERVICES.—The non-Federal interest for the restoration project under subsection (a)—

(1) may provide all or a portion of the non-Federal share of project costs in the form of in-kind services; and

(2) shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of project costs for design and construction work performed by the non-Federal interest before execution of a project cooperation agreement and for land, easements, and rights-of-way required for the restoration and acquired by the non-Federal interest before execution of such an agreement.

(c) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The operation and maintenance of the restoration project under subsection (a) shall be the full responsibility of the National Park Service.

SEC. 311. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA.

Section 5(b)(3)(C)(i) of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426h), is amended by inserting before the semicolon

the following: ", including the city of Miami Beach, Florida".

SEC. 312. SARDIS RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept from the State of Oklahoma or an agent of the State an amount, as determined under subsection (b), as prepayment of 100 percent of the water supply cost obligation of the State under Contract No. DACW56–74–JC–0314 for water supply storage at Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.

(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—The amount to be paid by the State of Oklahoma under subsection (a) shall be subject to adjustment in accordance with accepted discount purchase methods for Government properties as determined by an independent accounting firm designated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(c) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section shall otherwise affect any of the rights or obligations of the parties to the contract referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 313. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ILLINOIS WATERWAY SYSTEM NAVIGATION MODERNIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) exports are necessary to ensure job creation and an improved standard of living for the people of the United States;

(2) the ability of producers of goods in the United States to compete in the international marketplace depends on a modern and efficient transportation network;

(3) a modern and efficient waterway system is a transportation option necessary to provide United States shippers a safe, reliable, and competitive means to win foreign markets in an increasingly competitive international marketplace;

(4) the need to modernize is heightened because the United States is at risk of losing its competitive edge as a result of the priority that foreign competitors are placing on modernizing their own waterway systems;

(5) growing export demand projected over the coming decades will force greater demands on the waterway system of the United States and increase the cost to the economy if the system proves inadequate to satisfy growing export opportunities;

(6) the locks and dams on the upper Mississippi River and Illinois River waterway system were built in the 1930s and have some of the highest average delays to commercial tows in the country;

(7) inland barges carry freight at the lowest unit cost while offering an alternative to truck and rail

transportation that is environmentally sound, is energy efficient, is safe, causes little congestion, produces little air or noise pollution, and has minimal social impact; and

(8) it should be the policy of the Corps of Engineers to pursue aggressively modernization of the waterway system authorized by Congress to promote the relative competitive position of the United States in the international marketplace.

(b) PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.—In accordance with the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study, the Secretary shall proceed immediately to prepare engineering design, plans, and specifications for extension of locks 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 on the Mississippi River and the LaGrange and Peoria Locks on the Illinois River, to provide lock chambers 110 feet in width and 1,200 feet in length, so that construction can proceed immediately upon completion of studies and authorization of projects by Congress.

SEC. 314. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MANAGEMENT.

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

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "(e)" and all that follows through the end of paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(e) UNDERTAKINGS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, is authorized to undertake—

"(i) a program for the planning, construction, and evaluation of measures for fish and wildlife habitat rehabilitation and enhancement; and

"(ii) implementation of a program of long-term resource monitoring, computerized data inventory and analysis, and applied research.

"(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECTS.—Each project carried out under subparagraph (A)(i) shall—

"(i) to the maximum extent practicable, simulate natural river processes;

"(ii) include an outreach and education component; and

"(iii) on completion of the assessment under subparagraph (D), address identified habitat and natural resource needs.

"(C) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall create an independent technical advisory committee to review projects, monitoring plans, and habitat and natural resource needs assessments.

"(D) HABITAT AND NATURAL RESOURCE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

"(i) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to undertake a systemic, river reach, and pool scale assessment of habitat and natural resource needs to serve as a blueprint to guide habitat rehabilitation and long-term resource monitoring.

"(ii) DATA.—The habitat and natural resource needs assessment shall, to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence at the time of the assessment.

"(iii) TIMING.—The Secretary shall complete a habitat and natural resource needs assessment not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph.

"(2) REPORTS.—On December 31, 2005, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that—

"(A) contains an evaluation of the programs described in paragraph (1);

"(B) describes the accomplishments of each program;

"(C) includes results of a habitat and natural resource needs assessment; and

"(D) identifies any needed adjustments in the authorization under paragraph (1) or the authorized appropriations under paragraphs (3), (4), and (5).";

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "paragraph (1)(A)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(i)"; and

(ii) by striking "Secretary not to exceed" and all that follows and inserting "Secretary not to exceed $22,750,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.";

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking "paragraph (1)(B)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(ii)"; and

(ii) by striking "$7,680,000" and all that follows and inserting "$10,420,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.";

(D) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

"(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out paragraph (1)(C) not to exceed $350,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2009.

"(6) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, may transfer appropriated amounts between the programs under clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) and paragraph (1)(C).

"(B) APPORTIONMENT OF COSTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(D), the Secretary may apportion the costs equally between the programs authorized by paragraph (1)(A)."; and

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting "(i)" after "paragraph (1)(A)"; and

(II) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and, in the case of any project requiring non-Federal cost sharing, the non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "paragraphs (1)(B) and (1)(C) of this subsection" and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(ii)";

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "(A)"; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(k) St. Louis Area Urban Wildlife Habitat.—The Secretary shall investigate and, if appropriate, carry out restoration of urban wildlife habitat, with a special emphasis on the establishment of greenways in the St. Louis, Missouri, area and surrounding communities.".

SEC. 315. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVERS SALMON SURVIVAL.

Section 511 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3301 note; Public Law 104–303) is amended by striking subsection (a) and all that follows and inserting the following:

"(a) SALMON SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary shall accelerate ongoing research and development activities, and may carry out or participate in additional research and development activities, for the purpose of developing innovative methods and technologies for improving the survival of salmon, especially salmon in the Columbia/Snake River Basin.

"(2) ACCELERATED ACTIVITIES.—Accelerated research and development activities referred to in paragraph (1) may include research and development related to—

"(A) impacts from water resources projects and other impacts on salmon life cycles;

"(B) juvenile and adult salmon passage;

"(C) light and sound guidance systems;

"(D) surface-oriented collector systems;

"(E) transportation mechanisms; and

"(F) dissolved gas monitoring and abatement.

"(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Additional research and development activities referred to in paragraph (1) may include research and development related to—

"(A) studies of juvenile salmon survival in spawning and rearing areas;

"(B) estuary and near-ocean juvenile and adult salmon survival;

"(C) impacts on salmon life cycles from sources other than water resources projects;

"(D) cryopreservation of fish gametes and formation of a germ plasm repository for threatened and endangered populations of native fish; and

"(E) other innovative technologies and actions intended to improve fish survival, including the survival of resident fish.

"(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate any activities carried out under this subsection with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, affected Indian tribes, and the Northwest Power Planning Council.

"(5) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the research and development activities carried out under this subsection, including any recommendations of the Secretary concerning the research and development activities.

"(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 to carry out research and development activities under paragraph (3).

"(b) ADVANCED TURBINE DEVELOPMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary shall accelerate efforts toward developing and installing in Corps of Engineers-operated dams innovative, efficient, and environmentally safe hydropower turbines, including design of fish-friendly turbines, for use on the Columbia/Snake River hydrosystem.

"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $35,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

"(c) MANAGEMENT OF PREDATION ON COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SYSTEM NATIVE FISHES.—

"(1) NESTING AVIAN PREDATORS.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Commerce and the Sec-

retary of the Interior, and consistent with a management plan to be developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary shall carry out methods to reduce nesting populations of avian predators on dredge spoil islands in the Columbia River under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

"(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 to carry out research and development activities under this subsection.

"(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—Nothing in this section affects the authority of the Secretary to implement the results of the research and development carried out under this section or any other law.".

SEC. 316. NINE MILE RUN HABITAT RESTORATION, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary may credit against the non-Federal share such costs as are incurred by the non-Federal interests in preparing environmental and other preconstruction documentation for the habitat restoration project, Nine Mile Run, Pennsylvania, if the Secretary determines that the documentation is integral to the project.

SEC. 317. LARKSPUR FERRY CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall work with the Secretary of Transportation on a proposed solution to carry out the project

to maintain the Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California, authorized by section 601(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148).

SEC. 318. COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD IMPACT-RESPONSE MODELING SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may study and implement a Comprehensive Flood Impact-Response Modeling System for the Coralville Reservoir and the Iowa River watershed, Iowa.

(b) STUDY.—The study shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the combined hydrologic, geomorphic, environmental, economic, social, and recreational impacts of operating strategies within the watershed;

(2) creation of an integrated, dynamic flood impact model; and

(3) the development of a rapid response system to be used during flood and emergency situations.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit a report to Congress on the results of the study and modeling system and such recommendations as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated a total of $2,250,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 319. STUDY REGARDING INNOVATIVE FINANCING FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED PORTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and analysis of various alternatives for innovative financing of future construction, operation, and maintenance of projects in small and medium-sized ports.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days 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 Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the results of the study and any related legislative recommendations for consideration by Congress.

SEC. 320. CANDY LAKE PROJECT, OSAGE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The term "fair market value" means the amount for which a willing buyer would purchase and a willing seller would sell a parcel of land, as determined by a qualified, independent land appraiser.

(2) PREVIOUS OWNER OF LAND.—The term "previous owner of land" means a person (including a corporation) that conveyed, or a descendant of a deceased individual who conveyed, land to the Corps of Engineers for use in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army.

(b) LAND CONVEYANCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey, in accordance with this section, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land acquired by the United States for the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

(2) PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall give a previous owner of land first option to purchase the land described in paragraph (1).

(B) APPLICATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A previous owner of land that desires to purchase the land described in paragraph (1) that was owned by the previous owner of land, or by the individual from whom the previous owner of land is descended, shall file an application

to purchase the land with the Secretary not later than 180 days after the official date of notice to the previous owner of land under subsection (c).

(ii) FIRST TO FILE HAS FIRST OPTION.—If more than 1 application is filed for a parcel of land described in paragraph (1), first options to purchase the parcel of land shall be allotted in the order in which applications for the parcel of land were filed.

(C) IDENTIFICATION OF PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, identify each previous owner of land.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for land conveyed under this subsection shall be the fair market value of the land.

(3) DISPOSAL.—Any land described in paragraph (1) for which an application has not been filed under paragraph (2)(B) within the applicable time period shall be disposed of in accordance with law.

(4) EXTINGUISHMENT OF EASEMENTS.—All flowage easements acquired by the United States for use

in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma, are extinguished.

(c) NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify—

(A) each person identified as a previous owner of land under subsection (b)(2)(C), not later than 90 days after identification, by United States mail; and

(B) the general public, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, by publication in the Federal Register.

(2) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—Notice under this subsection shall include—

(A) a copy of this section;

(B) information sufficient to separately identify each parcel of land subject to this section; and

(C) specification of the fair market value of each parcel of land subject to this section.

(3) OFFICIAL DATE OF NOTICE.—The official date of notice under this subsection shall be the later of—

(A) the date on which actual notice is mailed; or

(B) the date of publication of the notice in the Federal Register.

SEC. 321. SALCHA RIVER AND PILEDRIVER SLOUGH, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), carry out flood damage reduction measures along the lower Salcha River and on Piledriver Slough, from its headwaters at the mouth of the Salcha River to the Chena Lakes Flood Control Project, in the vicinity of Fairbanks, Alaska, to protect against surface water flooding.

SEC. 322. EYAK RIVER, CORDOVA, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall evaluate and, if justified under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), carry out flood damage reduction measures along the Eyak River at the town of Cordova, Alaska.

SEC. 323. NORTH PADRE ISLAND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECT.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for ecosystem restoration and storm damage reduction at North Padre Island, Corpus Christi Bay, Texas, at a total estimated cost of $30,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $10,500,000, if the Secretary finds that the work is tech-

nically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. The Secretary shall make such a finding not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 324. KANOPOLIS LAKE, KANSAS.

(a) WATER SUPPLY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with the State of Kansas or another non-Federal interest, shall complete a water supply reallocation study at the project for flood control, Kanopolis Lake, Kansas, as a basis on which the Secretary shall enter into negotiations with the State of Kansas or another non-Federal interest for the terms and conditions of a reallocation of the water supply.

(2) OPTIONS.—The negotiations for storage reallocation shall include the following options for evaluation by all parties:

(A) Financial terms of storage reallocation.

(B) Protection of future Federal water releases from Kanopolis Dam, consistent with State water law, to ensure that the benefits expected from releases are provided.

(C) Potential establishment of a water assurance district consistent with other such districts established by the State of Kansas.

(D) Protection of existing project purposes at Kanopolis Dam to include flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

(b) IN-KIND CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may negotiate a credit for a portion of the financial repayment to the Federal Government for work performed by the State of Kansas, or another non-Federal interest, on land adjacent or in close proximity to the project, if the work provides a benefit to the project.

(2) WORK INCLUDED.—The work for which credit may be granted may include watershed protection and enhancement, including wetland construction and ecosystem restoration.

SEC. 325. NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.

Section 552(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3780) is amended by striking "for the project to be carried out with such assistance" and inserting ", or a public entity designated by the State director, to carry out the project with such assistance, subject to the project's meeting the certification requirement of subsection (c)(1)".

SEC. 326. CITY OF CHARLEVOIX REIMBURSEMENT, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary shall review and, if consistent with authorized project purposes, reimburse the city of Charlevoix, Michigan, for the Federal share of costs associated with construction of the new revetment connection to the Federal navigation project at Charlevoix Harbor, Michigan.

SEC. 327. HAMILTON DAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary may construct the Hamilton Dam flood control project, Michigan, under authority of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

SEC. 328. HOLES CREEK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, OHIO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the non-Federal share of project costs for the project for flood control, Holes Creek, Ohio, shall not exceed the sum of—

(1) the total amount projected as the non-Federal share as of September 30, 1996, in the Project Cooperation Agreement executed on that date; and

(2) 100 percent of the amount of any increases in the cost of the locally preferred plan over the cost estimated in the Project Cooperation Agreement.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest any amount paid by the non-Federal interest in excess of the non-Federal share.

SEC. 329. OVERFLOW MANAGEMENT FACILITY, RHODE ISLAND.

Section 585(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3791) is amended by striking "river" and inserting "sewer".

SEC. 330. ANACOSTIA RIVER AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND.

The Secretary may use the balance of funds appropriated for the improvement of the environment as part of the Anacostia River Flood Control and Navigation Project under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) to construct aquatic ecosystem restoration projects in the Anacostia River watershed under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330).

SEC. 331. EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

Subparagraphs (B) and (C)(i) of section 528(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3769) are amended by striking "1999" and inserting "2003".