

documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel MAGIC CARPET.

S. 1017. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel CRISSY.

S. 1040. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel ONRUST.

S. 1041. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel EXPLORER.

S. 1046. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for fourteen former United States Army hovercraft.

S. 1047. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade endorsements for the vessels ENCHANTED ISLES and ENCHANTED SEAS.

S. 1149. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel BABS, and for other purposes.

S. 1272. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel BILLY BUCK.

S. 1281. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel SARAH-CHRISTEN.

S. 1281. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel TRIAD.

S. 1319. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel TOO MUCH FUN, and for other purposes.

S. 1347. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel CAPTAIN DARYL, and for other purposes.

S. 1348. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel ALPHA TANGO, and for other purposes.

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for the vessel OLD HAT, and for other purposes.

S. 1358. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel CAROLYN, and for other purposes.

S. 1362. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel FOCUS.

S. 1383. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel WESTFJORD.

S. 1384. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel GOD'S GRACE II.

S. 1454. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certification of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries for the vessel JOAN MARIE, and for other purposes.

S. 1455. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel MOVIN ON, and for other purposes.

S. 1456. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel PLAY HARD, and for other purposes.

S. 1457. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel SHOGUN, and for other purposes.

S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel MOONRAKER, and for other purposes.

S. 1566. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel MARSH GRASS TOO.

S. 1588. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel KALYPSO.

S. 1631. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel EXTREME, and for other purposes.

S. 1648. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel HERCO TYME.

S. 1682. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel LIBERTY.

S. 1825. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel HALCYON.

S. 1826. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel COURIER SERVICE.

S. 1828. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel TOP GUN.

S. 1924. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for the vessel DAMN YANKEE.

S. 1933. To authorize a certificate of documentation for certain vessels, and for other purposes.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3592) to provide for 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, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3592

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 1996".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

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

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. Project authorizations.
Sec. 102. Small flood control projects.
Sec. 103. Small bank stabilization projects.
Sec. 104. Small navigation projects.
Sec. 105. Small shoreline protection projects.
Sec. 106. Small snagging and sediment removal project, Mississippi River, Little Falls, Minnesota.
Sec. 107. Small projects for improvement of the environment.
Sec. 108. Project to mitigate shore damage.

TITLE II—GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Cost sharing for dredged material disposal areas.
Sec. 202. Flood control policy.
Sec. 203. Feasibility study cost-sharing.
Sec. 204. Restoration of environmental quality.
Sec. 205. Environmental dredging.
Sec. 206. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 207. Beneficial uses of dredged material.
Sec. 208. Recreation policy and user fees.
Sec. 209. Recovery of costs.
Sec. 210. Cost sharing of environmental projects.
Sec. 211. Construction of flood control projects by non-Federal interests.
Sec. 212. Engineering and environmental innovations of national significance.
Sec. 213. Lease authority.
Sec. 214. Collaborative research and development.
Sec. 215. Dam safety program.
Sec. 216. Maintenance, rehabilitation, and modernization of facilities.
Sec. 217. Long-term sediment management strategies.
Sec. 218. Dredged material disposal facility partnerships.
Sec. 219. Obstruction removal requirement.
Sec. 220. Small project authorizations.
Sec. 221. Uneconomical cost-sharing requirements.
Sec. 222. Planning assistance to States.
Sec. 223. Corps of Engineers expenses.
Sec. 224. State and Federal agency review period.
Sec. 225. Limitation on reimbursement of non-Federal costs per project.
Sec. 226. Aquatic plant control.
Sec. 227. Sediments decontamination technology.
Sec. 228. Shore protection.
Sec. 229. Project deauthorizations.
Sec. 230. Support of Army Civil Works Program.
Sec. 231. Benefits to navigation.
Sec. 232. Loss of life prevention.
Sec. 233. Scenic and aesthetic considerations.
Sec. 234. Removal of study prohibitions.
Sec. 235. Sense of Congress; requirement regarding notice.
Sec. 236. Reservoir Management Technical Advisory Committee.
Sec. 237. Technical corrections.

TITLE III—PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

Sec. 301. Mobile Harbor, Alabama.
Sec. 302. Alamo Dam, Arizona.

- Sec. 303. Nogales Wash and Tributaries, Arizona.
- Sec. 304. Phoenix, Arizona.
- Sec. 305. San Francisco River at Clifton, Arizona.
- Sec. 306. Channel Islands Harbor, California.
- Sec. 307. Glenn-Colusa, California.
- Sec. 308. Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, San Pedro Bay, California.
- Sec. 309. Oakland Harbor, California.
- Sec. 310. Queensway Bay, California.
- Sec. 311. San Luis Rey, California.
- Sec. 312. Thames River, Connecticut.
- Sec. 313. Potomac River, Washington, District Of Columbia.
- Sec. 314. Canaveral Harbor, Florida.
- Sec. 315. Captiva Island, Florida.
- Sec. 316. Central and southern Florida, Canal 51.
- Sec. 317. Central and southern Florida, Canal 111 (C-111).
- Sec. 318. Jacksonville Harbor (Mill Cove), Florida.
- Sec. 319. Panama City Beaches, Florida.
- Sec. 320. Tybee Island, Georgia.
- Sec. 321. White River, Indiana.
- Sec. 322. Chicago, Illinois.
- Sec. 323. Chicago Lock and Thomas J. O'Brien Lock, Illinois.
- Sec. 324. Kaskaskia River, Illinois.
- Sec. 325. Locks and Dam 26, Alton, Illinois and Missouri.
- Sec. 326. North Branch of Chicago River, Illinois.
- Sec. 327. Illinois and Michigan Canal.
- Sec. 328. Halstead, Kansas.
- Sec. 329. Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Cumberland River, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.
- Sec. 330. Prestonburg, Kentucky.
- Sec. 331. Comite River, Louisiana.
- Sec. 332. Grand Isle and vicinity, Louisiana.
- Sec. 333. Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.
- Sec. 334. Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.
- Sec. 335. Mississippi River Outlets, Venice, Louisiana.
- Sec. 336. Red River Waterway, Louisiana.
- Sec. 337. Westwego to Harvey Canal, Louisiana.
- Sec. 338. Tolchester Channel, Maryland.
- Sec. 339. Saginaw River, Michigan.
- Sec. 340. Sault Sainte Marie, Chippewa County, Michigan.
- Sec. 341. Stillwater, Minnesota.
- Sec. 342. Cape Girardeau, Missouri.
- Sec. 343. New Madrid Harbor, Missouri.
- Sec. 344. St. John's Bayou—New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.
- Sec. 345. Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Park, New Jersey.
- Sec. 346. Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey.
- Sec. 347. Passaic River, New Jersey.
- Sec. 348. Ramapo River at Oakland, New Jersey and New York.
- Sec. 349. Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.
- Sec. 350. Arthur Kill, New York and New Jersey.
- Sec. 351. Jones Inlet, New York.
- Sec. 352. Kill Van Kull, New York and New Jersey.
- Sec. 353. Wilmington Harbor—Northeast Cape Fear River, North Carolina.
- Sec. 354. Garrison Dam, North Dakota.
- Sec. 355. Reno Beach-Howards Farm, Ohio.
- Sec. 356. Wister Lake, Oklahoma.
- Sec. 357. Bonneville Lock and Dam, Columbia River, Oregon and Washington.
- Sec. 358. Columbia River dredging, Oregon and Washington.
- Sec. 359. Grays Landing Lock and Dam, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 360. Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 361. Mussers Dam, Middle Creek, Snyder County, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 362. Saw Mill Run, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 363. Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 364. South Central Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 365. Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 366. San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico.
- Sec. 367. Narragansett, Rhode Island.
- Sec. 368. Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.
- Sec. 369. Dallas Floodway Extension, Dallas, Texas.
- Sec. 370. Upper Jordan River, Utah.
- Sec. 371. Haysi Lake, Virginia.
- Sec. 372. Rudee Inlet, Virginia Beach, Virginia.
- Sec. 373. Virginia Beach, Virginia.
- Sec. 374. East Waterway, Washington.
- Sec. 375. Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.
- Sec. 376. Moorefield, West Virginia.
- Sec. 377. Southern West Virginia.
- Sec. 378. West Virginia trail head facilities.
- Sec. 379. Kickapoo River, Wisconsin.
- Sec. 380. Teton County, Wyoming.
- TITLE IV—STUDIES
- Sec. 401. Corps capability study, Alaska.
- Sec. 402. McDowell Mountain, Arizona.
- Sec. 403. Nogales Wash and Tributaries, Arizona.
- Sec. 404. Garden Grove, California.
- Sec. 405. Mugu Lagoon, California.
- Sec. 406. Santa Ynez, California.
- Sec. 407. Southern California infrastructure.
- Sec. 408. Yolo Bypass, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California.
- Sec. 409. Chain of Rocks Canal, Illinois.
- Sec. 410. Quincy, Illinois.
- Sec. 411. Springfield, Illinois.
- Sec. 412. Beauty Creek Watershed, Valparaiso City, Porter County, Indiana.
- Sec. 413. Grand Calumet River, Hammond, Indiana.
- Sec. 414. Indiana Harbor Canal, East Chicago, Lake County, Indiana.
- Sec. 415. Koontz Lake, Indiana.
- Sec. 416. Little Calumet River, Indiana.
- Sec. 417. Tippecanoe River Watershed, Indiana.
- Sec. 418. Calcasieu Ship Channel, Hackberry, Louisiana.
- Sec. 419. Huron River, Michigan.
- Sec. 420. Saco River, New Hampshire.
- Sec. 421. Buffalo River Greenway, New York.
- Sec. 422. Port of Newburgh, New York.
- Sec. 423. Port of New York-New Jersey sediment study.
- Sec. 424. Port of New York-New Jersey navigation study.
- Sec. 425. Chagrin River, Ohio.
- Sec. 426. Cuyahoga River, Ohio.
- Sec. 427. Charleston, South Carolina, estuary.
- Sec. 428. Mustang Island, Corpus Christi, Texas.
- Sec. 429. Prince William County, Virginia.
- Sec. 430. Pacific region.
- Sec. 431. Financing of infrastructure needs of small and medium ports.
- TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
- Sec. 501. Project deauthorizations.
- Sec. 502. Project reauthorizations.
- Sec. 503. Continuation of authorization of certain projects.
- Sec. 504. Land conveyances.
- Sec. 505. Namings.
- Sec. 506. Watershed management, restoration, and development.
- Sec. 507. Lakes program.
- Sec. 508. Maintenance of navigation channels.
- Sec. 509. Great Lakes remedial action plans and sediment remediation.
- Sec. 510. Great Lakes dredged material testing and evaluation manual.
- Sec. 511. Great Lakes sediment reduction.
- Sec. 512. Great Lakes confined disposal facilities.
- Sec. 513. Chesapeake Bay restoration and protection program.
- Sec. 514. Extension of jurisdiction of Mississippi River Commission.
- Sec. 515. Alternative to annual passes.
- Sec. 516. Recreation partnership initiative.
- Sec. 517. Environmental infrastructure.
- Sec. 518. Corps capability to conserve fish and wildlife.
- Sec. 519. Periodic beach nourishment.
- Sec. 520. Control of aquatic plants.
- Sec. 521. Hopper dredges.
- Sec. 522. Design and construction assistance.
- Sec. 523. Field office headquarters facilities.
- Sec. 524. Corps of Engineers restructuring plan.
- Sec. 525. Lake Superior Center.
- Sec. 526. Jackson County, Alabama.
- Sec. 527. Earthquake Preparedness Center of Expertise Extension.
- Sec. 528. Quarantine facility.
- Sec. 529. Benton and Washington Counties, Arkansas.
- Sec. 530. Calaveras County, California.
- Sec. 531. Farmington Dam, California.
- Sec. 532. Prado Dam safety improvements, California.
- Sec. 533. Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.
- Sec. 534. Seven Oaks Dam, California.
- Sec. 535. Manatee County, Florida.
- Sec. 536. Tampa, Florida.
- Sec. 537. Watershed management plan for Deep River Basin, Indiana.
- Sec. 538. Southern and eastern Kentucky.
- Sec. 539. Louisiana coastal wetlands restoration projects.
- Sec. 540. Southeast Louisiana.
- Sec. 541. Restoration projects for Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.
- Sec. 542. Cumberland, Maryland.
- Sec. 543. Beneficial use of dredged material, Poplar Island, Maryland.
- Sec. 544. Erosion control measures, Smith Island, Maryland.
- Sec. 545. Duluth, Minnesota, alternative technology project.
- Sec. 546. Redwood River Basin, Minnesota.
- Sec. 547. Natchez Bluffs, Mississippi.
- Sec. 548. Sardis Lake, Mississippi.
- Sec. 549. Missouri River management.
- Sec. 550. St. Charles County, Missouri, flood protection.
- Sec. 551. Durham, New Hampshire.
- Sec. 552. Hackensack Meadowlands area, New Jersey.
- Sec. 553. Authorization of dredge material containment facility for Port of New York/New Jersey.
- Sec. 554. Hudson River habitat restoration, New York.
- Sec. 555. Queens County, New York.
- Sec. 556. New York Bight and Harbor study.
- Sec. 557. New York State Canal System.
- Sec. 558. New York City Watershed.
- Sec. 559. Ohio River Greenway.
- Sec. 560. Northeastern Ohio.
- Sec. 561. Grand Lake, Oklahoma.
- Sec. 562. Broad Top region of Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 563. Curwensville Lake, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 564. Hopper Dredge McFarland.
- Sec. 565. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 566. Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York.
- Sec. 567. Seven Points Visitors Center, Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 568. Southeastern Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 569. Wills Creek, Hyndman, Pennsylvania.
- Sec. 570. Blackstone River Valley, Rhode Island and Massachusetts.
- Sec. 571. East Ridge, Tennessee.
- Sec. 572. Murfreesboro, Tennessee.
- Sec. 573. Buffalo Bayou, Texas.
- Sec. 574. Harris County, Texas.
- Sec. 575. San Antonio River, Texas.
- Sec. 576. Neabsco Creek, Virginia.

- Sec. 577. Tangier Island, Virginia.
 Sec. 578. Pierce County, Washington.
 Sec. 579. Washington Aqueduct.
 Sec. 580. Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia, flood protection.
 Sec. 581. Huntington, West Virginia.
 Sec. 582. Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia.
 Sec. 583. West Virginia and Pennsylvania flood control.
 Sec. 584. Evaluation of beach material.
 Sec. 585. National Center for Nanofabrication and Molecular Self-Assembly.
 Sec. 586. Sense of Congress regarding St. Lawrence Seaway tolls.
 Sec. 587. Prado Dam, California.

TITLE VI—EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY UNDER HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

For purposes of 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.—Except as provided in this section, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:

(1) AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction, American and Sacramento Rivers, California: Supplemental Information Report for the American River Watershed Project, California, dated March 1996, at a total cost of \$57,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$42,975,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$14,325,000, consisting of the following:

(i) Approximately 24 miles of slurry wall in the existing levees along the lower American River.

(ii) Approximately 12 miles of levee modifications along the east bank of the Sacramento River downstream from the Natomas Cross Canal.

(iii) 3 telemeter streamflow gages upstream from the Folsom Reservoir.

(iv) Modifications to the existing flood warning system along the lower American River.

(B) CREDIT TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal sponsor shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for expenses that the sponsor has incurred for design and construction of any of the features authorized pursuant to this paragraph prior to the date on which Federal funds are appropriated for construction of the project. The amount of the credit shall be determined by the Secretary.

(C) OPERATION OF FOLSOM DAM.—The Secretary of the Interior shall continue to operate the Folsom Dam and Reservoir to the variable 400,000/670,000 acre-feet of flood control storage capacity as an interim measure and extend the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency until such date as a comprehensive flood control plan for the American River Watershed has been implemented.

(D) RESPONSIBILITY OF NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR.—The non-Federal sponsor shall be responsible for all operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs associated with the improvements undertaken pursuant to this paragraph, as well as for 25 percent of the costs for the variable flood control operation of the Folsom Dam

and Reservoir (including any incremental power and water purchase costs incurred by the Western Area Power Administration or the Bureau of Reclamation and any direction, capital, and operation and maintenance costs borne by either of such agencies). Notwithstanding any contract or other agreement, the remaining 75 percent of the costs for the variable flood control operation of the Folsom Dam and Reservoir shall be the responsibility of the United States and shall be nonreimbursable.

(2) SAN LORENZO RIVER, SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, San Lorenzo River, Santa Cruz, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of \$21,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$10,900,000.

(3) SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Santa Barbara Harbor, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 26, 1994, at a total cost of \$5,840,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,670,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,170,000.

(4) SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation and storm damage reduction, Santa Monica Breakwater, Santa Monica, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 7, 1996, at a total cost of \$6,440,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,220,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,220,000.

(5) MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA.—The project for storm damage reduction, Marin County shoreline, San Rafael, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated January 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$28,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$18,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$9,900,000.

(6) HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated October 30, 1995, at a total cost of \$15,180,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,180,000.

(7) ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND.—The project for environmental restoration, Anacostia River and Tributaries, District of Columbia and Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated November 15, 1994, at a total cost of \$17,144,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$12,858,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,286,000.

(8) ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, St. Johns County, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total Federal cost of \$15,881,000. Operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation shall be a non-Federal responsibility and the non-Federal interest must assume ownership of the bridge.

(9) LAKE MICHIGAN, ILLINOIS.—The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline erosion protection, Lake Michigan, Illinois, from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois-Indiana State line: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 14, 1994, at a total cost of \$204,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$110,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$94,000,000. The project shall include the breakwater near the South Water Filtration Plant described in the report as a separate element of the project, at a total cost of \$11,470,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$7,460,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,010,000. The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of any costs incurred by the non-Federal interest—

(A) in reconstructing the revetment structures protecting Solidarity Drive in Chicago,

Illinois, if such work is determined by the Secretary to be a component of the project; and

(B) in constructing the breakwater near the South Water Filtration Plant in Chicago, Illinois.

(10) KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 1, 1992, at a total cost of \$393,200,000. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(11) POND CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—The project for flood control, Pond Creek, Jefferson County, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$16,080,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,993,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,087,000.

(12) WOLF CREEK DAM AND LAKE CUMBERLAND, KENTUCKY.—The project for hydropower, Wolf Creek Dam and Lake Cumberland, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$53,763,000, with an estimated non-Federal cost of \$53,763,000. Funds derived by the Tennessee Valley Authority from its power program and funds derived from any private or public entity designated by the Southeastern Power Administration may be used to pay all or part of the costs of the project.

(13) PORT FOURCHON, LAFOURCHE PARISH, LOUISIANA.—A project for navigation, Belle Pass and Bayou Lafourche, Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 7, 1995, at a total cost of \$4,440,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,300,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,140,000.

(14) WEST BANK OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, NEW ORLEANS (EAST OF HARVEY CANAL), LOUISIANA.—The project for hurricane damage reduction, West Bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of New Orleans (East of Harvey Canal), Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 1, 1995, at a total cost of \$126,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$82,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$43,800,000.

(15) WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood control, Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 3, 1994, at a total cost of \$11,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$6,040,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,760,000.

(16) LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO.—The project for flood control, Las Cruces, New Mexico: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1996, at a total cost of \$8,278,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$5,494,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,784,000.

(17) LONG BEACH ISLAND, NEW YORK.—The project for storm damage reduction, Long Beach Island, New York: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 5, 1996, at a total cost of \$72,090,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$46,858,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$25,232,000.

(18) WILMINGTON HARBOR, CAPE FEAR RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor, Cape Fear and Northeast Cape Fear Rivers, North Carolina: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total cost of \$23,953,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$15,032,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,921,000.

(19) DUCK CREEK, CINCINNATI, OHIO.—The project for flood control, Duck Creek, Cincinnati, Ohio: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$15,947,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,960,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,987,000.

(20) WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, MCKENZIE SUBBASIN, OREGON.—The project for environmental restoration, Willamette River Temperature Control, McKenzie Subbasin, Oregon: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated February 1, 1996, at a total cost of \$38,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$38,000,000.

(21) RIO GRANDE DE ARECIBO, PUERTO RICO.—The project for flood control, Rio Grande de Arecibo, Puerto Rico: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 5, 1994, at a total cost of \$19,951,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,557,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$9,394,000.

(22) CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Charleston Harbor Deepening and Widening, South Carolina: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated July 18, 1996, at a total cost of \$116,639,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$72,798,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$43,841,000.

(23) BIG SIOUX RIVER AND SKUNK CREEK, SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA.—The project for flood control, Big Sioux River and Skunk Creek, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of \$34,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$25,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,700,000.

(24) WATERTOWN, SOUTH DAKOTA.—The project for flood control, Watertown and Vicinity, South Dakota: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated August 31, 1994, at a total cost of \$18,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$13,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,800,000.

(25) GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TEXAS.—The project for navigation and environmental preservation, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 28, 1996, at a total cost of \$18,283,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$18,283,000.

(26) HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TEXAS.—The project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 9, 1996, at a total initial construction cost of \$292,797,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$210,891,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$81,906,000. The project shall include deferred construction of additional environmental restoration features over the life of the project, at a total average annual cost of \$786,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$590,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$196,000. The construction of berthing areas and the removal of pipelines and other obstructions that are necessary for the project shall be accomplished at non-Federal expense. Non-Federal interests shall receive credit toward cash contributions required during construction and subsequent to construction for design and construction management work that is performed by non-Federal interests and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project.

(27) MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation, Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, West Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total cost of \$229,581,000. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. In conducting any real estate acquisition activities with respect to the project, the Secretary shall give priority consideration to those individuals who would be directly affected by any physical displacement due to project design and shall consider the financial circumstances of such individuals. The Secretary shall pro-

ceed with real estate acquisition in connection with the project expeditiously.

(b) PROJECTS WITH PENDING CHIEF'S REPORTS.—The following projects are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with a final report of the Chief of Engineers if such report is completed not later than December 31, 1996:

(1) CHIGNIK, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Chignik, Alaska, at a total cost of \$10,365,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,344,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,021,000.

(2) COOK INLET, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Cook Inlet, Alaska, at a total cost of \$5,342,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,006,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,336,000.

(3) ST. PAUL ISLAND HARBOR, ST. PAUL, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, St. Paul Harbor, St. Paul, Alaska, with an estimated total cost of \$18,981,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$12,188,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,793,000.

(4) NORCO BLUFFS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—A project for bluff stabilization, Norco Bluffs, Riverside County, California, with an estimated total cost of \$8,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$6,450,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,150,000.

(5) PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Port of Long Beach (Deepening), California, at a total cost of \$37,288,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$14,318,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$22,970,000.

(6) TERMINUS DAM, KAWEAH RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction and water supply, Terminus Dam, Kaweah River, California, at a total estimated cost of \$34,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$20,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$14,300,000.

(7) REHOBOTH BEACH AND DEWEY BEACH, DELAWARE.—A project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of \$9,423,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of \$6,125,000, and an estimated first non-Federal cost of \$3,298,000, and an average annual cost of \$282,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$183,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$99,000.

(8) BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for shoreline protection, Brevard County, Florida, at a total first cost of \$76,620,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of \$36,006,000, and an estimated first non-Federal cost of \$40,614,000, and an average annual cost of \$2,341,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$1,109,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$1,232,000.

(9) MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Miami Harbor Channel, Miami, Florida, with an estimated total cost of \$3,221,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$1,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,421,000.

(10) NORTH WORTH INLET, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation and shoreline protection, Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach Harbor, Florida, at a total cost of \$3,915,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$1,762,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,153,000.

(11) LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, SAVANNAH RIVER, GEORGIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation and related purposes, Lower Savannah River Basin, Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina, at a total cost of \$3,419,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,551,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$868,000.

(12) ABSECON ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Absecon Island, New Jersey, at a total cost of \$52,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$34,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$18,000,000.

(13) CAPE FEAR RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Cape Fear River deepening, North Carolina, at a total cost of \$210,264,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$130,159,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$80,105,000.

SEC. 102. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

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

(1) SOUTH UPLAND, SAN BERNADINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood control, South Upland, San Bernardino County, California.

(2) BIRDS, LAWRENCE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Birds, Lawrence County, Illinois.

(3) BRIDGEPORT, LAWRENCE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Bridgeport, Lawrence County, Illinois.

(4) EMBARRAS RIVER, VILLA GROVE, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Embarras River, Villa Grove, Illinois.

(5) FRANKFORT, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Frankfort, Will County, Illinois.

(6) SUMNER, LAWRENCE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Sumner, Lawrence County, Illinois.

(7) VERMILLION RIVER, DEMANADE PARK, LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA.—Project for non-structural flood control, Vermillion River, Demanade Park, Lafayette, Louisiana. In carrying out the study and the project (if any) under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use relevant information from the Lafayette Parish feasibility study and expedite completion of the study under this paragraph.

(8) VERMILLION RIVER, QUAIL HOLLOW SUBDIVISION, LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA.—Project for nonstructural flood control, Vermillion River, Quail Hollow Subdivision, Lafayette, Louisiana. In carrying out the study and the project (if any) under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use relevant information from the Lafayette Parish feasibility study and expedite completion of the study under this paragraph.

(9) KAWKAWLIN RIVER, BAY COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood control, Kawkawlin River, Bay County, Michigan.

(10) WHITNEY DRAIN, ARENAC COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood control, Whitney Drain, Arenac County, Michigan.

(11) FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MISSOURI.—Project for flood control, Festus and Crystal City, Missouri. In carrying out the study and the project (if any) under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use relevant information from the existing reconnaissance study and shall expedite completion of the study under this paragraph.

(12) KIMMSWICK, MISSOURI.—Project for flood control, Kimmswick, Missouri. In carrying out the study and the project (if any) under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use relevant information from the existing reconnaissance study and shall expedite completion of the study under this paragraph.

(13) RIVER DES PERES, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI.—Project for flood control, River Des Peres, St. Louis County, Missouri. In carrying out the study and the project (if any), the Secretary shall determine the feasibility of potential flood control measures, consider potential storm water runoff and related improvements, and cooperate with the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District.

(14) BUFFALO CREEK, ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Buffalo Creek, Erie County, New York.

(15) CAZENOVIA CREEK, ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Cazenovia Creek, Erie County, New York.

(16) CHEEKTOWAGA, ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Cheektowaga, Erie County, New York.

(17) FULMER CREEK, VILLAGE OF MOHAWK, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Fulmer Creek, Village of Mohawk, New York.

(18) MOYER CREEK, VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Moyer Creek, Village of Frankfort, New York.

(19) SAUQUOIT CREEK, WHITESBORO, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Sauquoit Creek, Whitesboro, New York.

(20) STEELE CREEK, VILLAGE OF ILION, NEW YORK.—Project for flood control, Steele Creek, Village of Iliion, New York.

(21) WILLAMETTE RIVER, OREGON.—Project for nonstructural flood control, Willamette River, Oregon, including floodplain and ecosystem restoration.

(22) GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.—Project for flood control, consisting of an early flood warning system, Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia.

(b) COST ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) LAKE ELSINORE, CALIFORNIA.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) for the project for flood control, Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California, shall be \$7,500,000.

(2) LOST CREEK, COLUMBUS, NEBRASKA.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted under such section 205 for the project for flood control, Lost Creek, Columbus, Nebraska, shall be \$5,500,000.

(3) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the projects referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) in order to take into account the change in the Federal participation in such projects pursuant to such paragraphs.

(4) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the project referred to in paragraph (1) under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

SEC. 103. SMALL BANK STABILIZATION PROJECTS.

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

(1) ST. JOSEPH RIVER, INDIANA.—Project for bank stabilization, St. Joseph River, South Bend, Indiana, including recreation and pedestrian access features.

(2) ALLEGHENY RIVER AT OIL CITY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for bank stabilization to address erosion problems affecting the pipeline crossing the Allegheny River at Oil City, Pennsylvania, including measures to address erosion affecting the pipeline in the bed of the Allegheny River and its adjacent banks.

(3) CUMBERLAND RIVER, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.—Project for bank stabilization, Cumberland River, Nashville, Tennessee.

(4) TENNESSEE RIVER, HAMILTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—Project for bank stabilization, Tennessee River, Hamilton County, Tennessee; except that the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted for the project shall be \$7,500,000.

SEC. 104. SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

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

(1) AKUTAN, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Akutan, Alaska, consisting of a bulkhead and a wave barrier, including application of innovative technology involving use of a permeable breakwater.

(2) GRAND MARAIS HARBOR BREAKWATER, MICHIGAN.—Project for navigation, Grand Marais Harbor breakwater, Michigan.

(3) DULUTH, MINNESOTA.—Project for navigation, Duluth, Minnesota.

(4) TACONITE, MINNESOTA.—Project for navigation, Taconite, Minnesota.

(5) TWO HARBORS, MINNESOTA.—Project for navigation, Two Harbors, Minnesota.

(6) CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, PEMISCOT COUNTY, MISSOURI.—Project for navigation, Caruthersville Harbor, Pemiscot County, Missouri, including enlargement of the existing harbor and bank stabilization measures.

(7) NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MISSOURI.—Project for navigation, New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, including enlargement of the existing harbor and bank stabilization measures.

(8) BROOKLYN, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Brooklyn, New York, including restoration of the pier and related navigation support structures, at the Sixty-Ninth Street Pier.

(9) BUFFALO INNER HARBOR, BUFFALO, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Buffalo Inner Harbor, Buffalo, New York.

(10) GLENN COVE CREEK, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Glenn Cove Creek, New York, including bulkheading.

(11) UNION SHIP CANAL, BUFFALO AND LACKAWANNA, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Union Ship Canal, Buffalo and Lackawanna, New York.

SEC. 105. SMALL SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS.

(a) PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects, and if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, shall carry out the project under section 3 of the Shoreline Protection Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g):

(1) FAULKNER'S ISLAND, CONNECTICUT.—Project for shoreline protection, Faulkner's Island, Connecticut; except that the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted for the project shall be \$4,500,000.

(2) FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.—Project for 1 mile of additional shoreline protection, Fort Pierce, Florida.

(3) ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NEW YORK.—Project for shoreline protection, Orchard Beach, Bronx, New York, New York; except that the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted for the project shall be \$5,200,000.

(4) SYLVAN BEACH BREAKWATER, VERONA, ONEIDA COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for shoreline protection, Sylvan Beach breakwater, Verona, Oneida County, New York.

(b) COST SHARING AGREEMENT.—In carrying out the project authorized by subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the property owner to determine the allocation of the project costs.

SEC. 106. SMALL SNAGGING AND SEDIMENT REMOVAL PROJECT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, LITTLE FALLS, MINNESOTA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for a project for clearing, snagging, and sediment removal, East Bank of the Mississippi River, Little Falls, Minnesota, including removal of sediment from culverts. The study shall include a determination of the adequacy of culverts to maintain flows through the channel. If the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary shall carry out the project under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a; 59 Stat. 23).

SEC. 107. SMALL PROJECTS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

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

(1) UPPER TRUCKEE RIVER, EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for environmental restoration, Upper Truckee River, El Dorado County, California, including measures for restoration of degraded wetlands and wildlife enhancement.

(2) SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for habitat restoration, San Lorenzo River, California.

(3) WHITTIER NARROWS DAM, CALIFORNIA.—Project for environmental restoration and remediation of contaminated water sources, Whittier Narrows Dam, California.

(4) UPPER JORDAN RIVER, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH.—Project for channel restoration and environmental improvement, Upper Jordan River, Salt Lake County, Utah.

SEC. 108. PROJECT TO MITIGATE SHORE DAMAGE.

The Secretary shall expedite the Assateague Island restoration feature of the Ocean City, Maryland, and vicinity study and, if the Secretary determines that the Federal navigation project has contributed to degradation of the shoreline, the Secretary shall carry out the project for shoreline restoration under section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 735); except that the maximum amount of Federal funds that may be allotted by the Secretary for the project shall be \$35,000,000. In carrying out the project, the Secretary shall coordinate with affected Federal and State agencies and shall enter into an agreement with the Federal property owner to determine the allocation of the project costs.

TITLE II—GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. COST SHARING FOR DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL AREAS.

(a) CONSTRUCTION.—Section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(a); 100 Stat. 4082-4083) is amended—

(1) by striking the last sentence of paragraph (2) and inserting the following: "The value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided under paragraph (3) and the costs of relocations borne by the non-Federal interests under paragraph (4) shall be credited toward the payment required under this paragraph.";

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting "and" after "rights-of-way,";

(B) by striking "and dredged material disposal areas"; and

(C) by inserting "including any lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations (other than utility relocations accomplished under paragraph (4)) that are necessary for dredged material disposal facilities" before the period at the end of such paragraph; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES FOR PROJECT CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'general navigation features' includes constructed land-based and aquatic dredged material disposal facilities that are necessary for the disposal of dredged material required for project construction and for which a contract for construction has not been awarded on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph.".

(b) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Section 101(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2211(b); 100 Stat. 4083) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1) IN GENERAL.—" before "The Federal";

(2) by indenting and moving paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking "pursuant to this Act" and inserting "by the Secretary pursuant to this Act or any other law approved after the date of the enactment of this Act"; and

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

"(2) DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES.—The Federal share of the cost of constructing land-based and aquatic dredged material disposal facilities that are necessary for the disposal of dredged material required for the operation and maintenance of a project and for which a contract for construction has not been awarded on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall be determined in accordance with subsection (a). The Federal share of operating and maintaining such facilities shall be determined in accordance with paragraph (1)."

(c) AGREEMENT.—Section 101(e)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2211(e)(1); 100 Stat. 4083) is amended by striking "and to provide dredged material disposal areas and perform" and inserting "including those necessary for dredged material disposal facilities, and to perform".

(d) CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING REQUIREMENTS AND EQUITABLE APPORTIONMENT.—Section 101 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2211; 100 Stat. 4082-4084) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) CONSIDERATION OF FUNDING REQUIREMENTS AND EQUITABLE APPORTIONMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that—

"(1) funding necessary for operation and maintenance dredging of commercial navigation harbors is provided before Federal funds are obligated for payment of the Federal share of costs associated with construction of dredged material disposal facilities in accordance with subsections (a) and (b);

"(2) funds expended for such construction are equitably apportioned in accordance with regional needs; and

"(3) the Secretary's participation in the construction of dredged material disposal facilities does not result in unfair competition with potential private sector providers of such facilities."

(e) ELIGIBLE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE DEFINED.—Section 214(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2241; 100 Stat. 4108) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting "Federal" after "means all";

(B) by inserting "(i)" after "including"; and

(C) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "; (ii) the construction of dredged material disposal facilities that are necessary for the operation and maintenance of any harbor or inland harbor; (iii) dredging and disposing of contaminated sediments which are in or which affect the maintenance of Federal navigation channels; (iv) mitigating for impacts resulting from Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities; and (v) operating and maintaining dredged material disposal facilities"; and

(2) in subparagraph (C) by striking "rights-of-way, or dredged material disposal areas," and inserting "or rights-of-way."

(f) AMENDMENT OF COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—If requested by the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall amend a project cooperation agreement executed on or before the date of the enactment of this Act to reflect the application of the amendments made by this section to any project for which a contract for construction has not been awarded on or before such date of enactment.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section (including the amendments made by

this section) shall increase, or result in the increase of, the non-Federal share of the costs of—

(1) any dredged material disposal facility authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act, including any facility authorized by section 123 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1823); or

(2) any dredged material disposal facility that is necessary for the construction or maintenance of a project authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. FLOOD CONTROL POLICY.

(a) FLOOD CONTROL COST SHARING.—

(1) INCREASED NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(a) and (b)) are each amended by striking "25 percent" each place it appears and inserting "35 percent".

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any project authorized after the date of the enactment of this Act and to any flood control project which is not specifically authorized by Congress for which a Detailed Project Report is approved after such date of enactment or, in the case of a project for which no Detailed Project Report is prepared, construction is initiated after such date of enactment.

(b) ABILITY TO PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(m) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) is amended to read as follows:

"(m) ABILITY TO PAY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any cost-sharing agreement under this section for flood control or agricultural water supply shall be subject to the ability of a non-Federal interest to pay.

"(2) CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES.—The ability of any non-Federal interest to pay shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria and procedures in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996; except that such criteria and procedures shall be revised within 6 months after the date of such enactment to reflect the requirements of paragraph (3).

"(3) REVISION OF PROCEDURES.—In revising procedures pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary—

"(A) shall consider—

"(i) per capita income data for the county or counties in which the project is to be located; and

"(ii) the per capita non-Federal cost of construction of the project for the county or counties in which the project is to be located;

"(B) shall not consider criteria (other than criteria described in subparagraph (A)) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996; and

"(C) may consider additional criteria relating to the non-Federal interest's financial ability to carry out its cost-sharing responsibilities, to the extent that the application of such criteria does not eliminate areas from eligibility for a reduction in the non-Federal share as determined under subparagraph (A).

"(4) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall reduce or eliminate the requirement that a non-Federal interest make a cash contribution for any project that is determined to be eligible for a reduction in the non-Federal share under procedures in effect under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)."

(2) APPLICABILITY.—

(A) GENERALLY.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any project, or separable element thereof, with respect to which the Secretary and the non-Federal interest have not

entered into a project cooperation agreement on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) AMENDMENT OF COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—If requested by the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall amend a project cooperation agreement executed on or before the date of the enactment of this Act to reflect the application of the amendment made by paragraph (1) to any project for which a contract for construction has not been awarded on or before such date of enactment.

(C) NON-FEDERAL OPTION.—If requested by the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall apply the criteria and procedures established pursuant to section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act for projects that are authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b-12; 100 Stat. 4133) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 402. FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.

"(a) COMPLIANCE WITH FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT AND INSURANCE PROGRAMS.—Before construction of any project for local flood protection or any project for hurricane or storm damage reduction and involving Federal assistance from the Secretary, the non-Federal interest shall agree to participate in and comply with applicable Federal flood plain management and flood insurance programs.

"(b) FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Within 1 year after the date of signing a project cooperation agreement for construction of a project to which subsection (a) applies, the non-Federal interest shall prepare a flood plain management plan designed to reduce the impacts of future flood events in the project area. Such plan shall be implemented by the non-Federal interest not later than 1 year after completion of construction of the project.

"(c) GUIDELINES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall develop guidelines for preparation of flood plain management plans by non-Federal interests under subsection (b). Such guidelines shall address potential measures, practices and policies to reduce loss of life, injuries, damages to property and facilities, public expenditures, and other adverse impacts associated with flooding and to preserve and enhance natural flood plain values.

"(2) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer any regulatory authority upon the Secretary.

"(d) TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical support to a non-Federal interest for a project to which subsection (a) applies for the development and implementation of plans prepared under subsection (b)."

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any project or separable element thereof with respect to which the Secretary and the non-Federal interest have not entered into a project cooperation agreement on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) NON-STRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL POLICY.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of policies, procedures, and techniques relating to the evaluation and development of flood control measures with a view toward identifying impediments that may exist to justifying non-structural flood control measures as alternatives to structural measures.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the findings on the review conducted under this subsection, together with any recommendations for modifying existing law to remove any impediments identified under such review.

(e) EMERGENCY RESPONSE.—Section 5(a)(1) of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(a)(1)), is amended by inserting before the first semicolon the following: “, or in implementation of nonstructural alternatives to the repair or restoration of such flood control work if requested by the non-Federal sponsor”.

(f) NONSTRUCTURAL ALTERNATIVES.—Section 73 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 701b-11; 88 Stat. 32) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) In the survey, planning, or design by any Federal agency of any project involving flood protection, such agency, with a view toward formulating the most economically, socially, and environmentally acceptable means of reducing or preventing flood damages, shall consider and address in adequate detail nonstructural alternatives, including measures that may be implemented by others, to prevent or reduce flood damages. Such alternatives may include watershed management, wetlands restoration, elevation or flood proofing of structures, floodplain regulation, relocation, and acquisition of floodplain lands for recreational, fish and wildlife, and other public purposes.”.

SEC. 203. FEASIBILITY STUDY COST-SHARING.

(a) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 105(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “during the period of such study”;

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “During the period of the study, the non-Federal share of the cost of the study shall be not more than 50 percent of the estimate of the cost of the study as contained in the feasibility cost-sharing agreement. The cost estimate may be amended only by mutual agreement of the Secretary and the non-Federal interests. The non-Federal share of any costs in excess of the cost estimate shall, except as otherwise mutually agreed by the Secretary and the non-Federal interests, be payable after the project has been authorized for construction and on the date on which the Secretary and non-Federal interests enter into an agreement pursuant to section 101(e) or 103(j). In the event the project which is the subject of the study is not authorized within the earlier of 5 years of the date of the final report of the Chief of Engineers concerning such study or 2 years of the date of termination of the study, the non-Federal share of any such excess costs shall be paid to the United States on the last day of such period.”; and

(3) in the second sentence, by striking “such non-Federal contribution” and inserting “the non-Federal share required under this paragraph”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding any feasibility cost-sharing agreement entered into by the Secretary and non-Federal interests. Upon request of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall amend any feasibility cost-sharing agreements in effect on the date of enactment of this Act so as to conform the agreements with the amendments.

(c) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or any amendment made by this section shall require the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal in-

terests for funds previously contributed for a study.

SEC. 204. RESTORATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.

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

(1) by striking “the operation of”;

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and to determine if the operation of such projects has contributed to the degradation of the quality of the environment”.

(b) PROGRAM OF PROJECTS.—Section 1135(b) of such Act is amended by striking the last 2 sentences of subsection (b).

(c) RESTORATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—Section 1135 of such Act is further amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

“(c) RESTORATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—If the Secretary determines that construction of a water resource project by the Secretary or operation of a water resources project constructed by the Secretary has contributed to the degradation of the quality of the environment, the Secretary may undertake measures for restoration of environmental quality and measures for enhancement of environmental quality that are associated with the restoration, either through modifications at the project site or at other locations that have been affected by the construction or operation of the project, if such measures do not conflict with the authorized project purposes.

“(d) NON-FEDERAL SHARE; LIMITATION ON MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of any modifications or measures carried out or undertaken pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall be 25 percent. Not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share may be in kind, including a facility, supply, or service that is necessary to carry out the modification. No more than \$5,000,000 in Federal funds may be expended on any single modification or measure carried out or undertaken pursuant to this section.”; and

(3) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking “program conducted under subsection (b)” and inserting “programs conducted under subsections (b) and (c)”.

(d) DEFINITION.—Section 1135 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) DEFINITION.—In this section the term ‘water resources project constructed by the Secretary’ includes a water resources project constructed or funded jointly by the Secretary and the head of any other Federal agency (including the Natural Resources Conservation Service).”.

SEC. 205. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

Section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639-4640) is amended—

(1) in each of subsections (a), (b), and (c) by inserting “and remediate” after “remove” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by inserting “and remediation” after “removal” each place it appears;

(3) in subsection (b)(2) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$30,000,000”; and

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall give priority to work in the following areas:

- “(1) Brooklyn Waterfront, New York.
- “(2) Buffalo Harbor and River, New York.
- “(3) Ashtabula River, Ohio.

“(4) Mahoning River, Ohio.

“(5) Lower Fox River, Wisconsin.”.

SEC. 206. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection projects when the Secretary determines that such projects will improve the quality of the environment and are in the public interest and that the environmental and economic benefits, both monetary and nonmonetary, of the project to be undertaken pursuant to this section justify the cost.

(b) COST SHARING.—Non-Federal interests shall provide 50 percent of the cost of construction of any project carried out under this section, including provision of all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and necessary relocations.

(c) AGREEMENTS.—Construction of a project under this section shall be initiated only after a non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary to pay the non-Federal share of the costs of construction required by this section and to pay 100 percent of any operation, maintenance, and replacement and rehabilitation costs with respect to the project in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

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

(e) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$25,000,000 annually to carry out this section.

SEC. 207. BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL.

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4826) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

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

“(e) SELECTION OF DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL METHOD.—In developing and carrying out a project for navigation involving the disposal of dredged material, the Secretary may select, with the consent of the non-Federal interest, a disposal method that is not the least-cost option if the Secretary determines that the incremental costs of such disposal method are minimal and that the benefits to the aquatic environment to be derived from such disposal method, including the creation of wetlands and control of shoreline erosion, justify its selection. The Federal share of such incremental costs shall be determined in accordance with subsection (c).”.

SEC. 208. RECREATION POLICY AND USER FEES.

(a) RECREATION POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide increased emphasis on and opportunities for recreation at water resources projects operated, maintained, or constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on specific measures taken to implement this subsection.

(b) RECREATION USER FEES.—Section 210(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. 460d-3(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) USE OF FEES COLLECTED AT FACILITY.—Subject to advance appropriations, the Secretary of the Army shall ensure that at least an amount equal to the total amount of fees collected at any project under this subsection in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1996, are expended in the succeeding fiscal year at such project for operation and maintenance of recreational facilities at such project.”.

SEC. 209. RECOVERY OF COSTS.

Amounts recovered under section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) for any response action taken by the Secretary in support of the Army Civil Works program and any other amounts recovered by the Secretary from a contractor, insurer, surety, or other person to reimburse the Army for any expenditure for environmental response activities in support of the Army civil works program shall be credited to the appropriate trust fund account from which the cost of such response action has been paid or will be charged.

SEC. 210. COST SHARING OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS.

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

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) subject to section 906 of this Act, environmental protection and restoration: 50 percent.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) apply only to projects authorized after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 211. CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Non-Federal interests are authorized to undertake flood control projects in the United States, subject to obtaining any permits required pursuant to Federal and State laws in advance of actual construction.

(b) STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES.—

(1) BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—A non-Federal interest may prepare, for review and approval by the Secretary, the necessary studies and design documents for any construction to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) BY SECRETARY.—Upon request of an appropriate non-Federal interest, the Secretary may undertake all necessary studies and design activities for any construction to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) and provide technical assistance in obtaining all necessary permits for such construction if the non-Federal interest contracts with the Secretary to furnish the United States funds for the studies and design activities during the period that the studies and design activities will be conducted.

(c) COMPLETION OF STUDIES AND DESIGN ACTIVITIES.—In the case of any study or design documents for a flood control project that were initiated before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to complete and transmit to the appropriate non-Federal interests the study or design documents or, upon the request of such non-Federal interests, to terminate the study or design activities and transmit the partially completed study or design documents to such non-Federal interests for completion. Studies and design documents subject to this subsection shall be completed without regard to the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any non-Federal interest which has received from the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) a favorable recommendation to carry out a flood control project or separable element thereof based on the results of completed studies and design documents for the project or element, may carry out the project or element if a final environmental impact statement has been filed for the project or element.

(2) PERMITS.—Any plan of improvement proposed to be implemented in accordance with this subsection shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements for obtaining the appropriate permits required under the Secretary's authority and such permits shall be granted subject to the non-Federal interest's acceptance of the terms and conditions of such permits if the Secretary determines that the applicable regulatory criteria and procedures have been satisfied.

(3) MONITORING.—The Secretary shall monitor any project for which a permit is granted under this subsection in order to ensure that such project is constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with the terms and conditions of such permit.

(e) REIMBURSEMENT.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to appropriation Acts, the Secretary is authorized to reimburse any non-Federal interest an amount equal to the estimate of the Federal share, without interest, of the cost of any authorized flood control project, or separable element thereof, constructed pursuant to this section—

(A) if, after authorization and before initiation of construction of the project or separable element, the Secretary approves the plans for construction of such project by the non-Federal interest; and

(B) if the Secretary finds, after a review of studies and design documents prepared pursuant to this section, that construction of the project or separable element is economically justified and environmentally acceptable.

(2) SPECIAL RULES.—

(A) REIMBURSEMENT.—For work (including work associated with studies, planning, design, and construction) carried out by a non-Federal interest with respect to a project described in subsection (f), the Secretary shall, subject to amounts being made available in advance in appropriations Acts, reimburse, without interest, the non-Federal interest an amount equal to the estimated Federal share of the cost of such work if such work is later recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary.

(B) CREDIT.—If the non-Federal interest for a project described in subsection (f) carries out work before completion of a reconnaissance study by the Secretary and if such work is determined by the Secretary to be compatible with the project later recommended by the Secretary, the Secretary shall credit the non-Federal interest for its share of the cost of the project for such work.

(3) MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN REVIEWING PLANS.—In reviewing plans under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider budgetary and programmatic priorities and other factors that the Secretary deems appropriate.

(4) MONITORING.—The Secretary shall regularly monitor and audit any project for flood control approved for construction under this section by a non-Federal interest in order to ensure that such construction is in compliance with the plans approved by the Secretary and that the costs are reasonable.

(5) LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENTS.—No reimbursement shall be made under this section unless and until the Secretary has certified that the work for which reimbursement is requested has been performed in accordance with applicable permits and approved plans.

(f) SPECIFIC PROJECTS.—For the purpose of demonstrating the potential advantages and effectiveness of non-Federal implementation of flood control projects, the Secretary shall enter into agreements pursuant to this section with non-Federal interests for development of the following flood control projects by such interests:

(1) BERRYESSA CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—The Berryessa Creek element of the project for flood control, Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California, authorized by section 101(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606); except that, subject to the approval of the Secretary as provided by this section, the non-Federal interest may design and construct an alternative to such element.

(2) LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, authorized by section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4611).

(3) STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California.

(4) UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, Upper Guadalupe River, California.

(5) BRAYS BAYOU, TEXAS.—Flood control components comprising the Brays Bayou element of the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 101(a)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610); except that, subject to the approval of the Secretary as provided by this section, the non-Federal interest may design and construct an alternative to the diversion component of such element.

(6) HUNTING BAYOU, TEXAS.—The Hunting Bayou element of the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, Texas, authorized by such section; except that, subject to the approval of the Secretary as provided by this section, the non-Federal interest may design and construct an alternative to such element.

(7) WHITE OAK BAYOU, TEXAS.—The project for flood control, White Oak Bayou watershed, Texas.

(g) TREATMENT OF FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION MEASURES.—For the purposes of this section, flood damage prevention measures at or in the vicinity of Morgan City and Berwick, Louisiana, shall be treated as an authorized element of the Atchafalaya Basin feature of the project for flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries.

SEC. 212. ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL INNOVATIONS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) SURVEYS, PLANS, AND STUDIES.—To encourage innovative and environmentally sound engineering solutions and innovative environmental solutions to problems of national significance, the Secretary may undertake surveys, plans, and studies and prepare reports which may lead to work under existing civil works authorities or to recommendations for authorizations.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$3,000,000 for each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1996.

(2) FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may accept and expend additional funds from other Federal agencies, States, or non-Federal entities for purposes of carrying out this section.

SEC. 213. LEASE AUTHORITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may lease space available in buildings for which funding for construction or purchase was provided from the revolving fund established by the 1st section of the Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1954 (33 U.S.C. 576; 67 Stat. 199) under such terms and conditions as are acceptable to the Secretary. The proceeds from such leases shall be credited to the revolving fund for the purposes set forth in such Act.

SEC. 214. COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FUNDING FROM OTHER FEDERAL SOURCES.—Section 7 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4022-4023) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “civil works” before “mission”; and

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

“(e) FUNDING FROM OTHER FEDERAL SOURCES.—The Secretary may accept and expend additional funds from other Federal programs, including other Department of Defense programs, to carry out the purposes of this section.”

(b) PRE-AGREEMENT TEMPORARY PROTECTION OF TECHNOLOGY.—Such section 7 is further amended—

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

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) PRE-AGREEMENT TEMPORARY PROTECTION OF TECHNOLOGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that information developed as a result of research and development activities conducted by the Corps of Engineers is likely to be subject to a cooperative research and development agreement within 2 years of its development and that such information would be a trade secret or commercial or financial information that would be privileged or confidential if the information had been obtained from a non-Federal party participating in a cooperative research and development agreement under section 12 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980, the Secretary may provide appropriate protection against the dissemination of such information, including exemption from subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, until the earlier of the date the Secretary enters into such an agreement with respect to such technology or the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date of such determination.

“(2) TREATMENT.—Any technology covered by this section which becomes the subject of a cooperative research and development agreement shall be accorded the protection provided under section 12(c)(7)(B) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 3710a(c)(7)(B)) as if such technology had been developed under a cooperative research and development agreement.”; and

(3) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking “(b)” and inserting “(c)”.

SEC. 215. DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “National Dam Safety Program Act of 1996”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Dams are an essential part of the national infrastructure. Dams fail from time to time with catastrophic results; thus, dam safety is a vital public concern.

(2) Dam failures have caused, and can cause in the future, enormous loss of life, injury, destruction of property, and economic and social disruption.

(3) Some dams are at or near the end of their structural, useful, or operational life. With respect to future dam failures, the loss, destruction, and disruption can be substantially reduced through the development and implementation of dam safety hazard reduction measures, including—

(A) improved design and construction standards and practices supported by a national dam performance resource bank;

(B) safe operations and maintenance procedures;

(C) early warning systems;

(D) coordinated emergency preparedness plans; and

(E) public awareness and involvement programs.

(4) Dam safety problems persist nationwide. The diversity in Federal and State dam safety programs calls for national leadership in a cooperative effort involving Federal and State governments and the private sector. An expertly staffed and adequately financed dam safety hazard reduction program, based on Federal, State, local, and private research, planning, decisionmaking, and contributions, would reduce the risk of such loss, destruction, and disruption from dam failure by an amount far greater than the cost of such program.

(5) There is a fundamental need for a national dam safety program and the need will continue. An effective national program in dam safety hazards reduction will require input from and review by Federal and non-Federal experts in dams design, construction, operation, and maintenance and in the practical application of dam failure hazards reduction measures. At the present time, there is no national dam safety program.

(6) The coordinating authority for national leadership is provided through the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (hereinafter in this section referred to as “FEMA”) dam safety program through Executive Order 12148 in coordination with appropriate Federal agencies and the States.

(7) While FEMA's dam safety program shall continue as a proper Federal undertaking and shall provide the foundation for a National Dam Safety Program, statutory authority to meet increasing needs and to discharge Federal responsibilities in national dam safety is needed.

(8) Statutory authority will strengthen FEMA's leadership role, will codify the national dam safety program, and will authorize the Director of FEMA (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Director”) to communicate directly with Congress on authorizations and appropriations and to build upon the hazard reduction aspects of national dam safety.

(c) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to reduce the risks to life and property from dam failure in the United States through the establishment and maintenance of an effective national dam safety program which will bring together the Federal and non-Federal communities' expertise and resources to achieve national dam safety hazard reduction. It is not the intent of this section to preempt any other Federal or State authorities nor is the intent of this section to mandate State participation in the grant assistance program to be established under this section.

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

(1) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term “Federal agency” means any Federal agency that designs, finances, constructs, owns, operates, maintains, or regulates the construction, operation, or maintenance of any dam.

(2) NON-FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term “non-Federal agency” means any State agency that has regulatory authority over the safety of non-Federal dams.

(3) FEDERAL GUIDELINES FOR DAM SAFETY.—The term “Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety” refers to a FEMA publication number 93, dated June 1979, which defines management practices for dam safety at all Federal agencies.

(4) PROGRAM.—The term “program” means the national dam safety program established under subsection (e).

(5) DAM.—The term “dam” means any artificial barrier with the ability to impound water, wastewater, or liquid-borne materials for the purpose of storage or control of water which is—

(A) 25 feet or more in height from (i) the natural bed of the stream or watercourse measured at the downstream toe of the barrier, or (ii) from the lowest elevation of the outside limit of the barrier if the barrier is not across a stream channel or watercourse, to the maximum water storage elevation; or

(B) has an impounding capacity for maximum storage elevation of 50 acre-feet or more.

Such term does not include any such barrier which is not greater than 6 feet in height regardless of storage capacity or which has a storage capacity at maximum water storage elevation not greater than 15 acre-feet regardless of height, unless such barrier, due to its location or other physical characteristics, is likely to pose a significant threat to human life or property in the event of its failure. Such term does not include a levee.

(6) HAZARD REDUCTION.—The term “hazard reduction” means those efforts utilized to reduce the potential consequences of dam failure to life and property.

(7) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the 50 States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(8) PARTICIPATING STATE.—The term “participating State” means any State that elects to participate in the grant assistance program established under this Act.

(9) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” means, when used in a geographical sense, all of the States.

(10) MODEL STATE DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—The term “Model State Dam Safety Program” refers to a document, published by FEMA (No. 123, dated April 1987) and its amendments, developed by State dam safety officials, which acts as a guideline to State dam safety agencies for establishing a dam safety regulatory program or improving an already-established program.

(e) NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Director, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, State dam safety agencies, and the National Dam Safety Review Board established by paragraph (5)(C), shall establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions and policies of this Act, a coordinated national dam safety program. This program shall—

(A) be administered by FEMA to achieve the objectives set forth in paragraph (3);

(B) involve, where appropriate, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Energy, Interior, and Labor, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the International Boundaries Commission (United States section), the Tennessee Valley Authority, and FEMA; and

(C) include each of the components described in paragraph (4), the implementation plan described in paragraph (5), and the assistance for State dam safety programs to be provided under this section.

(2) DUTIES.—The Director—

(A) within 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall develop the implementation plan described in paragraph (5);

(B) within 300 days after such date of enactment, shall submit to the appropriate authorizing committees of Congress the implementation plan described in paragraph (5); and

(C) by rule within 360 days after such date of enactment—

(i) shall develop and implement the national dam safety program under this section;

(ii) shall establish goals, priorities, and target dates for implementation of the program; and

(iii) shall provide a method for cooperation and coordination with, and assistance to (as feasible), interested governmental entities in all States.

(3) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the national dam safety program are as follows:

(A) To ensure that new and existing dams are safe through the development of technologically and economically feasible programs and procedures for national dam safety hazard reduction.

(B) To encourage acceptable engineering policies and procedures used for dam site investigation, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and emergency preparedness.

(C) To encourage establishment and implementation of effective dam safety programs in each participating State based on State standards.

(D) To develop and encourage public awareness projects to increase public acceptance and support of State dam safety programs.

(E) To develop technical assistance materials for Federal and non-Federal dam safety programs.

(F) To develop mechanisms with which to provide Federal technical assistance for dam safety to the non-Federal sector.

(4) COMPONENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The national dam safety program shall consist of a Federal element and a non-Federal element and 3 functional activities: leadership, technical assistance, and public awareness.

(B) ELEMENTS.—

(i) FEDERAL ELEMENT.—The Federal element of the program incorporates all the activities and practices undertaken by Federal agencies to implement the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL ELEMENT.—The non-Federal element of the program involves the activities and practices undertaken by participating States, local governments, and the private sector to safely build, regulate, operate, and maintain dams and Federal activities which foster State efforts to develop and implement effective programs for the safety of dams.

(C) ACTIVITIES.—

(i) LEADERSHIP ACTIVITY.—The leadership activity of the program shall be the responsibility of FEMA. FEMA shall coordinate Federal efforts in cooperation with appropriate Federal agencies and State dam safety agencies.

(ii) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITY.—The technical assistance activity of the program involves the transfer of knowledge and technical information among the Federal and non-Federal elements.

(iii) PUBLIC AWARENESS ACTIVITY.—The public awareness activity provides for the education of the public, including State and local officials, to the hazards of dam failure and ways to reduce the adverse consequences of dam failure and related matters.

(5) GRANT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Director shall develop an implementation plan which shall demonstrate dam safety improvements through fiscal year 2001 and shall recommend appropriate roles for Federal agencies and for State and local units of government, individuals, and private organizations. The implementation plan shall provide, at a minimum, for the following:

(A) ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—In order to encourage the establishment and maintenance of effective programs intended to ensure dam safety to protect human life and property and to improve such existing programs, the Director shall provide, from amounts made available under subsection (g) of this section, assistance to participating States to establish and maintain dam safety programs, first, according to the basic provisions for a dam safety program listed below and, second,

according to more advanced requirements and standards authorized by the review board under subparagraph (C) and the Director with the assistance of established criteria such as the Model State Dam Safety Program. Participating State dam safety programs must be working toward meeting the following primary criteria to be eligible for primary assistance or must meet the following primary criteria prior to working toward advanced assistance:

(i) STATE LEGISLATION.—A dam safety program must be authorized by State legislation to include, at a minimum, the following:

(I) PLAN REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—Authority to review and approve plans and specifications to construct, enlarge, modify, remove, or abandon dams.

(II) PERIODIC INSPECTIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION.—Authority to perform periodic inspections during construction for the purpose of ensuring compliance with approved plans and specifications.

(III) STATE APPROVAL.—Upon completion of construction, a requirement that, before operation of the structure, State approval is received.

(IV) SAFETY INSPECTIONS.—Authority to require or perform the inspection of all dams and reservoirs that pose a significant threat to human life and property in the event of failure at least every 5 years to determine their continued safety and a procedure for more detailed and frequent safety inspections.

(V) PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER.—A requirement that all inspections be performed under the supervision of a registered professional engineer with related experience in dam design and construction.

(VI) ORDERS.—Authority to issue orders, when appropriate, to require owners of dams to perform necessary maintenance or remedial work, revise operating procedures, or take other actions, including breaching dams when deemed necessary.

(VII) REGULATIONS.—Rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the State's legislative authority.

(VIII) EMERGENCY FUNDS.—Necessary emergency funds to assure timely repairs or other changes to, or removal of, a dam in order to protect human life and property and, if the owner does not take action, to take appropriate action as expeditiously as possible.

(IX) EMERGENCY PROCEDURES.—A system of emergency procedures that would be utilized in the event a dam fails or in the event a dam's failure is imminent, together with an identification of those dams where failure could be reasonably expected to endanger human life and of the maximum area that could be inundated in the event of a failure of the dam, as well as identification of those necessary public facilities that would be affected by such inundation.

(i) STATE APPROPRIATIONS.—State appropriations must be budgeted to carry out the provisions of the State legislation.

(B) WORK PLAN CONTRACTS.—The Director shall enter into contracts with each participating State to determine a work plan necessary for a particular State dam safety program to reach a level of program performance previously agreed upon in the contract. Federal assistance under this section shall be provided to aid the State dam safety program in achieving its goal.

(C) NATIONAL DAM SAFETY REVIEW BOARD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be established a National Dam Safety Review Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"), which shall be responsible for monitoring participating State implementation of the requirements of the assistance program. The Board is authorized to utilize the expertise of other agencies of the United States and to enter into contracts for

necessary studies to carry out the requirements of this section. The Board shall consist of 11 members selected for their expertise in dam safety as follows:

(I) 5 to represent FEMA, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Interior.

(II) 5 members selected by the Director who are dam safety officials of States.

(III) 1 member selected by the Director to represent the United States Committee on Large Dams.

(ii) NO COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Board who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to compensation received for the services of the member as an officer or employee of the United States. Each member of the Board who is not an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation.

(iii) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of services for the Board.

(iv) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board.

(D) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—No grant may be made to a participating State under this subsection in any fiscal year unless the State enters into such agreement with the Director as the Director may require to ensure that the participating State will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all other sources for programs to assure dam safety for the protection of human life and property at or above the average level of such expenditures in its 2 fiscal years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(E) PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF STATE PARTICIPATION.—Any program which is submitted to the Director for participation in the assistance program under this subsection shall be deemed approved 120 days following its receipt by the Director unless the Director determines within such 120-day period that the submitted program fails to reasonably meet the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B). If the Director determines the submitted program cannot be approved for participation, the Director shall immediately notify the State in writing, together with his or her reasons and those changes needed to enable the submitted program to be approved.

(F) REVIEW OF STATE PROGRAMS.—Utilizing the expertise of the Board, the Director shall periodically review the approved State dam safety programs. In the event the Board finds that a program of a participating State has proven inadequate to reasonably protect human life and property and the Director agrees, the Director shall revoke approval of the State's participation in the assistance program and withhold assistance under this section, until the State program has been re-approved.

(G) COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The head of any Federal agency, when requested by any State dam safety agency, shall provide information on the construction, operation, or maintenance of any dam or allow officials of the State agency to participate in any Federal inspection of any dam.

(H) DAM INSURANCE REPORT.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall report to the Congress on the availability of dam insurance and make recommendations.

(f) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Within 90 days after the last day of each odd-numbered fiscal year, the Director shall submit a biennial report to Congress describing the status of the program being implemented under this section and describing the progress achieved by the Federal agencies during the 2 previous years in implementing the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety. Each such report shall include any recommendations for legislative and other action deemed necessary and appropriate. The report shall also include a summary of the progress being made in improving dam safety by participating States.

(g) AUTHORIZING OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) GENERAL PROGRAM.—

(A) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director to carry out the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) (in addition to any authorizations for similar purposes included in other Acts and the authorizations set forth in paragraphs (2) through (5) of this subsection)—

- (i) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1997;
- (ii) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;
- (iii) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;
- (iv) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and
- (v) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(B) APPORTIONMENT FORMULA.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), sums appropriated under this paragraph shall be distributed annually among participating States on the following basis: One-third among those States determined in subsection (e) as qualifying for funding, and two-thirds in proportion to the number of dams and appearing as State-regulated dams on the National Dam Inventory in each participating State that has been determined in subsection (e)(5)(A) as qualifying for funding, to the number of dams in all participating States.

(ii) LIMITATION TO 50 PERCENT OF COST.—In no event shall funds distributed to any State under this paragraph exceed 50 percent of the reasonable cost of implementing an approved dam safety program in such State.

(iii) ALLOCATION BETWEEN PRIMARY AND ADVANCED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—The Director and Review Board shall determine how much of funds appropriated under this paragraph is allotted to participating States needing primary funding and those needing advanced funding.

(2) TRAINING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall, at the request of any State that has or intends to develop a dam safety program under subsection (e)(5)(A), provide training for State dam safety staff and inspectors.

(B) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

(3) RESEARCH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall undertake a program of technical and archival research in order to develop improved techniques, historical experience, and equipment for rapid and effective dam construction, rehabilitation, and inspection, together with devices for the continued monitoring, of dams for safety purposes.

(B) STATE PARTICIPATION; REPORTS.—The Director shall provide for State participation in the research under this paragraph and periodically advise all States and Congress of the results of such research.

(C) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

(4) DAM INVENTORY.—

(A) MAINTENANCE AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary is authorized to maintain and periodically publish updated information on the inventory of dams.

(B) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

(5) PERSONNEL.—

(A) EMPLOYMENT.—The Director is authorized to employ additional staff personnel in numbers sufficient to carry out the provisions of this section.

(B) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph \$400,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

(6) LIMITATION.—No funds authorized by this section shall be used to construct or repair any Federal or non-Federal dams.

(h) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a national program of inspection of dams", approved August 8, 1972 (33 U.S.C 467-467m; Public Law 92-367), is amended—

(1) in the first section by striking "means any artificial barrier" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "has the meaning such term has under subsection (d) of the National Dam Safety Program Act of 1996.";

(2) by striking the 2d sentence of section 3;

(3) by striking section 5 and sections 7 through 14; and

(4) by redesignating section 6 as section 5.

SEC. 216. MAINTENANCE, REHABILITATION, AND MODERNIZATION OF FACILITIES.

In accomplishing the maintenance, rehabilitation, and modernization of hydroelectric power generating facilities at water resources projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Secretary is authorized to increase the efficiency of energy production and the capacity of these facilities if, after consulting with other appropriate Federal and State agencies, the Secretary determines that such uprating—

(1) is economically justified and financially feasible;

(2) will not result in significant adverse effects on the other purposes for which the project is authorized;

(3) will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts; and

(4) will not involve major structural or operation changes in the project.

SEC. 217. LONG-TERM SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with non-Federal sponsors of navigation projects for development of long-term management strategies for controlling sediments in such projects.

(b) CONTENTS OF STRATEGIES.—Each strategy developed under this section for a navigation project—

(1) shall include assessments of the following with respect to the project: sediment rates and composition, sediment reduction options, dredging practices, long-term management of any dredged material disposal facilities, remediation of such facilities, and alternative disposal and reuse options;

(2) shall include a timetable for implementation of the strategy; and

(3) shall incorporate, as much as possible, relevant ongoing planning efforts, including remedial action planning, dredged material management planning, harbor and waterfront development planning, and watershed management planning.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In developing strategies under this section, the Secretary shall consult with interested Federal agencies, States, and Indian tribes and provide an opportunity for public comment.

SEC. 218. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITY PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) ADDITIONAL CAPACITY.—

(1) PROVIDED BY SECRETARY.—At the request of a non-Federal project sponsor, the Secretary may provide additional capacity at a dredged material disposal facility constructed by the Secretary beyond that which would be required for project purposes if the non-Federal project sponsor agrees to pay, during the period of construction, all costs associated with the construction of the additional capacity.

(2) COST RECOVERY AUTHORITY.—The non-Federal project sponsor may recover the costs assigned to the additional capacity through fees assessed on 3rd parties whose dredged material is deposited in the facility and who enter into agreements with the non-Federal sponsor for the use of such facility. The amount of such fees may be determined by the non-Federal sponsor.

(b) NON-FEDERAL USE OF DISPOSAL FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary—

(A) may permit the use of any dredged material disposal facility under the jurisdiction of, or managed by, the Secretary by a non-Federal interest if the Secretary determines that such use will not reduce the availability of the facility for project purposes; and

(B) may impose fees to recover capital, operation, and maintenance costs associated with such use.

(2) USE OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 401(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act but subject to advance appropriations, any monies received through collection of fees under this subsection shall be available to the Secretary, and shall be used by the Secretary, for the operation and maintenance of the disposal facility from which they were collected.

(c) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a program to evaluate and implement opportunities for public-private partnerships in the design, construction, management, or operation of dredged material disposal facilities in connection with construction or maintenance of Federal navigation projects.

(2) PRIVATE FINANCING.—

(A) AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with a project sponsor, a private entity, or both for the acquisition, design, construction, management, or operation of a dredged material disposal facility (including any facility used to demonstrate potential beneficial uses of dredged material) using funds provided in whole or in part by the private entity.

(B) REIMBURSEMENT.—If any funds provided by a private entity are used to carry out a project under this subsection, the Secretary may reimburse the private entity over a period of time agreed to by the parties to the agreement through the payment of subsequent user fees. Such fees may include the payment of a disposal or tipping fee for placement of suitable dredged material at the facility.

(C) AMOUNT OF FEES.—User fees paid pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be sufficient to repay funds contributed by the private entity plus a reasonable return on investment approved by the Secretary in cooperation with the project sponsor and the private entity.

(D) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of such fee shall be equal to the percentage of the total cost which would otherwise be borne by the Federal Government as required pursuant to existing cost sharing requirements, including section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) and section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2325).

(E) BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE.—Any spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)

of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 651(c)(2)) authorized by this section shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 219. OBSTRUCTION REMOVAL REQUIREMENT.

(a) PENALTY.—Section 16 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 411; 30 Stat. 1153), is amended—

(1) by striking “thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen” each place it appears and inserting “13, 14, 15, 19, and 20”; and

(2) by striking “not exceeding twenty-five hundred dollars nor less than five hundred dollars” and inserting “of up to \$25,000 per day”.

(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 20 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 415; 30 Stat. 1154), is amended—

(1) by striking “expense” the first place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting “actual expense, including administrative expenses,”;

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “cost” and inserting “actual cost, including administrative costs,”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) REMOVAL REQUIREMENT.—Within 24 hours after the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating issues an order to stop or delay navigation in any navigable waters of the United States because of conditions related to the sinking or grounding of a vessel, the owner or operator of the vessel, with the approval of the Secretary of the Army, shall begin removal of the vessel using the most expeditious removal method available or, if appropriate, secure the vessel pending removal to allow navigation to resume. If the owner or operator fails to begin removal or to secure the vessel pending removal or fails to complete removal as soon as possible, the Secretary of the Army shall remove or destroy the vessel using the summary removal procedures under subsection (a) of this section.”.

SEC. 220. SMALL PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$12,500,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”; and

(2) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

SEC. 221. UNECONOMICAL COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 221(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b) is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting the following: “; except that no such agreement shall be required if the Secretary determines that the administrative costs associated with negotiating, executing, or administering the agreement would exceed the amount of the contribution required from the non-Federal interest and are less than \$25,000.”.

SEC. 222. PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES.

Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “, watersheds, or ecosystems” after “basins”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “\$6,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$300,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

SEC. 223. CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.

Section 211 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701u; 64 Stat. 183) is amended—

(1) by striking “continental limits of the”; and

(2) by striking the 2d colon and all that follows through “for this purpose”.

SEC. 224. STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCY REVIEW PERIOD.

The 1st section of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes”, approved December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 701-1(a); 58 Stat. 888), is amended—

(1) by striking “Within ninety” and inserting “Within 30”; and

(2) by striking “ninety-day period.” and inserting “30-day period.”.

SEC. 225. LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL COSTS PER PROJECT.

Section 215(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$3,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”; and

(2) by striking the final period.

SEC. 226. AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL.

(a) ADDITIONAL CONTROLLED PLANTS.—Section 104(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(a)) is amended by inserting after “alligatorweed,” the following: “melaleuca.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 104(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 610(b)) is amended by striking “\$12,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

SEC. 227. SEDIMENTS DECONTAMINATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) PROJECT PURPOSE.—Section 405(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2239 note; 106 Stat. 4863) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) PROJECT PURPOSE.—The purpose of the project to be carried out under this section is to provide for the development of 1 or more sediment decontamination technologies on a pilot scale demonstrating a capacity of at least 500,000 cubic yards per year.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The first sentence of section 405(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows: “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.”.

(c) REPORTS.—Section 405 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 1998, and periodically thereafter, the Administrator and the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the project to be carried out under this section, including an assessment of the progress made in achieving the intent of the program set forth in subsection (a)(3).”.

SEC. 228. SHORE PROTECTION.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426e; 60 Stat. 1056), is amended—

(1) by striking “damage to the shores” and inserting “damage to the shores and beaches”; and

(2) by striking “the following provisions” and all that follows through the period at the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following: “this Act, to promote shore protection projects and related research that encourage the protection, restoration, and enhancement of sandy beaches, including beach restoration and periodic beach nourishment, on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprises. In carrying out this policy, preference shall be given to areas in which there has been a Federal investment of funds and areas with respect to which the need for prevention or mitigation of damage to shores and beaches is attributable to Federal navigation projects or other Federal activities.”.

(b) NONPUBLIC SHORES.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking “or from the protection of nearby public property or” and inserting “, if there are sufficient benefits, including benefits to local and regional economic development and to the local and regional ecology (as determined under subsection (e)(2)(B)), or”; and

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “(e) No” and inserting the following:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No”;

(2) by moving the remainder of the text of paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) STUDIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) recommend to Congress studies concerning shore protection projects that meet the criteria established under this Act (including subparagraph (B)(iii)) and other applicable law;

“(ii) conduct such studies as Congress requires under applicable laws; and

“(iii) report the results of the studies to the appropriate committees of Congress.

“(B) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall recommend to Congress the authorization or reauthorization of shore protection projects based on the studies conducted under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making recommendations, the Secretary shall consider the economic and ecological benefits of a shore protection project and the ability of the non-Federal interest to participate in the project.

“(iii) CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL BENEFITS.—In analyzing the economic and ecological benefits of a shore protection project, or a flood control or other water resource project the purpose of which includes shore protection, the Secretary shall consider benefits to local and regional economic development, and to the local and regional ecology, in calculating the full economic and ecological justifications for the project.

“(C) COORDINATION OF PROJECTS.—In conducting studies and making recommendations for a shore protection project under this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

“(i) determine whether there is any other project being carried out by the Secretary or the head of another Federal agency that may be complementary to the shore protection project; and

“(ii) if there is such a complementary project, describe the efforts that will be made to coordinate the projects.

“(3) SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct, or cause to be constructed, any shore protection project authorized by Congress, or separable element of such a project, for which funds have been appropriated by Congress.

“(B) AGREEMENTS.—

“(i) REQUIREMENT.—After authorization by Congress, and before commencement of construction, of a shore protection project or separable element, the Secretary shall enter into a written agreement with a non-Federal interest with respect to the project or separable element.

“(ii) TERMS.—The agreement shall—

“(I) specify the life of the project; and

“(II) ensure that the Federal Government and the non-Federal interest will cooperate in carrying out the project or separable element.

“(C) COORDINATION OF PROJECTS.—In constructing a shore protection project or separable element under this paragraph, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate the project or element with any complementary project identified under paragraph (2)(C).

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall report biennially to the appropriate committees of Congress on the status of all ongoing shore protection studies and shore protection projects carried out under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.”

(d) REQUIREMENT OF AGREEMENTS PRIOR TO REIMBURSEMENTS.—

(1) SMALL SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS.—Section 2 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426f; 60 Stat. 1056), is amended—

(A) by striking “SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 2. REIMBURSEMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;
(B) in subsection (a) (as so designated)—
(i) by striking “local interests” and inserting “non-Federal interests”;

(ii) by inserting “or separable element of the project” after “project”; and
(iii) by inserting “or separable elements” after “projects” each place it appears; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—After authorization of reimbursement by the Secretary under this section, and before commencement of construction, of a shore protection project, the Secretary shall enter into a written agreement with the non-Federal interest with respect to the project or separable element.

“(2) TERMS.—The agreement shall—

“(A) specify the life of the project; and

“(B) ensure that the Federal Government and the non-Federal interest will cooperate in carrying out the project or separable element.”

(2) OTHER SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS.—Section 206(e)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 426i-1(e)(1)(A); 106 Stat. 4829) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “and enters into a written agreement with the non-Federal interest with respect to the project or separable element (including the terms of cooperation)”.

(e) STATE AND REGIONAL PLANS.—The Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 4 (33 U.S.C. 426h) as section 5; and

(2) by inserting after section 3 (33 U.S.C. 426e) the following:

“SEC. 4. STATE AND REGIONAL PLANS.

“The Secretary may—

“(1) cooperate with any State in the preparation of a comprehensive State or regional plan for the conservation of coastal resources located within the boundaries of the State;

“(2) encourage State participation in the implementation of the plan; and

“(3) submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate Federal participation in carrying out the plan.”

(f) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426h), (as redesignated by subsection (e)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act, the following definitions apply:

“(1) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

“(2) SEPARABLE ELEMENT.—The term ‘separable element’ has the meaning provided by section 103(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(f)).

“(3) SHORE.—The term ‘shore’ includes each shoreline of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, the Great Lakes, and lakes, estuaries, and bays directly connected therewith.

“(4) SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT.—The term ‘shore protection project’ includes a project for beach nourishment, including the replacement of sand.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Act entitled “An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property”, approved August 13, 1946, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(3) of the first section (33 U.S.C. 426e(b)(3)) by striking “of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers,” and by striking the final period; and

(B) in section 3 (33 U.S.C. 426g) by striking “Secretary of the Army” and inserting “Secretary”.

(g) OBJECTIVES OF PROJECTS.—Section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962-2; 84 Stat. 1829) is amended by inserting “(including shore protection projects such as projects for beach nourishment, including the replacement of sand)” after “water resource projects”.

SEC. 229. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Before” at the beginning of the second sentence and inserting “Upon”; and

(2) by inserting “planning, designing, or” before “construction” in the last sentence.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 52 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 579a note; 102 Stat. 4044) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

SEC. 230. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In carrying out research and development in support of the civil works program of the Department of the Army, the Secretary may utilize contracts, cooperative research and development agreements, cooperative agreements, and grants with non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, colleges and universities, consortia, professional and technical societies, public and private scientific and technical foundations, research institutions, educational organizations, and nonprofit organizations.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—With respect to contracts for research and development, the Secretary may include requirements that have potential commercial application and may also use such potential application as an evaluation factor where appropriate.

SEC. 231. BENEFITS TO NAVIGATION.

In evaluating potential improvements to navigation and the maintenance of navigation projects, the Secretary shall consider, and include for purposes of project justification, economic benefits generated by cruise ships as commercial navigation benefits.

SEC. 232. LOSS OF LIFE PREVENTION.

Section 904 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2281) is amended by inserting “including the loss of life

which may be associated with flooding and coastal storm events,” after “costs.”.

SEC. 233. SCENIC AND AESTHETIC CONSIDERATIONS.

In conducting studies of potential water resources projects, the Secretary shall consider measures to preserve and enhance scenic and aesthetic qualities in the vicinity of such projects.

SEC. 234. REMOVAL OF STUDY PROHIBITIONS.

Nothing in section 208 of the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986 (100 Stat. 749), section 505 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (106 Stat. 1343), or any other provision of law shall be deemed to limit the authority of the Secretary to undertake studies for the purpose of investigating alternative modes of financing hydroelectric power facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army with funds appropriated after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 235. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available under this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a).

SEC. 236. RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 310 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2319; 104 Stat. 4639) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by striking “(b) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—”.

SEC. 237. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) SECTION 203 OF 1992 ACT.—Section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4826) is amended by striking “(8662)” and inserting “(8862)”.

(b) SECTION 225 OF 1992 ACT.—Section 225(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4838) is amended by striking “(8662)” in the second sentence and inserting “(8862)”.

TITLE III—PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 301. MOBILE HARBOR, ALABAMA.

The undesignated paragraph under the heading “MOBILE HARBOR, ALABAMA” in section 201(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4090) is amended by striking the first semicolon and all that follows and inserting a period and the following: “In disposing of dredged material from such project, the Secretary, after compliance with applicable laws and after opportunity for public review and comment, may consider alternatives to disposal of such material in the Gulf of Mexico, including environmentally acceptable alternatives for beneficial uses of dredged material and environmental restoration.”.

SEC. 302. ALAMO DAM, ARIZONA.

The project for flood control and other purposes, Alamo Dam and Lake, Arizona, authorized by section 10 of the River and Harbor Act of December 22, 1944, (58 Stat. 900), is modified to authorize the Secretary to operate the Alamo Dam to provide fish and wildlife benefits both upstream and downstream of the Dam. Such operation shall not reduce flood control and recreation benefits provided by the project.

SEC. 303. NOGALES WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, ARIZONA.

The project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606), is modified to direct the Secretary to permit the non-Federal contribution for the project to be determined in accordance with sections 103(k) and 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and to direct the Secretary to enter into negotiations with non-Federal interests pursuant to section 103(l) of such Act concerning the timing of the initial payment of the non-Federal contribution.

SEC. 304. PHOENIX, ARIZONA.

Section 321 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4848) is amended—

(1) by striking "control" and inserting "control, ecosystem restoration,"; and

(2) by striking "\$6,500,000." and inserting "\$17,500,000."

SEC. 305. SAN FRANCISCO RIVER AT CLIFTON, ARIZONA.

The project for flood control, San Francisco River, Clifton, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$21,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$13,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,300,000.

SEC. 306. CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.

The project for navigation, Channel Islands Harbor, Port of Hueneme, California, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1252) is modified to direct the Secretary to pay 100 percent of the costs of dredging the Channel Islands Harbor sand trap.

SEC. 307. GLENN-COLUSA, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control, Sacramento River, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and the Sacramento River, California, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1917 (39 Stat. 948), and as modified by section 102 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1990 (103 Stat. 649), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the portion of the project at Glenn-Colusa, California, at a total cost of \$14,200,000.

SEC. 308. LOS ANGELES AND LONG BEACH HARBORS, SAN PEDRO BAY, CALIFORNIA.

The navigation project for Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, San Pedro Bay, California, authorized by section 201(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4091), is modified to provide that, notwithstanding section 101(a)(4) of such Act, the cost of the relocation of the sewer outfall by the Port of Los Angeles shall be credited toward the payment required from the non-Federal interest by section 101(a)(2) of such Act.

SEC. 309. OAKLAND HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.

The projects for navigation, Oakland Outer Harbor, California, and Oakland Inner Harbor, California, authorized by section 202 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4092), are modified by combining the 2 projects into 1 project, to be designated as the Oakland Harbor, California, project. The Oakland Harbor, California, project shall be prosecuted by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended in the reports designated in such section 202, at a total cost of \$90,850,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$59,150,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$31,700,000. The

non-Federal share of project costs and any available credits toward the non-Federal share shall be calculated on the basis of the total cost of the combined project.

SEC. 310. QUEENSWAY BAY, CALIFORNIA.

Section 4(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4016) is amended by adding at the end the following sentence: "In addition, the Secretary shall perform advance maintenance dredging in the Queensway Bay Channel, California, at a total cost of \$5,000,000."

SEC. 311. SAN LUIS REY, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control of the San Luis Rey River, California, authorized pursuant to section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5; 79 Stat. 1073-1074), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost not to exceed \$81,600,000 with an estimated Federal cost of \$61,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$20,500,000.

SEC. 312. THAMES RIVER, CONNECTICUT.

(a) RECONFIGURATION OF TURNING BASIN.—The project for navigation, Thames River, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1029), is modified to make the turning basin have the following alignment: Starting at a point on the eastern limit of the existing project, N251052.93, E783934.59, thence running north 5 degrees 25 minutes 21.3 seconds east 341.06 feet to a point, N251392.46, E783966.82, thence running north 47 degrees 24 minutes 14.0 seconds west 268.72 feet to a point, N251574.34, E783769.00, thence running north 88 degrees 41 minutes 52.2 seconds west 249.06 feet to a point, N251580.00, E783520.00, thence running south 46 degrees 16 minutes 22.9 seconds west 318.28 feet to a point, N251360.00, E783290.00, thence running south 19 degrees 01 minute 32.2 seconds east 306.76 feet to a point, N251070.00, E783390.00, thence running south 45 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds east 155.56 feet to a point, N250960.00, E783500.00 on the existing western limit.

(b) NON-FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIAL DREDGING.—Any required initial dredging of the widened portions of the turning basin identified in subsection (a) shall be accomplished at non-Federal expense.

(c) CONFORMING DEAUTHORIZATION.—Those portions of the existing turning basin which are not included in the reconfigured turning basin as described in subsection (a) shall no longer be authorized after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 313. POTOMAC RIVER, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The project for flood protection, Potomac River, Washington, District of Columbia, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (74 Stat. 1574), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the General Design Memorandum dated May 1992 at a Federal cost of \$1,800,000; except that a temporary closure may be used instead of a permanent structure at 17th Street. Operation and maintenance of the project shall be a Federal responsibility.

SEC. 314. CANAVERAL HARBOR, FLORIDA.

The project for navigation, Canaveral Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 101(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to reclassify the removal and replacement of stone protection on both sides of the channel as general navigation features. The Secretary shall reimburse any costs that are incurred by the non-Federal sponsor in connection with the reclassified work and that the Secretary determines to be in excess of the non-Federal share of costs

for general navigation features. The Federal and non-Federal shares of the cost of the reclassified work shall be determined in accordance with section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

SEC. 315. CAPTIVA ISLAND, FLORIDA.

The project for shoreline protection, Captiva Island, Lee County, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1073), is modified to direct the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interest for beach renourishment work accomplished by such interest as if such work occurred after execution of the agreement entered into pursuant to section 215 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5) with respect to such project.

SEC. 316. CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, CANAL 51.

The project for flood protection of West Palm Beach, Florida (C-51), authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1183), is modified to provide for the construction of an enlarged stormwater detention area, Storm Water Treatment Area 1 East, generally in accordance with the plan of improvements described in the February 15, 1994, report entitled "Everglades Protection Project, Palm Beach County, Florida, Conceptual Design", with such modifications as are approved by the Secretary. The additional work authorized by this subsection shall be accomplished at Federal expense. Operation and maintenance of the stormwater detention area shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the Central and Southern Florida project, and all costs of such operation and maintenance shall be provided by non-Federal interests.

SEC. 317. CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, CANAL 111 (C-111).

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1176) and modified by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 740-741), is modified to authorize the Secretary to implement the recommended plan of improvement contained in a report entitled "Central and Southern Florida Project, Final Integrated General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement, Canal 111 (C-111), South Dade County, Florida", dated May 1994, including acquisition by non-Federal interests of such portions of the Frog Pond and Rocky Glades areas as are needed for the project.

(b) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of implementing the plan of improvement shall be 50 percent.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR RESPONSIBILITY.—The Department of the Interior shall pay 25 percent of the cost of acquiring such portions of the Frog Pond and Rocky Glades areas as are needed for the project. The amount paid by the Department of the Interior shall be included as part of the Federal share of the cost of implementing the plan.

(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs of the improvements undertaken pursuant to this subsection shall be 100 percent; except that the Federal Government shall reimburse the non-Federal project sponsor 60 percent of the costs of operating and maintaining pump stations that pump water into Taylor Slough in the Everglades National Park.

SEC. 318. JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (MILL COVE), FLORIDA.

The project for navigation, Jacksonville Harbor (Mill Cove), Florida, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4139-4140), is modified to direct the Secretary to carry out

a project for flow and circulation improvement within Mill Cove, at a total cost of \$2,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,000,000.

SEC. 319. PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for shoreline protection, Panama City Beaches, Florida, authorized by section 501(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4133), is modified to direct the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the non-Federal interest for carrying out such project in accordance with section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4828).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the progress made in carrying out this section.

SEC. 320. TYBEE ISLAND, GEORGIA.

The project for beach erosion control, Tybee Island, Georgia, authorized pursuant to section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5), is modified to include as an integral part of the project the portion of the ocean shore of Tybee Island located south of the existing south terminal groin between 18th and 19th Streets.

SEC. 321. WHITE RIVER, INDIANA.

The project for flood control, Indianapolis on West Fork of the White River, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1586), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake riverfront alterations as described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Master Plan, dated February 1994, at a total cost of \$85,975,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of \$39,975,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of \$46,000,000. The cost of work, including relocations undertaken by the non-Federal interest after February 15, 1994, on features identified in the Master Plan shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of project costs.

SEC. 322. CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

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 limit the capacity of the reservoir project not to exceed 11,000,000,000 gallons or 32,000 acre-feet, to provide that the reservoir project may not be located north of 55th Street or west of East Avenue in the vicinity of McCook, Illinois, and to provide that the reservoir project may only be constructed on the basis of a specific plan that has been evaluated by the Secretary under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

SEC. 323. CHICAGO LOCK AND THOMAS J. O'BRIEN LOCK, ILLINOIS.

The project for navigation, Chicago Harbor, Lake Michigan, Illinois, for which operation and maintenance responsibility was transferred to the Secretary under chapter IV of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983 (97 Stat. 311) and section 107 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1982 (95 Stat. 1137) is modified to direct the Secretary to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of making such structural repairs as are necessary to prevent leakage through the Chicago Lock and the Thomas J. O'Brien Lock, Illinois, and to determine the need for installing permanent flow measurement equipment at such locks to measure any leakage. The Secretary is authorized to carry out such repairs and installations as are necessary following completion of the study.

SEC. 324. KASKASKIA RIVER, ILLINOIS.

The project for navigation, Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by section 101 of

the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1175), is modified to add fish and wildlife and habitat restoration as project purposes.

SEC. 325. LOCKS AND DAM 26, ALTON, ILLINOIS AND MISSOURI.

Section 102(l) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4613) is amended—

(1) by striking “, that requires no separable project lands and” and inserting “on project lands and other contiguous non-project lands, including those lands referred to as the Alton Commons. The recreational development”;

(2) by inserting “shall be” before “at a Federal construction”;

(3) by striking “. The recreational development” and inserting “, and”.

SEC. 326. NORTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER, ILLINOIS.

The project for flood protection, North Branch of the Chicago River, Illinois, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4115), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated March 1994, at a total cost of \$34,228,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$20,905,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$13,323,000.

SEC. 327. ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL.

Section 314(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4847) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Such improvements shall include marina development at Lock 14, to be carried out in consultation with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, at a total cost of \$6,374,000.”

SEC. 328. HALSTEAD, KANSAS.

The project for flood control, Halstead, Kansas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4116), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated March 19, 1993, at a total cost of \$11,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,325,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,775,000.

SEC. 329. LEVISA AND TUG FORKS OF THE BIG SANDY RIVER AND CUMBERLAND RIVER, KENTUCKY, WEST VIRGINIA, AND VIRGINIA.

The project for flood control, Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Cumberland River, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, authorized by section 202(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339), is modified to provide that the minimum level of flood protection to be afforded by the project shall be the level required to provide protection from a 100-year flood or from the flood of April 1977, whichever level of protection is greater.

SEC. 330. PRESTONBURG, KENTUCKY.

Section 109(a) of Public Law 104-46 (109 Stat. 408) is amended by striking “Modification No. 2” and inserting “Modification No. 3”.

SEC. 331. COMITE RIVER, LOUISIANA.

The Comite River Diversion project for flood control, authorized as part of the project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, by section 101(11) of the Water Resource Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4802-4803), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$121,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$70,577,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$51,023,000.

SEC. 332. GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LOUISIANA.

The project for hurricane damage prevention, flood control, and beach erosion along Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act

of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct a permanent breakwater and levee system at a total cost of \$17,000,000.

SEC. 333. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LOUISIANA.

The project for hurricane damage prevention and flood control, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), is modified to provide that St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, and the Lake Borgne Basin Levee District, Louisiana, shall not be required to pay the unpaid balance, including interest, of the non-Federal cost-share of the project.

SEC. 334. MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LOUISIANA.

The Mississippi Delta Region project, Louisiana, authorized as part of the project for hurricane-flood protection project on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), is modified to direct the Secretary to provide a credit to the State of Louisiana toward its non-Federal share of the cost of the project. The credit shall be for the cost incurred by the State in developing and relocating oyster beds to offset the adverse impacts on active and productive oyster beds in the Davis Pond project area but shall not exceed \$7,500,000.

SEC. 335. MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS, VENICE, LOUISIANA.

The project for navigation, Mississippi River Outlets, Venice, Louisiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731), is modified to provide for the extension of the 16-foot deep by 250-foot wide Baptiste Collette Bayou entrance channel to approximately Mile 8 of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet navigation channel, at a total estimated Federal cost of \$80,000.

SEC. 336. RED RIVER WATERWAY, LOUISIANA.

The project for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, Red River Waterway, Louisiana, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources and Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4142) and modified by section 102(p) of the Water Resources and Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4613), is further modified—

(1) to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$10,500,000; and

(2) to provide that lands that are purchased adjacent to the Loggy Bayou Wildlife Management Area may be located in Caddo Parish or Red River Parish.

SEC. 337. WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LOUISIANA.

The project West Bank Hurricane Protection Levee, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, authorized by section 401(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4128), is modified to include the Lake Cataouatche Area Levee as part of the authorized project, at a total cost of \$14,375,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,344,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,031,000.

SEC. 338. TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, 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—

(1) to expedite review of potential straightening of the channel at the Tolchester Channel S-Turn; and

(2) if determined to be feasible and necessary for safe and efficient navigation, to implement such straightening as part of project maintenance.

SEC. 339. SAGINAW RIVER, MICHIGAN.

The project for flood protection, Saginaw River, Michigan, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 311) is modified to include as part of the project the

design and construction of an inflatable dam on the Flint River, Michigan, at a total cost of \$500,000.

SEC. 340. SAULT SAINTE MARIE, CHIPPEWA COUNTY, MICHIGAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Sault Sainte Marie, Chippewa County, Michigan, authorized by section 1149 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254-4255), is modified as provided by this subsection.

(b) PAYMENT OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project referred to in subsection (a) shall be paid as follows:

(1) That portion of the non-Federal share which the Secretary determines is attributable to use of the lock by vessels calling at Canadian ports shall be paid by the United States.

(2) The remaining portion of the non-Federal share shall be paid by the Great Lakes States pursuant to an agreement entered into by such States.

(c) PAYMENT TERM OF ADDITIONAL PERCENTAGE.—The amount to be paid by non-Federal interests pursuant to section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(a)) and this subsection with respect to the project referred to in subsection (a) may be paid over a period of 50 years or the expected life of the project, whichever is shorter.

(d) GREAT LAKES STATES DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term "Great Lakes States" means the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

SEC. 341. STILLWATER, MINNESOTA.

Section 363 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4861-4862) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "riverfront," the following: "and expansion of such system if the Secretary determines that the expansion is feasible,";

(2) by striking "\$3,200,000" and inserting "\$11,600,000";

(3) by striking "\$2,400,000" and inserting "\$8,700,000"; and

(4) by striking "\$800,000" and inserting "\$2,900,000".

SEC. 342. CAPE GIRARDEAU, MISSOURI.

The project for flood control, Cape Girardeau, Jackson Metropolitan Area, Missouri, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4118-4119), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project, including implementation of nonstructural measures, at a total cost of \$45,414,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$33,030,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$12,384,000.

SEC. 343. NEW MADRID HARBOR, MISSOURI.

The project for navigation, New Madrid Harbor, Missouri, authorized pursuant to section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) and modified by section 102(n) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4807), is further modified to direct the Secretary to assume responsibility for maintenance of the existing Federal channel referred to in such section 102(n) in addition to maintaining New Madrid County Harbor.

SEC. 344. ST. JOHN'S BAYOU—NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MISSOURI.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal assistance made available under the rural enterprise zone program of the Department of Agriculture may be used toward payment of the non-Federal share of the costs of the project for flood control, St. John's Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4118).

SEC. 345. JOSEPH G. MINISH PASSAIC RIVER PARK, NEW JERSEY.

Section 101(a)(18)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4608) is amended by striking "\$25,000,000" and inserting "\$75,000,000".

SEC. 346. MOLLY ANN'S BROOK, NEW JERSEY.

The project for flood control, Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated April 3, 1996, at a total cost of \$40,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$22,600,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$17,500,000.

SEC. 347. PASSAIC RIVER, NEW JERSEY.

Section 1148 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1148. PASSAIC RIVER BASIN.

"(a) ACQUISITION OF LANDS.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire from willing sellers lands on which residential structures are located and which are subject to frequent and recurring flood damage, as identified in the supplemental floodway report of the Corps of Engineers, Passaic River Buyout Study, September 1995, at an estimated total cost of \$194,000,000.

"(b) RETENTION OF LANDS FOR FLOOD PROTECTION.—Lands acquired by the Secretary under this section shall be retained by the Secretary for future use in conjunction with flood protection and flood management in the Passaic River Basin.

"(c) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out this section shall be 25 percent plus any amount that might result from application of the requirements of subsection (d).

"(d) APPLICABILITY OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In evaluating and implementing the project under this section, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of this Act, to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the project."

SEC. 348. RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NEW JERSEY AND NEW YORK.

The project for flood control, Ramapo River at Oakland, New Jersey and New York, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4120), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated May 1994, at a total cost of \$11,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,800,000.

SEC. 349. RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NEW JERSEY.

Section 102(q) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4808) is amended by striking "for Cliffwood Beach".

SEC. 350. ARTHUR KILL, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.

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), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project to a depth of not to exceed 45 feet if determined to be feasible by the Secretary at a total cost of \$83,000,000.

SEC. 351. JONES INLET, NEW YORK.

The project for navigation, Jones Inlet, New York, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 13), is modified to direct the Secretary to

place uncontaminated dredged material on beach areas down-drift from the federally maintained channel for the purpose of mitigating the interruption of littoral system natural processes caused by the jetty and continued dredging of the federally maintained channel.

SEC. 352. KILL VAN KULL, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.

The project for navigation, Kill Van Kull, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4095), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project at a total cost of \$750,000,000.

SEC. 353. WILMINGTON HARBOR-NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.

The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor-Northeast Cape Fear River, North Carolina, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4095), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the General Design Memorandum dated April 1990 and the General Design Memorandum Supplement dated February 1994, at a total cost of \$52,041,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$25,729,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$26,312,000.

SEC. 354. GARRISON DAM, NORTH DAKOTA.

The project for flood control, Garrison Dam, North Dakota, authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 891), is modified to authorize the Secretary to acquire permanent flowage and saturation easements over the lands in Williams County, North Dakota, extending from the riverward margin of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District main canal to the north bank of the Missouri River, beginning at the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District pumping station located in the northeast quarter of section 17, township 152 north, range 104 west, and continuing northeasterly downstream to the land referred to as the East Bottom, and any other lands outside of the boundaries of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District which have been adversely affected by rising ground water and surface flooding. Any easement acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection shall include the right, power, and privilege of the Government to submerge, overflow, percolate, and saturate the surface and subsurface of the land. The cost of acquiring such easements shall not exceed 90 percent, or be less than 75 percent, of the unaffected fee value of the lands. The project is further modified to authorize the Secretary to provide a lump sum payment of \$60,000 to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District for power requirements associated with operation of the drainage pumps and to relinquish all right, title, and interest of the United States to the drainage pumps located within the boundaries of the Irrigation District.

SEC. 355. RENO BEACH-HOWARDS FARM, OHIO.

The project for flood protection, Reno Beach-Howards Farm, Ohio, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1178), is modified to provide that the value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and disposal areas that are necessary to carry out the project and are provided by the non-Federal interest shall be determined on the basis of the appraisal performed by the Corps of Engineers and dated April 4, 1985.

SEC. 356. WISTER LAKE, OKLAHOMA.

The flood control project for Wister Lake, LeFlore County, Oklahoma, authorized by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1218), is modified to increase the elevation of the conservation pool to 478 feet and to adjust the seasonal pool operation to accommodate the change in the conservation pool elevation.

SEC. 357. BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for Bonneville Lock and Dam, Columbia River, Oregon and Washington, authorized by the Act of August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), and modified by section 83 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 35), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to convey to the city of North Bonneville, Washington, at no further cost to the city, all right, title and interest of the United States in and to the following:

(1) Any municipal facilities, utilities fixtures, and equipment for the relocated city, and any remaining lands designated as open spaces or municipal lots not previously conveyed to the city, specifically, Lots M1 through M15, M16 (the "community center lot"), M18, M19, M22, M24, S42 through S45, and S52 through S60.

(2) The "school lot" described as Lot 2, block 5, on the plat of relocated North Bonneville.

(3) Parcels 2 and C, but only upon the completion of any environmental response actions required under applicable law.

(4) That portion of Parcel B lying south of the existing city boundary, west of the sewage treatment plant, and north of the drainage ditch that is located adjacent to the northerly limit of the Hamilton Island landfill, provided the Secretary determines, at the time of the proposed conveyance, that the Army has taken all action necessary to protect human health and the environment.

(5) Such portions of Parcel H which can be conveyed without a requirement for further investigation, inventory or other action by the Department of the Army under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act.

(6) Such easements as the Secretary deems necessary for—

(A) sewer and water line crossings of relocated Washington State Highway 14; and

(B) reasonable public access to the Columbia River across those portions of Hamilton Island that remain under the ownership of the United States.

(b) TIME PERIOD FOR CONVEYANCES.—The conveyances referred to in subsections (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(5), and (a)(6)(A) shall be completed within 180 days after the United States receives the release referred to in subsection (d). All other conveyances shall be completed expeditiously, subject to any conditions specified in the applicable subsection.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the conveyances authorized by subsection (a) is to resolve all outstanding issues between the United States and the city of North Bonneville.

(d) ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF PAYMENT; RELEASE OF CLAIMS RELATING TO RELOCATION OF CITY.—As a prerequisite to the conveyances authorized by subsection (a), the city of North Bonneville shall execute an acknowledgement of payment of just compensation and shall execute a release of any and all claims for relief of any kind against the United States growing out of the relocation of the city of North Bonneville, or any prior Federal legislation relating thereto, and shall dismiss, with prejudice, any pending litigation, if any, involving such matters.

(e) RELEASE BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receipt of the city's acknowledgment and release referred to in subsection (d), the Attorney General of the United States shall dismiss any pending litigation, if any, arising out of the relocation of the city of North Bonneville, and execute a release of any and all rights to damages of any kind under the February 20, 1987, judgment of the United States Claims Court, including any interest thereon.

(f) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ENTITLEMENTS; RELEASE BY CITY OF CLAIMS.—Within 60 days after the conveyances authorized by subsection (a) (other than paragraph (6)(B)) have been completed, the city shall execute an acknowledgement that all entitlements under such paragraph have been completed and shall execute a release of any and all claims for relief of any kind against the United States arising out of this subsection.

(g) EFFECTS ON CITY.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the city of North Bonneville, or any successor in interest thereto, shall—

(1) be precluded from exercising any jurisdiction over any lands owned in whole or in part by the United States and administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in connection with the Bonneville project; and

(2) be authorized to change the zoning designations of, sell, or resell Parcels S35 and S56, which are presently designated as open spaces.

SEC. 358. COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

The project for navigation, Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers below Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 152), is modified to direct the Secretary—

(1) to conduct channel simulation and to carry out improvements to the existing deep draft channel between the mouth of the river and river mile 34 at a cost not to exceed \$2,400,000; and

(2) to conduct overdepth and advance maintenance dredging that is necessary to maintain authorized channel dimensions.

SEC. 359. GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for navigation Grays Landing Lock and Dam, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 301(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4110), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$181,000,000. The costs of construction of the project are to be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

SEC. 360. LACKAWANNA RIVER AT SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for flood control, Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101(16) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4803), is modified to direct the Secretary to carry out the project for flood control for the Plot and Green Ridge sections of the project.

SEC. 361. MUSSERS DAM, MIDDLE CREEK, SNYDER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

Section 209(e)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4830) is amended by striking "\$3,000,000" and inserting "\$5,000,000".

SEC. 362. SAW MILL RUN, PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for flood control, Saw Mill Run, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project in accordance with the report of the Corps of Engineers dated April 8, 1994, at a total cost of \$12,780,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,585,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,195,000.

SEC. 363. SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.

The navigation project for the Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of August 8, 1917 (40 Stat. 252), is modified to provide for the periodic removal

and disposal of sediment to a depth of 6 feet detained within portions of the Fairmount pool between the Fairmount Dam and the Columbia Bridge, generally within the limits of the channel alignments referred to as the Schuylkill River Racecourse and return lane, and the Belmont Water Works intakes and Boathouse Row.

SEC. 364. SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) COST SHARING.—Section 313(d)(3)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4846; 109 Stat. 407) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Total project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for design and construction services and other in-kind work, whether occurring subsequent to, or within 6 years prior to, entering into an agreement with the Secretary. The Federal share may be provided in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs. Non-Federal interests shall also receive credit for grants and the value of work performed on behalf of such interests by State and local agencies."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 313(g)(1) of such Act (106 Stat. 4846; 109 Stat. 407) is amended by striking "\$50,000,000" and inserting "\$90,000,000".

SEC. 365. WYOMING VALLEY, PENNSYLVANIA.

The project for flood control, Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake as part of the construction of the project mechanical and electrical upgrades to existing stormwater pumping stations in the Wyoming Valley and to undertake mitigation measures.

SEC. 366. SAN JUAN HARBOR, PUERTO RICO.

The project for navigation, San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4097), is modified to authorize the Secretary to deepen the bar channel to depths varying from 49 feet to 56 feet below mean low water with other modifications to authorized interior channels as generally described in the General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, dated March 1994, at a total cost of \$43,993,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$27,341,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$16,652,000.

SEC. 367. NARRAGANSETT, RHODE ISLAND.

Section 361(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4861) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$200,000" and inserting "\$1,900,000";

(2) by striking "\$150,000" and inserting "\$1,425,000"; and

(3) by striking "\$50,000" and inserting "\$475,000".

SEC. 368. CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The project for navigation, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4096), is modified to direct the Secretary to undertake ditching, clearing, spillway replacement, and dike reconstruction of the Clouter Creek Disposal Area, as a part of the operation and maintenance of the Charleston Harbor project.

SEC. 369. DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, DALLAS, TEXAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, Dallas Floodway Extension, Dallas, Texas, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1091), is modified to provide that flood protection

works constructed by the non-Federal interests along the Trinity River in Dallas, Texas, for Rochester Park and the Central Wastewater Treatment Plant shall be included as a part of the project and the cost of such works shall be credited against the non-Federal share of project costs but shall not be included in calculating benefits of the project.

(b) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—The amount to be credited under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary. In determining such amount, the Secretary may permit crediting only for that portion of the work performed by the non-Federal interests which is compatible with the project referred to in subsection (a), including any modification thereof, and which is required for construction of such project.

(c) CASH CONTRIBUTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of the requirement contained in section 103(a)(1)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to the project referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 370. UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UTAH.

The project for flood control, Upper Jordan River, Utah, authorized by section 101(a)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$12,870,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,580,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,290,000.

SEC. 371. HAYS LAKE, VIRGINIA.

The Haysi Lake, Virginia, feature of the project for flood control, Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, authorized by section 202(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339), is modified—

(1) to add recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement as project purposes;

(2) to direct the Secretary to construct the Haysi Dam feature of the project substantially in accordance with Plan A as set forth in the Draft General Plan Supplement Report for the Levisa Fork Basin, Virginia and Kentucky, dated May 1995;

(3) to direct the Secretary to apply section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4087) to the construction of such feature in the same manner as that section is applied to other projects or project features construed pursuant to such section 202(a); and

(4) to provide for operation and maintenance of recreational facilities on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 372. RUDEE INLET, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.

The project for navigation and shoreline protection, Rudee Inlet, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148), is modified to authorize the Secretary to continue maintenance of the project for 50 years beginning on the date of initial construction of the project. The Federal share of the cost of such maintenance shall be determined in accordance with title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

SEC. 373. VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.

The non-Federal share of the costs 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), shall be reduced by \$3,120,803, or by such amount as is determined by an audit carried out by the Secretary to be due to the city of Virginia Beach as reimbursement for the Federal share of beach nourishment activities carried out by the city between October 1, 1986, and September 30, 1993, if the Federal Government has not reimbursed the city

for the activities prior to the date on which a project cooperative agreement is executed for the project.

SEC. 374. EAST WATERWAY, WASHINGTON.

The project for navigation, East and West waterways, Seattle Harbor, Washington, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Appropriations Act of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1275), is modified to direct the Secretary—

(1) to expedite review of potential deepening of the channel in the East waterway from Elliott Bay to Terminal 25 to a depth of up to 51 feet; and

(2) if determined to be feasible, to implement such deepening as part of project maintenance.

In carrying out work authorized by this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the Port of Seattle regarding use of Slip 27 as a dredged material disposal area.

SEC. 375. BLUESTONE LAKE, WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 102(ff) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4810) is amended by inserting "except for that organic matter necessary to maintain and enhance the biological resources of such waters and such nonobtrusive items of debris as may not be economically feasible to prevent being released through such project," after "project," the first place it appears.

SEC. 376. MOOREFIELD, WEST VIRGINIA.

The project for flood control, Moorefield, West Virginia, authorized by section 101(a)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610-4611), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$22,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$17,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,900,000.

SEC. 377. SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) COST SHARING.—Section 340(c)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) COST SHARING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Total project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by such interest prior to entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project. The credit for such design work shall not exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

"(B) INTEREST.—In the event of delays in the funding of the non-Federal share of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

"(C) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs, including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such project on publicly owned or controlled lands, but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

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

(b) FUNDING.—Section 340(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856) is amended by striking "\$5,000,000" and inserting "\$25,000,000".

SEC. 378. WEST VIRGINIA TRAIL HEAD FACILITIES.

Section 306 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4840-4841) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary shall enter into an interagency agreement with the Federal entity which provided assistance in the preparation of the study for the purposes of providing ongoing technical assistance and oversight for the trail facilities envisioned by the master plan developed under this section. The Federal entity shall provide such assistance and oversight."

SEC. 379. KICKAPOO RIVER, WISCONSIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and allied purposes, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1190) and modified by section 814 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4169), is further modified as provided by this section.

(b) TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary shall transfer to the State of Wisconsin, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to the lands described in paragraph (3), including all works, structures, and other improvements to such lands.

(2) TRANSFER TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Subject to the requirements of this subsection, on the date of the transfer under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lands that are culturally and religiously significant sites of the Ho-Chunk Nation (a federally recognized Indian tribe) and are located within the lands described in paragraph (3). Such lands shall be specified in accordance with paragraph (4)(C) and may not exceed a total of 1,200 acres.

(3) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The lands to be transferred pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) are the approximately 8,569 acres of land associated with the LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project referred to in subsection (a) in Vernon County, Wisconsin, in the following sections:

(A) Section 31, Township 14 North, Range 1 West of the 4th Principal Meridian.

(B) Sections 2 through 11, and 16, 17, 20, and 21, Township 13 North, Range 2 West of the 4th Principal Meridian.

(C) Sections 15, 16, 21 through 24, 26, 27, 31, and 33 through 36, Township 14 North, Range 2 West of the 4th Principal Meridian.

(4) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) HOLD HARMLESS; REIMBURSEMENT OF UNITED STATES.—The transfer under paragraph (1) shall be made on the condition that the State of Wisconsin enters into a written agreement with the Secretary to hold the United States harmless from all claims arising from or through the operation of the lands and improvements subject to the transfer. If title to the lands described in paragraph (3) is sold or transferred by the State, then the State shall reimburse the United States for the price originally paid by the United States for purchasing such lands.

(B) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make the transfers under paragraphs (1) and (2) only if on or before October 31, 1997, the State of Wisconsin enters into and submits to the Secretary a memorandum of understanding, as specified in subparagraph (C), with the tribal organization (as defined by section 4(l) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(l))) of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(C) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The memorandum of understanding referred to in subparagraph (B) shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

(i) A description of sites and associated lands to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (2).

(ii) An agreement specifying that the lands transferred under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be preserved in a natural state and developed only to the extent necessary to enhance outdoor recreational and educational opportunities.

(iii) An agreement specifying the terms and conditions of a plan for the management of the lands to be transferred under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(iv) A provision requiring a review of the plan referred to in clause (iii) to be conducted every 10 years under which the State of Wisconsin, acting through the Kickapoo Valley Governing Board, and the Ho-Chunk Nation may agree to revisions of the plan in order to address changed circumstances on the lands transferred under paragraph (2). Such provision may include a plan for the transfer by the State to the Secretary of the Interior of any additional site discovered to be culturally and religiously significant to the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(5) ADMINISTRATION OF LANDS.—The lands transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (2), and any lands transferred to the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (3), shall be held in trust for, and added to and administered as part of the reservation of, the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(6) TRANSFER OF FLOWAGE EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall transfer to the owner of the servient estate, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to each flowage easement acquired as part of the project referred to in subsection (a) within Township 14 North, Range 2 West of the 4th Principal Meridian, Vernon County, Wisconsin.

(7) DEAUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project referred to in subsection (a) is not authorized after the date of the transfer under this subsection.

(8) INTERIM MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary shall continue to manage and maintain the LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project referred to in subsection (a) until the date of the transfer under this section.

(c) COMPLETION OF PROJECT FEATURES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall undertake the completion of the following features of the project referred to in subsection (a):

(A) The continued relocation of State highway route 131 and county highway routes P and F substantially in accordance with plans contained in Design Memorandum No. 6, Relocation-LaFarge Reservoir, dated June 1970; except that the relocation shall generally follow the existing road rights-of-way through the Kickapoo Valley.

(B) Environmental cleanup and site restoration of abandoned wells, farm sites, and safety modifications to the water control structures.

(C) Cultural resource activities to meet the requirements of Federal law.

(2) PARTICIPATION BY STATE OF WISCONSIN.—In undertaking the completion of the features described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall determine the requirements of the State of Wisconsin on the location and design of each such feature.

(d) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, \$17,000,000.

SEC. 380. TETON COUNTY, WYOMING.

Section 840 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4176) is amended—

(1) by striking “: Provided, That” and inserting “; except that”;

(2) by striking “in cash or materials” and inserting “, through providing in-kind services or cash or materials.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into agreements with the non-Federal sponsor permitting the non-Federal sponsor to perform operation and maintenance for the project on a cost-reimbursable basis.”.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

SEC. 401. CORPS CAPABILITY STUDY, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall review the capability of the Corps of Engineers to plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain rural sanitation projects for rural and Native villages in Alaska. Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit findings and recommendations on the agency's capability, together with recommendations on the advisability of assuming such a mission.

SEC. 402. MCDOWELL MOUNTAIN, ARIZONA.

The Secretary shall credit the non-Federal share of the cost of the feasibility study on the McDowell Mountain project an amount equivalent to the cost of work performed by the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, and accomplished prior to the city's entering into an agreement with the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the work is necessary for the study.

SEC. 403. NOGALES WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, ARIZONA.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the relationship of flooding in Nogales, Arizona, and floodflows emanating from Mexico.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), together with recommendations concerning the appropriate level of non-Federal participation in the project for flood control, Nogales Wash and tributaries, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606).

SEC. 404. GARDEN GROVE, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to assess the feasibility of implementing improvements in the regional flood control system within Garden Grove, California.

SEC. 405. MUGU LAGOON, CALIFORNIA.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the environmental impacts associated with sediment transport, flood flows, and upstream watershed land use practices on Mugu Lagoon, California. The study shall include an evaluation of alternatives for the restoration of the estuarine ecosystem functions and values associated with Mugu Lagoon and the endangered and threatened species inhabiting the area.

(b) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Navy and shall coordinate with State and local resource agencies to assure that the study is compatible with restoration efforts for the Calleguas Creek watershed.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

SEC. 406. SANTA YNEZ, CALIFORNIA.

(a) PLANNING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a comprehensive river basin management plan addressing the long term ecological, economic, and flood control needs of the Santa Ynez River basin, California. In preparing such plan, the Secretary shall consult the Santa Barbara Flood Control District and other affected local governmental entities.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to the Santa Barbara Flood Control District with respect to implementation of the plan to be prepared under subsection (a).

SEC. 407. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—Section 116(d)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4624) is amended—

(1) in the heading of paragraph (1) by inserting “AND ASSISTANCE” after “STUDY”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “In addition, the Secretary shall provide technical, design, and planning assistance to non-Federal interests in developing potential infrastructure projects.”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 116(d)(3) of such Act is amended by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$7,500,000”.

SEC. 408. YOLO BYPASS, SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall study the advisability of acquiring land in the vicinity of the Yolo Bypass in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, for the purpose of environmental mitigation for the flood control project for Sacramento, California, and other water resources projects in the area.

SEC. 409. CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall complete a limited reevaluation of the authorized St. Louis Harbor Project in the vicinity of the Chain of Rocks Canal, Illinois, and consistent with the authorized purposes of that project, to include evacuation of waters interior to the Chain of Rocks Canal East Levee.

SEC. 410. QUINCY, ILLINOIS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall study and evaluate the critical infrastructure of the Fabius River Drainage District, the South Quincy Drainage and Levee District, the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, and the city of Quincy, Illinois—

(1) to determine if additional flood protection needs of such infrastructure should be identified or implemented;

(2) to produce a definition of critical infrastructure;

(3) to develop evaluation criteria; and

(4) to enhance existing geographic information system databases to encompass relevant data that identify critical infrastructure for use in emergencies and in routine operation and maintenance activities.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF OTHER STUDIES.—In conducting the study under this section, the Secretary shall consider the recommendations of the Interagency Floodplain Management Committee Report, the findings of the Floodplain Management Assessment of the Upper Mississippi River and Lower Missouri Rivers and Tributaries, and other relevant studies and findings.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study, together with recommendations regarding each of the purposes of the study described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).

SEC. 411. SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall provide technical, planning, and design assistance to the city of Springfield, Illinois, in developing—

(1) an environmental impact statement for the proposed development of a water supply reservoir, including the preparation of necessary documentation in support of the environmental impact statement; and

(2) an evaluation of technical, economic, and environmental impacts of such development.

SEC. 412. BEAUTY CREEK WATERSHED, VALPARAISO CITY, PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to assess the feasibility of implementing

streambank erosion control measures and flood control measures within the Beauty Creek watershed, Valparaiso City, Porter County, Indiana.

SEC. 413. GRAND CALUMET RIVER, HAMMOND, INDIANA.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study to establish a methodology and schedule to restore the wetlands at Wolf Lake and George Lake in Hammond, Indiana.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 414. INDIANA HARBOR CANAL, EAST CHICAGO, LAKE COUNTY, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of including environmental and recreational features, including a vegetation buffer, as part of the project for navigation, Indiana Harbor Canal, East Chicago, Lake County, Indiana, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 657).

SEC. 415. KOONTZ LAKE, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of implementing measures to restore Koontz Lake, Indiana, including measures to remove silt, sediment, nutrients, aquatic growth, and other noxious materials from Koontz Lake, measures to improve public access facilities to Koontz Lake, and measures to prevent or abate the deposit of sediments and nutrients in Koontz Lake.

SEC. 416. LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the impact of the project for flood control, Little Calumet River, Indiana, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4115), on flooding and water quality in the vicinity of the Black Oak area of Gary, Indiana.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), together with recommendations for cost-effective remediation of impacts described in subsection (a).

(c) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the cost of the study to be conducted under subsection (a) shall be 100 percent.

SEC. 417. TIPPECANOE RIVER WATERSHED, INDIANA.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of water quality and environmental restoration needs in the Tippecanoe River watershed, Indiana, including measures necessary to reduce siltation in Lake Shafer and Lake Freeman.

(b) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary shall provide technical, planning, and design assistance to the Shafer Freeman Lakes Environmental Conservation Corporation in addressing potential environmental restoration activities determined as a result of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 418. CALCASIEU SHIP CHANNEL, HACKBERRY, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the need for improved navigation and related support service structures in the vicinity of the Calcasieu Ship Channel, Hackberry, Louisiana.

SEC. 419. HURON RIVER, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the need for channel improvements and associated modifications for the purpose of providing a harbor of refuge at Huron River, Michigan.

SEC. 420. SACO RIVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of flood control problems along the Saco River in Hart's Location, New Hampshire, for the

purpose of evaluating retaining walls, berms, and other structures with a view to potential solutions involving repair or replacement of existing structures and shall consider other alternatives for flood damage reduction.

SEC. 421. BUFFALO RIVER GREENWAY, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of a potential greenway trail project along the Buffalo River between the park system of the city of Buffalo, New York, and Lake Erie. Such study shall include preparation of an integrated plan of development that takes into consideration the adjacent parks, nature preserves, bikeways, and related recreational facilities.

SEC. 422. PORT OF NEWBURGH, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of the feasibility of carrying out improvements for navigation at the port of Newburgh, New York.

SEC. 423. PORT OF NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY SEDIMENT STUDY.

(a) **STUDY OF MEASURES TO REDUCE SEDIMENT DEPOSITION.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of measures that could reduce sediment deposition in the vicinity of the Port of New York-New Jersey for the purpose of reducing the volumes to be dredged for navigation projects in the Port.

(b) **DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing and operating an underwater confined dredged material disposal site in the Port of New York-New Jersey which could accommodate as much as 250,000 cubic yards of dredged materials for the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of an underwater confined disposal pit as an environmentally suitable method of containing certain sediments.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the studies conducted under this section, together with any recommendations of the Secretary concerning reduction of sediment deposition referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 424. PORT OF NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY 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.

SEC. 425. CHAGRIN RIVER, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of flooding problems along the Chagrin River in Eastlake, Ohio. In conducting such study, the Secretary shall evaluate potential solutions to flooding from all sources, including that resulting from ice jams, and shall evaluate the feasibility of a sedimentation collection pit and other potential measures to reduce flooding.

SEC. 426. CUYAHOGA RIVER, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate the integrity of the bulkhead system located on the Federal channel along the Cuyahoga River in the vicinity of Cleveland, Ohio, and shall provide to the non-Federal interest an analysis of costs and repairs of the bulkhead system.

SEC. 427. CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA, ESTUARY.

The Secretary is authorized to conduct a study of the Charleston estuary area located in Charleston, Berkeley, and Dorchester Counties, South Carolina, for the purpose of evaluating environmental conditions in the tidal reaches of the Ashley, Cooper, Stono,

and Wando Rivers and the lower portions of Charleston Harbor.

SEC. 428. MUSTANG ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of navigation along the south-central coast of Texas near Corpus Christi for the purpose of determining the feasibility of constructing and maintaining the Packery Channel on the southern portion of Mustang Island.

SEC. 429. PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study of flooding, erosion, and other water resources problems in Prince William County, Virginia, including an assessment of wetlands protection, erosion control, and flood damage reduction needs of the County.

SEC. 430. PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary is authorized to conduct studies in the interest of navigation in that part of the Pacific region that includes American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) **COST SHARING.**—The cost sharing provisions of section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215; 100 Stat. 4088-4089) shall apply to studies under this section.

SEC. 431. FINANCING OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF SMALL AND MEDIUM PORTS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of alternative financing mechanisms for ensuring adequate funding for the infrastructure needs of small and medium ports.

(b) **MECHANISMS TO BE STUDIED.**—Mechanisms to be studied under subsection (a) shall include the establishment of revolving loan funds.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

The following projects are not authorized after the date of the enactment of this Act:

(1) **BRANFORD HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.**—The following portion of the project for navigation, Branford River, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of June 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 333): Starting at a point on the Federal channel line whose coordinates are N156181.32, E581572.38, running south 70 degrees 11 minutes 8 seconds west a distance of 171.58 feet to another point on the Federal channel line whose coordinates are N156123.18, E581410.96.

(2) **BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.**—The following portion of the project for navigation, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297): A 2.4-acre anchorage area, 9 feet deep, and an adjacent 0.6-acre anchorage, 6 feet deep, located on the west side of Johnsons River.

(3) **GUILFORD HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.**—The following portion of the project for navigation, Guilford Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (50 Stat. 13): Starting at a point where the Sluice Creek Channel intersects with the main entrance channel, N159194.63, E623201.07, thence running north 24 degrees 58 minutes 15.2 seconds west 478.40 feet to a point N159628.31, E622999.11, thence running north 20 degrees 18 minutes 31.7 seconds west 351.53 feet to a point N159957.99, E622877.10, thence running north 69 degrees 41 minutes 37.9 seconds east 55.000 feet to a point

N159977.08, E622928.69, thence turning and running south 20 degrees 18 minutes 31.0 seconds east 349.35 feet to a point N159649.45, E623049.94, thence turning and running south 24 degrees 58 minutes 11.1 seconds east 341.36 feet to a point N159340.00, E623194.04, thence turning and running south 90 degrees 0 minutes 0 seconds east 78.86 feet to a point N159340.00, E623272.90.

(4) JOHNSONS RIVER CHANNEL, BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Johnsons River Channel, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 634): Northerly of a line across the Federal channel. The coordinates of such line are N 123318.35, E 486301.68 and N 123257.15, E 486380.77.

(5) MYSTIC RIVER, CONNECTICUT.—The following portion of the project for improving the Mystic River, Connecticut, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 802):

Beginning in the 15-foot deep channel at coordinates north 190860.82, east 814416.20, thence running southeast about 52.01 feet to the coordinates north 190809.47, east 814424.49, thence running southwest about 34.02 feet to coordinates north 190780.46, east 814406.70, thence running north about 80.91 feet to the point of beginning.

(6) NORWALK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(A) DEAUTHORIZATION.—The portion of the project for navigation, Norwalk Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1276), that lies northerly of a line across the Federal channel having coordinates N104199.72, E417774.12 and N104155.59, E417628.96, and those portions of the 6-foot deep East Norwalk Channel and Anchorage, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 13), not included in the description of the realignment of the project contained in subparagraph (B).

(B) REALIGNMENT DESCRIPTION.—The realigned 6-foot deep East Norwalk Channel and Anchorage is described as follows: starting at a point on the East Norwalk Channel, N95743.02, E419581.37, thence running northwesterly about 463.96 feet to a point N96197.93, E419490.18, thence running northwesterly about 549.32 feet to a point N96608.49, E419125.23, thence running northwesterly about 384.06 feet to a point N96965.94, E418984.75, thence running northwesterly about 407.26 feet to a point N97353.87, E418860.78, thence running westerly about 58.26 feet to a point N97336.26, E418805.24, thence running northwesterly about 70.99 feet to a point N97390.30, E418759.21, thence running westerly about 71.78 feet to a point on the anchorage limit N97405.26, E418689.01, thence running southerly along the western limits of the existing Federal anchorage until reaching a point N95893.74, E419449.17, thence running in a southwesterly direction about 78.74 feet to a point on the East Norwalk Channel N95815.62, E419439.33.

(C) REDESIGNATION.—All of the realigned channel shall be redesignated as anchorage, with the exception of that portion of the channel which narrows to a width of 100 feet and terminates at a line whose coordinates are N96456.81, E419260.06, and N96390.37, E419185.32, which shall remain as a channel.

(7) SOUTHPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(A) DEAUTHORIZATION PORTION OF PROJECT.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Southport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1029):

(i) The 6-foot deep anchorage located at the head of the project.

(ii) The portion of the 9-foot deep channel beginning at a bend in the channel whose coordinates are north 109131.16, east 452653.32 running thence in a northeasterly direction about 943.01 feet to a point whose coordinates are north 109635.22, east 453450.31 running thence in a southeasterly direction about 22.66 feet to a point whose coordinates are north 109617.15, east 453463.98 running thence in a southwesterly direction about 945.18 feet to the point of beginning.

(B) REMAINDER.—The remaining portion of the project referred to in subparagraph (A) northerly of a line whose coordinates are north 108699.15, east 452768.36 and north 108655.66, east 452858.73 shall be redesignated as an anchorage.

(8) STONY CREEK, BRANFORD, CONNECTICUT.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Stony Creek, Connecticut, authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577): The 6-foot maneuvering basin starting at a point N157031.91, E599030.79, thence running northeasterly about 221.16 feet to a point N157191.06, E599184.37, thence running northerly about 162.60 feet to a point N157353.56, E599189.99, thence running southwesterly about 358.90 feet to the point of origin.

(9) KENNEBUNK RIVER, MAINE.—That portion of the project for navigation, Kennebunk River, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173) and consisting of a 6-foot deep channel that lies northerly of a line whose coordinates are N191412.53, E417265.28 and N191445.83, E417332.48.

(10) YORK HARBOR, MAINE.—That portion of the project for navigation, York Harbor, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480), located in the 8-foot deep anchorage area beginning at coordinates N 109340.19, E 372066.93, thence running north 65 degrees 12 minutes 10.5 seconds E 423.27 feet to a point N 109517.71, E372451.17, thence running north 28 degrees 42 minutes 58.3 seconds west 11.68 feet to a point N 109527.95, E 372445.56, thence running south 63 degrees 37 minutes 24.6 seconds west 422.63 feet returning to the point of beginning and that portion in the 8-foot deep anchorage area beginning at coordinates N 108557.24, E 371645.88, thence running south 60 degrees 41 minutes 17.2 seconds east 484.51 feet to a point N 108320.04, E 372068.36, thence running north 29 degrees 12 minutes 53.3 seconds east 15.28 feet to a point N 108333.38, E 372075.82, thence running north 62 degrees 29 minutes 42.1 seconds west 484.73 feet returning to the point of beginning.

(11) CHELSEA RIVER, BOSTON HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), consisting of a 35-foot deep channel in the Chelsea River: Beginning at a point on the northern limit of the existing project N505357.84, E724519.19, thence running northeasterly about 384.19 feet along the northern limit of the existing project to a bend on the northern limit of the existing project N505526.87, E724864.20, thence running southeasterly about 368.00 feet along the northern limit of the existing project to another point N505404.77, E725211.35, thence running westerly about 594.53 feet to a point N505376.12, E724617.51, thence running southwesterly about 100.00 feet to the point of origin.

(12) COHASSET HARBOR, COHASSET, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Cohasset Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(A) The portion starting at a point N453510.15, E792664.63, thence running south 53 degrees 07 minutes 05.4 seconds west 307.00 feet to a point N453325.90, E792419.07, thence running north 57 degrees 56 minutes 36.8 seconds west 201.00 feet to a point N453432.58, E792248.72, thence running south 88 degrees 57 minutes 25.6 seconds west 50.00 feet to a point N453431.67, E792198.73, thence running north 01 degree 02 minutes 52.3 seconds west 66.71 feet to a point N453498.37, E792197.51, thence running north 69 degrees 12 minutes 52.3 seconds east 332.32 feet to a point N453616.30, E792508.20, thence running south 55 degrees 50 minutes 24.1 seconds east 189.05 feet to the point of origin.

(B) The portion starting at a point N452886.64, E791287.83, thence running south 00 degrees 00 minutes 00.0 seconds west 56.04 feet to a point N452830.60, E791287.83, thence running north 90 degrees 00 minutes 00.0 seconds west 101.92 feet to a point, N452830.60, E791185.91, thence running north 52 degrees 12 minutes 49.7 seconds east 89.42 feet to a point, N452885.39, E791256.58, thence running north 87 degrees 42 minutes 33.8 seconds east 31.28 feet to the point of origin.

(C) The portion starting at a point, N452261.08, E792040.24, thence running north 89 degrees 07 minutes 19.5 seconds east 118.78 feet to a point, N452262.90, E792159.01, thence running south 43 degrees 39 minutes 06.8 seconds west 40.27 feet to a point, N452233.76, E792131.21, thence running north 74 degrees 33 minutes 29.1 seconds west 94.42 feet to a point, N452258.90, E792040.20, thence running north 01 degree 03 minutes 04.3 seconds east 2.18 feet to the point of origin.

(13) FALMOUTH, MASSACHUSETTS.—

(A) DEAUTHORIZATIONS.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Falmouth Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1172):

(i) The portion commencing at a point north 199286.37 east 844394.81 a line running north 73 degrees 09 minutes 29 seconds east 440.34 feet to a point north 199413.99 east 844816.36, thence turning and running north 43 degrees 09 minutes 34.5 seconds east 119.99 feet to a point north 199501.52 east 844898.44, thence turning and running south 66 degrees 52 minutes 03.5 seconds east 547.66 feet returning to a point north 199286.41 east 844394.91.

(ii) The portion commencing at a point north 199647.41 east 845035.25 a line running north 43 degrees 09 minutes 33.1 seconds east 767.15 feet to a point north 200207.01 east 845560.00, thence turning and running north 11 degrees 04 minutes 24.3 seconds west 380.08 feet to a point north 200580.01 east 845487.00, thence turning and running north 22 degrees 05 minutes 50.8 seconds east 1332.36 feet to a point north 201814.50 east 845988.21, thence turning and running north 02 degrees 54 minutes 15.7 seconds east 15.0 feet to a point north 201829.48 east 845988.97, thence turning and running south 24 degrees 56 minutes 42.3 seconds west 1410.29 feet returning to the point north 200550.75 east 845394.18.

(B) REDESIGNATION.—The portion of the project for navigation Falmouth, Massachusetts, referred to in subparagraph (A) upstream of a line designated by the 2 points north 199463.18 east 844496.40 and north 199350.36 east 844544.60 is redesignated as an anchorage area.

(14) MYSTIC RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Mystic River, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 164): The 35-foot deep channel beginning at a point on the northern limit of the existing project, N506243.78, E717600.27, thence running easterly about 1000.00 feet along the northern limit of the existing project to a point, N506083.42,

E718587.33, thence running southerly about 40.00 feet to a point, N506043.94, E718580.91, thence running westerly about 1000.00 feet to a point, N506204.29, E717593.85, thence running northerly about 40.00 feet to the point of origin.

(15) RESERVED CHANNEL, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.—That portion of the project for navigation, Reserved Channel, Boston, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4607), that consists of a 40-foot deep channel beginning at a point along the southern limit of the authorized project, N489391.22, E728246.54, thence running northerly about 54 feet to a point, N489445.53, E728244.97, thence running easterly about 2,926 feet to a point, N489527.38, E731170.41, thence running southeasterly about 81 feet to a point, N489474.87, E731232.55, thence running westerly about 2,987 feet to the point of origin.

(16) WEYMOUTH-FORE AND TOWN RIVERS, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1089):

(A) The 35-foot deep channel beginning at a bend on the southern limit of the existing project, N457394.01, E741109.74, thence running westerly about 405.25 feet to a point, N457334.64, E740708.86, thence running southwesterly about 462.60 feet to another bend in the southern limit of the existing project, N457132.00, E740293.00, thence running northeasterly about 857.74 feet along the southern limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(B) The 15 and 35-foot deep channels beginning at a point on the southern limit of the existing project, N457163.41, E739903.49, thence running northerly about 111.99 feet to a point, N457275.37, E739900.76, thence running westerly about 692.37 feet to a point, N457303.40, E739208.96, thence running southwesterly about 190.01 feet to another point on the southern limit of the existing project, N457233.17, E739032.41, thence running easterly about 873.87 feet along the southern limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(17) COCHECO RIVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The portion of the project for navigation, Cocheco River, New Hampshire, 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 September 19, 1890 (26 Stat. 436), that consists of a 7-foot deep channel that lies northerly of a line the coordinates of which are N255292.31, E713095.36, and N255334.51, E713138.01.

(18) MORRISTOWN HARBOR, NEW YORK.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Morristown Harbor, New York, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Act of January 21, 1927 (44 Stat. 1011): The portion that lies north of the north boundary of Morris Street extended.

(19) OSWEGATCHIE RIVER, OGDENSBURG NEW YORK.—The portion of the Federal channel of the project for navigation, Ogdensburg Harbor, New York, authorized by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 635), as modified by the first section of the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1037), that is in the Oswegatchie River in Ogdensburg, New York, from the southernmost alignment of the Route 68 bridge upstream to the northernmost alignment of the Lake Street bridge.

(20) CONNEAUT HARBOR, OHIO.—The most southerly 300 feet of the 1,670-foot long Shore Arm of the project for navigation, Conneaut Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the first section

of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 633).

(21) LORAIN SMALL BOAT BASIN, LAKE ERIE, OHIO.—The portion of the Federal navigation channel, Lorain Small Boat Basin, Lake Erie, Ohio, authorized pursuant to section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 486) that is situated in the State of Ohio, County of Lorain, Township of Black River and is a part of Original Black River Township Lot Number 1, Tract Number 1, further known as being submerged lands of Lake Erie owned by the State of Ohio and that is more definitely described as follows:

Commencing at a drill hole found on the centerline of Lakeside Avenue (60 feet in width) at the intersection of the centerline of the East Shorearm of Lorain Harbor, said point is known as United States Army Corps of Engineers Monument No. 203 (N658012.20, E208953.88).

Thence, in a line north 75 degrees 26 minutes 12 seconds west, a distance of 387.87 feet to a point (N658109.73, E2089163.47). This point is hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as the "principal point of beginning".

Thence, north 58 degrees 14 minutes 11 seconds west, a distance of 50.00 feet to a point (N658136.05, E2089120.96).

Thence, south 67 degrees 49 minutes 32 seconds east, a distance of 665.16 feet to a point (N657885.00, E2088505.00).

Thence, north 88 degrees 13 minutes 52 seconds east, a distance of 551.38 feet to a point (N657902.02, E2087953.88).

Thence, north 29 degrees 17 minutes 42 seconds east, a distance of 114.18 feet to point (N658001.60, E2088009.75).

Thence, south 88 degrees 11 minutes 40 seconds east, a distance of 477.00 feet to a point (N657986.57, E2088486.51).

Thence, north 68 degrees 11 minutes 06 seconds east, a distance of 601.95 feet to a point (N658210.26, E2089045.35).

Thence, north 35 degrees 11 minutes 34 seconds east, a distance of 89.58 feet to a point (N658283.47, E2089096.98).

Thence, south 20 degrees 56 minutes 30 seconds east, a distance of 186.03 feet to the principal point of beginning (N658109.73, E2089163.47) and containing within such bounds 2.81 acres, more or less, of submerged land.

(22) APPONAUG COVE, WARWICK, RHODE ISLAND.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Apponaug Cove, Rhode Island, authorized under section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 480): The 6-foot channel bounded by coordinates N223269.93, E513089.12; N223348.31, E512799.54; N223251.78, E512773.41; and N223178.0, E513046.0.

(23) PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WISCONSIN.—The following portion of the navigation project for Port Washington Harbor, Wisconsin, authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of July 11, 1870 (16 Stat. 223): Beginning at the northwest corner of project at Channel Pt. No. 36, of the Federal Navigation Project, Port Washington Harbor, Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, at coordinates N513529.68, E2535215.64, thence 188 degrees 31 minutes 59 seconds, a distance of 178.32 feet, thence 196 degrees 47 minutes 17 seconds, a distance of 574.80 feet, thence 270 degrees 58 minutes 25 seconds, a distance of 465.50 feet, thence 178 degrees 56 minutes 17 seconds, a distance of 130.05 feet, thence 87 degrees 17 minutes 05 seconds, a distance of 510.22 feet, thence 104 degrees 58 minutes 31 seconds, a distance of 178.33 feet, thence 115 degrees 47 minutes 55 seconds, a distance of 244.15 feet, thence 25 degrees 12 minutes 08 seconds, a distance of 310.00 feet, thence 294 degrees 46 minutes 50 seconds, a distance of 390.20 feet, thence 16 degrees 56 minutes 16 seconds, a distance of 570.90 feet, thence 266 degrees 01 minutes 25 seconds, a distance of

190.78 feet to Channel Pt. No. 36, point of beginning.

SEC. 502. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) GRAND PRAIRIE REGION AND BAYOU METO BASIN, ARKANSAS.—The project for flood control, Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 174) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(1)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary; except that the scope of the project includes ground water protection and conservation, agricultural water supply, and waterfowl management.

(b) WHITE RIVER, ARKANSAS.—The project for navigation, White River Navigation to Batesville, Arkansas, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4139) and deauthorized by section 52(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4045), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(c) DES PLAINES RIVER, ILLINOIS.—The project for wetlands research, Des Plaines River, Illinois, authorized by section 45 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4041) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(d) ALPENA HARBOR, MICHIGAN.—The project for navigation, Alpena Harbor, Michigan, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1090) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(e) ONTONAGON HARBOR, ONTONAGON COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—The project for navigation, Ontonagon Harbor, Ontonagon County, Michigan, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1176) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(f) KNIFE RIVER HARBOR, MINNESOTA.—The project for navigation, Knife River Harbor, Minnesota, authorized by section 100 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 41) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

(g) CLIFFWOOD BEACH, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control on Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 118) and deauthorized pursuant to section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

SEC. 503. CONTINUATION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding section 1001 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a), the following projects shall remain authorized to be carried out by the Secretary:

(1) CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MICHIGAN.—The project for navigation, Cedar River Harbor, Michigan, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1090).

(2) CROSS VILLAGE HARBOR, MICHIGAN.—The project for navigation, Cross Village Harbor, Michigan, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1405).

(b) LIMITATION.—A project described in subsection (a) shall not be authorized for construction after the last day of the 5-year period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act unless, during such period,

funds have been obligated for the construction (including planning and design) of the project.

SEC. 504. LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) OAKLAND INNER HARBOR TIDAL CANAL PROPERTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 205 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4633) is amended—

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

“(3) To adjacent land owners, the United States title to all or portions of that part of the Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal which are located within the boundaries of the city in which such land rests. Such conveyance shall be at fair market value.”;

(2) by inserting after “right-of-way” the following: “or other rights deemed necessary by the Secretary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “The conveyances and processes involved will be at no cost to the United States.”.

(b) MARIEMONT, OHIO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the village of Mariemont, Ohio, for a sum of \$85,000 all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land (including improvements thereto) under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and known as the “Ohio River Division Laboratory”, as such parcel is described in paragraph (4).

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) PROCEEDS.—All proceeds from the conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States and credited as miscellaneous receipts.

(4) PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) is the parcel situated in the State of Ohio, County of Hamilton, Township 4, Fractional Range 2, Miami Purchase, Columbia Township, Section 15, being parts of Lots 5 and 6 of the subdivision of the dower tract of the estate of Joseph Ferris as recorded in Plat Book 4, Page 112, of the Plat Records of Hamilton County, Ohio, Recorder's Office, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at an iron pin set to mark the intersection of the easterly line of Lot 5 of said subdivision of said dower tract with the northerly line of the right-of-way of the Norfolk and Western Railway Company as shown in Plat Book 27, Page 182, Hamilton County, Ohio, Surveyor's Office, thence with said northerly right-of-way line;

South 70 degrees 10 minutes 13 seconds west 258.52 feet to a point; thence leaving the northerly right-of-way of the Norfolk and Western Railway Company;

North 18 degrees 22 minutes 02 seconds west 302.31 feet to a point in the south line of Mariemont Avenue; thence along said south line;

North 72 degrees 34 minutes 35 seconds east 167.50 feet to a point; thence leaving the south line of Mariemont Avenue;

North 17 degrees 25 minutes 25 seconds west 49.00 feet to a point; thence

North 72 degrees 34 minutes 35 seconds east 100.00 feet to a point; thence

South 17 degrees 25 minutes 25 seconds east 49.00 feet to a point; thence

North 72 degrees 34 minutes 35 seconds east 238.90 feet to a point; thence

South 00 degrees 52 minutes 07 seconds east 297.02 feet to a point in the northerly line of the Norfolk and Western Railway Company; thence with said northerly right-of-way;

South 70 degrees 10 minutes 13 seconds west 159.63 feet to a point of beginning, containing 3.22 acres, more or less.

(c) EUFAULA LAKE, OKLAHOMA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the city of Eufaula, Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land consisting of approximately 12.5 acres located at the Eufaula Lake project.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for the conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be the fair market value of the parcel (as determined by the Secretary) and payment of all costs of the United States in making the conveyance, including the costs of—

(A) the survey required under paragraph (4);

(B) any other necessary survey or survey monumentation;

(C) compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(D) any coordination necessary with respect to requirements relating to endangered species, cultural resources, and clean air (including the costs of agency consultation and public hearings).

(3) LAND SURVEYS.—The exact acreage and description of the parcel to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by such surveys as the Secretary considers necessary, which shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE SURVEY.—Prior to making the conveyance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall conduct an environmental baseline survey to determine the levels of any contamination (as of the date of the survey) for which the United States would be responsible under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and any other applicable law.

(5) CONDITIONS CONCERNING RIGHTS AND EASEMENT.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be subject to existing rights and to retention by the United States of a flowage easement over all portions of the parcel that lie at or below the flowage easement contour for the Eufaula Lake project.

(6) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) BOARDMAN, OREGON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the city of Boardman, Oregon, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land consisting of approximately 141 acres acquired as part of the John Day Lock and Dam project in the vicinity of such city currently under lease to the Boardman Park and Recreation District.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) PARK AND RECREATION PROPERTIES.—Properties to be conveyed under this subsection that will be retained in public ownership and used for public park and recreation purposes shall be conveyed without consideration. If any such property is no longer used for public park and recreation purposes, then title to such property shall revert to the Secretary.

(B) OTHER PROPERTIES.—Properties to be conveyed under this subsection and not described in subparagraph (A) shall be conveyed at fair market value.

(3) CONDITIONS CONCERNING RIGHTS AND EASEMENT.—The conveyance of properties under this subsection shall be subject to existing first rights of refusal regarding acquisition of such properties and to retention of a flowage easement over portions of the properties that the Secretary determines to be necessary for operation of the project.

(4) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of properties under this subsection

shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) TRI-CITIES AREA, WASHINGTON.—

(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make the conveyances to the local governments referred to in paragraph (2) of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in paragraph (2).

(2) PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS.—

(A) BENTON COUNTY.—The property to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) to Benton County, Washington, is the property in such county which is designated “Area D” on Exhibit A to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-81-43.

(B) FRANKLIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) to Franklin County, Washington, is—

(i) the 105.01 acres of property leased pursuant to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20 as executed by Franklin County, Washington, on April 7, 1977;

(ii) the 35 acres of property leased pursuant to Supplemental Agreement No. 1 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20;

(iii) the 20 acres of property commonly known as “Richland Bend” which is designated by the shaded portion of Lot 1, Section 11, and the shaded portion of Lot 1, Section 12, Township 9 North, Range 28 East, W.M. on Exhibit D to Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20;

(iv) the 7.05 acres of property commonly known as “Taylor Flat” which is designated by the shaded portion of Lot 1, Section 13, Township 11 North, Range 28 East, W.M. on Exhibit D to Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20;

(v) the 14.69 acres of property commonly known as “Byers Landing” which is designated by the shaded portion of Lots 2 and 3, Section 2, Township 10 North, Range 28 East, W.M. on Exhibit D to Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20; and

(vi) all levees within Franklin County, Washington, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, and the property upon which the levees are situated.

(C) CITY OF KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) to the city of Kennewick, Washington, is the property within the city which is subject to the Municipal Sublease Agreement entered into on April 6, 1989, between Benton County, Washington, and the cities of Kennewick and Richland, Washington.

(D) CITY OF RICHLAND, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1), to the city of Richland, Washington, is the property within the city which is subject to the Municipal Sublease Agreement entered into on April 6, 1989, between Benton County, Washington, and the Cities of Kennewick and Richland, Washington.

(E) CITY OF PASCO, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1), to the city of Pasco, Washington, is—

(i) the property within the city of Pasco, Washington, which is leased pursuant to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-10; and

(ii) all levees within such city, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, and the property upon which the levees are situated.

(F) PORT OF PASCO, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) to the Port of Pasco, Washington, is—

(i) the property owned by the United States which is south of the Burlington Northern Railroad tracks in Lots 1 and 2, Section 20, Township 9 North, Range 31 East, W.M.; and

(ii) the property owned by the United States which is south of the Burlington Northern Railroad tracks in Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in each of Sections 21, 22, and 23, Township 9 North, Range 31 East, W.M.

(G) ADDITIONAL PROPERTIES.—In addition to properties described in subparagraphs (A) through (F), the Secretary may convey to a local government referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (F) such properties under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the Tri-Cities area as the Secretary and the local government agree are appropriate for conveyance.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The conveyances under paragraph (1) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY.—The property described in paragraph (2)(B)(vi) shall be conveyed only after Franklin County, Washington, has entered into a written agreement with the Secretary which provides that the United States shall continue to operate and maintain the flood control drainage areas and pump stations on the property conveyed and that the United States shall be provided all easements and rights necessary to carry out that agreement.

(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR CITY OF PASCO.—The property described in paragraph (2)(E)(ii) shall be conveyed only after the city of Pasco, Washington, has entered into a written agreement with the Secretary which provides that the United States shall continue to operate and maintain the flood control drainage areas and pump stations on the property conveyed and that the United States shall be provided all easements and rights necessary to carry out that agreement.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—

(i) PARK AND RECREATION PROPERTIES.—Properties to be conveyed under this subsection that will be retained in public ownership and used for public park and recreation purposes shall be conveyed without consideration. If any such property is no longer used for public park and recreation purposes, then title to such property shall revert to the Secretary.

(ii) OTHER PROPERTIES.—Properties to be conveyed under this subsection and not described in clause (i) shall be conveyed at fair market value.

(4) LAKE WALLULA LEVEES.—

(A) DETERMINATION OF MINIMUM SAFE HEIGHT.—

(i) CONTRACT.—Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall contract with a private entity agreed to under clause (ii) to determine, within 6 months after such date of enactment, the minimum safe height for the levees of the project for flood control, Lake Wallula, Washington. The Secretary shall have final approval of the minimum safe height.

(ii) AGREEMENT OF LOCAL OFFICIALS.—A contract shall be entered into under clause (i) only with a private entity agreed to by the Secretary, appropriate representatives of Franklin County, Washington, and appropriate representatives of the city of Pasco, Washington.

(B) AUTHORITY.—A local government may reduce, at its cost, the height of any levee of the project for flood control, Lake Wallula, Washington, within the boundaries of such local government to a height not lower than the minimum safe height determined pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(f) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—Any contract for sale, deed, or other transfer of real property under this section shall be car-

ried out in compliance with all applicable provisions of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and other environmental laws.

SEC. 505. NAMINGS.

(a) MILT BRANDT VISITORS CENTER, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The visitors center at Warm Springs Dam, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1192), shall be known and designated as the "Milt Brandt Visitors Center".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the visitors center referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Milt Brandt Visitors Center".

(b) CARR CREEK LAKE, KENTUCKY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Carr Fork Lake in Knott County, Kentucky, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1188), shall be known and designated as the "Carr Creek Lake".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lake referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Carr Creek Lake".

(c) WILLIAM H. NATCHER BRIDGE, MACEO, KENTUCKY, AND ROCKPORT, INDIANA.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The bridge on United States Route 231 which crosses the Ohio River between Maceo, Kentucky, and Rockport, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the "William H. Natcher Bridge".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the bridge referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William H. Natcher Bridge".

(d) JOHN T. MYERS LOCK AND DAM, INDIANA AND KENTUCKY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Uniontown Lock and Dam, on the Ohio River, Indiana and Kentucky, shall be known and designated as the "John T. Myers Lock and Dam".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John T. Myers Lock and Dam".

(e) J. EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, INDIANA.—

(1) REDESIGNATION.—The lake on the Wabash River in Huntington and Wells Counties, Indiana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 312), and known as Huntington Lake, shall be known and designated as the "J. Edward Roush Lake".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lake referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J. Edward Roush Lake".

(f) RUSSELL B. LONG LOCK AND DAM, RED RIVER WATERWAY, LOUISIANA.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Lock and Dam 4 of the Red River Waterway, Louisiana, shall be known and designated as the "Russell B. Long Lock and Dam".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—A reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Russell B. Long Lock and Dam".

(g) WILLIAM L. JESS DAM AND INTAKE STRUCTURE, OREGON.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The dam located at mile 153.6 on the Rogue River in Jackson County, Oregon, and commonly known as the Lost

Creek Dam Lake Project, shall be known and designated as the "William L. Jess Dam and Intake Structure".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the dam referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William L. Jess Dam and Intake Structure".

(h) ABERDEEN LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The lock and dam at Mile 358 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is designated as the "Aberdeen Lock and Dam".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "Aberdeen Lock and Dam".

(i) AMORY LOCK, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Lock A at Mile 371 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is designated as the "Amory Lock".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "Amory Lock".

(j) FULTON LOCK, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Lock C at Mile 391 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is designated as the "Fulton Lock".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "Fulton Lock".

(k) HOWELL HEFLIN LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) REDESIGNATION.—The lock and dam at Mile 266 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, known as the Gainesville Lock and Dam, is redesignated as the "Howell Heflin Lock and Dam".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "Howell Heflin Lock and Dam".

(l) G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY LOCK, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Lock E at Mile 407 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is designated as the "G.V. 'Sonny' Montgomery Lock".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "G.V. 'Sonny' Montgomery Lock".

(m) JOHN RANKIN LOCK, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Lock D at Mile 398 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is designated as the "John Rankin Lock".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "John Rankin Lock".

(n) JOHN C. STENNIS LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) REDESIGNATION.—The lock and dam at Mile 335 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, known as the Columbus Lock and Dam, is redesignated as the "John C. Stennis Lock and Dam".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "John C. Stennis Lock and Dam".

(c) JAMIE WHITTEN LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) REDESIGNATION.—The lock and dam at Mile 412 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, known as the Bay Springs Lock and Dam, is redesignated as the "Jamie Whitten Lock and Dam".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "Jamie Whitten Lock and Dam".

(p) GLOVER WILKINS LOCK, TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Lock B at Mile 376 of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is designated as the "Glover Wilkins Lock".

(2) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record to the lock referred to in paragraph (1) is deemed to be a reference to the "Glover Wilkins Lock".

SEC. 506. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, RESTORATION, AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical, planning, and design assistance to non-Federal interests for carrying out watershed management, restoration, and development projects at the locations described in subsection (d).

(b) SPECIFIC MEASURES.—Assistance provided pursuant to subsection (a) may be in support of non-Federal projects for the following purposes:

(1) Management and restoration of water quality.

(2) Control and remediation of toxic sediments.

(3) Restoration of degraded streams, rivers, wetlands, and other waterbodies to their natural condition as a means to control flooding, excessive erosion, and sedimentation.

(4) Protection and restoration of watersheds, including urban watersheds.

(5) Demonstration of technologies for non-structural measures to reduce destructive impact of flooding.

(c) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this section shall be 50 percent.

(d) PROJECT LOCATIONS.—The Secretary may provide assistance under subsection (a) for projects at the following locations:

(1) Gila River and Tributaries, Santa Cruz River, Arizona.

(2) Rio Salado, Salt River, Phoenix and Tempe, Arizona.

(3) Colusa basin, California.

(4) Los Angeles River watershed, California.

(5) Russian River watershed, California.

(6) Sacramento River watershed, California.

(7) San Pablo Bay watershed, California.

(8) Nancy Creek, Utoy Creek, and North Peachtree Creek and South Peachtree Creek basin, Georgia.

(9) Lower Platte River watershed, Nebraska.

(10) Juniata River watershed, Pennsylvania, including Raystown Lake.

(11) Upper Potomac River watershed, Grant and Mineral Counties, West Virginia.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 507. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148-4149) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (10);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(12) Goodyear Lake, Otsego County, New York, removal of silt and aquatic growth;

"(13) Otsego Lake, Otsego County, New York, removal of silt and aquatic growth and measures to address high nutrient concentration;

"(14) Oneida Lake, Oneida County, New York, removal of silt and aquatic growth;

"(15) Skaneateles and Owasco Lakes, New York, removal of silt and aquatic growth and prevention of sediment deposit; and

"(16) Twin Lakes, Paris, Illinois, removal of silt and excess aquatic vegetation, including measures to address excessive sedimentation, high nutrient concentration, and shoreline erosion."

SEC. 508. MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon request of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall be responsible for maintenance of the following navigation channels constructed or improved by non-Federal interests if the Secretary determines that such maintenance is economically justified and environmentally acceptable and that the channel was constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering and design standards:

(1) Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Fields Landing Channel, California.

(2) Mare Island Strait, California; except that, for purposes of this section, the navigation channel shall be deemed to have been constructed or improved by non-Federal interests.

(3) Mississippi River Ship Channel, Chalmette Slip, Louisiana.

(4) Greenville Inner Harbor Channel, Mississippi.

(5) Providence Harbor Shipping Channel, Rhode Island.

(6) Matagorda Ship Channel, Point Comfort Turning Basin, Texas.

(7) Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Rincon Canal System, Texas.

(8) Brazos Island Harbor, Texas, connecting channel to Mexico.

(9) Blair Waterway, Tacoma Harbor, Washington.

(b) COMPLETION OF ASSESSMENT.—Within 6 months of receipt of a request from the non-Federal interest for Federal assumption of maintenance of a channel listed in subsection (a), the Secretary shall make a determination as provided in subsection (a) and advise the non-Federal interest of the Secretary's determination.

SEC. 509. GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS AND SEDIMENT REMEDIATION.

Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4644) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS AND SEDIMENT REMEDIATION.

"(a) GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical, planning, and engineering assistance to State and local governments and nongovernmental entities designated by the State or local government in the development and implementation of remedial action plans for areas of concern in the Great Lakes identified under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement of 1978.

"(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Non-Federal interests shall contribute, in cash or by providing in-kind contributions, 50 percent of costs of activities for which assistance is provided under paragraph (1).

"(b) SEDIMENT REMEDIATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (acting through the Great Lakes National Program

Office), may conduct pilot- and full-scale demonstration projects of promising techniques to remediate contaminated sediments in freshwater coastal regions in the Great Lakes basin. The Secretary must conduct no fewer than 3 full-scale demonstration projects under this subsection.

"(2) SITE SELECTION FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In selecting the sites for the technology demonstration projects, the Secretary shall give priority consideration to Saginaw Bay, Michigan, Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin, Grand Calumet River, Indiana, Ashtabula River, Ohio, Buffalo River, New York, and Duluth/Superior Harbor, Minnesota.

"(3) DEADLINE FOR IDENTIFICATIONS.—Within 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall identify the sites and technologies to be demonstrated and complete each such full-scale demonstration project within 3 years after such date of enactment.

"(4) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Non-Federal interests shall contribute 50 percent of costs of projects under this subsection. Such costs may be paid in cash or by providing in-kind contributions.

"(5) AUTHORIZATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2000."

SEC. 510. GREAT LAKES DREDGED MATERIAL TESTING AND EVALUATION MANUAL.

The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall provide technical assistance to non-Federal interests on testing procedures contained in the Great Lakes Dredged Material Testing and Evaluation Manual developed pursuant to section 230.2(c) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 511. GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT REDUCTION.

(a) GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL.—For each major river system or set of major river systems depositing sediment into a Great Lakes federally authorized commercial harbor, channel maintenance project site, or Area of Concern identified under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement of 1978, the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the Great Lakes States, shall develop a tributary sediment transport model.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR MODELS.—In developing a tributary sediment transport model under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) build upon data and monitoring information generated in earlier studies and programs of the Great Lakes and their tributaries; and

(2) complete models for 30 major river systems, either individually or in combination as part of a set, within the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 512. GREAT LAKES CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the general conditions of confined disposal facilities in the Great Lakes.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a), including the following:

(1) A description of the cumulative effects of confined disposal facilities in the Great Lakes.

(2) Recommendations for specific remediation actions for each confined disposal facility in the Great Lakes.

(3) An evaluation of, and recommendations for, confined disposal facility management

practices and technologies to conserve capacity at such facilities and to minimize adverse environmental effects at such facilities throughout the Great Lakes system.

SEC. 513. CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to provide to non-Federal interests in the Chesapeake Bay watershed technical, planning, design, and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects affecting the Chesapeake Bay, including projects for sediment and erosion control, protection of eroding shorelines, protection of essential public works, wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, and beneficial uses of dredged material, and other related projects.

(b) **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned and will be publicly operated and maintained.

(c) **COOPERATION AGREEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a project cooperation agreement pursuant to section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1818) with a non-Federal interest to provide for technical, planning, design, and construction assistance for the project.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each agreement entered into pursuant to this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials, of a plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications and an estimate of expected benefits.

(B) **LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.**—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation and maintenance of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(d) **COST SHARING.**—

(1) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2)(B), the Federal share of the total project costs of each local cooperation agreement entered into under this section shall be 75 percent.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(A) **PROVISION OF LANDS, EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, AND RELOCATIONS.**—The non-Federal interests for a project to which this section applies shall provide the lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for the project.

(B) **VALUE OF LANDS, EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, AND RELOCATIONS.**—In determining the non-Federal contribution toward carrying out a local cooperation agreement entered into under this section, the Secretary shall provide credit to a non-Federal interest for the value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas provided by the non-Federal interest, except that the amount of credit provided for a project under this paragraph may not exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(C) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.**—The non-Federal share of the costs of operation and maintenance of carrying out the agreement under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS AND AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this section waives, limits, or otherwise affects the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(2) **COOPERATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall cooperate with the heads of appropriate Federal agencies.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, together with a recommendation concerning whether or not the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$15,000,000.

SEC. 514. EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

The jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, established by the first section of the Act of June 28, 1879 (33 U.S.C. 641; 21 Stat. 37), is extended to include—

(1) all of the area between the eastern side of the Bayou Lafourche Ridge from Donaldsonville, Louisiana, to the Gulf of Mexico and the west side levee of the Mississippi River from Donaldsonville, Louisiana, to the Gulf of Mexico;

(2) Alexander County, Illinois; and

(3) the area in the State of Illinois from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers northward to the vicinity of Mississippi River mile 39.5, including the Len Small Drainage and Levee District, insofar as such area is affected by the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

SEC. 515. ALTERNATIVE TO ANNUAL PASSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall evaluate the feasibility of implementing an alternative to the \$25 annual pass that the Secretary currently offers to users of recreation facilities at water resources projects of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) **ANNUAL PASS.**—The evaluation under subsection (a) shall include the establishment of an annual pass which costs \$10 or less for the use of recreation facilities at Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the project carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether annual passes for individual projects should be offered on a nationwide basis.

SEC. 516. RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall promote Federal, non-Federal, and private sector cooperation in creating public recreation opportunities and developing the necessary supporting infrastructure at water resources projects of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) **INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**—

(1) **RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**—In demonstrating the feasibility of the public-private cooperative, the Secretary shall provide, at Federal expense, such infrastructure improvements as are necessary to support a potential private recreational development at the Raystown Lake Project, Pennsylvania, generally in accordance with the Master Plan Update (1994) for the project.

(2) **AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with an appropriate non-Federal public entity to ensure that the infrastructure improvements constructed by the Secretary on non-project lands pursuant to paragraph (1) are transferred to and operated and maintained by the non-Federal public entity.

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$4,500,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the cooperative efforts carried out under this section,

including the improvements required by subsection (b).

SEC. 517. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4836-4837) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for providing construction assistance under this section—

“(1) \$10,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(5);

“(2) \$2,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(6);

“(3) \$10,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(7);

“(4) \$11,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(8);

“(5) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(16); and

“(6) \$20,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(17).”.

SEC. 518. CORPS CAPABILITY TO CONSERVE FISH AND WILDLIFE.

Section 704(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263(b); 100 Stat. 4157) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$5,000,000”; and inserting “\$10,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (4) by inserting “and Virginia” after “Maryland”.

SEC. 519. PERIODIC BEACH NOURISHMENT.

The Secretary shall carry out periodic beach nourishment for each of the following projects for a period of 50 years beginning on the date of initiation of construction of such project:

(1) **BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.**—Project for shoreline protection, segments II and III, Broward County, Florida.

(2) **FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.**—Project for shoreline protection, Fort Pierce, Florida.

(3) **LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.**—Project for shoreline protection, Lee County, Captiva Island segment, Florida.

(4) **PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.**—Project for shoreline protection, Jupiter/Carlin, Ocean Ridge, and Boca Raton North Beach segments, Palm Beach County, Florida.

(5) **PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FLORIDA.**—Project for shoreline protection, Panama City Beaches, Florida.

(6) **TYBEE ISLAND, GEORGIA.**—Project for beach erosion control, Tybee Island, Georgia.

SEC. 520. CONTROL OF AQUATIC PLANTS.

The Secretary shall carry out under section 104(b) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(b))—

(1) a program to control aquatic plants in Lake St. Clair, Michigan; and

(2) program to control aquatic plants in the Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 521. HOPPER DREDGES.

Section 3 of the Act of August 11, 1888 (33 U.S.C. 622; 25 Stat. 423), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **PROGRAM TO INCREASE USE OF PRIVATE HOPPER DREDGES.**—

“(1) **INITIATION.**—The Secretary shall initiate a program to increase the use of private industry hopper dredges for the construction and maintenance of Federal navigation channels.

“(2) **READY RESERVE STATUS FOR HOPPER DREDGE WHEELER.**—In order to carry out the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary shall, not later than the earlier of 90 days after the date of completion of the rehabilitation of the hopper dredge McFarland pursuant to section 564 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 or October 1, 1997, place the Federal hopper dredge Wheeler in a ready reserve status.

“(3) **TESTING AND USE OF READY RESERVE HOPPER DREDGE.**—The Secretary may periodically perform routine tests of the equipment

of the vessel placed in a ready reserve status under this subsection to ensure the vessel's ability to perform emergency work. The Secretary shall not assign any scheduled hopper dredging work to such vessel but shall perform any repairs needed to maintain the vessel in a fully operational condition. The Secretary may place the vessel in active status in order to perform any dredging work only in the event the Secretary determines that private industry has failed to submit a responsive and responsible bid for work advertised by the Secretary or to carry out the project as required pursuant to a contract with the Secretary.

"(4) REPAIR AND REHABILITATION.—The Secretary may undertake any repair and rehabilitation of any Federal hopper dredge, including the vessel placed in ready reserve status under paragraph (2) to allow the vessel to be placed into active status as provided in paragraph (3).

"(5) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall develop and implement procedures to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, private industry hopper dredge capacity is available to meet both routine and time-sensitive dredging needs. Such procedures shall include—

"(A) scheduling of contract solicitations to effectively distribute dredging work throughout the dredging season; and

"(B) use of expedited contracting procedures to allow dredges performing routine work to be made available to meet time-sensitive, urgent, or emergency dredging needs.

"(6) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall report to Congress on whether the vessel placed in ready reserve status pursuant to paragraph (2) is needed to be returned to active status or continued in a ready reserve status or whether another Federal hopper dredge should be placed in a ready reserve status.

"(7) LIMITATIONS.—

"(A) REDUCTIONS IN STATUS.—The Secretary may not further reduce the readiness status of any Federal hopper dredge below a ready reserve status except any vessel placed in such status for not less than 5 years which the Secretary determines has not been used sufficiently to justify retaining the vessel in such status.

"(B) INCREASE IN ASSIGNMENTS OF DREDGING WORK.—For each fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall not assign any greater quantity of dredging work to any Federal hopper dredge in an active status than was assigned to that vessel in the average of the 3 prior fiscal years.

"(8) CONTRACTS; PAYMENT OF CAPITAL COSTS.—The Secretary may enter into a contract for the maintenance and crewing of any vessel retained in a ready reserve status. The capital costs (including depreciation costs) of any vessel retained in such status shall be paid for out of funds made available from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and shall not be charged against the Corps of Engineers' Revolving Fund Account or any individual project cost unless the vessel is specifically used in connection with that project."

SEC. 522. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary shall provide design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests for the following projects:

(1) Repair and rehabilitation of the Lower Girard Lake Dam, Girard, Ohio, at an estimated total cost of \$2,500,000.

(2) Construction of a multi-purpose dam and reservoir, Bear Valley Dam, Franklin County, Pennsylvania, at an estimated total cost of \$15,000,000.

(3) Repair and upgrade of the dam and appurtenant features at Lake Merriweather, Little Calpasture River, Virginia, at an estimated total cost of \$6,000,000.

SEC. 523. FIELD OFFICE HEADQUARTERS FACILITIES.

Subject to amounts being made available in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use Plant Replacement and Improvement Program funds to design and construct a new headquarters facility for—

(1) the New England Division, Waltham, Massachusetts; and

(2) the Jacksonville District, Jacksonville, Florida.

SEC. 524. CORPS OF ENGINEERS RESTRUCTURING PLAN.

(a) DIVISION OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.—The Secretary shall continue to maintain a division office of the Corps of Engineers in Chicago, Illinois, notwithstanding any plan developed pursuant to title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996 (109 Stat. 405) to reduce the number of division offices. Such division office shall be responsible for the 5 district offices for which the division office was responsible on June 1, 1996.

(b) DISTRICT OFFICE, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—The Secretary shall not reassign the St. Louis District of the Corps of Engineers from the operational control of the Lower Mississippi Valley Division.

SEC. 525. LAKE SUPERIOR CENTER.

(a) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary, shall assist the Minnesota Lake Superior Center authority in the construction of an educational facility to be used in connection with efforts to educate the public in the economic, recreational, biological, aesthetic, and spiritual worth of Lake Superior and other large bodies of fresh water.

(b) PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.—Prior to providing any assistance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall verify that the facility to be constructed under subsection (a) will be owned by the public authority established by the State of Minnesota to develop, operate, and maintain the Lake Superior Center.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, \$10,000,000 for the construction of the facility under subsection (a).

SEC. 526. JACKSON COUNTY, ALABAMA.

The Secretary shall provide technical, planning, and design assistance to non-Federal interests for wastewater treatment and related facilities, remediation of point and nonpoint sources of pollution and contaminated riverbed sediments, and related activities in Jackson County, Alabama, including the city of Stevenson. The Federal cost of such assistance may not exceed \$5,000,000.

SEC. 527. EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS CENTER OF EXPERTISE EXTENSION.

The Secretary shall establish an extension of the Earthquake Preparedness Center of Expertise for the central United States at an existing district office of the Corps of Engineers near the New Madrid fault.

SEC. 528. QUARANTINE FACILITY.

Section 108(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4816) is amended by striking "\$1,000,000" and inserting "\$4,000,000".

SEC. 529. BENTON AND WASHINGTON COUNTIES, ARKANSAS.

Section 220 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4836-4837) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—The Secretary may make available to the non-Federal interests funds not to exceed an amount equal to the Federal share of the total

project cost to be used by the non-Federal interests to undertake the work directly or by contract."

SEC. 530. CALAVERAS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements with non-Federal interests to develop and carry out, in cooperation with Federal and State agencies, reclamation and protection projects for the purpose of abating and mitigating surface water quality degradation caused by abandoned mines in the watershed of the lower Mokelumne River in Calaveras County, California.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Any project under subsection (a) that is located on lands owned by the United States shall be undertaken in consultation with the Federal entity with administrative jurisdiction over such lands.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the activities conducted under cooperation agreements entered into under subsection (a) shall be 75 percent; except that, with respect to projects located on lands owned by the United States, the Federal share shall be 100 percent. The non-Federal share of project costs may be provided in the form of design and construction services. Non-Federal interests shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of such services completed by such interests prior to entering an agreement with the Secretary for a project.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for projects undertaken under this section.

SEC. 531. FARMINGTON DAM, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONJUNCTIVE USE STUDY.—The Secretary is directed to continue participation in the Stockton, California Metropolitan Area Flood Control study to include the evaluation of the feasibility of storage of water at Farmington Dam to implement a conjunctive use plan. In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult with the Stockton East Water District concerning joint operation or potential transfer of Farmington Dam. The Secretary shall make recommendations on facility transfers and operational alternatives as part of the Secretary's report to Congress.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress, no later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the feasibility of a conjunctive use plan using Farmington Dam for water storage.

SEC. 532. LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CALIFORNIA.

The non-Federal share for a project to add water conservation to the existing Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, project shall be 100 percent of separable first costs and separable operation, maintenance, and replacement costs associated with the water conservation purpose.

SEC. 533. PRADO DAM SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary, in coordination with the State of California, shall provide technical assistance to Orange County, California, in developing appropriate public safety and access improvements associated with that portion of California State Route 71 being relocated for the Prado Dam feature of the project authorized as part of the project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113).

SEC. 534. SEVEN OAKS DAM, CALIFORNIA.

The non-Federal share for a project to add water conservation to the Seven Oaks Dam, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, project shall be 100 percent of separable first costs and separable operation, maintenance,

and replacement costs associated with the water conservation purpose.

SEC. 535. MANATEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

The project for flood control, Cedar Hammock (Wares Creek), Florida, is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the Final Detailed Project Report and Environmental Assessment, dated April 1995, at a total cost of \$13,846,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of \$8,783,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,063,000.

SEC. 536. TAMPA, FLORIDA.

The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement under section 230 of this Act with the Museum of Science and Industry, Tampa, Florida, to provide technical, planning, and design assistance to demonstrate the water quality functions found in wetlands, at an estimated total Federal cost of \$500,000.

SEC. 537. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR DEEP RIVER BASIN, INDIANA.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, shall develop a watershed management plan for the Deep River Basin, Indiana, which includes Deep River, Lake George, Turkey Creek, and other related tributaries in Indiana.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan to be developed by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall address specific concerns related to the Deep River Basin area, including sediment flow into Deep River, Turkey Creek, and other tributaries; control of sediment quality in Lake George; flooding problems; the safety of the Lake George Dam; and watershed management.

SEC. 538. SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in southern and eastern Kentucky. Such assistance may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in southern and eastern Kentucky, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply, storage, treatment, and distribution facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

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

(c) PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a project cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with such assistance.

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

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

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of each such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to assure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Total project costs under each agreement entered into under this subsection shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal, except that the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by such interest before entry into the agreement with the Secretary. The Federal

share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN FINANCING COSTS.—In the event of delays in the reimbursement of the non-Federal share of a project, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest and other associated financing costs necessary for such non-Federal interest to provide the non-Federal share of the project's cost.

(C) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest toward its share of project costs, including for costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the placement of such project on publicly owned or controlled lands, but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(D) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Operation and maintenance costs shall be 100 percent non-Federal.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as waiving, limiting, or otherwise affecting the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law which would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1999, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether or not such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(g) SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "southern and eastern Kentucky" means Morgan, Floyd, Pulaski, Wayne, Laurel, Knox, Pike, Menifee, Perry, Harlan, Breathitt, Martin, Jackson, Wolfe, Clay, Magoffin, Owsley, Johnson, Leslie, Lawrence, Knott, Bell, McCreary, Rockcastle, Whitley, Lee, and Letcher Counties, Kentucky.

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

SEC. 539. LOUISIANA COASTAL WETLANDS RESTORATION PROJECTS.

Section 303(f) of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 3952(f); 104 Stat. 4782-4783) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking "and (3)" and inserting "(3), and (5)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) FEDERAL SHARE IN CALENDAR YEARS 1996 AND 1997.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), amounts made available in accordance with section 306 of this title to carry out coastal wetlands restoration projects under this section in calendar years 1996 and 1997 shall provide 90 percent of the cost of such projects."

SEC. 540. SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA.

(a) FLOOD CONTROL.—The Secretary is directed to proceed with engineering, design, and construction of projects to provide for flood control and improvements to rainfall drainage systems in Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany Parishes, Louisiana, in accordance with the following reports of the New Orleans District Engineer: Jefferson and Orleans Parishes, Louisiana, Urban Flood Control and Water Quality Management, July 1992; Tangipahoa, Techefunct, and Tickfaw Rivers, Louisiana, June 1991; St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana, July 1996; and Schneider Canal, Slidell, Louisiana, Hurricane Protection, May 1990.

(b) COST SHARING.—The cost of any work performed by the non-Federal interests subsequent to the reports referred to in subsection (a) and determined by the Secretary

to be a compatible and integral part of the projects shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the projects.

(c) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of projects described in the reports referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 541. RESTORATION PROJECTS FOR MARYLAND, PENNSYLVANIA, AND WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements with non-Federal interests to develop and carry out, in cooperation with Federal and State agencies, reclamation and protection projects for the purpose of abating and mitigating surface water quality degradation caused by abandoned mines along—

(A) the North Branch of the Potomac River, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia; and

(B) the New River, West Virginia, watershed.

(2) ADDITIONAL MEASURES.—Projects under paragraph (1) may also include measures for the abatement and mitigation of surface water quality degradation caused by the lack of sanitary wastewater treatment facilities or the need to enhance such facilities.

(3) CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Any project under paragraph (1) that is located on lands owned by the United States shall be undertaken in consultation with the Federal entity with administrative jurisdiction over such lands.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the activities conducted under cooperation agreements entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall be 75 percent; except that, with respect to projects located on lands owned by the United States, the Federal share shall be 100 percent. The non-Federal share of project costs may be provided in the form of design and construction services. Non-Federal interests shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of such services completed by such interests prior to entering an agreement with the Secretary for a project.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000 for projects undertaken under subsection (a)(1)(A) and \$5,000,000 for projects undertaken under subsection (a)(1)(B).

SEC. 542. CUMBERLAND, MARYLAND.

The Secretary is directed to provide technical, planning, and design assistance to State, local, and other Federal entities for the restoration of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, in the vicinity of Cumberland, Maryland.

SEC. 543. BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL, POPLAR ISLAND, MARYLAND.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for the beneficial use of dredged material at Poplar Island, Maryland, pursuant to section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992; except that, notwithstanding the limitation contained in subsection (e) of such section, the initial cost of constructing dikes for the project shall be \$78,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$58,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$19,500,000.

SEC. 544. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES, SMITH ISLAND, MARYLAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall implement erosion control measures in the vicinity of Rhodes Point, Smith Island, Maryland, at an estimated total Federal cost of \$450,000.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION ON EMERGENCY BASIS.—The project under subsection (a) shall be carried out on an emergency basis in view of the national, historic, and cultural value of the island and in order to protect

the Federal investment in infrastructure facilities.

(c) **COST SHARING.**—Cost sharing applicable to hurricane and storm damage reduction shall be applicable to the project to be carried out under subsection (a).

SEC. 545. DULUTH, MINNESOTA, ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY PROJECT.

(a) **PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary shall develop and implement alternative methods for decontamination and disposal of contaminated dredged material at the Port of Duluth, Minnesota.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, to carry out this section \$1,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 546. REDWOOD RIVER BASIN, MINNESOTA.

(a) **STUDY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT.**—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the State of Minnesota, shall conduct a study, and develop a strategy, for using wetland restoration, soil and water conservation practices, and non-structural measures to reduce flood damages, improve water quality, and create wildlife habitat in the Redwood River basin and the subbasins draining into the Minnesota River, at an estimated Federal cost of \$4,000,000.

(b) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the cost of the study and development of the strategy shall be 25 percent and may be provided through in-kind services and materials.

(c) **COOPERATION AGREEMENT.**—In conducting the study and developing the strategy under this section, the Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies, including activities for the implementation of wetland restoration projects and soil and water conservation measures.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Secretary shall undertake development and implementation of the strategy authorized by this section in cooperation with local landowners and local government officials.

SEC. 547. NATCHEZ BLUFFS, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the project for bluff stabilization, Natchez Bluffs, Natchez, Mississippi, substantially in accordance with (1) the Natchez Bluffs Study, dated September 1985, (2) the Natchez Bluffs Study: Supplement I, dated June 1990, and (3) the Natchez Bluffs Study: Supplement II, dated December 1993, in the portions of the bluffs described in subsection (b), at a total cost of \$17,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$12,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,300,000.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT LOCATION.**—The portions of the Natchez Bluffs where the project is to be carried out under subsection (a) are described in the studies referred to in subsection (a) as—

(1) Clifton Avenue, area 3;

(2) the bluff above Silver Street, area 6;

(3) the bluff above Natchez Under-the-Hill, area 7; and

(4) Madison Street to State Street, area 4.

SEC. 548. SARDIS LAKE, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) **MANAGEMENT.**—The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the State of Mississippi and the city of Sardis, Mississippi, to the maximum extent practicable, in the management of existing and proposed leases of land consistent with the Sardis Lake Recreation and Tourism Master Plan prepared by the city for the economic development of the Sardis Lake area.

(b) **FLOOD CONTROL STORAGE.**—The Secretary shall review the study conducted by the city of Sardis, Mississippi, regarding the impact of the Sardis Lake Recreation and

Tourism Master Plan prepared by the city on flood control storage in Sardis Lake. The city shall not be required to reimburse the Secretary for the cost of such storage, or the cost of the Secretary's review, if the Secretary finds that the loss of flood control storage resulting from implementation of the master plan is not significant.

SEC. 549. MISSOURI RIVER MANAGEMENT.

(a) **NAVIGATION SEASON EXTENSION.**—

(1) **INCREASES.**—The Secretary, working with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, shall incrementally increase the length of each navigation season for the Missouri River by 15 days from the length of the previous navigation season and those seasons thereafter, until such time as the navigation season for the Missouri River is increased by 1 month from the length of the navigation season on April 1, 1996.

(2) **APPLICATION OF INCREASES.**—Increases in the length of the navigation season under paragraph (1) shall be applied in calendar year 1996 so that the navigation season in such calendar year for the Missouri River begins on April 1, 1996, and ends on December 15, 1996.

(3) **ADJUSTMENT OF NAVIGATION LEVELS.**—Scheduled full navigation levels shall be incrementally increased to coincide with increases in the navigation season under paragraph (1).

(b) **WATER CONTROL POLICIES AFFECTING NAVIGATION CHANNELS.**—The Secretary may not take any action which is inconsistent with a water control policy of the Corps of Engineers in effect on January 1, 1995, if such action would result in—

(1) a reduction of 10 days or more in the total number of days in a year during which vessels are able to use navigation channels; or

(2) a substantial increase in flood damage to lands adjacent to a navigation channel, unless such action is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION.**—Whenever a Federal department, agency, or instrumentality conducts an environmental impact statement with respect to management of the Missouri River system, the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality shall also conduct a cost benefit analysis on any changes proposed in the management of the Missouri River.

SEC. 550. ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI, FLOOD PROTECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no county located at the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers or community located in any county located at the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers shall have its participation in any Federal program suspended, revoked, or otherwise affected solely due to that county or community permitting the raising of levees by any public-sponsored levee district, along an alignment approved by the circuit court of such county, to a level sufficient to contain a 20-year flood.

(b) **TREATMENT OF EXISTING PERMITS.**—If any public-sponsored levee district has received a Federal permit valid during the Great Flood of 1993 to improve or modify its levee system before the date of the enactment of this Act, such permit shall be considered adequate to allow the raising of the height of levees in such system under subsection (a).

SEC. 551. DURHAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement under section 230 of this Act with the University of New Hampshire to

provide technical assistance for a water treatment technology center addressing the needs of small communities.

SEC. 552. HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS AREA, NEW JERSEY.

Section 324(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4849) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) Mitigation, enhancement, and acquisition of significant wetlands that contribute to the Meadowlands ecosystem.”

SEC. 553. AUTHORIZATION OF DREDGE MATERIAL CONTAINMENT FACILITY FOR PORT OF NEW YORK/NEW JERSEY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a dredged material containment facility with a capacity commensurate with the long-term dredged material disposal needs of port facilities under the jurisdiction of the Port of New York/New Jersey. Such facility may be a near-shore dredged material disposal facility along the Brooklyn waterfront. The costs associated with feasibility studies, design, engineering, and construction shall be shared with the local sponsor in accordance with the provisions of section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

(b) **BENEFICIAL USE.**—After the facility to be constructed under subsection (a) has been filled to capacity with dredged material, the Secretary shall maintain the facility for the public benefit.

SEC. 554. HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NEW YORK.

(a) **HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECT.**—The Secretary shall expedite the feasibility study of the Hudson River Habitat Restoration, Hudson River Basin, New York, and shall carry out no fewer than 4 projects for habitat restoration, to the extent the Secretary determines such work to be technically feasible. Such projects shall be designed to—

(1) provide a pilot project to assess and improve habitat value and environmental outputs of recommended projects;

(2) provide a demonstration project to evaluate various restoration techniques for effectiveness and cost;

(3) fill an important local habitat need within a specific portion of the study area; and

(4) take advantage of ongoing or planned actions by other agencies, local municipalities, or environmental groups that would increase the effectiveness or decrease the overall cost of implementing one of the recommended restoration project sites.

(b) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—Non-Federal interests shall provide 25 percent of the cost on each project undertaken under subsection (a). The non-Federal share may be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$11,000,000.

SEC. 555. QUEENS COUNTY, NEW YORK.

(a) **DESCRIPTION OF NONNAVIGABLE AREA.**—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the area of Long Island City, Queens County, New York, that—

(1) is not submerged;

(2) lies between the southerly high water line (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of Anable Basin (also known as the “11th Street Basin”) and the northerly high water line (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of Newtown Creek; and

(3) extends from the high water line (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of the East River to the original high water line of the East River;

is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States.

(b) **REQUIREMENT THAT AREA BE IMPROVED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) shall apply

only to those portions of the area described in subsection (a) that are, or will be, bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied by permanent structures or other permanent physical improvements (including parkland).

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL LAW.**—Improvements described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to applicable Federal laws, including—

(A) sections 9 and 10 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 March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401 and 403);

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

(C) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(c) **EXPIRATION DATE.**—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) shall expire with respect to a portion of the area described in subsection (a), if the portion—

(1) is not bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied by a permanent structure or other permanent physical improvement (including parkland) in accordance with subsection (b) by the date that is 20 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) requires an improvement described in subsection (b)(2) that is subject to a permit under an applicable Federal law and the improvement is not commenced by the date that is 5 years after the date of issuance of the permit.

SEC. 556. NEW YORK BIGHT AND HARBOR STUDY.

Section 326(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4851) is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”.

SEC. 557. NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to make capital improvements to the New York State Canal System.

(b) **AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall, with the consent of appropriate local and State entities, enter into such arrangements, contracts, and leases with public and private entities as may be necessary for the purposes of rehabilitation, renovation, preservation, and maintenance of the New York State Canal System and its related facilities, including trailside facilities and other recreational projects along the waterways of the canal system.

(c) **NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “New York State Canal System” means the Erie, Oswego, Champlain, and Cayuga-Seneca Canals.

(d) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the cost of capital improvements under this section shall be 50 percent.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000.

SEC. 558. NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the New York City Watershed.

(2) **FORM.**—Assistance provided under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in the New York City Watershed, including projects for water supply, storage, treatment, and distribution facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

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

(c) **ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.**—

(1) **CERTIFICATION.**—A project shall be eligible for financial assistance under this sec-

tion only if the State director for the project certifies to the Secretary that the project will contribute to the protection and enhancement of the quality or quantity of the New York City water supply.

(2) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.**—In certifying projects to the Secretary, the State director shall give special consideration to those projects implementing plans, agreements, and measures which preserve and enhance the economic and social character of the watershed communities.

(3) **PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS.**—Projects eligible for assistance under this section shall include the following:

(A) Implementation of intergovernmental agreements for coordinating regulatory and management responsibilities.

(B) Acceleration of whole farm planning to implement best management practices to maintain or enhance water quality and to promote agricultural land use.

(C) Acceleration of whole community planning to promote intergovernmental cooperation in the regulation and management of activities consistent with the goal of maintaining or enhancing water quality.

(D) Natural resources stewardship on public and private lands to promote land uses that preserve and enhance the economic and social character of the watershed communities and protect and enhance water quality.

(d) **COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a project cooperation agreement with the State director for the project to be carried out with such assistance.

(e) **COST SHARING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Total project costs under each agreement entered into under this section shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by such interest prior to entering into the agreement with the Secretary for a project. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(2) **INTEREST.**—In the event of delays in the reimbursement of the non-Federal share of a project, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest costs incurred to provide the non-Federal share of a project's cost.

(3) **LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.**—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest toward its share of project costs, including direct costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the placement of such project on public owned or controlled lands, but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(4) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.**—Operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent non-Federal.

(f) **APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2000, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(h) **NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, the term “New York City Watershed” means the land area within the counties of Delaware, Greene,

Schoharie, Ulster, Sullivan, Westchester, Putnam, and Dutchess which contributes water to the water supply system of New York City.

(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000.

SEC. 559. OHIO RIVER GREENWAY.

(a) **EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF STUDY.**—The Secretary is directed to expedite the completion of the study for the Ohio River Greenway, Jeffersonville, Clarksville, and New Albany, Indiana.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Upon completion of the study, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary shall participate with the non-Federal interests in the construction of the project.

(c) **COST SHARING.**—Total project costs under this section shall be shared at 50 percent Federal and 50 percent non-Federal.

(d) **LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—Non-Federal interests shall be responsible for providing all lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for the project.

(e) **CREDIT.**—The non-Federal interests shall receive credit for those costs incurred by the non-Federal interests that the Secretary determines are compatible with the study, design, and implementation of the project.

SEC. 560. NORTHEASTERN OHIO.

The Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to local interests for planning the establishment of a regional water authority in northeastern Ohio to address the water problems of the region. The Federal share of the costs of such planning shall not exceed 75 percent.

SEC. 561. GRAND LAKE, OKLAHOMA.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall carry out and complete a study of flood control in Grand/Neosho Basin and tributaries in the vicinity of Pensacola Dam in northeastern Oklahoma to determine the scope of the backwater effects of operation of the dam and to identify any lands which the Secretary determines have been adversely impacted by such operation or should have been originally purchased as flowage easement for the project.

(b) **ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—Upon completion of the study and subject to advance appropriations, the Secretary shall acquire from willing sellers such real property interests in any lands identified in the study as the Secretary determines are necessary to reduce the adverse impacts identified in the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.**—The Secretary shall transmit to Congress reports on the operation of the Pensacola Dam, including data on and a description of releases in anticipation of flooding (referred to as preoccupancy releases), and the implementation of this section. The first of such reports shall be transmitted not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

(2) **MAXIMUM FUNDING FOR STUDY.**—Of amounts appropriated to carry out this section, not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for carrying out the study under subsection (a).

SEC. 562. BROAD TOP REGION OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Section 304 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4840) is amended—

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

“(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the activities conducted under the cooperative agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall be 75 percent. The non-Federal share of project costs may be provided in the form of design and construction services and other in-kind work provided by the non-Federal interests, whether occurring subsequent to, or within 6 years prior to, entering into an agreement with the Secretary. Non-Federal interests shall receive credit for grants and the value of work performed on behalf of such interests by State and local agencies.”; and

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “\$5,500,000” and inserting “\$11,000,000”.

SEC. 563. CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall modify the allocation of costs for the water reallocation project at Curwensville Lake, Pennsylvania, to the extent that the Secretary determines that such reallocation will provide environmental restoration benefits in meeting in-stream flow needs in the Susquehanna River basin.

SEC. 564. HOPPER DREDGE MCFARLAND.

(a) PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania, to make modernization and efficiency improvements to the hopper dredge McFarland.

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

(1) determine whether the McFarland should be returned to active service or the reserve fleet after the project is completed; and

(2) establish minimum standards of dredging service to be met in areas served by the McFarland while the drydocking is taking place.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 565. PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) WATER WORKS RESTORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide planning, design, and construction assistance for the protection and restoration of the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Water Works.

(2) COORDINATION.—In providing assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall coordinate with the Fairmount Park Commission and the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

(b) COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR SCHUYLKILL NAVIGATION CANAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperation agreement with the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to participate in the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of the Schuylkill Navigation Canal at Manayunk.

(2) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation under paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$300,000 annually.

(3) AREA INCLUDED.—For purposes of this subsection, the Schuylkill Navigation Canal includes the section approximately 10,000 feet long extending between Lock and Fountain Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(c) SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK.—

(1) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical, planning, design, and construction assistance for the Schuylkill River Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(2) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$2,700,000 to carry out this subsection.

(d) PENNYPACK PARK.—

(1) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical, design, construction, and financial assistance for measures for the improvement and restoration of aquatic habitats and aquatic resources at Pennypack Park, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(2) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—In providing assistance under this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements with the city of Philadelphia, acting through the Fairmount Park Commission.

(3) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, \$15,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

(e) FRANKFORD DAM.—

(1) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements with the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, acting through the Fairmount Park Commission, to provide assistance for the elimination of the Frankford Dam, the replacement of the Rhawn Street Dam, and modifications to the Roosevelt Dam and the Verree Road Dam.

(2) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996, \$900,000, to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 566. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK.

(a) STUDY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of New York, shall conduct a study, and develop a strategy, for using wetland restoration, soil and water conservation practices, and nonstructural measures to reduce flood damages, improve water quality, and create wildlife habitat in the following portions of the Upper Susquehanna River basin:

(1) the Juniata River watershed, Pennsylvania, at an estimated Federal cost of \$15,000,000; and

(2) the Susquehanna River watershed upstream of the Chemung River, New York, at an estimated Federal cost of \$10,000,000.

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the study and development of the strategy shall be 25 percent and may be provided through in-kind services and materials.

(c) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—In conducting the study and developing the strategy under this section, the Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies, including activities for the implementation of wetland restoration projects and soil and water conservation measures.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall undertake development and implementation of the strategy authorized by this section in cooperation with local landowners and local government officials.

SEC. 567. SEVEN POINTS VISITORS CENTER, RAYSTOWN LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct a visitors center and related public use facilities at the Seven Points Recreation Area at Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, generally in accordance with the Master Plan Update (1994) for the Raystown Lake Project.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,500,000.

SEC. 568. SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in southeastern Pennsylvania. Such assistance may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and re-

source protection and development projects in southeastern Pennsylvania, including projects for waste water treatment and related facilities, water supply, storage, treatment, and distribution facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

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

(c) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with such assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

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

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of each such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to assure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Total project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by such interest prior to entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project. The credit for such design work shall not exceed 6 percent of the total construction costs of the project. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

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

(C) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs, including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such project on publicly owned or controlled lands, but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

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

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as waiving, limiting, or otherwise affecting the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law which would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether or not such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(f) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “Southeastern Pennsylvania” means Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery Counties, Pennsylvania.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this section \$25,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 569. WILLS CREEK, HYNDMAN, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for flood control, Wills Creek, Borough of Hyndman, Pennsylvania, at an estimated total cost of \$5,000,000. For purposes of section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1829), benefits attributable to the national economic development objectives set forth in such section shall include all primary, secondary, and tertiary benefits attributable to the flood control project authorized by this section regardless of to whom such benefits may accrue.

SEC. 570. BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY, RHODE ISLAND AND MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with Federal, State, and local interests, shall provide technical, planning, and design assistance in the development and restoration of the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—Funds made available under this section for planning and design of a project may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of such planning and design.

SEC. 571. EAST RIDGE, TENNESSEE.

The Secretary shall review the flood management study for the East Ridge and Hamilton County area undertaken by the Tennessee Valley Authority and shall carry out the project at an estimated total cost of \$25,000,000.

SEC. 572. MURFREESBORO, TENNESSEE.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for environmental enhancement, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, in accordance with the Report and Environmental Assessment, Black Fox, Murfree and Oaklands Spring Wetlands, Murfreesboro, Rutherford County, Tennessee, dated August 1994.

SEC. 573. BUFFALO BAYOU, TEXAS.

The non-Federal interest for the projects for flood control, Buffalo Bayou Basin, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1258), and Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610), may be reimbursed by up to \$5,000,000 or may receive a credit of up to \$5,000,000 against required non-Federal project cost-sharing contributions for work performed by the non-Federal interest at each of the following locations if such work is compatible with the following authorized projects: White Oak Bayou, Brays Bayou, Hunting Bayou, Garners Bayou, and the Upper Reach on Greens Bayou.

SEC. 574. SAN ANTONIO RIVER, TEXAS.

Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 215(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5(a)) and the agreement executed on November 7, 1992, by the Secretary and the San Antonio River Authority, Texas, the Secretary shall reimburse the San Antonio River Authority an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000 for the work carried out by the Authority under the agreement, including any amounts paid to the Authority under the terms of the agreement before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 575. NEABSCO CREEK, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for flood control, Neabscoc Creek Watershed, Prince William County, Virginia, at an estimated total cost of \$1,500,000.

SEC. 576. TANGIER ISLAND, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary is directed to design and construct a breakwater at the North Channel on Tangier Island, Virginia, at a total cost of

\$1,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$300,000. Congress finds that in view of the historic preservation benefits resulting from the project authorized by this section, the overall benefits of the project exceed the costs of the project.

SEC. 577. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During any evaluation of economic benefits and costs for projects set forth in subsection (b) that occurs after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall not consider flood control works constructed by non-Federal interests within the drainage area of such projects prior to the date of such evaluation in the determination of conditions existing prior to construction of the project.

(b) SPECIFIC PROJECTS.—The projects to which subsection (a) apply are—

(1) the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4610);

(2) the project for flood control, Cypress Creek, Texas, authorized by section 3(a)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4014); and

(3) the project for flood control, Buffalo Bayou Basin, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1258).

SEC. 578. PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to Pierce County, Washington, to address measures that are necessary to assure that non-Federal levees are adequately maintained and satisfy eligibility criteria for rehabilitation assistance under section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n; 55 Stat. 650). Such assistance shall include a review of the requirements of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Settlement Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-41) and standards for project maintenance and vegetation management used by the Secretary to determine eligibility for levee rehabilitation assistance with a view toward amending such standards as needed to make non-Federal levees eligible for assistance that may be necessary as a result of future flooding.

(b) LEVEE REHABILITATION.—The Secretary shall expedite a review to determine the extent to which requirements of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Settlement Act of 1989 limited the ability of non-Federal interests to adequately maintain existing non-Federal levees that were damaged by flooding in 1995 and 1996 and, to the extent that such ability was limited by such Act, the Secretary shall carry out the rehabilitation of such levees.

SEC. 579. WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.

(a) REGIONAL ENTITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress encourages the non-Federal public water supply customers of the Washington Aqueduct to establish a non-Federal public or private entity, or to enter into an agreement with an existing non-Federal public or private entity, to receive title to the Washington Aqueduct and to operate, maintain, and manage the Washington Aqueduct in a manner that adequately represents all interests of such customers.

(2) CONSENT OF CONGRESS.—Congress grants consent to the jurisdictions which are customers of the Washington Aqueduct to establish a non-Federal entity to receive title to the Washington Aqueduct and to operate, maintain, and manage the Washington Aqueduct.

(3) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the jurisdictions referred to in this

subsection from pursuing alternative options regarding ownership, operation, maintenance, and management of the Washington Aqueduct.

(b) PROGRESS REPORT AND PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the progress in achieving the objectives of subsection (a) and a plan for the transfer of ownership, operation, maintenance, and management of the Washington Aqueduct to a non-Federal public or private entity. Such plan shall include a transfer of ownership, operation, maintenance, and management of the Washington Aqueduct that is consistent with the provisions of this section and a detailed consideration of any proposal to transfer such ownership or operation, maintenance, or management to a private entity.

(c) TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transfer, without consideration but subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States and the non-Federal public water supply customers, all right, title, and interest of the United States in the Washington Aqueduct, its real property, facilities, equipment, supplies, and personalty—

(A) to a non-Federal public or private entity established pursuant to subsection (a); or

(B) in the event no entity is established pursuant to subsection (a), a non-Federal public or private entity selected by the Secretary which reflects, to the extent possible, a consensus among the non-Federal public water supply customers.

(2) TRANSFEREE SELECTION CRITERIA.—The selection of a non-Federal public or private entity under paragraph (1)(B) shall be based on technical, managerial, and financial capabilities and on consultation with the non-Federal public water supply customers and after opportunity for public input.

(3) ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—The entity to whom transfer under paragraph (1) is made shall assume full responsibility for performing and financing the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, and necessary capital improvements of the Washington Aqueduct so as to ensure the continued operation of the Washington Aqueduct consistent with its intended purpose of providing an uninterrupted supply of potable water sufficient to meet the current and future needs of the Washington Aqueduct service area.

(4) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding the 2-year deadline established in paragraph (1), the Secretary may provide a 1-time 6-month extension of such deadline if the Secretary determines that the non-Federal public water supply customers are making progress in establishing an entity pursuant to subsection (a) and that such an extension would likely result in the establishment of such an entity.

(d) INTERIM BORROWING AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal years 1997 and 1998 borrowing authority in amounts sufficient to cover those obligations which the Army Corps of Engineers is required to incur in carrying out capital improvements during such fiscal years for the Washington Aqueduct to assure its continued operation until such time as the transfer under subsection (c) has taken place, provided that such amounts do not exceed \$16,000,000 for fiscal year 1997 and \$54,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The borrowing authority under paragraph (1) shall be provided to the Secretary by the Secretary of the Treasury under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be necessary in the public interest and may be provided only after each of the non-Federal public water supply customers of the Washington Aqueduct has entered into a contractual agreement with the Secretary to pay its pro rata share of the costs associated with such borrowing.

(3) IMPACT ON IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with other Federal agencies, shall transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that assesses the impact of the borrowing authority provided under this subsection on near-term improvement projects under the Washington Aqueduct Improvement Program, work scheduled during fiscal years 1997 and 1998, and the financial liability to be incurred.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.—The term "Washington Aqueduct" means the Washington Aqueduct facilities and related facilities owned by the Federal Government as of the date of the enactment of this Act, including the dams, intake works, conduits, and pump stations that capture and transport raw water from the Potomac River to the Dalecarlia Reservoir, the infrastructure and appurtenances used to treat water taken from the Potomac River by such facilities to potable standards, and related water distribution facilities.

(2) NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY CUSTOMERS.—The term "non-Federal public water supply customers" means the District of Columbia, Arlington County, Virginia, and the city of Falls Church, Virginia.

SEC. 580. GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA, FLOOD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is directed to design and implement a flood damage reduction program for the Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia, in the vicinity of Durbin, Cass, Marlinton, Renick, Ronceverte, and Alderson as generally presented in the District Engineer's draft Greenbrier River Basin Study Evaluation Report, dated July 1994, to the extent provided under subsection (b) to afford those communities a level of protection against flooding sufficient to reduce future losses to these communities from the likelihood of flooding such as occurred in November 1985, January 1996, and May 1996.

(b) FLOOD PROTECTION MEASURES.—The flood damage reduction program referred to in subsection (a) may include the following as the Chief of Engineers determines necessary and advisable in consultation with the communities referred to in subsection (a)—

(1) local protection projects such as levees, floodwalls, channelization, small tributary stream impoundments, and nonstructural measures such as individual flood proofing; and

(2) floodplain relocations and resettlement site developments, floodplain evacuations, and a comprehensive river corridor and watershed management plan generally in accordance with the District Engineer's draft Greenbrier River Corridor Management Plan, Concept Study, dated April 1996.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—For purposes of section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1829), benefits attributable to the national economic development objectives set forth therein shall include all primary, sec-

ondary, and tertiary benefits attributable to the flood damage reduction program authorized by this section regardless of to whom they might accrue.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 581. HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA.

The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia, to provide technical assistance to the Center for Environmental, Geotechnical and Applied Sciences.

SEC. 582. LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WEST VIRGINIA.

The Secretary shall review the watershed plan and the environmental impact statement prepared for the Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia by the Natural Resources Conservation Service pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) and shall carry out the project.

SEC. 583. WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall design and construct flood control measures in the Cheat and Tygart River Basins, West Virginia, and the Lower Allegheny, Lower Monongahela, West Branch Susquehanna, and Juanita River Basins, Pennsylvania, at a level of protection sufficient to prevent any future losses to these communities from flooding such as occurred in January 1996, but no less than 100 year level of protection.

(b) PRIORITY COMMUNITIES.—In implementing this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the communities of Parsons and Rowlesburg, West Virginia, in the Cheat River Basin and Bellington and Phillipi, West Virginia, in the Tygart River Basin, and Connellsville, Pennsylvania, in the Lower Monongahela River Basin, and Benson, Hooversville, Clymer, and New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, in the Lower Allegheny River Basin, and Patton, Barnesboro, Coalport and Spangler, Pennsylvania, in the West Branch Susquehanna River Basin, and Bedford, Linds Crossings, and Logan Township in the Juniata River Basin.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—For purposes of section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, benefits attributable to the national economic development objectives set forth in such section shall include all primary, secondary, and tertiary benefits attributable to the flood control measures authorized by this section regardless of to whom such benefits may accrue.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 584. EVALUATION OF BEACH MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall evaluate procedures and requirements used in the selection and approval of materials to be used in the restoration and nourishment of beaches. Such evaluation shall address the potential effects of changing existing procedures and requirements on the implementation of beach restoration and nourishment projects and on the aquatic environment.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the evaluation under this section, the Secretaries shall consult with appropriate State agencies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall transmit a report to Congress on their findings under this section.

SEC. 585. NATIONAL CENTER FOR NANOFABRICATION AND MOLECULAR SELF-ASSEMBLY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for not to

exceed 50 percent of the costs of the necessary fixed and movable equipment for a National Center for Nanofabrication and Molecular Self-Assembly to be located in Evansville, Illinois.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—No financial assistance may be provided under this section unless an application is made to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$7,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1996.

SEC. 586. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLLS.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should engage in negotiations with the Government of Canada for the purposes of—

(1) eliminating tolls along the St. Lawrence Seaway system; and

(2) identifying ways to maximize the movement of goods and commerce through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

SEC. 587. PRADO DAM, CALIFORNIA.

(a) SEPARABLE ELEMENT REVIEW.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review, in cooperation with the non-Federal interest, the Prado Dam feature of the project for flood control, Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4113), with a view toward determining whether the feature may be considered a separable element, as that term is defined in section 103(f) of such Act.

(2) MODIFICATION OF COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—If the Prado Dam feature is determined to be a separable element under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reduce the non-Federal cost-sharing requirement for such feature in accordance with section 103(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(a)(3)) and shall enter into a project cooperation agreement with the non-Federal interest to reflect the modified cost-sharing requirement and to carry out construction.

(b) DAM SAFETY ADJUSTMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall determine the estimated costs associated with dam safety improvements that would have been required in the absence of flood control improvements authorized for the Santa Ana River Mainstem project referred to in subsection (a) and shall reduce the non-Federal share for the Prado Dam feature of such project by an amount equal to the Federal share of such dam safety improvements, updated to current price levels.

TITLE VI—EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY UNDER HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND

SEC. 601. EXTENSION OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY UNDER HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

Paragraph (1) of section 9505(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) to carry out section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION CONTRIBUTED TO
AVERSION OF NATIONAL RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, with the Speaker's permission I will first inform the House of another matter of great importance to the country and to the Congress.

With regard to the potential national railroad strikes, as of early this morning, labor and management have reached agreement on all the outstanding disputes, thereby averting the possibility of a shutdown and averting the need for congressional intervention. We are extremely pleased about this.

The parties reached a voluntary agreement. The House and Senate, the White House, and the Department of Transportation made it very clear that labor and management should work out their differences on their own. They did that. Labor and management deserve great credit for having done it.

Here in the House, certainly the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. MOLINARI, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. WISE, worked diligently with us; in the Senate, Senators KASSEBAUM and KENNEDY; with the White House working very closely, Mr. Panetta and Mr. Ickes, and indeed, the Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Peña.

So we all worked together to present a united front. The bipartisan effort created an environment in which this agreement could be reached and a national rail strike averted. I thank the chairman for being able to make these comments on my time before we move to the legislation before us today, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, is a comprehensive authorization of the water resources programs of the Army Corps of Engineers. It represents 4 years of bipartisan effort to preserve and develop the water infrastructure that is so vital to the Nation's safety and economic well-being.

First, let me thank and congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their vision and tireless efforts in helping move this legislation. I want to give special thanks to Committee Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR, Subcommittee Chairman SHERRY BOEHLERT, and Subcommittee Ranking Member BOB BORSKI. Their leadership and contributions have been outstanding.

H.R. 3592 is the end result of 4 years of review and preparation. In the 103d Congress, the House overwhelmingly passed H.R. 4460, a bill that should have become the Water Resources Development Act of 1994. Unfortunately, that bill did not become law, and for the first time since 1986, Congress was unable to enact WRDA legislation.

During the 104th Congress, we committed to restoring certainty to the

process and fulfilling our commitment to non-Federal project sponsors, most of whom had already committed substantial funds to projects.

We conducted 4 days of hearings, receiving testimony from over 90 witnesses, including numerous members of congress, the administration, project sponsors, national water resources and environmental organizations, and State and local officials.

The bill we bring to the floor today truly represents a fair and balanced proposal.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3592 accomplishes three important objectives:

First, it reflects the committee's continued commitment to improving the Nation's water infrastructure.

Second, it responds to policy initiatives to modernize Corps of Engineers activities and to achieve programmatic reforms.

Third, and this is very important, it takes advantage of Corps capabilities and recognizes evolving national priorities by expanding and creating new authorities for protecting and enhancing the environment.

In developing this bill, we have tried hard to be responsive to Members' requests; however, in today's tight fiscal climate, we simply had to establish and adhere to reasonable criteria. For example, we adhered to the cost-sharing rules established in 1986.

In fact, in the area of flood control, we have actually increased the non-Federal share for future projects. In another area, dredging for navigation projects, we have revised the rules to assure consistency and fairness in selecting methods for the disposal of dredged material.

Another criteria used in preparing this legislation was the availability of a Corps report. We have adhered to the requirement that new projects have a final Corps of Engineers report, or will have one within the next few months. This assures that projects that have undergone the Corps review process receive top priority.

Is the bill perfect? Probably not. We have heard concern about a handful of provisions and intend to address those as the bill progresses. There are some differences between H.R. 3592 and its Senate counterpart that must be resolved. In addition, I understand that the administration, while generally supportive of our approach, will suggest some changes to the bill.

Therefore, as we move forward with this important legislation, I intend to work with all parties to assure that the final product reflects a balance of all interests.

H.R. 3592 is a strong bipartisan bill. It reflects balance in every sense of the word and a responsible approach to developing water infrastructure, preserving and enhancing the environment, and strengthening Federal, State, and local partnerships.

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman BOEHLERT, and ranking member OBERSTAR in support of the Water Resources Act of 1996.

I want to compliment Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman BOEHLERT for the totally fair and bipartisan manner in which this bill was drafted.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee works best when we work together.

I am pleased that this bill marks a return to the bipartisan spirit that existed in the past.

The bill also demonstrates the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's continuing strong commitment to investment in the Nation's infrastructure.

Harbor deepening, inland waterway improvements and flood control are vital cornerstones of our Nation's economic vitality.

The ports of America are the doors that link our Nation to billions of dollars of international trade.

In the Philadelphia area, our port supports 50,000 jobs—making a vital contribution to our regional economy.

The 11,000 mile inland waterway system provides vital transportation for bulk farm products and coal.

It is essential that we continue to provide funding for port and inland waterway projects.

We are also proposing to continue the expansion of the mission of the Corps of Engineers to improvement of environmental infrastructure.

We should be aggressive in using the talents and abilities of the Corps of Engineers to meet our huge infrastructure needs.

We should also redirect the corps' program to address the infrastructure needs of our Nation's metropolitan areas.

In flood control, this bill makes important changes that I strongly support.

We have proposed to increase the requirements for mitigation planning before structural flood control projects are built.

An upgraded mitigation program will save us money from start to finish. We will be able to reduce the cost of project construction and it is likely that we will reduce disaster relief costs.

We are also proposing an increase in the non-Federal cost sharing for flood control projects from the current minimum of 25 percent to 35 percent.

This increase is a simple recognition of our Federal budget situation.

We have dwindling resources available for these programs.

An increase in the local share will help spread Federal dollars to more projects and will help FOCUS resources on more worthy projects.

The administration proposed a 50 percent non-Federal share which would have done even more to spread scarce Federal dollars and weed out poor quality projects.

The 50 percent cost-share is something to consider in the future.

At a hearing last year, I pointed out that we should be prepared for cuts in the Corps of Engineers programs as part of general spending reductions. Unfortunately, my prediction has become a reality.

The inadequate 602(b) allocation for energy and water development appropriations shows the clear impact of the balanced budget.

We risk lasting, negative impacts on our infrastructure investment programs in the future.

We must work together on a bipartisan basis to ensure that while we are getting our Federal fiscal house in order, programs to invest in critical infrastructure needs are protected.

I hope to work with Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman BOEHLERT, and ranking member OBERSTAR in that effort in the same bipartisan manner in which we drafted the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

I urge support for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the people who really made this Bill Happen—Ken Kopocis, Art, Chan, Barbara Rogers, and Pam Keller of the Democratic staff of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and Mike Strachn and the Republican staff of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. While this bill authorizes a number of much needed projects to address infrastructure needs and environmental restoration throughout the Nation, I am particularly pleased with two provisions in this bill.

One of these is the authorization of funding to deepen and widen the Houston ship channel. These improvements are essential to the economic development not only of the region, but of the country generally.

The Houston ship channel is a critical economic lifeline between our Nation and the rest of the world. The Port of Houston draws cargo from every State in the Nation. It is the No. 1 U.S. port in foreign tonnage and the second busiest in total tonnage.

To remain competitive, however, the ship channel must be improved to permit faster, safer handling of cargo vessels.

The improvements authorized are also consistent with the port's and my enduring commitment to the environment.

By working with 13 Federal and State agencies, the port and the Corps of Engineers arrived at a plan that will

use the dredged material from the ship channel project to create over 4,000 acres of additional marsh land to be used in developing bird islands, boater destinations, and shoreline erosion projects.

These beneficial uses have received the very strong support of several key environmental groups in the Galveston Bay area.

The second provision allows certain flood control districts to carry out flood control projects with far greater flexibility than ever before. The Harris County Flood Control District will demonstrate to the Corps of Engineers that it can design and construct flood projects faster and cheaper when it is not burdened by Federal redtape.

For too long, excessive Federal regulation has slowed the design and construction of flood projects. Many Harris County flood control projects currently in the design stage were first authorized for study in the 1940's.

Bringing these projects to the local level has the potential to save the Federal Government hundreds of millions of dollars. Without the unnecessary redtape, there can be greater efficiency and greater input from the affected community. The result will be taxpayer savings and projects being completed much more quickly.

Again, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to support it, as well.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in today in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 for very important reasons: Shore protection and responsible disposal of contaminated dredged materials. I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR, Subcommittee Chairman SHERRY BOEHLERT, and Ranking Member BOB BORSKI for their support on these critical issues—issues that are particularly important for my State, New Jersey.

Included as part of this bill is the Shore Protection Act, a bill sponsored by CLAY SHAW and myself as the co-chairs of the Congressional Coastal Caucus. This bill will clarify and reaffirm the role of the Federal Government in shore protection, and—in particular—beach nourishment activities. Congress has repeatedly rejected the administration policy to end Army Corps participation inshore protection projects. By passing this bill, we are taking the additional step of actually mandating the Federal Government's role in shore protection. And for that reason, I am pleased to support this bill.

In addition, WRDA 1996 contains provisions that are greatly significant to the responsible disposal of contaminated dredged material, and by that I mean disposal that does not include

ocean dumping. These provisions will allow our ports to be dredged without threatening our ocean environment or our coastal economy. I would like to thank my colleagues from New Jersey who are on the committee—and in particular, BOB FRANKS and BOB MENENDEZ—for their hard work and support on this issue.

The port provisions in this bill will take us a long way to getting out of the ocean for dredged material disposal by providing for Federal/non-federal cost-sharing of confined disposal facilities, it will open up the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for use on these disposal facilities, it will allow for tipping fees to be levied for use of these facilities, it authorizes a much needed confined disposal facility for the Port of New York and New Jersey, and it reauthorizes the ongoing sediment decontamination technology demonstration project for the Port of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I really do again want to thank the committee, and the ranking members and the chairman of both the full committee and subcommittee, for their support. This is a very important bill for the State of New Jersey, and does a lot and goes a long way towards protecting our ocean environment.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER].

Mr. WELLER. I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Water Resources Development Act, 1996, which I note passed unanimously with strong bipartisan support on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This legislation is essential if we want to improve our Nation's infrastructure by improving and protecting our communities from flood problems and improve water infrastructure. This bipartisan bill will create jobs, protect property, lives, and protect the environment.

I do want to note that approximately one-fourth of the funding authorized in this bill is directly related to preserving and protecting the environment.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly about two provisions in this bill that are very important to my home State of Illinois and also to my congressional district, two provisions that will create jobs, protect property from flooding, and preserve the environment.

First, this bill authorizes a much needed stormwater retention facility in the village of Frankfort. The village experiences constant flooding of the intersections of two strategic regional arterial highways following any significant rain. Construction of this water retention facility will greatly reduce the flow rate during heavy rainfall.

The second provision I would like to touch on would provide for improvements near lock 14 for future development of a marina on the north side of the Illinois River, will bring jobs, promote tourism, and promote recreation. Both projects have bipartisan support locally.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his help, and I ask for bipartisan support for this important legislation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], subcommittee chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] for the opportunity to speak on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Water Resources Development Act is vital to thousands of Americans that live along our Nation's shores including those in my district. There are two important parts of this bill I would like to recognize. The first is the Houston Ship Channel widening and dredging project which will expand the capabilities of the Port of Houston to meet the challenges of expanding global trade and maintain its competitive edge as a major international port.

This port brings \$5 billion annually to our area, providing 200,000 jobs and will be important as it continues to expand. It also is important because of its environmental impact, which my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] spoke of which affects Galveston Bay which part of is also in my district.

This legislation also constructively addresses the issue of Federal flood control polity reform. As Congress seeks to balance the budget, the scarcity of Federal dollars for watershed management threatens hundreds of projects in southeast Texas and around the country.

I greatly appreciate that the committee adopted legislative language proposed by myself and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], my fellow Texan, the distinguished majority whip, which will give local agencies more control.

Giving these agencies more control, such as the Harris County Flood Control District, with the ability to construct these projects will save precious time and thus lives and property, cut Federal costs, better protect the environment, and reduce Federal disaster assistance needed to bail out communities in times of floods.

This legislation is important because it designates three test sites in Harris County providing for local control over project design, implementation, and

construction. Under this plan the Federal Government would remain a partner in flood control but local governments would gain the authority to respond more quickly and innovatively to their community's flood control needs. Federal flood control policy must adapt to increasing budgetary constraints without sacrificing public safety and environmental protection. The bottom line will be safer communities and savings for the taxpayers.

I thank my colleagues for including this in the bill, and I strongly urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN].

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for America as well as a great day for the residents and businesses of the Chicagoland area. After nearly a decade of fruitless effort, both Houses of Congress are finally approving a plan to preserve and protect the Chicago lakefront which is in serious jeopardy of being washed away due to the severe erosion of its protective seawall.

Included in this WRDA bill is an authorization for the Illinois Erosion Protection Project which will direct the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to assist the city of Chicago in restoring 8 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline.

The existing shoreline protection system was built between 1910 and 1930, and has outlived its design life by more than 30 years. Significant deterioration of the existing shore structures is obvious to those who live and work in that area or drive alone Chicago's magnificent Lake Shore Drive.

Mr. Speaker, Lake Shore Drive, a Federal highway—US 41—as well as a major local expressway carrying traffic to and from the center of the city, was a victim of the deteriorating seawall this past spring.

On March 19th, high winds caused Lake Michigan waters to overtop the current deteriorated structures, flooding the drive and hurling chunks of the seawall onto the roadway. If the protection project is not authorized, the Army Corps predicts partial failure of the structure supporting the shorelines by 1998.

According to a Chicago Tribune editorial from this past April: "The seawall project, in which Chicago would shoulder a third of the \$200 million cost, has nothing to do with pork. It has everything to do with government's responsibility to maintain public-works infrastructure that is crucial to the well-being of its citizens."

I am happy to report that today the Federal Government will not shrink from its responsibility.

Before I close, I want to take a moment to express my appreciation to Chairman SHUSTER and Water Resources Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT for their help and leadership in guiding this bill to the floor. My Chicago colleague, BILL LIPINSKI, a member of the Transportation and Infra-

structure Committee, was instrumental in authorizing the shoreline protection project, and I thank him as well.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Railroads.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, ranking Member OBERSTAR, Chairman BOEHLERT, and ranking Member BORSKI for getting this bill to the floor and impressively getting it to the floor in this fashion where it can move without controversy and move. That is the important thing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about investment. It is about moving coal and chemicals and commerce along our Nation's inland waterway system and through our ports. It is about providing flood protection and preventing soil erosion.

Most important for West Virginia, this bill provides the authorization to build the important Marmet locks, which are at the top of the priority list for the Army Corps of Engineers. It is about ending uncertainty for the almost 200 families in that area that have been waiting and waiting to see whether or not real estate acquisition and appraisal would begin. Not everyone supports the locks in the area but most understand that it is going to happen and the question is when.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about giving the go to the Huntington District Corps of Engineers to get under way and to get those engineers working now and to get the real estate acquisition project started as soon as possible. It was only last week that this House was not able to fund the real estate acquisition because of the policy that the Committee on Appropriations had of not funding new starts, that is, construction starts that had not been authorized. This bill is the authorization. With this bill, that then gives the ability to begin to seek the funding that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, with this authorization bill that passes the House today, we now have to go and conference with the Senate and work out differences in that bill. Hopefully in September, we can conference with the Senate and we can also then bring that bill back, get it approved and sent to the President and make it law before the Congress adjourns in October, and then we can begin the process of seeking the funding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, and I certainly appreciate those that have made it possible. I know a lot of people in the Marmet and Belle areas of West Virginia appreciate it, also.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI].

(Mr. MARTINI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, as well as the gentleman from New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, who worked tirelessly to put together a fair and economically responsible bill.

This bill has carefully balanced the interests of environmentalists with those in the business community and provided the language that will enable our ports to once again flourish, our citizens to be protected from flooding; our environment to be protected and our taxpayers' dollars to be wisely and not frivolously spent.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to state that this bill includes authorized funds for a buyout alternative to the Passaic River Flood Tunnel. In 1994 when I ran for Congress I recognized the importance of flood protection to the citizens of my district. In addition, I recognized that there must be a more economical and environmentally sound flood control alternative to a \$1.9 billion proposed flood tunnel with potential negative effects on area wetlands and the existing ecosystems.

By authorizing \$194 million for the buyout alternative, we are taking great strides toward both flood protection for our citizens and environmental protection for the Passaic River, while saving taxpayers money.

The bill also includes authorization for the Molly Ann's Brook flood protection project and I am pleased that the committee treated this project with the urgency and priority that it deserves.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I extend my thanks to the chairman for his vigorous activity in making this bill a good bill to come to the floor in a bipartisan manner and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

(Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal about the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 which is excellent, which is a very positive constructive piece of legislation. I have to join my colleagues, however, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] in expressing my very strong opposition to one particular provision within this bill which frankly makes a mockery of the Missouri River management process that is currently taking place by the Corps of Engineers.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a 6-year, \$23 million process in rewriting the Master Manual for the management of the Missouri River. Despite that, however, there is a provision within this legislation which gives priority to navigation, despite the fact

that navigation accounts only for 1 percent of the economic benefit that flows from the uses of the Missouri River. It disregards flood control, recreation, drinking water, power production and wildlife, and our opposition is shared not just by the Northern Plains Members but by this administration, by the American Rivers Group, by the National Audubon Society, by the National Wildlife Federation, by the Environmental Defense Fund, by the Sierra Club, by Friends of the Earth, by the Bass Angler Sportsmens Society, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and other recreation, wildlife and conservation organizations.

There is no doubt that this provision, if it remains in place, would threaten water supply by mandating yearly extra releases of water from upstream reservoirs, drawing down water reserves needed in times of drought. It would increase flood risks by mandating releases of water in December after the Missouri River is frozen. It will increase power rates to western area power administration users by lowering water levels, especially during the winter, thus in turn lowering generating capacity. It will be an environmental disaster drawing down reservoir levels, pose a threat to endangered and threatened species of native fisheries, and, frankly, it will waste Federal resources already devoted to the Master Manual design.

This Congress would be better served by allowing the Corps of Engineers to pursue their Master Manual, redesign a \$23 million project rather than intervening legislative with no hearings, with no public input on this major change in the management of the Missouri River.

If this bill were not on this calendar, I would be offering an amendment with my colleagues. Since it is not, and no amendments are permitted, I want to share with my colleagues that we will be working with the conference committee very carefully to see to it that this particular provision of this needed legislation is in fact stricken and that the Missouri River management can be conducted on the basis of science and proper management processes rather than by arbitrary legislative effort.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

(Mrs. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation because it's going to create new jobs and economic opportunity in Washington State's Third Congressional District.

This bill includes a proposal that settles 20 years of controversy between the city of North Bonneville and the Federal Government. This conflict started after the town was literally moved so that the Government could build a powerhouse at the Bonneville Dam.

A key part of this settlement will free up parcels of land that the city can use for economic development.

This bill will give community leaders a chance to bring in family wage jobs and give the people of Skamania County more hope.

In addition to creating new jobs, this bill will help keep the thousands of jobs supported by international trade on the Columbia River.

This bill ensures that the Corps of Engineers will maintain safe passage on the Columbia by calling for aggressive maintenance work in the channel.

If ports in cities like Vancouver, Kalama, and Longview, are going to remain competitive internationally, they need the certainty that larger shipping vessels will be able to navigate the Columbia River safely and efficiently.

I commend Chairman BOEHLERT and Chairman SHUSTER for their hard work on this bill and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and his committee for the excellent work they have done on this bill. I want to particularly call to the chairman's attention language in the bill that is extremely vital for safety, health, hurricane protection, and environmental protection matters dealing with the Parish of Terrebonne in the heart of the Third District of Louisiana. Terrebonne in French means good Earth. Yet it is threatened more and more every day by saltwater intrusion. Parish residents' safe drinking water has been threatened by rising levels of salinity. Hurricane threats to the community have been largely accumulating as a result of damage and erosion to its coastal barriers and to its coastal marshlands. One particular problem involves the Houma Navigation Canal which is a direct outlet to the Gulf of Mexico. As salinity levels rush into this canal, some 200,000 acres of sensitive marshlands are being destroyed and salinity levels are increasingly putting at risk the drinking water of the communities.

□ 1200

My understanding is that this bill will allow the corps to separate from its 3-to-5-year work on the entire Morganza, LA, to the Gulf of Mexico feasibility study the central issue of a lock structure, which the corps has already identified, under its reconnaissance and feasibility studies, as a necessary feature in its overall plans; that will permit the independent study of this lock structure in the hopes of hastening its authorization and completion; and that this particular project has been recommended not only by the State of Louisiana but by the Federal task force of the Coastal Wetlands Planning and Protection Restoration Act, the Federal act designed to protect those sensitive coastal wetlands.

It is my understanding that that language is included. Yet because the corps may not finish this independent study by December, the bill does not

yet contain an authorization to proceed with this lock structure; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that that is correct. Certainly it is our intention to pursue this vigorously to get the job done as quickly as possible.

Mr. TAUZIN. I would also assume that, if and when this independent study is completed, as we expect it will be, that we will have the full cooperation of the chairman of the committee in hastening the completion of this?

Mr. SHUSTER. That would certainly be my intention.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the chairman and appreciate his help on this.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As we have heard throughout this debate, this is an important bill. It accomplishes a lot of good for many parts of the country. Unfortunately, this bill contains a poison pill relative to my part of the country, and that is the provision in this legislation that would direct the Corps of Engineers to extend navigation on the Missouri River by 1 month.

The management of our Nation's rivers is a complex thing. The more expertise we get on this issue, the more we begin to understand just how complex it is. The Corps of Engineers, in fact, are looking at the management issues attendant to the management of the Missouri River and will end up investing nearly 10 years in a revision manual effort, an effort that will cost up to \$24.5 million. By exhaustive hearings and research, they will weigh and come out with a product that ultimately directs the management of this river.

Now, we are all frustrated that this process has taken so long. Upstream is frustrated, downstream is frustrated. But the way the downstream interests are reacting to their frustration is just to direct with legislative language a management priority for navigation and extend it 1 month while we are at it. It is not that simple.

That directive would shortchange and injure a variety of upstream interests, including irrigation, hydropower, municipal water supply, and flood control. The economic interests in comparison do not even compare, \$1 billion of economic activity from the collection of upstream interests compared to the \$10 million directly related to downstream navigation.

It is not simply an upstream-downstream deal. In fact, downstream interests are injured as well by this provision. The fact is when we extend navigation on the Missouri through the month of December, we get freeze-up, and freeze-up causes ice jams, and ice

jams cause flooding ironically to the areas of the very proponents of this measure. Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, all would be hit with floods as a result of this provision.

We need to work collectively and collaboratively in developing a plan for the Missouri River, and that effort is underway locally right now. I have a clipping quoting the Governor of Iowa opposing extending the navigation season, even though he is a downstream interest, saying, "I hate to see this become a legislative football. I think there is enough other important issues for Congress to address."

They are working and trying to resolve locally these competing interests. We should not be preempting the upstream interests with a show of legislative clout from downstream interests. That is simply not the way to manage our Nation's precious water issues.

Finally, and of great concern, is the fact that this poison pill does more than cause me heartburn. This poison pill threatens enactment of this legislation. We have assurances from the Senate that this provision will never pass and, if it is insisted in the bill, the bill will never pass. Let us pull this provision out in conference committee and enact this comprehensive very important water bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATOURETTE].

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in the strongest support of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. On behalf of the people that I represent back in Ohio, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER, and chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, Congressman BOEHLERT, and also the ranking members of our fine committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman OBERSTAR, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, for making this a truly bipartisan bill that we can all be proud of.

This bill is good for the water resources of the Nation, it is good for the environment, and for the Great Lakes it is great. Many of the ports and harbors within the Great Lakes are suffering from light loading problems, where because of our inability to open late, dispose of dredge spoils, contaminated and otherwise, we have a situation that makes our ports and harbors non-competitive.

The environmental dredging section of this particular bill will again allow the Great Lakes' ports and harbors to be competitive for areas like Eastlake and Ashtabula and also the City of Cleveland, OH.

I thank the chair and committee for bringing this bill forward today in this manner, and I would urge every Member of this House to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

My colleagues, recognizing the importance of enacting a good Water Resources Development Act and, sadly, recalling that this bill failed to pass into law in the last Congress, and I want to see it pass this Congress, I nonetheless take this opportunity early on here to rely my objection to language in this bill which would create an entirely inappropriate mandated intervention into the proper management of the Missouri-Mississippi system.

I join my colleagues, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY]. My objection as an upstream Representative is very similar to theirs.

This bill, we have been told, contains congressional directive to the Army Corps of Engineers concerning the regulation of the Missouri's main stem. The Corps of Engineers is, as we have heard, in the process of completing their plan for managing the main flow of the Missouri. This is a 10-year plan. They are in about their 6th year of it. They are very carefully developing that plan by balancing the needs of all the users along the main stem of the Missouri. Now along comes this legislation and, through a kind of a midnight slam dunk of language, we insert the mandate that upsets what the Corps of Engineers has spent all this time and money trying to do, and that is balance the uses of the Missouri.

If this bill became law as is, it would mandate, against the objections of the Corps, a late release of water downstream from the upstream reservoirs, which is greater than the Corps now things should be done.

If that late release of water goes forward, it will threaten water supply in the upstream States in a drought year. It will increase flood risks in the very critical downstream States. It is likely to raise the power rates of consumers who use WAPA. And finally, it will threaten species and native fisheries. That is probably why most of the major conservation groups in this country are opposing this language in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to agree in conference with the Senate to take this language out.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], vice chairman of the subcommittee.

(Mr. WAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and all those involved from both sides of the aisle on a job well done.

As the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I strongly encourage our

colleagues to support the Water Resources Development Act and remind our colleagues that behind the national defense of our country, as our ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] so eloquently reminds us on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, this was the second function of the Federal Government, to meet the basic infrastructure needs of a thankful nation. The natural disasters that we have, flooding, bank stabilization along our riverways and waterways. Very essential function of our Federal Government.

Many of these needs are met by the Army Corps of Engineers. Ladies and gentlemen, my father wore the castles of the Army Corps of Engineers on his lapels. They do good work and we are grateful for their service. The Water Resources Development Act meets real needs in real people's lives all across the country.

Earlier this year I held a field hearing in northeastern Oklahoma, where Kansas and Oklahoma and Missouri all meet. This bill meets real needs in that part of the world, in my part of the world, in the Southeastern United States. This is one of those critical functions that we are here to deliver to the people and they are waiting for this bill. Many people.

Let us come together today with an overwhelming show of support. This bill will save money. I encourage my colleagues to have an impact on the people that we are elected to represent. Vote yes enthusiastically for WRDA.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss with the chairman of the committee an issue of great importance concerning a provision in this bill to extend the navigation season on the Missouri River. As my three preceding colleagues on this side of the aisle have said, extending navigation and drawing down the reservoirs in the upper Mississippi basin have the potential to negatively impact irrigation, drinking water, recreation, and hydropower uses of the river.

I am concerned this particular provision was inserted in the bill without the benefit of a hearing or comment with upstream Missouri River interests. I seek the assurances of the chairman that as we work through the conference he will be open to the concerns of the upper basin States.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not the intent of the committee to harm any of the Missouri River interests with this language.

While the provision was put in response to concerns to several of our committee members, clearly all Missouri River interests must be addressed before making significant changes to the management of the Missouri River system.

I certainly will work with all Missouri River interests to bring this matter to resolution.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the assurances of the chairman. This is an important bill to many Members of the body. Many of us were disappointed when the 1994 Water Resources Development Act stalled in the Senate, in part over disputes between upstream and downstream Missouri River interests.

The Senate bill contains no provision to extend Missouri River navigation. It is my sincere desire that such disputes do not prevent passage of the 1996 water resources bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank him and the other gentlemen who have spoken on this issue for bringing their concerns to our attention. We will certainly take all of the interested parties' concerns into consideration as the bill progresses. Let me assure all of the parties that we intend to resolve this important issue in a mutually agreeable manner.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] on our side for the splendid work he has done over many, many months in crafting this bill, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for the work that he has contributed, of course to our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], for bringing about a truly inclusive process to bring us to this point where we can bring this massive bill for the first time in my recollection on the suspension calendar on the House floor.

I would also like to express great appreciation to the staff members on both sides, without mentioning names, because I will certainly forget somebody. They have really worked hard and carried the burden of this very complex legislation.

Most of the cities, the great cities of our country, are cities because they were ports. They started out as ports. Seventy-five percent of the population of our Nation lives along the water. We are a Nation inextricably tied to the water as a means of transportation, as a means of commerce, as a means of livelihood, and as a means of enjoyment.

This legislation dates back to the roots of our history as a Nation and as a committee. The earliest works of the Congress were the works that our committee brings to the floor today, those that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], I thought so very warmly and touchingly described in talking about his father's having served in the

corps. The corps has done so much to increase the yield of our Nation by the water resources development that it undertakes in the navigation, the locks and dams, the ports, the harbors, the riverways, and we advance that cause with all of the many provisions that we bring together in this legislation.

For flood control we raise a minimum non-Federal share from 25 to 35 percent. And to help communities in the transition, we applied the new minimum only prospectively. I think that is a reasonable and responsible prudent step to undertake.

□ 1215

We also deal with the matter of dredged disposal material from the Great Lakes by providing for cost sharing and confined disposal facilities vitally important for this one-fifth of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth to provide this protection. There are many other provisions in this legislation.

Suffice it to say, this is one of the finest bills our committee has ever brought forward. I urge its adoption by the House and express my fervent hope that the other body will concur with us and bring this legislation to the President's desk for signature as soon as possible.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to recognize the staff who made such a great contribution to this legislation and the senior staff on both sides of the aisle: Mike Strachn, Lee Forsgren, Ken Kopocis, and Art Chan, as well as the other staff who really performed in an outstanding manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], ranking minority member, for their significant input into this legislative process. And, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], my good friend, the ranking member of the subcommittee, my special thanks for all that he has done.

Mr. Speaker, this is a product of Members of Congress from all sections of the country, from different political persuasions coming together and working together because it makes good sense for America.

I particularly want to thank Mike Strachn of the professional staff. He came to us from the Corps of Engineers. He had a very distinguished career and he has lent his expertise to us

as we fashioned this very important bill. All the staff is good, but Mike is very special in my heart, and I thank him.

This bill reflects regional, environmental and Political balance. Every single American will benefit from the water resources improvements provided for in this legislation.

Our Nation's water infrastructure is critical to both the economic and environmental health of our Nation and the proposal before us today provides for continued improvement in both of these areas.

I am particularly proud of the new course that the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 charts on the environment. WRDA '96 is the "greenest" Corps bill in the history of the republic. Perhaps since the original 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act, no Congress has placed a greater emphasis than the 104th Congress on using the Corps of Engineers' considerable engineering expertise to improve the environmental quality of our Nation's lakes, rivers, and harbors.

Nearly 25 percent of all the funding in this bill will go to environmentally sensitive water infrastructure programs and projects. The legislation before us also seeks to maximize the amount of flood protection we receive for our Federal resources by changing the Federal-local cost share from 75 percent Federal-25 percent local to 65 percent Federal-35 percent local.

This change in cost share is also viewed by members of the environmental community as a step toward ensuring that the wisest path for flood control management is pursued. I strongly support this adjustment and believe it demonstrates this committee's commitment to sensible fiscal and environmental policies.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1996, beyond its impressive environmental mission, also ensures that our Nation's ports and rivers will continue to be efficient conduits for commerce.

Many claim that water transportation is the most efficient form of transportation in this country, and with the passage of WRDA '96, our Nation will enjoy this efficient mode of transportation well into the next century. Though we often take it for granted, most of the fuel we consume and the food we eat has traveled on our Nation's waterways.

I think it is evident from my remarks I am very proud of the bipartisan water resources bill, not just because I am privileged to serve as chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, but because I am privileged to work with people like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI]; Republicans and Democrats alike, taking seriously the people's business and the mission of shaping responsible public policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give this bill the overwhelming and enthusiastic support it deserves for all the right reasons.

Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank the members and staff of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for including language in the Water Resources Development Act which will help advance an important project in my district known as the Lower Amazon Creek restoration and protection project.

The project, which received approval previously from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the Water Resources Development Act section 1135 program, is currently moving into the design and cost estimate phases. Yet a small portion of the project, which was originally constructed jointly by the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Services, now known as the Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS], had previously been left out of the project because of an apparent lack of statutory authority by the Corps of Engineers. This portion of the project is critical to the restoration of the Lower Amazon Creek and I am encouraged that this language will foster the necessary cooperation between the Corps and the NRCS to complete this important project.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their support of this critical legislation and urge my counterparts in the Senate to support this provision of the bill.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the work Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman BOEHLERT, and Transportation Committee Ranking Members OBERSTAR and BORSKI have put into this bill, in a bipartisan manner, and for the excellent support the staff has given us on this bill. Their expertise on the vital issues contained in this bill is something of which the citizens of this country should be proud, and this story of how Congress helps better the lives of every American is too often untold. I'm proud of the work we're doing here.

As I recently expressed to the majority leader, it is important that we deliver on promises to our districts in ways that our constituents tell me are most vital to their everyday health and safety. Poll after poll tells us that these bread-and-butter issues are far more important to average Americans than broad, theoretical policy objectives. This bill accomplishes just that. WRDA will benefit many of our communities.

My district has several pressing needs in flood control, stream bank protection, inland waterway navigation, basic infrastructure, and environmental protection. The fundamental mission of the Corps of Engineers is widely recognized in east Tennessee. Fulfillment of our commitments to these communities, which are faced with both safety and economic concerns, can happen if H.R. 3592 gets passed into law swiftly. Unlike the fate of the WRDA bill from the last Congress, I believe that this work will get done. The other body is poised and ready, and today, we take another huge step forward.

I expect that these vital issues will not get bogged down in Presidential politics or die in conference. Ironically, these are issues in which the other body has taken the lead and House action will bring us tangible results. Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues not to shrink from this task at hand because some

may call this bill pork. Our process here has revolved around sound science and engineering, authorizing those projects that fit criteria and pass muster from the Corps of Engineers. My father served in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—wore castles on his lapels—and I know the quality of the work done through their civilian works program.

This bill is about responsibly authorizing needed works in a cost-effective manner, not simply allowing Congress to appropriate money without due process. In some cases, this bill will authorize projects at dollar amounts below original estimates because we worked with the involved parties to find better solutions than the most expensive plans out there. We increase local responsibility and expect the Federal Government to be responsive to local needs.

One final note, Mr. Speaker, You will notice that while the Corps of Engineers is very active in Tennessee, in my home State, and the six other Southeastern States served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which also falls under the jurisdiction of this committee, we have many ongoing projects and needs that are not mentioned in this bill. That is because TVA, in its ongoing mission and existing authorization, carries out projects every year that have to compete for those same scarce appropriations dollars coming out of the energy and water bill. We all know what a squeeze is on for these dollars this year and the situation may be worse before it gets better, as we balance the Federal budget. I want to remind our colleagues that although you will see no TVA project mentioned in H.R. 3592, the Tennessee Valley region still has needs that TVA is expected to meet in the coming years. Because TVA has ongoing authority, I hope that this committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Congress will not prejudice any TVA project that meets the same criteria as these projects listed in this bill when it comes time to funding just because it is not listed in this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, coming from the beautiful coastal area of southwest Florida, I know that the protection and proper stewardship of our coastal resources is vital. The Water Resources Development Act authorizes funding for the Army Corps of Engineers. The corps is doing good work in Florida—from its high-profile role in the restoration of our unique Everglades, to assisting local governments like Captiva Island with shoreline protection. I would note that the Clinton administration has tried to end the involvement of the corps in joint shoreline projects. I am pleased this bill includes legislation introduced by my Florida colleague CLAY SHAW that will overturn the President's policy and ensure the continued involvement of the corps in worthwhile beach restoration projects. Overall, this is a responsible authorization bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the work you, Chairman BOEHLERT and ranking Members OBERSTAR and BORSKI have put into this bill, in a bipartisan manner, and for the excellent support the staff has given us during the hearing process and drafting of this bill. The expertise within this committee on the vital issues contained in this bill is something of which the citizens of this country should be proud, and this story of how Congress helps

better the lives of every American is too often untold. I'm proud of the work we're doing here, and it's one of the reasons I asked to serve on this committee and under your leadership, Chairman SHUSTER.

As I recently expressed to our House majority leader, it is important that we deliver on promises to our districts in ways that our constituents tell me are most vital to their everyday health and safety. Poll after poll tells us that these bread-and-butter issues are far more important to average Americans than broad, theoretical policy objectives. This bill accomplishes just that. WRDA will benefit many of our communities.

My district has several pressing needs in flood control, stream bank protection, inland waterway navigation, basic infrastructure, and environmental protection. The fundamental mission of the Corps of Engineers is widely recognized in east Tennessee. Fulfillment of our commitments to these communities, which are faced with both safety and economic concerns, can happen if H.R. 3592 gets passed into law, and I hope that this bill will not suffer the same fate of the WRDA bill from the last Congress. Today, we take another huge step forward.

I hope these vital issues do not get bogged down in Presidential politics or die in conference. Ironically, these are issues in which the Senate has taken the lead and House action will bring us tangible results. Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues not to shrink from this task at hand because some may call this bill pork. Our process here has revolved around sound science and engineering, authorizing those projects that fit criteria and pass muster from the Corps of Engineers. My father served in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—wore castles on his lapels—and I know the quality of the work done through their civilian works program.

This bill is about responsibly authorizing needed works in a cost-effective manner, not simply allowing Congress to appropriate money without due process. In some cases, this bill will authorize projects at dollar amounts below original estimates because we worked with the involved parties to find better solutions than the most expensive plans out there. We increase local responsibility and expect the Federal Government to be responsive to local needs.

One final note, Mr. Speaker. You will notice that while the Corps of Engineers is very active in Tennessee, in my home State, and the six other Southeastern States served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which also falls under the jurisdiction of this committee, we have many ongoing projects and needs that are not mentioned in this bill. That is because TVA, in its ongoing mission and existing authorization, carries out projects every year that have to compete for those same scarce appropriations dollars coming out of the energy and water bill. We all know what a squeeze is on for these dollars this year and the situation may get worse before it gets better, as we balance the Federal budget. I want to remind our colleagues that although you will see no TVA project mentioned in H.R. 3592, the Tennessee Valley region still has needs that TVA is expected to meet in the coming years. Because TVA has ongoing authority, I hope that this committee, the Appropriations Committee,

and the Congress will not prejudice any TVA project that meets the same criteria as these projects listed in this bill when it comes time to funding just because it is not listed in this bill.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. Chairman SHUSTER and Water Resources Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT both deserve credit for the bipartisan cooperation they have demonstrated in putting this legislation together. Because of their efforts it is no surprise that H.R. 3592 was unanimously approved by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

H.R. 3592 authorizes the activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers through fiscal year 2000. Many provisions in the bill relate to critical flood control and marine transportation projects that will save lives and property, protect the environment, and improve commerce along many of our Nation's great rivers.

One flood control project of critical importance to my central Illinois district is in the city of Villa Grove. This is the second of the last 3 years that Villa Grove, and Douglas County, have been placed on the State and Federal disaster lists because of flooding. The city faces flooding threats from the Embarras River, which flows north-south through the city; the Jordan Slough, a tributary of the Embarras River; and the West Ditch, which collects storm water runoff from farms west of the city and runs directly through the center of Villa Grove.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has surveyed the latest damage and agreed that corrective action is appropriate. City officials have suggested diverting water from the West Ditch by grading certain runoff areas, installing box culverts in several locations, and possibly modifying the river's path outside of the city. Clearly, Villa Grove's flooding problems will only become more frequent and severe if they are not addressed in the near future.

While the Villa Grove flood control project is only a small portion of this bill, I believe it is illustrative of the kind of flood relief that many communities around the United States desperately need. To the residents of Villa Grove, H.R. 3592 is one of the most important bills this Congress will act on, and I urge all of my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act [WRDA] of 1996. Not only is this bill a fiscally responsible approach to America's need for inland waterway and flood control projects, but it will be of substantial benefit to the environment as well. As a matter of fact, almost one quarter of the entire bill is devoted to programs and projects of an environmentally sensitive nature.

An excellent case in point is the 550 acre Des Plaines River Wetlands Demonstration Project [DPRWDP] in northern Illinois which would be reauthorized by section 502 of this bill. Originated in 1983 as a cooperative Federal, State, local, and private venture, the purpose of this project was to produce significant research information on the creation, maintenance, and restoration of wetlands. Since then, almost \$9 million has been spent—\$1.9 million by the Federal Government, another \$1.8 million by the State of Illinois, nearly \$1.7 million by local government entities, and \$3.4

million by the private sector—in pursuit of that objective. The results speak for themselves, and for the reauthorization of this project so that the \$2.2 million in Federal money authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 can be fully appropriated.

Since its inception 13 years ago, the DPRWDP has become an internationally recognized wetlands research effort that not only features 6 experimental wetlands cells but also a pair of wetlands mitigation banks that are demonstrating just how effectively the pressures of economic development can be reconciled with the need for environmental protection. Land that was once devoted to farming and gravel mining operations has been converted into a carefully monitored and controlled wetlands laboratory in which no less than 12 research teams from 14 different organizations, including 9 universities, have conducted, and continue to conduct, investigations into the way in which wetlands work and how they can affect such things as flooding, water quality, and habitat preservation.

As a result of all this work, over 150 articles, reports, proceedings, book chapters, abstracts, technical papers, theses, and dissertations have been published, not to mention the 50 plus newspaper, magazine, and newsletter articles that have written on the DPRWDP's research and its implications for such important public policy matters as flood control, species preservation, and water quality enhancement. For example, the August 25, 1995 New York Times carried a 2 page feature article on the DPRWDP, and a similar project in St. Charles, IL, which focused on the extent to which the existence of wetlands could prevent flooding.

So that the significance of these findings is not lost upon my colleagues, let me mention several of them specifically. One, based on the determination that a wetland can trap more than 80 percent of the sediments and nutrients contained in incoming river water, concluded that water quality in a given watershed could be improved if as little as 2 to 4 percent of that watershed were converted to wetlands. Another, evidenced by the return of flora, fauna, and four State-endangered birds to the DPRWDP site, speaks to the potential of wetlands for accommodating endangered or threatened species. And then there is the matter of flooding, the indication being that only 2 to 6 percent of a watershed need be devoted to wetlands in order to accommodate floodwaters. However, more work needs to be done before the full benefit of these and other findings can be realized. If we are to understand more fully how wetlands may best be restored and if a detailed "how-to" manual is to become available by the end of the century, then the Federal Government needs to invest more money in this project in the near future.

To achieve those objectives within that timeframe, another \$7 million and perhaps more will be needed, sooner rather than later. Revenues realized from the wetlands mitigation banks at the DPRWDP site will account for some of that money and private sources may provide additional financial support. But the funds generated from those sources alone is unlikely to be sufficient to get the job done by the year 2000 unless the remainder of the \$2.2 million authorized by the 1988 WRDA is

actually appropriated. To date, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, whose good works are authorized by WRDA legislation, has only invested a small portion of either the \$1.9 million spent by the Federal Government on the DPRWDP or the \$1 million earmarked for the project in the 1992 Energy and Water appropriations measure. Not only that, but of the \$125,000 or so the Corps has invested to date, none has been devoted to construction work.

Due to that combination of circumstances, the DPRWDP was deauthorized in 1993, even though it had been the recipient of nearly \$2 million in Federal money over the years and it had received an appropriation as late as 1992. As a consequence, statutory language reauthorizing the project became necessary, otherwise it would not be in a position to compete effectively for subsequent Federal appropriation. WRDA legislation being the proper place for such language, I was pleased with, and gratified by, its inclusion in the committee-reported version of H.R. 3592. My thanks go to the chairman and members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and especially to the chairman and members of its Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, for their consideration in that regard.

In closing, let me just say that enactment of this reauthorization language will pay big dividends in the future. Not only will the research data, instruction manuals, and mitigation banks generated by the DPRWDP enable Americans to conserve, construct, and restore valuable wetlands, but the insights provided will be of great benefit to those interested in controlling flooding or in accommodating necessary economic growth without compromising important environmental values. In short, the DPRWDP is a winner in every sense of the word and I urge my colleagues to give it their support by passing the legislation that contains its statutory reauthorization.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to a provision in the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 which could potentially cause grave harm to the upper Missouri River basin and at the same time set a dangerous and far-reaching precedent for water management in this Nation. I am speaking of section 545 in the bill before us today. This section proposes to extend the navigation season on the Missouri River by 1 month from the current 8-month season. While seemingly insignificant, extension of the navigation season would impact irrigation, drinking water supplies, hydropower generation, flood control efforts, recreational activities, and native fisheries.

According to the Army Corps of Engineers, the most severe impacts of extending the navigation season would be on water supply upstream and flood control downstream. Extension of navigation service by 1 month would require draining almost 1 million acre feet of drought reserve storage from each of the upper basin reservoirs, including Lake Sakakawea in North Dakota. Under this provision the corps would be required to release that water regardless of upstream weather conditions. During a series of drought years, farmers in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota could be caught without needed irrigation water, cities and towns could be left with insufficient clean drinking water supplies, hydropower plants could lose generating capac-

ity, and recreation areas may be left high and dry literally miles from the water. These upstream uses of the river, which result in over \$1 billion in economic activity annually, would be sacrificed in a short-sighted attempt to support navigation, a minor use of the river, generating only \$10 million each year.

The corps has also indicated that this reckless provision may actually lead to increased flooding risks throughout the Missouri basin. Under section 545 the corps would be required to continue navigation releases throughout December, even after the river freezes at Bismarck, ND, and Pierre, SD, increasing the risk of ice jam floods in those cities. The effects downstream, however, could be even worse. The corps has identified the stretches of the river between northwest Iowa and central Missouri as areas most heavily prone to ice jam formation. With the increased water releases expected from extending the navigation season, floods behind ice jams would be more severe than under normal flows. The ice chunks would also be larger, damaging riverbanks, dikes, and possibly even major structures like the Gavins Point Dam. Clearly, extending the navigation season makes little sense from a flood control standpoint.

Diverse interests have expressed their extreme dismay over inclusion of this provision in WRDA. The administration has asked for its removal from the bill. Eight leading environmental advocacy organizations have sent a letter to Congress opposing this attempt to hijack Missouri River management. American Rivers, National Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, and Bass Anglers Sportsman Society all agree that lengthening the navigation season will negatively impact the entire Missouri River basin. The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies oppose inclusion of this language in the WRDA bill. Even the Governor of Iowa, a downstream State, recently spoke out against extension of navigation through legislation.

If the resounding opposition to this provision and the potential damages from enactment of this provision do not provide enough evidence for its removal its precedent-setting nature should. Section 545 was slipped into the manager's amendment of the WRDA bill at the full committee markup and only subsequently made public. No hearings were conducted to determine its effect on the Missouri basin and not 1 minute of debate was conducted about the advisability of implementing such a scheme. Now this bill is brought up under suspension with no opportunity to have a stand-alone vote on this special-interest perk. Never before has Congress spelled out specific water management policy in statute, and it should not be doing so today.

Compare, if you will, that process to the one the corps is currently completing to review and update the Missouri River master manual. The corps has spent 6 years and \$23 million to conduct a thorough revision of water management on the Missouri River. Many of us are frustrated by the continual delays in the release of the master manual but that does not mean that Congress should circumvent the process. For decades, the professional engineers of the Army Corps have done their best to manage the waters of the United States to the benefit of all uses. To turn water manage-

ment over to the whim of special interests and political deal-making should make all members with rivers in their districts shudder. We cannot allow the corps to be placed in a statutory straightjacket when it comes to making sound decision about water management.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Members that final consideration of the 1994 WRDA stalled over upstream-downstream struggles over flood control and navigation. Many Members have necessary and valuable projects in this bill. We must not allow this provision on the Missouri River to hold up the passage of this bill through conference. I urge the chairman and ranking members of the House and Senate committees to strike this language so this necessary water bill can be enacted without delay. Upstream and downstream interests can work together to solve the vexing differences between our regions over Missouri River management. Local representatives have already begun to discuss these issues on the local level. I fervently believe that we should do everything we can to encourage those efforts and stop trying to direct water policy through congressional fiat.

AMERICAN RIVERS, BASS ANGLERS SPORTSMAN SOCIETY, ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, SIERRA CLUB, SIERRA CLUB LEGAL DEFENSE FUND

JULY 25, 1996.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The undersigned conservation groups are deeply concerned that a provision in H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, would lead to the extinction of several fish and wildlife species that inhabit the Missouri River and reduce opportunities for recreation. Representatives Earl Pomeroy (D-ND), Tim Johnson (D-SD), and Pat Williams (D-MT) will offer an amendment to strip H.R. 3592 of this provision, and we urge you to support this amendment.

Section 541 of H.R. 3592 would require the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to release water from the Missouri's six mainstem dams to support navigation from April 1 to December 15, regardless of the amount of water available to support other river uses. Dam releases designed solely to support navigation would not only have devastating environmental consequence but would also reduce economic benefits from hydropower, recreation and water supply. These industries—which generate more than \$1 billion in economic benefits annually—would be sacrificed to support an industry that generates a mere \$10 million each year.

Despite the economic and environmental impacts of the provision, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee added Sec. 541 during full committee mark-up without hearing from a single witness. The two-page provision was included in a 70-page manager's amendment that was released to conservation groups after the Committee had already acted.

The Missouri River has been dramatically altered to support navigation. The river's six dams impound the world's largest reservoir system, blocking fish passage and altering the movement of sediment. The river between Sioux City and St. Louis, channelized to one-third of its original width, has lost more than 90 percent of its wetlands, islands, chutes and sandbars. Three federally endangered species are already jeopardized by current water management, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Many others species, including popular sportfish like blue catfish, have fallen to less than 10 percent of

their historic populations. This provision would prevent the Corps of Engineers from taking steps necessary to reverse their decline and prevent their extinction.

This amendment will prevent the Corps of Engineers from reducing flood losses. Landowners farming converted side channels and backwaters are among the most flood-prone in the nation. In the wake of flooding in 1993 and 1995, federal programs rebuilt many levees twice, often spending more federal funds on repairs than the protected land was worth. Section 541 would prohibit the Corps from using the conveyance capacity of floodplain lands acquired from willing sellers to protect other floodplain land owners.

This amendment will also have high economic costs. Originally forecast to carry 12 to 20 million tons annually, commercial navigation on the Missouri River peaked at 3.3 million tons in 1977 and has fallen to just 1.5 million tons, generating \$10 million in economic benefits. By contrast, Missouri River recreation generates \$75 million in economic benefits, water supply generates \$450 million, and hydropower generates \$625 million. Missouri River navigation accounts for just 1 percent of the economic benefits produced by the river, and is the means of transportation for only one-tenth of 1 percent of the corn produced in Missouri, Kansas, Iowa and Nebraska. Just 2 percent of the wheat produced in those states is shipped by Missouri River barge.

Despite the economic insignificance of Missouri River navigation, Section 541 would direct the Corps of Engineers to extend the navigation season at enormous expense to other river industries. The provision would prevent the Corps from managing the Missouri's dams to support Mississippi River navigation during periods of low water. Section 541 would also require dam releases to support Missouri River navigation regardless of the amount of water in the system, potentially exacerbating downstream flooding or wasting precious water during droughts.

We urge you to support the amendment offered by Representatives Earl Pomeroy (D-ND), Tim Johnson (D-SD), and Pat Williams (D-MT) to strip H.R. 3592 of this provision.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FABER,
American Rivers.
BRUCE SHUPP,
Bass Anglers Sportsman Society.
TIM SEARCHINGER,
Environmental Defense Fund.
GALWAIN KRIPKE,
Friends of the Earth.
JOHN ECHEVERRIA,
National Audubon Society.
DAVID CONRAD,
National Wildlife Federation.
JONATHAN ELA,
Sierra Club.
AMY MATHEWS-AMOS,
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, ND, July 26, 1996.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHUSTER: I am deeply concerned with the obviously flawed provision in H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The bill contains language requiring the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to extend the navigation season on the Missouri River by one month, regardless of the amount of water available to support the other authorized primary uses. This provision would be devastating, especially during drought periods when system releases are to be reduced to save and ensure water in storage for all users, including navigation. This provision is ill-conceived and irrespon-

sibly allows for abuse of our precious natural resources and is a license to steal water.

The economic and environmental impacts of Section 541 of H.R. 3592 would cause severe economic impacts to all Missouri River Basin states and their stakeholders. The current system operation is already extremely biased and heavily favors a minuscule, dwindling, archaic, heavily subsidized and highly marginal Missouri River navigation. Barge traffic produces only one percent of the annual net economic benefits derived from the management of the Missouri River. A decision by the political winds and pork barrel special interests of Washington should not destroy sensible water management. The Missouri River and its reservoirs are under the care of all of us, not a special interest group. I ask that you strike this language and leave the complicated matters of reservoir operations in the hands of the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the basin states.

Sincerely,

EDWARD T. SCHAFER
Governor.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES, RESOLUTION, OPPOSITION TO EXTENDED NAVIGATION ON THE LOWER MISSOURI RIVER

Whereas, the uses of Missouri River water for fish, wildlife, recreation, and other related beneficial purposes have been well documented; and

Whereas, the benefits of these fish, wildlife, and water-based activities have been shown to generate millions of dollars to the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas, the Corps of Engineers is nearing completion of a long-term, \$20+ million review of its operating criteria and procedures (Master Manual review process) of six Missouri River impoundments; and

Whereas, all eight Missouri River basin states and all basin tribes have supported the Corps Master Manual review process; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress is poised to legislatively require a one-month extension of navigation flow which will lower water levels in Missouri River mainstream reservoirs and severely limit the Corps operational flexibility, and this would be in contradiction to the findings of the Corps Master Manual review; and

Whereas, the impacts of lowering the water level in these reservoirs have been shown to be detrimental to fish species including native and endangered species; and

Whereas, the benefits of retaining water in mainstream reservoirs have been shown to far exceed the benefits of moving water downstream for navigation purposes on the lower Missouri: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, at its annual meeting on July 26, 1996, at Honolulu, Hawaii, supports deletion of Section 541 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (H.R. 3592) which would require a one-month extension of the navigation season on the lower Missouri River, despite accelerating the dewatering of the reservoirs which support fish and wildlife uses, and would circumvent the Corps own review of their operating procedures.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3592, the Water Resources Development Act, which authorizes projects and programs of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is strongly bipartisan, and places special emphasis on protecting the environment. In fact, I believe it should be stressed that passage of this legislation represents an important environmental accomplishment for this Congress.

Of particular importance to the Hudson Valley, I would like to draw attention to section 551 of the act, which incorporates the provisions of legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 3471, the Hudson River Habitat Restoration Act. The legislation which we are considering today authorizes \$11 million for at least four habitat restoration projects along the Hudson River basin.

Mr. Speaker, the Hudson River estuary is an important habitat to a wide range of waterfowl and aquatic species. Many important habitats along the river—wetlands, marshes, and so forth—have been degraded over the past century as industry and agriculture grew along the river. The legislation that I have introduced seeks Federal funding for critical habitat projects identified by the Corps of Engineers and New York's Department of Environmental Conservation.

I recently had the pleasure of touring one of the proposed sites, the Manitou Marsh near Philipstown in my district. Tidal marshes such as this one represent a very productive ecosystem, a wonderful habitat for raptors, waterfowl and fish, and serve to clean pollutants from the river. Road and factory construction dating from the 19th century has adversely affected the tidal flows in and out of the marsh, a problem this legislation seeks to correct.

This legislation supports an ongoing and cooperative effort that has involved various levels of government, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the New York Department of Environmental Conservation, local environmental organizations, such as the Museum of the Hudson Highlands, Scenic Hudson, and the Audubon Society, as well as private sector businesses, such as Metro North Railroad.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important and vital environmental legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3592, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 640) 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 640

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 1996".

(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—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

- Sec. 201. Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.
Sec. 202. Heber Springs, Arkansas.
Sec. 203. Morgan Point, Arkansas.
Sec. 204. White River Basin Lakes, Arkansas and Missouri.
Sec. 205. Central and Southern Florida.
Sec. 206. West Palm Beach, Florida.
Sec. 207. Everglades and South Florida ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 208. Arkansas City and Winfield, Kansas.
Sec. 209. Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.
Sec. 210. Coldwater River Watershed, Mississippi.
Sec. 211. Periodic maintenance dredging for Greenville Inner Harbor Channel, Mississippi.
Sec. 212. Sardis Lake, Mississippi.
Sec. 213. Yalobusha River Watershed, Mississippi.
Sec. 214. Libby Dam, Montana.
Sec. 215. Small flood control project, Malta, Montana.
Sec. 216. Cliffwood Beach, New Jersey.
Sec. 217. Fire Island Inlet, New York.
Sec. 218. Queens County, New York.
Sec. 219. Buford Trenton Irrigation District, North Dakota and Montana.
Sec. 220. Jamestown Dam and Pipestem Dam, North Dakota.
Sec. 221. Wister Lake project, LeFlore County, Oklahoma.
Sec. 222. Willamette River, McKenzie Subbasin, Oregon.
Sec. 223. Abandoned and wrecked barge removal, Rhode Island.
Sec. 224. Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island.
Sec. 225. Cooper Lake and Channels, Texas.
Sec. 226. Rudee Inlet, Virginia Beach, Virginia.
Sec. 227. Virginia Beach, Virginia.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 301. Cost-sharing for environmental projects.
Sec. 302. Collaborative research and development.
Sec. 303. National dam safety program.
Sec. 304. Hydroelectric power project uprating.
Sec. 305. Federal lump-sum payments for Federal operation and maintenance costs.
Sec. 306. Cost-sharing for removal of existing project features.
Sec. 307. Termination of technical advisory committee.
Sec. 308. Conditions for project deauthorizations.
Sec. 309. Participation in international engineering and scientific conferences.
Sec. 310. Research and development in support of Army civil works program.
Sec. 311. Interagency and international support authority.
Sec. 312. Section 1135 program.
Sec. 313. Environmental dredging.

- Sec. 314. Feasibility studies.
Sec. 315. Obstruction removal requirement.
Sec. 316. Levee owners manual.
Sec. 317. Risk-based analysis methodology.
Sec. 318. Sediments decontamination technology.
Sec. 319. Melaleuca tree.
Sec. 320. Faulkner Island, Connecticut.
Sec. 321. Designation of lock and dam at the Red River Waterway, Louisiana.
Sec. 322. Jurisdiction of Mississippi River Commission, Louisiana.
Sec. 323. William Jennings Randolph access road, Garrett County, Maryland.
Sec. 324. Arkabutla Dam and Lake, Mississippi.
Sec. 325. New York State canal system.
Sec. 326. Quonset Point-Davisville, Rhode Island.
Sec. 327. Clouter Creek disposal area, Charleston, South Carolina.
Sec. 328. Nuisance aquatic vegetation in Lake Gaston, Virginia and North Carolina.
Sec. 329. Washington Aqueduct.
Sec. 330. Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program.
Sec. 331. Research and development program to improve salmon survival.
Sec. 332. Recreational user fees.
Sec. 333. Shore protection.
Sec. 334. Shoreline erosion control demonstration.
Sec. 335. Review period for State and Federal agencies.
Sec. 336. Dredged material disposal facilities.
Sec. 337. Applicability of cost-sharing provisions.
Sec. 338. Section 215 reimbursement limitation per project.
Sec. 339. Waiver of uneconomical cost-sharing requirement.
Sec. 340. Planning assistance to States.
Sec. 341. Recovery of costs for cleanup of hazardous substances.
Sec. 342. City of North Bonneville, Washington.
Sec. 343. Columbia River Treaty Fishing Access.
Sec. 344. Tri-Cities area, Washington.
Sec. 345. Designation of locks and dams on Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.
Sec. 346. Designation of J. Bennett Johnston Waterway.
Sec. 347. Technical corrections.

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 REPORTS.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, 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 the respective reports designated in this subsection:

(1) HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated October 30, 1995, at a total cost of \$15,180,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$10,116,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,064,000.

(2) MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CALIFORNIA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Marin County Shoreline, San Rafael Canal, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated January 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$27,200,000,

with an estimated Federal cost of \$17,700,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$9,500,000.

(3) SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, San Lorenzo River, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of \$16,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,000,000 and the habitat restoration, at a total cost of \$4,050,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$3,040,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,010,000.

(4) SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Santa Barbara Harbor, Santa Barbara, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 26, 1994, at a total cost of \$5,720,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,580,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,140,000.

(5) ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND MARYLAND.—The project for environmental restoration, Anacostia River and tributaries, District of Columbia and Maryland: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated October 1994, at a total cost of \$18,820,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$14,120,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,700,000.

(6) PALM VALLEY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Palm Valley Bridge, County Road 210, over the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway in St. Johns County, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total Federal cost of \$15,312,000. As a condition of receipt of Federal funds, St. Johns County shall assume full ownership of the replacement bridge, including all associated operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs.

(7) ILLINOIS SHORELINE STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, WILMETTE TO ILLINOIS AND INDIANA STATE LINE.—The project for lake level flooding and storm damage reduction, extending from Wilmette, Illinois, to the Illinois and Indiana State line: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 14, 1994, at a total cost of \$204,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$110,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$94,000,000. The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of any costs that the non-Federal interest incurs in constructing the breakwater near the South Water Filtration Plant, Chicago, Illinois.

(8) KENTUCKY LOCK ADDITION, KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, Kentucky Lock Addition, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 1, 1992, at a total cost of \$467,000,000. The construction costs of the project shall be paid—

(A) 50 percent from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury; and

(B) 50 percent from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(9) POND CREEK, KENTUCKY.—The project for flood control, Pond Creek, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$16,865,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,243,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,622,000.

(10) WOLF CREEK HYDROPOWER, CUMBERLAND RIVER, KENTUCKY.—The project for hydropower, Wolf Creek Dam and Lake Cumberland, Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$50,230,000. Funds derived by the Tennessee Valley Authority from the power program of the Authority and funds derived from any private or public entity designated by the Southeastern Power Administration may be used for all or part of any cost-sharing requirements for the project.

(11) PORT FOURCHON, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Port Fourchon, Louisiana: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 7, 1995, at a total cost of \$2,812,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,211,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$601,000.

(12) WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, JEFFERSON PARISH, LOUISIANA.—The West Bank Hurricane Protection Levee, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana project, authorized by section 401(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4128), is modified to authorize the Secretary to extend protection to areas east of the Harvey Canal, including an area east of the Algiers Canal: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 1, 1995, at a total cost of \$217,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$141,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$75,600,000.

(13) STABILIZATION OF NATCHEZ BLUFFS, MISSISSIPPI.—The project for bluff stabilization, Natchez Bluffs, Natchez, Mississippi: Natchez Bluffs Study, dated September 1985, Natchez Bluffs Study: Supplement I, dated June 1990, and Natchez Bluffs Study: Supplement II, dated December 1993, in the portions of the bluffs described in the reports designated in this paragraph as Clifton Avenue, area 3; Bluff above Silver Street, area 6; Bluff above Natchez Under-the-Hill, area 7; and Madison Street to State Street, area 4, at a total cost of \$17,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$12,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,300,000.

(14) WOOD RIVER AT GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood control, Wood River at Grand Island, Nebraska: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 3, 1994, at a total cost of \$10,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$5,250,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,250,000.

(15) ATLANTIC COAST OF LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Atlantic Coast of Long Island from Jones Inlet to East Rockaway Inlet, Long Beach Island, New York: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 5, 1996, at a total cost of \$72,091,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$46,859,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$25,232,000.

(16) WILMINGTON HARBOR, CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVERS, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor, Cape Fear-Northeast Cape Fear Rivers, North Carolina: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total cost of \$23,290,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$16,955,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,335,000.

(17) DUCK CREEK, OHIO.—The project for flood control, Duck Creek, Cincinnati, Ohio: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 28, 1994, at a total cost of \$15,408,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,556,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,852,000.

(18) BIG SIOUX RIVER AND SKUNK CREEK AT SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA.—The project for flood control, Big Sioux River and Skunk Creek at Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 30, 1994, at a total cost of \$31,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$23,600,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,000,000.

(19) HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TEXAS.—The project for navigation and environmental restoration, Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 9, 1996, at a total cost of \$508,757,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$286,141,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$222,616,000.

(20) ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AT GREAT BRIDGE, CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation at Great Bridge, Virginia Highway 168, over the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway

in Chesapeake, Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated July 1, 1994, at a total cost of \$23,680,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$20,341,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,339,000. The city of Chesapeake shall assume full ownership of the replacement bridge, including all associated operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs.

(21) MARMET LOCK REPLACEMENT, KANAWHA RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.—The project for navigation, Marmet Lock Replacement, Marmet Locks and Dam, Kanawha River, West Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1994, at a total cost of \$229,581,000. The construction costs of the project shall be paid—

(A) 50 percent from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury; and

(B) 50 percent from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund established by section 9506 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO FAVORABLE 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 favorable final report (or in the case of the project described in paragraph (6), a favorable feasibility report) of the Chief of Engineers, if the report is completed not later than December 31, 1996:

(1) CHIGNIK, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Chignik, Alaska, at a total cost of \$10,365,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,344,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,021,000.

(2) COOK INLET, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Cook Inlet, Alaska, at a total cost of \$5,342,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,006,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,336,000.

(3) AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood damage reduction, American and Sacramento Rivers, California: Supplemental Information Report for the American River Watershed Project, California, dated March 1996, at a total cost of \$57,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$42,975,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$14,325,000, consisting of—

(i) approximately 24 miles of slurry wall in the levees along the lower American River;

(ii) approximately 12 miles of levee modifications along the east bank of the Sacramento River downstream from the Natomas Cross Canal;

(iii) 3 telemeter streamflow gauges upstream from the Folsom Reservoir; and

(iv) modifications to the flood warning system along the lower American River.

(B) CREDIT TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of project costs for expenses that the non-Federal interest incurs for design or construction of any of the features authorized under this paragraph before the date on which Federal funds are made available for construction of the project. The amount of the credit shall be determined by the Secretary.

(C) INTERIM OPERATION.—Until such time as a comprehensive flood control plan for the American River watershed has been implemented, the Secretary of the Interior shall continue to operate the Folsom Dam and Reservoir to the variable 400,000/670,000 acre-feet of flood control storage capacity and shall extend the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency with respect to the watershed.

(D) OTHER COSTS.—The non-Federal interest shall be responsible for—

(i) all operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs associated with the improvements carried out under this paragraph; and

(ii) the costs of the variable flood control operation of the Folsom Dam and Reservoir.

(4) SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CALIFORNIA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Santa Monica breakwater, California, at a total cost of \$6,440,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$4,220,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,220,000.

(5) LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, SAVANNAH RIVER, GEORGIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA.—The project for environmental restoration, Lower Savannah River Basin, Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina, at a total cost of \$3,419,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,551,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$868,000.

(6) NEW HARMONY, INDIANA.—The project for shoreline erosion protection, Wabash River at New Harmony, Indiana, at a total cost of \$2,800,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$700,000.

(7) CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL, MARYLAND AND DELAWARE.—The project for navigation and safety improvements, Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Baltimore Harbor channels, Delaware and Maryland, at a total cost of \$33,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$25,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$8,000,000.

(8) POPLAR ISLAND, MARYLAND.—The project for beneficial use of clean dredged material in connection with the dredging of Baltimore Harbor and connecting channels, Poplar Island, Maryland, at a total cost of \$307,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$230,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$77,000,000.

(9) LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO.—The project for flood damage reduction, Las Cruces, New Mexico, at a total cost of \$8,278,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$5,494,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,784,000.

(10) CAPE FEAR RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Cape Fear River deepening, North Carolina, at a total cost of \$210,264,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$130,159,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$80,105,000.

(11) CHARLESTON HARBOR, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, at a total cost of \$116,639,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$72,798,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$43,841,000.

SEC. 102. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) MOBILE HARBOR, ALABAMA.—The undesignated paragraph under the heading "MOBILE HARBOR, ALABAMA" in section 201(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4090) is amended by striking the first semicolon and all that follows and inserting a period and the following: "In disposing of dredged material from the project, the Secretary, after compliance with applicable laws and after opportunity for public review and comment, may consider alternatives to disposal of such material in the Gulf of Mexico, including environmentally acceptable alternatives consisting of beneficial uses of dredged material and environmental restoration."

(b) SAN FRANCISCO RIVER AT CLIFTON, ARIZONA.—If a favorable final report of the Chief of Engineers is issued not later than December 31, 1996, the project for flood control on the San Francisco River at Clifton, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-640; 104 Stat. 4606), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the

project at a total cost of \$21,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$13,800,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,300,000.

(c) LOS ANGELES AND LONG BEACH HARBORS, SAN PEDRO BAY, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, San Pedro Bay, California, authorized by section 201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4091), is modified to provide that, for the purpose of section 101(a)(2) of the Act (33 U.S.C. 2211(a)(2)), the sewer outfall relocated over a distance of 4,458 feet by the Port of Los Angeles at a cost of approximately \$12,000,000 shall be considered to be a relocation.

(d) OAKLAND HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The projects for navigation, Oakland Outer Harbor, California, and Oakland Inner Harbor, California, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4092), are modified to combine the 2 projects into 1 project, to be designated as the Oakland Harbor, California, project. The Oakland Harbor, California, project shall be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended in the reports designated for the projects in the section, except that the non-Federal share of project cost and any available credits toward the non-Federal share shall be calculated on the basis of the total cost of the combined project. The total cost of the combined project is \$102,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$64,120,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$38,480,000.

(e) BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide periodic beach nourishment for the Broward County, Florida, Hillsborough Inlet to Port Everglades (Segment II), shore protection project, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298; 79 Stat. 1090), through the year 2020. The beach nourishment shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the section 934 study and reevaluation report for the project carried out under section 156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5f) and approved by the Chief of Engineers by memorandum dated June 9, 1995.

(2) COSTS.—The total cost of the activities required under this subsection shall not exceed \$15,457,000, of which the Federal share shall not exceed \$9,846,000.

(f) CANAVERAL HARBOR, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Canaveral Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 101(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to reclassify the removal and replacement of stone protection on both sides of the channel as general navigation features of the project subject to cost sharing in accordance with section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(a)). The Secretary may reimburse the non-Federal interests for such costs incurred by the non-Federal interests in connection with the removal and replacement as the Secretary determines are in excess of the non-Federal share of the costs of the project required under the section.

(g) FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall provide periodic beach nourishment for the Fort Pierce beach erosion control project, St. Lucie County, Florida, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298; 79 Stat. 1092), through the year 2020.

(h) TYBEE ISLAND, GEORGIA.—The Secretary shall provide periodic beach nourishment for a period of up to 50 years for the project for beach erosion control, Tybee Island, Georgia, constructed under section 201

of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5).

(i) NORTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER, ILLINOIS.—The project for flood control for the North Branch of the Chicago River, Illinois, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4115), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project substantially in accordance with the post authorization change report for the project dated March 1994, at a total cost of \$34,228,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$20,905,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$13,323,000.

(j) HALSTEAD, KANSAS.—The project for flood control, Halstead, Kansas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4116), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the post authorization change report for the project dated March 1993, at a total cost of \$11,100,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,325,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,775,000.

(k) BAPTISTE COLLETTE BAYOU, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Mississippi River Outlets, Venice, Louisiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-483; 82 Stat. 731), is modified to provide for the extension of the 16-foot deep (mean low gulf) by 250-foot wide Baptiste Collette Bayou entrance channel to approximately mile 8 of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet navigation channel at a total estimated Federal cost of \$80,000, including \$4,000 for surveys and \$76,000 for Coast Guard aids to navigation.

(l) COMITE RIVER, LOUISIANA.—If a favorable final report of the Chief of Engineers is issued not later than December 31, 1996, the Comite River diversion project for flood control authorized as part of the project for flood control, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, by section 101(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4802), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of \$121,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$70,577,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$51,023,000.

(m) MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Mississippi River Ship Channel, Gulf to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, authorized by the matter under the heading "CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL" under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL" in chapter IV of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (99 Stat. 313), is modified to require the Secretary, as part of the operations and maintenance segment of the project, to assume responsibility for periodic maintenance dredging of the Chalmette Slip to a depth of minus 33 feet mean low gulf, if the Secretary determines that the project modification is economically justified, environmentally acceptable, and consistent with other Federal policies.

(n) RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA.—The project for navigation, Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-483; 82 Stat. 731), is modified to require the Secretary to dredge and perform other related work as required to reestablish and maintain access to, and the environmental value of, the bendway channels designated for preservation in project documentation prepared before the date of enactment of this Act. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the local cooperation requirements for other navigation features of the project.

(o) WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LOUISIANA.—If a favorable post authorization

change report is issued not later than December 31, 1996, the project for hurricane damage prevention and flood control, Westwego to Harvey Canal, Louisiana, authorized by section 401(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4128), is modified to include the Lake Cataouatche area levee as part of the project at a total cost of \$14,375,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,344,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,031,000.

(p) TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MARYLAND.—The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500; 72 Stat. 297), is modified to direct the Secretary—

(1) to expedite review of potential straightening of the channel at the Tolchester Channel S-Turn; and

(2) if before December 31, 1996, it is determined to be feasible and necessary for safe and efficient navigation, to implement the straightening as part of project maintenance.

(q) STILLWATER, MINNESOTA.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a design memorandum for the project authorized by section 363 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4861). The design memorandum shall include an evaluation of the Federal interest in construction of that part of the project that includes the secondary flood wall, but shall not include an evaluation of the reconstruction and extension of the levee system for which construction is scheduled to commence in 1996. If the Secretary determines that there is such a Federal interest, the Secretary shall construct the secondary flood wall, or the most feasible alternative, at a total project cost of not to exceed \$11,600,000. The Federal share of the cost shall be 75 percent.

(r) CAPE GIRARDEAU, MISSOURI.—The project for flood control, Cape Girardeau, Jackson Metropolitan Area, Missouri, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4118-4119), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project, including the implementation of nonstructural measures, at a total cost of \$44,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$32,600,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$12,100,000.

(s) FLAMINGO AND TROPICANA WASHES, NEVADA.—The project for flood control, Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries (Flamingo and Tropicana Washes), Nevada, authorized by section 101(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4803), is modified to provide that the Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal sponsors (or other appropriate non-Federal interests) for the Federal share of any costs that the non-Federal sponsors (or other appropriate non-Federal interests) incur in carrying out the project consistent with the project cooperation agreement entered into with respect to the project.

(t) NEWARK, NEW JERSEY.—The project for flood control, Passaic River Main Stem, New Jersey and New York, authorized by paragraph (18) of section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-640; 104 Stat. 4607) (as amended by section 102(p) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4807)), is modified to separate the project element described in subparagraph (B) of the paragraph. The project element shall be considered to be a separate project and shall be carried out in accordance with the subparagraph.

(u) ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NEW MEXICO.—The second sentence of section

1113(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4232) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that the Federal share of scoping and reconnaissance work carried out by the Secretary under this section shall be 100 percent”.

(v) WILMINGTON HARBOR-NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for navigation, Wilmington Harbor-Northeast Cape Fear River, North Carolina, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4095), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the general design memorandum for the project dated April 1990 and the general design memorandum supplement for the project dated February 1994, at a total cost of \$50,921,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$25,128,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$25,793,000.

(w) BROKEN BOW LAKE, RED RIVER BASIN, OKLAHOMA.—The project for flood control and water supply, Broken Bow Lake, Red River Basin, Oklahoma, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500; 72 Stat. 309) and modified by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1187) and section 102(v) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4808), is further modified to provide for the reallocation of a sufficient quantity of water supply storage space in Broken Bow Lake to support the Mountain Fork trout fishery. Releases of water from Broken Bow Lake for the Mountain Fork trout fishery as mitigation for the loss of fish and wildlife resources in the Mountain Fork River shall be carried out at no expense to the State of Oklahoma.

(x) COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—The project for navigation, Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers below Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, preservation, and completion of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 157), is modified to direct the Secretary—

(1) to conduct channel simulation and to carry out improvements to the deep draft channel between the mouth of the river and river mile 34, at a cost not to exceed \$2,400,000; and

(2) to conduct overdepth and advance maintenance dredging that is necessary to maintain authorized channel dimensions.

(y) GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.—The project for navigation, Lock and Dam 7 Replacement, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 301(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4110), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project in accordance with the post authorization change report for the project dated September 1, 1995, at a total Federal cost of \$181,000,000.

(z) SAW MILL RUN, PENNSYLVANIA.—The project for flood control, Saw Mill Run, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4124), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project substantially in accordance with the post authorization change and general reevaluation report for the project, dated April 1994, at a total cost of \$12,780,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,585,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,195,000.

(aa) WYOMING VALLEY, PENNSYLVANIA.—The project for flood control, Wyoming Val-

ley, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4124), is modified to authorize the Secretary—

(1) to include as part of the construction of the project mechanical and electrical upgrades to stormwater pumping stations in the Wyoming Valley; and

(2) to carry out mitigation measures that the Secretary is otherwise authorized to carry out but that the general design memorandum for phase II of the project, as approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army having responsibility for civil works on February 15, 1996, provides will be carried out for credit by the non-Federal interest with respect to the project.

(bb) ALLENDALE DAM, NORTH PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.—The project for reconstruction of the Allendale Dam, North Providence, Rhode Island, authorized by section 358 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4861), is modified to authorize the Secretary to reconstruct the dam, at a total cost of \$350,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$262,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$87,500.

(cc) INDIA POINT RAILROAD BRIDGE, SEEKONK RIVER, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.—The first sentence of section 1166(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4258) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,300,000”; and

(2) by striking “\$250,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$650,000”.

(dd) CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.—The project for navigation, Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, Texas, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes”, approved September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1039), is modified to include the Rincon Canal system as a part of the Federal project that shall be maintained at a depth of 12 feet, if the Secretary determines that the project modification is economically justified, environmentally acceptable, and consistent with other Federal policies.

(ee) DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, DALLAS, TEXAS.—The flood protection works constructed by the non-Federal interest along the Trinity River in Dallas, Texas, for Rochester Park and the Central Wastewater Treatment Plant shall be included as a part of the plan implemented for the Dallas Floodway Extension component of the Trinity River, Texas, project authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298; 79 Stat. 1091). The cost of the works shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of project costs without regard to further economic analysis of the works.

(ff) MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, PORT LAVACA, TEXAS.—The project for navigation, Matagorda Ship Channel, Port Lavaca, Texas, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500; 72 Stat. 298), is modified to require the Secretary to assume responsibility for the maintenance of the Point Comfort Turning Basin Expansion Area to a depth of 36 feet, as constructed by the non-Federal interests. The modification described in the preceding sentence shall be considered to be in the public interest and to be economically justified.

(gg) UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UTAH.—The project for flood control, Upper Jordan River, Utah, authorized by section 101(a)(23) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-640; 104 Stat. 4610), is modified to authorize the Secretary to carry out the project substantially in accordance with the general design memorandum for the project dated March 1994, and the post au-

thorization change report for the project dated April 1994, at a total cost of \$12,870,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$8,580,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$4,290,000.

(hh) GRUNDY, VIRGINIA.—The Secretary shall proceed with planning, engineering, design, and construction of the Grundy, Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project, authorized by section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1981 (Public Law 96-367; 94 Stat. 1339), in accordance with Plan 3A as set forth in the preliminary draft detailed project report of the Huntington District Commander, dated August 1993.

(ii) HAYS DAM, VIRGINIA AND KENTUCKY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct the Hays Dam feature of the project authorized by section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1981 (Public Law 96-367; 94 Stat. 1339), substantially in accordance with Plan A as set forth in the preliminary draft general plan supplement report of the Huntington District Engineer for the Levisa Fork Basin, Virginia and Kentucky, dated May 1995.

(2) RECREATIONAL COMPONENT.—The non-Federal interest shall be responsible for not more than 50 percent of the costs associated with the construction and implementation of the recreational component of the Hays Dam feature.

(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), operation and maintenance of the Hays Dam feature shall be carried out by the Secretary.

(B) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The non-Federal interest shall be responsible for 100 percent of all costs associated with the operation and maintenance.

(4) ABILITY TO PAY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall apply section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) to the construction of the Hays Dam feature in the same manner as section 103(m) of the Act is applied to other projects or project features constructed under section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1981 (Public Law 96-367; 94 Stat. 1339).

(jj) PETERSBURG, WEST VIRGINIA.—The project for flood control, Petersburg, West Virginia, authorized by section 101(a)(26) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-640; 104 Stat. 4611), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project at a total cost of not to exceed \$26,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$19,195,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,405,000.

(kk) TETON COUNTY, WYOMING.—Section 840 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4176) is amended—

(1) by striking “Secretary: *Provided, That*” and inserting the following: “Secretary. In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into agreements with the non-Federal sponsors permitting the non-Federal sponsors to provide operation and maintenance for the project on a cost-reimbursable basis. The”;

(2) by inserting “, through providing in-kind services or” after “\$35,000”; and

(3) by inserting a comma after “materials”.

SEC. 103. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) BRANFORD HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 2,267 square foot portion of the project for navigation in the Branford River, Branford Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by 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 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 333), lying shoreward of a line described in paragraph (2), is deauthorized.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LINE.—The line referred to in paragraph (1) is described as follows: beginning at a point on the authorized Federal navigation channel line the coordinates of which are N156,181.32, E581,572.38, running thence south 70 degrees, 11 minutes, 8 seconds west a distance of 171.58 feet to another point on the authorized Federal navigation channel line the coordinates of which are N156,123.16, E581,410.96.

(b) BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) ANCHORAGE AREA.—The portion of the project for navigation, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-500; 72 Stat. 297), consisting of a 2-acre anchorage area with a depth of 6 feet at the head of Johnsons River between the Federal channel and Hollisters Dam, is deauthorized.

(2) JOHNSONS RIVER CHANNEL.—The portion of the project for navigation, Johnsons River Channel, Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 634), that is northerly of a line across the Federal channel the coordinates of which are north 123318.35, east 486301.68, and north 123257.15, east 486380.77, is deauthorized.

(c) GUILFORD HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation, Guilford Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 13), that consists of the 6-foot deep channel in Sluice Creek and that is not included in the description of the realigned channel set forth in paragraph (2) is deauthorized.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF REALIGNED CHANNEL.—The realigned channel referred to in paragraph (1) is described as follows: starting at a point where the Sluice Creek Channel intersects with the main entrance channel, N159194.63, E623201.07, thence running north 24 degrees, 58 minutes, 15.2 seconds west 478.40 feet to a point N159628.31, E622999.11, thence running north 20 degrees, 18 minutes, 31.7 seconds west 351.53 feet to a point N159957.99, E622877.10, thence running north 69 degrees, 41 minutes, 37.9 seconds east 55.00 feet to a point N159977.08, E622928.69, thence turning and running south 20 degrees, 18 minutes, 31.0 seconds east 349.35 feet to a point N159649.45, E623049.94, thence turning and running south 24 degrees, 58 minutes, 11.1 seconds east 341.36 feet to a point N159340.00, E623194.04, thence turning and running south 90 degrees, 0 minutes, 0 seconds east 78.86 feet to a point N159340.00, E623272.90.

(d) NORWALK HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The following portions of projects for navigation, Norwalk Harbor, Connecticut, are deauthorized:

(A) The portion authorized by 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 March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1276), that lies northerly of a line across the Federal channel having coordinates N104199.72, E417774.12 and N104155.59, E417628.96.

(B) The portions of the 6-foot deep East Norwalk Channel and Anchorage, authorized by the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and

for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 13), that are not included in the description of the realigned channel and anchorage set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF REALIGNED CHANNEL AND ANCHORAGE.—The realigned 6-foot deep East Norwalk Channel and Anchorage referred to in paragraph (1)(B) is described as follows: starting at a point on the East Norwalk Channel, N95743.02, E419581.37, thence running northwesterly about 463.96 feet to a point N96197.93, E419490.18, thence running northwesterly about 549.32 feet to a point N96608.49, E419125.23, thence running northwesterly about 384.06 feet to a point N96965.94, E418984.75, thence running northwesterly about 407.26 feet to a point N97353.87, E418860.78, thence running westerly about 58.26 feet to a point N97336.26, E418805.24, thence running northwesterly about 70.99 feet to a point N97390.30, E418759.21, thence running westerly about 71.78 feet to a point on the anchorage limit N97405.26, E418689.01, thence running southerly along the western limits of the Federal anchorage in existence on the date of enactment of this Act until reaching a point N95893.74, E419449.17, thence running in a southwesterly direction about 78.74 feet to a point on the East Norwalk Channel N95815.62, E419439.33.

(3) DESIGNATION OF REALIGNED CHANNEL AND ANCHORAGE.—All of the realigned channel shall be redesignated as an anchorage, with the exception of the portion of the channel that narrows to a width of 100 feet and terminates at a line the coordinates of which are N96456.81, E419260.06 and N96390.37, E419185.32, which shall remain as a channel.

(e) SOUTHPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Southport Harbor, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1029), are deauthorized:

(A) The 6-foot deep anchorage located at the head of the project.

(B) The portion of the 9-foot deep channel beginning at a bend in the channel the coordinates of which are north 109131.16, east 452653.32, running thence in a northeasterly direction about 943.01 feet to a point the coordinates of which are north 109635.22, east 453450.31, running thence in a southeasterly direction about 22.66 feet to a point the coordinates of which are north 109617.15, east 453463.98, running thence in a southwesterly direction about 945.18 feet to the point of beginning.

(2) REMAINDER.—The portion of the project referred to in paragraph (1) that is remaining after the deauthorization made by the paragraph and that is northerly of a line the coordinates of which are north 108699.15, east 452768.36, and north 108655.66, east 452858.73, is redesignated as an anchorage.

(f) STONY CREEK, CONNECTICUT.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Stony Creek, Connecticut, authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), located in the 6-foot deep maneuvering basin, is deauthorized: beginning at coordinates N157,031.91, E599,030.79, thence running northeasterly about 221.16 feet to coordinates N157,191.06, E599,184.37, thence running northerly about 162.60 feet to coordinates N157,353.56, E599,189.99, thence running southwesterly about 358.90 feet to the point of beginning.

(g) THAMES RIVER, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) MODIFICATION.—The project for navigation, Thames River, Connecticut, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on riv-

ers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1029), is modified to reconfigure the turning basin in accordance with the following alignment: beginning at a point on the eastern limit of the existing project, N251052.93, E783934.59, thence running north 5 degrees, 25 minutes, 21.3 seconds east 341.06 feet to a point, N251392.46, E783966.82, thence running north 47 degrees, 24 minutes, 14.0 seconds west 268.72 feet to a point, N251574.34, E783769.00, thence running north 88 degrees, 41 minutes, 52.2 seconds west 249.06 feet to a point, N251580.00, E783520.00, thence running south 46 degrees, 16 minutes, 22.9 seconds west 318.28 feet to a point, N251360.00, E783290.00, thence running south 19 degrees, 1 minute, 32.2 seconds east 306.76 feet to a point, N251070.00, E783390.00, thence running south 45 degrees, 0 minutes, 0 seconds, east 155.56 feet to a point, N250960.00, E783500.00 on the existing western limit.

(2) PAYMENT FOR INITIAL DREDGING.—Any required initial dredging of the widened portions identified in paragraph (1) shall be carried out at no cost to the Federal Government.

(3) DEAUTHORIZATION.—The portions of the turning basin that are not included in the reconfigured turning basin described in paragraph (1) are deauthorized.

(h) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—The following portion of the navigation project for East Boothbay Harbor, Maine, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 631, chapter 382) (commonly referred to as the "River and Harbor Act of 1910"), containing approximately 1.15 acres and described in accordance with the Maine State Coordinate System, West Zone, is deauthorized:

Beginning at a point noted as point number 6 and shown as having plan coordinates of North 9, 722, East 9, 909 on the plan entitled, "East Boothbay Harbor, Maine, examination, 8-foot area", and dated August 9, 1955, Drawing Number F1251 D-6-2, said point having Maine State Coordinate System, West Zone coordinates of Northing 74514, Easting 698381; and

Thence, North 58 degrees, 12 minutes, 30 seconds East a distance of 120.9 feet to a point; and

Thence, South 72 degrees, 21 minutes, 50 seconds East a distance of 106.2 feet to a point; and

Thence, South 32 degrees, 04 minutes, 55 seconds East a distance of 218.9 feet to a point; and

Thence, South 61 degrees, 29 minutes, 40 seconds West a distance of 148.9 feet to a point; and

Thence, North 35 degrees, 14 minutes, 12 seconds West a distance of 87.5 feet to a point; and

Thence, North 78 degrees, 30 minutes, 58 seconds West a distance of 68.4 feet to a point; and

Thence, North 27 degrees, 11 minutes, 39 seconds West a distance of 157.3 feet to the point of beginning.

(i) YORK HARBOR, MAINE.—The following portions of the project for navigation, York Harbor, Maine, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 480), are deauthorized:

(1) The portion located in the 8-foot deep anchorage area beginning at coordinates N109340.19, E372066.93, thence running north 65 degrees, 12 minutes, 10.5 seconds east 423.27 feet to a point N109517.71, E372451.17, thence running north 28 degrees, 42 minutes, 58.3 seconds west 11.68 feet to a point N109527.95, E372445.56, thence running south 63 degrees, 37 minutes, 24.6 seconds west 422.63 feet to the point of beginning.

(2) The portion located in the 8-foot deep anchorage area beginning at coordinates

N108557.24, E371645.88, thence running south 60 degrees, 41 minutes, 17.2 seconds east 484.51 feet to a point N108320.04, E372068.36, thence running north 29 degrees, 12 minutes, 53.3 seconds east 15.28 feet to a point N108333.38, E372075.82, thence running north 62 degrees, 29 minutes, 42.1 seconds west 484.73 feet to the point of beginning.

(j) COHASSET HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Cohasset Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 12), or carried out pursuant to section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), are deauthorized: a 7-foot deep anchorage and a 6-foot deep anchorage; beginning at site 1, beginning at a point N453510.15, E792664.63, thence running south 53 degrees 07 minutes 05.4 seconds west 307.00 feet to a point N453325.90, E792419.07, thence running north 57 degrees 56 minutes 36.8 seconds west 201.00 feet to a point N453432.58, E792248.72, thence running south 88 degrees 57 minutes 25.6 seconds west 50.00 feet to a point N453431.67, E792198.73, thence running north 01 degree 02 minutes 52.3 seconds west 66.71 feet to a point N453498.37, E792197.51, thence running north 69 degrees 12 minutes 52.3 seconds east 332.32 feet to a point N453616.30, E792508.20, thence running south 55 degrees 50 minutes 24.1 seconds east 189.05 feet to point of origin; then site 2, beginning at a point, N452886.64, E791287.83, thence running south 00 degrees 00 minutes 00.0 seconds west 56.04 feet to a point, N452830.60, E791287.83, thence running north 90 degrees 00 minutes 00.0 seconds west 101.92 feet to a point, N452830.60, E791185.91, thence running north 52 degrees 12 minutes 49.7 seconds east 89.42 feet to a point, N452885.39, E791256.58, thence running north 87 degrees 42 minutes 33.8 seconds east 31.28 feet to point of origin; and site 3, beginning at a point, N452261.08, E792040.24, thence running north 89 degrees 07 minutes 19.5 seconds east 118.78 feet to a point, N452262.90, E792159.01, thence running south 43 degrees 39 minutes 06.8 seconds west 40.27 feet to a point, N452233.76, E792131.21, thence running north 74 degrees 33 minutes 29.1 seconds west 94.42 feet to a point, N452258.90, E792040.20, thence running north 01 degree 03 minutes 04.3 seconds east 2.18 feet to point of origin.

(k) FALL RIVER HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS AND RHODE ISLAND.—The project for navigation, Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-483; 82 Stat. 731), is modified to provide that alteration of the drawspan of the Brightman Street Bridge to provide a channel width of 300 feet shall not be required after the date of enactment of this Act.

(l) COCHECO RIVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for navigation, Cochecho River, New Hampshire, 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 September 19, 1890 (26 Stat. 436), and consisting of a 7-foot deep channel that lies northerly of a line the coordinates of which are N255292.31, E713095.36, and N255334.51, E713138.01, is deauthorized.

(2) MAINTENANCE DREDGING.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall perform maintenance dredging for the remaining authorized portions of the Federal navigation channel under the project described in paragraph (1) to restore authorized channel dimensions.

(m) MORRISTOWN HARBOR, NEW YORK.—The portion of the project for navigation, Morris-

town Harbor, New York, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved January 21, 1927 (44 Stat. 1014), that lies north of the northern boundary of Morris Street extended is deauthorized.

(n) OSWEGATCHIE RIVER, OGDENSBURG, NEW YORK.—The portion of the Federal channel in the Oswegatchie River in Ogdensburg, New York, from the southernmost alignment of the Route 68 bridge, upstream to the northernmost alignment of the Lake Street bridge, is deauthorized.

(o) APPONAUG COVE, RHODE ISLAND.—The following portion of the project for navigation, Apponaug Cove, Rhode Island, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 480), consisting of the 6-foot deep channel, is deauthorized: beginning at a point, N223269.93, E513089.12, thence running northwesterly to a point N223348.31, E512799.54, thence running southwesterly to a point N223251.78, E512773.41, thence running southeasterly to a point N223178.00, E513046.00, thence running northeasterly to the point of beginning.

(p) KICKAPOO RIVER, WISCONSIN.—

(1) PROJECT MODIFICATION.—The project for flood control and allied purposes, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1190), as modified by section 814 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4169), is further modified as provided by this subsection.

(2) TRANSFERS OF PROPERTY.—

(A) TRANSFER TO STATE OF WISCONSIN.—Subject to the requirements of this paragraph, the Secretary shall transfer to the State of Wisconsin, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands described in subparagraph (E), including all works, structures, and other improvements to the lands, but excluding lands transferred under subparagraph (B).

(B) TRANSFER TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Subject to the requirements of this paragraph, on the date of the transfer under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lands that are culturally and religiously significant sites of the Ho-Chunk Nation (a federally recognized Indian tribe) and are located within the lands described in subparagraph (E). The lands shall be described in accordance with subparagraph (C)(ii)(I) and may not exceed a total of 1,200 acres.

(C) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make the transfers under subparagraphs (A) and (B) only if—

(1) the State of Wisconsin enters into a written agreement with the Secretary to hold the United States harmless from all claims arising from or through the operation of lands and improvements subject to the transfer under subparagraph (A); and

(II) on or before October 30, 1997, the State of Wisconsin enters into and submits to the Secretary a memorandum of understanding, as specified in clause (ii), with the tribal organization (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b) of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(ii) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The memorandum of understanding referred to in clause (i)(II) shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of sites and associated lands to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under subparagraph (B).

(II) An agreement specifying that the lands transferred under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be preserved in a natural state and developed only to the extent necessary to enhance outdoor recreational and educational opportunities.

(III) An agreement specifying the terms and conditions of a plan for the management of the lands to be transferred under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(IV) A provision requiring a review of the plan referred to in subclause (III) to be conducted every 10 years under which the State of Wisconsin, acting through the Kickapoo Valley Governing Board, and the Ho-Chunk Nation may agree to revisions of the plan in order to address changed circumstances on the lands transferred under subparagraphs (A) and (B). The provision may include a plan for the transfer to the Secretary of the Interior of any additional site discovered to be culturally and religiously significant to the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(V) An agreement preventing or limiting the public disclosure of the location or existence of each site of particular cultural or religious significance to the Ho-Chunk Nation, if public disclosure would jeopardize the cultural or religious integrity of the site.

(D) ADMINISTRATION OF LANDS.—The lands transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under subparagraph (B), and any lands transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under the memorandum of understanding entered into under subparagraph (C), or under any revision of the memorandum of understanding agreed to under subparagraph (C)(ii)(IV), shall be held in trust by the United States for, and added to and administered as part of the reservation of, the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(E) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The lands referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) are the approximately 8,569 acres of land associated with the LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project referred to in paragraph (1) in Vernon County, Wisconsin, in the following sections:

(i) Section 31, Township 14 North, Range 1 West of the 4th Principal Meridian.

(ii) Sections 2 through 11, and 16, 17, 20, and 21, Township 13 North, Range 2 West of the 4th Principal Meridian.

(iii) Sections 15, 16, 21 through 24, 26, 27, 31, and 33 through 36, Township 14 North, Range 2 West of the 4th Principal Meridian.

(3) TRANSFER OF FLOWAGE EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall transfer to the owner of the servient estate, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to each flowage easement acquired as part of the project referred to in paragraph (1) within Township 14 North, Range 2 West of the 4th Principal Meridian, Vernon County, Wisconsin.

(4) DEAUTHORIZATION.—The LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project referred to in paragraph (1) is not authorized after the date of the transfers under paragraph (2).

(5) INTERIM MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary shall continue to manage and maintain the LaFarge Dam and Lake portion of the project referred to in paragraph (1) until the date of the transfers under paragraph (2).

SEC. 104. STUDIES.

(a) RED RIVER, ARKANSAS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project to permit navigation on the Red River in southwest Arkansas; and

(2) in conducting the study, analyze regional economic benefits that were not included in the limited economic analysis contained in the reconnaissance report for the project dated November 1995.

(b) BEAR CREEK DRAINAGE, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall

conduct a review of the Bear Creek Drainage, San Joaquin County, California, flood control project, authorized by section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 901), to develop a comprehensive plan for additional flood damage reduction measures for the city of Stockton, California, and surrounding areas.

(c) LAKE ELSINORE, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a study of the advisability of modifying, for the purpose of flood control pursuant to section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), the Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California, flood control project, for water conservation storage up to an elevation of 1,249 feet above mean sea level; and

(2) report to Congress on the study, including making recommendations concerning the advisability of so modifying the project.

(d) LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall review the feasibility of navigation improvements at Long Beach Harbor, California, including widening and deepening of the navigation channel, as provided for in section 201(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4091). The Secretary shall complete the report not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) MORMON SLOUGH/CALAVERAS RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of the Mormon Slough/Calaveras River, California, flood control project, authorized by section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 902), to develop a comprehensive plan for additional flood damage reduction measures for the city of Stockton, California, and surrounding areas.

(f) MURRIETA CREEK, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall review the completed feasibility study of the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, including identified alternatives, concerning Murrieta Creek from Temecula to Wildomar, Riverside County, California, to determine the Federal interest in participating in a project for flood control.

(g) PINE FLAT DAM FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.—The Secretary shall study the feasibility of fish and wildlife habitat improvement measures identified for further study by the Pine Flat Dam Fish and Wildlife Habitat Restoration Investigation Reconnaissance Report.

(h) WEST DADE, FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall conduct a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest in using the West Dade, Florida, reuse facility to increase the supply of surface water to the Everglades in order to enhance fish and wildlife habitat.

(i) SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE WATER RESOURCES STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study to address the current and future needs for flood damage prevention and reduction, water supply, and other related water resources needs in the Savannah River Basin.

(2) SCOPE.—The scope of the study shall be limited to an analysis of water resources issues that fall within the traditional civil works missions of the Army Corps of Engineers.

(3) COORDINATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Secretary shall ensure that the study is coordinated with the Environmental

Protection Agency and the ongoing watershed study by the Agency of the Savannah River Basin.

(j) BAYOU BLANC, CROWLEY, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest in the construction of a bulkhead system, consisting of either steel sheet piling with tiebacks or concrete, along the embankment of Bayou Blanc, Crowley, Louisiana, in order to alleviate slope failures and erosion problems in a cost-effective manner.

(k) HACKBERRY INDUSTRIAL SHIP CHANNEL PARK, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall incorporate the area of Hackberry, Louisiana, as part of the overall study of the Lake Charles ship channel, bypass channel, and general anchorage area in Louisiana, to explore the possibility of constructing additional anchorage areas.

(l) CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—The Secretary shall conduct a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest in channel improvements in channel A of the North Las Vegas Wash in the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada, for the purpose of flood control.

(m) LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of the restoration of wetlands in the Lower Las Vegas Wash, Nevada, for the purposes of erosion control and environmental restoration.

(n) NORTHERN NEVADA.—The Secretary shall conduct reconnaissance studies, in the State of Nevada, of—

(1) the Humboldt River, and the tributaries and outlets of the river;

(2) the Truckee River, and the tributaries and outlets of the river;

(3) the Carson River, and the tributaries and outlets of the river; and

(4) the Walker River, and the tributaries and outlets of the river; in order to determine the Federal interest in flood control, environmental restoration, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreation, water conservation, water quality, and toxic and radioactive waste.

(o) BUFFALO HARBOR, NEW YORK.—The Secretary shall determine the feasibility of excavating the inner harbor and constructing the associated bulkheads in Buffalo Harbor, New York.

(p) COEYMANS, NEW YORK.—The Secretary shall conduct a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest in reopening the secondary channel of the Hudson River in the town of Coeymans, New York, which has been narrowed by silt as a result of the construction of Coeymans middle dike by the Army Corps of Engineers.

(q) SHINNECOCK INLET, NEW YORK.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a reconnaissance study in Shinnecock Inlet, New York, to determine the Federal interest in constructing a sand bypass system, or other appropriate alternative, for the purposes of allowing sand to flow in the natural east-to-west pattern of the sand and preventing the further erosion of the beaches west of the inlet and the shoaling of the inlet.

(r) KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNELS, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—The Secretary shall continue engineering and design in order to complete the navigation project at Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay Channels, New York and New Jersey, authorized to be constructed in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (Public Law 99-88; 99 Stat. 313), and section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4095), described in the general design memorandum for the project, and approved in the Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 14, 1981.

(s) COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OREGON.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a feasibility study for the ecosystem restoration project at Columbia Slough, Oregon, as reported in the August 1993 Revised Reconnaissance Study. The study shall be a demonstration study done in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency.

(t) WILLAMETTE RIVER, OREGON.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the Federal interest in carrying out a non-structural flood control project along the Willamette River, Oregon, for the purposes of floodplain and ecosystem restoration.

(u) LACKAWANNA RIVER AT SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the report entitled "Report of the Chief of Engineers: Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pennsylvania", dated June 29, 1992, to determine whether changed conditions in the Diamond Plot and Green Ridge sections, Scranton, Pennsylvania, would result in an economically justified flood damage reduction project at those locations; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the results of the review.

(v) CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the Charleston, South Carolina, estuary area located in Charleston, Berkeley, and Dorchester Counties, South Carolina, for the purpose of evaluating environmental conditions in the tidal reaches of the Ashley, Cooper, Stono, and Wando Rivers and the lower portions of Charleston Harbor.

(w) OAAHE DAM TO LAKE SHARPE, SOUTH DAKOTA.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a study to determine the feasibility of sediment removal and control in the area of the Missouri River downstream of Oahe Dam through the upper reaches of Lake Sharpe, including the lower portion of the Bad River, South Dakota;

(2) develop a comprehensive sediment removal and control plan for the area—

(A) based on the assessment by the study of the dredging, estimated costs, and time required to remove sediment from affected areas in Lake Sharpe;

(B)(i) based on the identification by the study of high erosion areas in the Bad River channel; and

(ii) including recommendations and related costs for such of the areas as are in need of stabilization and restoration; and

(C)(i) based on the identification by the study of shoreline erosion areas along Lake Sharpe; and

(ii) including recommended options for the stabilization and restoration of the areas;

(3) use other non-Federal engineering analyses and related studies in determining the feasibility of sediment removal and control as described in paragraph (1); and

(4) credit the costs of the non-Federal engineering analyses and studies referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) toward the non-Federal share of the feasibility study conducted under paragraph (1).

(x) MUSTANG ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of navigation along the south-central coast of Texas near Corpus Christi for the purpose of determining the feasibility of constructing and maintaining the Packery Channel on the southern portion of Mustang Island.

(y) ASHLEY CREEK, UTAH.—The Secretary is authorized to study the feasibility of undertaking a project for fish and wildlife restoration at Ashley Creek, near Vernal, Utah.

(z) PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of flooding, erosion, and other water resource problems

in Prince William County, Virginia, including an assessment of the wetland protection, erosion control, and flood damage reduction needs of the county.

(aa) PACIFIC REGION.—The Secretary shall conduct studies in the interest of navigation in the part of the Pacific Region that includes American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. For the purpose of this subsection, the cost-sharing requirements of section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215) shall apply.

(bb) MORGANZA, LOUISIANA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the environmental, flood control and navigational impacts associated with the construction of a lock structure in the Houma Navigation Canal as an independent feature of the overall flood damage prevention study currently being conducted under the Morganza, Louisiana to the Gulf of Mexico feasibility study. In preparing such study, the Secretary shall consult the South Terrebonne Tidewater Management and Conservation District and consider the District's Preliminary Design Document, dated February 1994. Further, the Secretary shall evaluate the findings of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Federal Task Force, as authorized by Public Law 101-646, relating to the lock structure.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1), together with recommendations on immediate implementation not later than 6 months after the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. GRAND PRAIRIE REGION AND BAYOU METO BASIN, ARKANSAS.

The project for flood control and water supply, Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 174) and deauthorized under section 1001(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(1)), is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary if, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary submits a report to Congress that—

(1) describes necessary modifications to the project that are consistent with the functions of the Army Corps of Engineers; and

(2) contains recommendations concerning which Federal agencies (such as the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Geological Survey) are most appropriate to have responsibility for carrying out the project.

SEC. 202. HEBER SPRINGS, ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the city of Heber Springs, Arkansas, to provide 3,522 acre-feet of water supply storage in Greens Ferry Lake, Arkansas, for municipal and industrial purposes, at no cost to the city.

(b) NECESSARY FACILITIES.—The city of Heber Springs shall be responsible for 100 percent of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of any intake, transmission, treatment, or distribution facility necessary for utilization of the water supply.

(c) ADDITIONAL WATER SUPPLY STORAGE.—Any additional water supply storage required after the date of enactment of this Act shall be contracted for and reimbursed by the city of Heber Springs, Arkansas.

SEC. 203. MORGAN POINT, ARKANSAS.

The Secretary shall accept as in-kind contributions for the project at Morgan Point, Arkansas—

(1) the items described as fish and wildlife facilities and land in the Morgan Point

Broadway Closure Structure modification report for the project, dated February 1994; and

(2) fish stocking activities carried out by the non-Federal interests for the project.

SEC. 204. WHITE RIVER BASIN LAKES, ARKANSAS AND MISSOURI.

The project for flood control and power generation at White River Basin Lakes, Arkansas and Missouri, authorized by section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1218), shall include recreation and fish and wildlife mitigation as purposes of the project, to the extent that the purposes do not adversely impact flood control, power generation, or other authorized purposes of the project.

SEC. 205. CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA.

The project for Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-483; 82 Stat. 740), is modified, subject to the availability of appropriations, to authorize the Secretary to implement the recommended plan of improvement contained in a report entitled "Central and Southern Florida Project, Final Integrated General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement, Canal 111 (C-111), South Dade County, Florida", dated May 1994 (including acquisition of such portions of the Frog Pond and Rocky Glades areas as are needed for the project), at a total cost of \$156,000,000. The Federal share of the cost of implementing the plan of improvement shall be 50 percent. The Secretary of the Interior shall pay 25 percent of the cost of acquiring such portions of the Frog Pond and Rocky Glades areas as are needed for the project, which amount shall be included in the Federal share. The non-Federal share of the operation and maintenance costs of the improvements undertaken pursuant to this section shall be 100 percent, except that the Federal Government shall reimburse the non-Federal interest in an amount equal to 60 percent of the costs of operating and maintaining pump stations that pump water into Taylor Slough in Everglades National Park.

SEC. 206. WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA.

The project for flood protection of West Palm Beach, Florida (C-51), authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1183), is modified to provide for the construction of an enlarged stormwater detention area, Storm Water Treatment Area 1 East, generally in accordance with the plan of improvements described in the February 15, 1994, report entitled "Everglades Protection Project, Palm Beach County, Florida, Conceptual Design", prepared by Burns and McDonnell, and as further described in detailed design documents to be approved by the Secretary. The additional work authorized by this section shall be accomplished at full Federal cost in recognition of the water supply benefits accruing to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and the Everglades National Park and in recognition of the statement in support of the Everglades restoration effort set forth in the document signed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary in July 1993. Operation and maintenance of the stormwater detention area shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the Central and Southern Florida project, with all costs of the operation and maintenance work borne by non-Federal interests.

SEC. 207. EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEVELOP.—The term "develop" means any preconstruction or land acquisition planning activity.

(2) SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM.—The term "South Florida ecosystem" means the Florida Everglades restoration area that includes lands and waters within the boundary of the South Florida Water Management District, the Florida Keys, and the near-shore coastal waters of South Florida.

(3) TASK FORCE.—The term "Task Force" means the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force established by subsection (c).

(b) SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

(1) MODIFICATIONS TO CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA PROJECT.—

(A) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall, if necessary, develop modifications to the project for Central and Southern Florida, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1176), to restore, preserve, and protect the South Florida ecosystem and to provide for the water-related needs of the region.

(B) CONCEPTUAL PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The modifications under subparagraph (A) shall be set forth in a conceptual plan prepared in accordance with clause (ii) and adopted by the Task Force (referred to in this section as the "conceptual plan").

(ii) BASIS FOR CONCEPTUAL PLAN.—The conceptual plan shall be based on the recommendations specified in the draft report entitled "Conceptual Plan for the Central and Southern Florida Project Restudy", published by the Governor's Commission for a Sustainable South Florida and dated June 4, 1996.

(C) INTEGRATION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Restoration, preservation, and protection of the South Florida ecosystem shall include a comprehensive science-based approach that integrates ongoing Federal and State efforts, including—

(i) the project for the ecosystem restoration of the Kissimmee River, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4802);

(ii) the project for flood protection, West Palm Beach Canal, Florida (canal C-51), authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1183), as modified by section 205 of this Act;

(iii) the project for modifications to improve water deliveries into Everglades National Park authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 410r-8);

(iv) the project for Central and Southern Florida authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-483; 82 Stat. 740), as modified by section 204 of this Act;

(v) activities under the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and Protection Act (Public Law 101-65; 16 U.S.C. 1433 note); and

(vi) the Everglades construction project implemented by the State of Florida under the Everglades Forever Act of the State of Florida.

(2) IMPROVEMENT OF WATER MANAGEMENT FOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—The improvement of water management, including improvement of water quality for ecosystem restoration, preservation, and protection, shall be an authorized purpose of the Central and Southern Florida project referred to in paragraph (1)(A). Project features necessary to improve water management, including features necessary to provide water to restore, protect, and preserve the South Florida ecosystem, shall be included in any modifications to be developed for the project under paragraph (1).

(3) SUPPORT PROJECTS.—The Secretary may develop support projects and other facilities

necessary to promote an adaptive management approach to implement the modifications authorized to be developed by paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) INTERIM IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Secretary implements a component of the conceptual plan, including a support project or other facility under paragraph (3), the Jacksonville District Engineer shall submit an interim implementation report to the Task Force for review.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each interim implementation report shall document the costs, benefits, impacts, technical feasibility, and cost-effectiveness of the component and, as appropriate, shall include documentation of environmental effects prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(C) ENDORSEMENT BY TASK FORCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Task Force endorses the interim implementation report of the Jacksonville District Engineer for a component, the Secretary shall submit the report to Congress.

(ii) COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS.—Endorsement by the Task Force shall be deemed to fulfill the coordination requirements under the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 701-1).

(5) AUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not initiate construction of a component until such time as a law is enacted authorizing construction of the component.

(B) DESIGN.—The Secretary may continue to carry out detailed design of a component after the date of submission to Congress of the interim implementation report recommending the component.

(6) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Federal share of the costs of preparing interim implementation reports under paragraph (4) and implementing the modifications (including the support projects and other facilities) authorized to be developed by this subsection shall be 50 percent.

(B) WATER QUALITY FEATURES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the non-Federal share of the cost of project features necessary to improve water quality under paragraph (2) shall be 100 percent.

(ii) CRITICAL FEATURES.—If the Task Force determines, by resolution accompanying endorsement of an interim implementation report under paragraph (4), that the project features described in clause (i) are critical to ecosystem restoration, the Federal share of the cost of the features shall be 50 percent.

(C) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interests for the Federal share of any reasonable costs that the non-Federal interests incur in acquiring land for any component authorized by law under paragraph (5) if the land acquisition has been endorsed by the Task Force and supported by the Secretary.

(c) SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION TASK FORCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP.—There is established the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force, which shall consist of the following members (or, in the case of the head of a Federal agency, a designee at the level of assistant secretary or an equivalent level):

- (A) The Secretary of the Interior, who shall serve as chairperson of the Task Force.
- (B) The Secretary of Commerce.
- (C) The Secretary.
- (D) The Attorney General.

(E) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(F) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(G) The Secretary of Transportation.

(H) 1 representative of the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the tribal chairman.

(I) 1 representative of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Florida, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the tribal chairman.

(J) 3 representatives of the State of Florida, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the State of Florida.

(K) 2 representatives of the South Florida Water Management District, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the State of Florida.

(L) 2 representatives of local governments in the South Florida ecosystem, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the State of Florida.

(2) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall—

(i) coordinate the development of consistent policies, strategies, plans, programs, and priorities for addressing the restoration, protection, and preservation of the South Florida ecosystem; and

(ii) develop a strategy and priorities for implementing the components of the conceptual plan;

(iii) review programs, projects, and activities of agencies and entities represented on the Task Force to promote the objectives of ecosystem restoration and maintenance;

(iv) refine and provide guidance concerning the implementation of the conceptual plan;

(v) periodically review the conceptual plan in light of current conditions and new information and make appropriate modifications to the conceptual plan; and

(vi) submit to Congress a report on each modification to the conceptual plan under subclause (i);

(vii) establish a Florida-based working group, which shall include representatives of the agencies and entities represented on the Task Force and other entities as appropriate, for the purpose of recommending policies, strategies, plans, programs, and priorities to the Task Force;

(viii) prepare an annual cross-cut budget of the funds proposed to be expended by the agencies, tribes, and governments represented on the Task Force on the restoration, preservation, and protection of the South Florida ecosystem; and

(ix) submit a biennial report to Congress that summarizes the activities of the Task Force and the projects, policies, strategies, plans, programs, and priorities planned, developed, or implemented for restoration of the South Florida ecosystem and progress made toward the restoration.

(B) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Task Force and the working group established under subparagraph (A)(v) may establish such other advisory subcommittees as are necessary to assist the Task Force in carrying out its duties, including duties relating to public policy and scientific issues.

(3) DECISIONMAKING.—Each decision of the Task Force shall be made by majority vote of the members of the Task Force.

(4) APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(A) CHARTER; TERMINATION.—The Task Force shall not be subject to sections 9(c) and 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(B) NOTICE OF MEETINGS.—The Task Force shall be subject to section 10(a)(2) of the Act, except that the chairperson of the Task Force is authorized to use a means other than publication in the Federal Register to provide notice of a public meeting and provide an equivalent form of public notice.

(5) COMPENSATION.—A member of the Task Force shall receive no compensation for the service of the member on the Task Force.

(6) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Travel expenses incurred by a member of the Task Force in the performance of services for the Task Force shall be paid by the agency, tribe, or government that the member represents.

SEC. 208. ARKANSAS CITY AND WINFIELD, KANSAS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of commencing construction of the project for flood control, Arkansas City, Kansas, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4116), and the project for flood control, Winfield, Kansas, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298; 79 Stat. 1078), the project cooperation agreements for the projects, as submitted by the District Office of the Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa, Oklahoma, shall be deemed to be approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army having responsibility for civil works and the Tulsa District Commander as of September 30, 1996, if the approvals have not been granted by that date.

SEC. 209. MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET, LOUISIANA.

Section 844 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4177) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) COMMUNITY IMPACT MITIGATION PLAN.—Using funds made available under subsection (a), the Secretary shall implement a comprehensive community impact mitigation plan, as described in the evaluation report of the New Orleans District Engineer dated August 1995, that, to the maximum extent practicable, provides for mitigation or compensation, or both, for the direct and indirect social and cultural impacts that the project described in subsection (a) will have on the affected areas referred to in subsection (b)."

SEC. 210. COLDWATER RIVER WATERSHED, MISSISSIPPI.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate all remaining work associated with the Coldwater River Watershed Demonstration Erosion Control Project, as authorized by Public Law 98-8 (97 Stat. 13).

SEC. 211. PERIODIC MAINTENANCE DREDGING FOR GREENVILLE INNER HARBOR CHANNEL, MISSISSIPPI.

The Greenville Inner Harbor Channel, Mississippi, is deemed to be a portion of the navigable waters of the United States, and shall be included among the navigable waters for which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains a 10-foot navigable channel. The navigable channel for the Greenville Inner Harbor Channel shall be maintained in a manner that is consistent with the navigable channel to the Greenville Harbor and the portion of the Mississippi River adjacent to the Greenville Harbor that is maintained by the Army Corps of Engineers, as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 212. SARDIS LAKE, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the State of Mississippi and the city of Sardis to the maximum extent practicable in the management of existing and proposed leases of land consistent with the master tourism and recreational plan for the economic development of the Sardis Lake area prepared by the city.

SEC. 213. YALOBUSHA RIVER WATERSHED, MISSISSIPPI.

The project for flood control at Grenada Lake, Mississippi, shall be extended to include the Yalobusha River Watershed (including the Toposhaw Creek), at a total cost of not to exceed \$3,800,000. The Federal share of the cost of flood control on the extended project shall be 75 percent.

SEC. 214. LIBBY DAM, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 103(c)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(c)(1)), the Secretary shall—

(1) complete the construction and installation of generating units 6 through 8 at Libby Dam, Montana; and

(2) remove the partially constructed haul bridge over the Kootenai River, Montana.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 215. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, MALTA, MONTANA.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to expend such Federal funds as are necessary to complete the small flood control project begun at Malta, Montana, pursuant to section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

SEC. 216. CLIFFWOOD BEACH, NEW JERSEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or the status of the project authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1180) for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control on Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, the Secretary shall undertake a project to provide periodic beach nourishment for Cliffwood Beach, New Jersey, for a 50-year period beginning on the date of execution of a project cooperation agreement by the Secretary and an appropriate non-Federal interest.

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project authorized by this section shall be 35 percent.

SEC. 217. FIRE ISLAND INLET, NEW YORK.

For the purpose of replenishing the beach, the Secretary shall place sand dredged from the Fire Island Inlet on the shoreline between Gilgo State Park and Tobay Beach to protect Ocean Parkway along the Atlantic Ocean shoreline in Suffolk County, New York.

SEC. 218. QUEENS COUNTY, NEW YORK.

(a) DESCRIPTION OF NONNAVIGABLE AREA.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the area of Long Island City, Queens County, New York, that—

(1) is not submerged;

(2) lies between the southerly high water line (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of Anable Basin (also known as the "11th Street Basin") and the northerly high water line (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of Newtown Creek; and

(3) extends from the high water line (as of the date of enactment of this Act) of the East River to the original high water line of the East River;

is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States.

(b) REQUIREMENT THAT AREA BE IMPROVED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) shall apply only to those portions of the area described in subsection (a) that are, or will be, bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied by permanent structures or other permanent physical improvements (including parkland).

(2) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL LAW.—Improvements described in paragraph (1) shall

be subject to applicable Federal laws, including—

(A) sections 9 and 10 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 March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401 and 403);

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

(C) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(c) EXPIRATION DATE.—The declaration of nonnavigability under subsection (a) shall expire with respect to a portion of the area described in subsection (a), if the portion—

(1) is not bulkheaded, filled, or otherwise occupied by a permanent structure or other permanent physical improvement (including parkland) in accordance with subsection (b) by the date that is 20 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) requires an improvement described in subsection (b)(2) that is subject to a permit under an applicable Federal law, and the improvement is not commenced by the date that is 5 years after the date of issuance of the permit.

SEC. 219. BUFORD TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NORTH DAKOTA AND MONTANA.

(a) ACQUISITION OF EASEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall acquire, from willing sellers, permanent flowage and saturation easements over—

(A) the land in Williams County, North Dakota, extending from the riverward margin of the Buford Trenton Irrigation District main canal to the north bank of the Missouri River, beginning at the Buford Trenton Irrigation District pumping station located in the NE¼ of section 17, T-152-N, R-104-W, and continuing northeasterly downstream to the land referred to as the East Bottom; and

(B) any other land outside the boundaries of the land described in subparagraph (A) within or contiguous to the boundaries of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District that has been affected by rising ground water and the risk of surface flooding.

(2) SCOPE.—The easements acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall include the right, power, and privilege of the Federal Government to submerge, overflow, percolate, and saturate the surface and subsurface of the lands and such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) PAYMENT.—In acquiring the easements under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall pay an amount based on the unaffected fee value of the lands to be acquired by the Federal Government. For the purpose of this paragraph, the unaffected fee value of the lands is the value of the lands as if the lands had not been affected by rising ground water and the risk of surface flooding.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF DRAINAGE PUMPS.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary shall—

(1) convey to the Buford Trenton Irrigation District all right, title, and interest of the United States in the drainage pumps located within the boundaries of the District; and

(2) provide a lump-sum payment of \$60,000 for power requirements associated with the operation of the drainage pumps.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$34,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 220. JAMESTOWN DAM AND PIPESTEM DAM, NORTH DAKOTA.

(a) REVISIONS TO WATER CONTROL MANUALS.—In consultation with the State of South Dakota and the James River Water Development District, the Secretary shall review and consider revisions to the water

control manuals for the Jamestown Dam and Pipestem Dam, North Dakota, to modify operation of the dams so as to reduce the magnitude and duration of flooding and inundation of land located within the 10-year floodplain along the James River in South Dakota.

(b) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

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

(A) complete a study to determine the feasibility of providing flood protection for the land referred to in subsection (a); and

(B) submit a report on the study to Congress.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider all reasonable project-related and other options.

SEC. 221. WISTER LAKE PROJECT, LEFLORE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.

The Secretary shall maintain a minimum conservation pool level of 478 feet at the Wister Lake project in LeFlore County, Oklahoma, authorized by section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1218). Notwithstanding title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 et seq.) or any other provision of law, any increase in water supply yield that results from the pool level of 478 feet shall be treated as unallocated water supply until such time as a user enters into a contract for the supply under such applicable laws concerning cost-sharing as are in effect on the date of the contract.

SEC. 222. WILLAMETTE RIVER, MCKENZIE SUBBASIN, OREGON.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out a project to control the water temperature in the Willamette River, McKenzie Subbasin, Oregon, to mitigate the negative impacts on fish and wildlife resulting from the operation of the Blue River and Cougar Lake projects, McKenzie River Basin, Oregon. The cost of the facilities shall be repaid according to the allocations among the purposes of the original projects.

SEC. 223. ABANDONED AND WRECKED BARGE REMOVAL, RHODE ISLAND.

Section 361 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4861) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to alleviate a hazard to navigation and recreational activity, the Secretary shall remove a sunken barge from waters off the shore of the Narragansett Town Beach in Narragansett, Rhode Island, at a total cost of \$1,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$1,425,000, and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$475,000. The Secretary shall not remove the barge until title to the barge has been transferred to the United States or the non-Federal interest. The transfer of title shall be carried out at no cost to the United States."

SEC. 224. PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RHODE ISLAND.

The Secretary shall incorporate a channel extending from the vicinity of the Fox Point hurricane barrier to the vicinity of the Francis Street bridge in Providence, Rhode Island, into the navigation project for Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298; 79 Stat. 1089). The channel shall have a depth of up to 10 feet and a width of approximately 120 feet and shall be approximately 1.25 miles in length.

SEC. 225. COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TEXAS.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF LANDS.—The Secretary is authorized to accept from a non-Federal

interest additional lands of not to exceed 300 acres that—

(1) are contiguous to the Cooper Lake and Channels Project, Texas, authorized by section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298; 79 Stat. 1091) and section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4145); and

(2) provide habitat value at least equal to the habitat value provided by the lands authorized to be redesignated under subsection (b).

(b) REDESIGNATION OF LANDS TO RECREATION PURPOSES.—Upon the acceptance of lands under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to redesignate mitigation lands of not to exceed 300 acres to recreation purposes.

(c) FUNDING.—The cost of all work under this section, including real estate appraisals, cultural and environmental surveys, and all development necessary to avoid net mitigation losses, to the extent required, shall be borne by the non-Federal interest.

SEC. 226. RUDEE INLET, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.

Notwithstanding the limitation set forth in section 107(b) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577(b)), Federal participation in the maintenance of the Rudee Inlet, Virginia Beach, Virginia, project shall continue for the life of the project. Nothing in this section shall alter or modify the non-Federal cost sharing responsibility as specified in the Rudee Inlet, Virginia Beach, Virginia Detailed Project Report, dated October 1983.

SEC. 227. VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the non-Federal share of the costs 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 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4136), shall be reduced by \$3,120,803, or by such amount as is determined by an audit carried out by the Department of the Army to be due to the city of Virginia Beach as reimbursement for beach nourishment activities carried out by the city between October 1, 1986, and September 30, 1993, if the Federal Government has not reimbursed the city for the activities prior to the date on which a project cooperation agreement is executed for the project.

(b) EXTENSION OF FEDERAL PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5f), the Secretary shall extend Federal participation in the periodic nourishment of Virginia Beach as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1254) and modified by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1177).

(2) DURATION.—Federal participation under paragraph (1) shall extend until the earlier of—

(A) the end of the 50-year period provided for in section 156 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5f); and

(B) the completion of the project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Virginia Beach, Virginia, as modified by section 102(cc) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4810).

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. COST-SHARING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS.

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

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) environmental protection and restoration: 25 percent.”.

SEC. 302. COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 7 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2313) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

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

“(d) TEMPORARY PROTECTION OF TECHNOLOGY.—

“(1) PRE-AGREEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that information developed as a result of a research or development activity conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers is likely to be subject to a cooperative research and development agreement within 2 years after the development of the information, and that the information would be a trade secret or commercial or financial information that would be privileged or confidential if the information had been obtained from a non-Federal party participating in a cooperative research and development agreement under section 12 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a), the Secretary may provide appropriate protections against the dissemination of the information, including exemption from subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, until the earlier of—

“(A) the date on which the Secretary enters into such an agreement with respect to the information; or

“(B) the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the determination.

“(2) POST-AGREEMENT.—Any information subject to paragraph (1) that becomes the subject of a cooperative research and development agreement shall be subject to the protections provided under section 12(c)(7)(B) of the Act (15 U.S.C. 3710a(c)(7)(B)) as if the information had been developed under a cooperative research and development agreement.”.

SEC. 303. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1)(A) dams are an essential part of the national infrastructure;

(B) dams fail from time to time with catastrophic results; and

(C) dam safety is a vital public concern;

(2) dam failures have caused, and may cause in the future, loss of life, injury, destruction of property, and economic and social disruption;

(3)(A) some dams are at or near the end of their structural, useful, or operational life; and

(B) the loss, destruction, and disruption resulting from dam failures can be substantially reduced through the development and implementation of dam safety hazard reduction measures, including—

(i) improved design and construction standards and practices supported by a national dam performance resource bank located at Stanford University in California;

(ii) safe operation and maintenance procedures;

(iii) early warning systems;

(iv) coordinated emergency preparedness plans; and

(v) public awareness and involvement programs;

(4)(A) dam safety problems persist nationwide;

(B) while dam safety is principally a State responsibility, the diversity in Federal and State dam safety programs calls for national

leadership in a cooperative effort involving the Federal Government, State governments, and the private sector; and

(C) an expertly staffed and adequately financed dam safety hazard reduction program, based on Federal, State, local, and private research, planning, decisionmaking, and contributions, would reduce the risk of the loss, destruction, and disruption resulting from dam failure by an amount far greater than the cost of the program;

(5)(A) there is a fundamental need for a national program for dam safety hazards reduction, and the need will continue; and

(B) to be effective, such a national program will require input from, and review by, Federal and non-Federal experts in—

(i) dam design, construction, operation, and maintenance; and

(ii) the practical application of dam failure hazard reduction measures;

(6) as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) there is no national dam safety program; and

(B) the coordinating authority for national leadership concerning dam safety is provided through the dam safety program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency established under Executive Order 12148 (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 note) in coordination with members of the Interagency Committee on Dam Safety and with States; and

(7) while the dam safety program of FEMA is a proper Federal undertaking, should continue, and should provide the foundation for a national dam safety program, statutory authority is needed—

(A) to meet increasing needs and to discharge Federal responsibilities in dam safety;

(B) to strengthen the leadership role of FEMA;

(C) to codify the national dam safety program;

(D) to authorize the Director of FEMA to communicate directly with Congress on authorizations and appropriations; and

(E) to build on the hazard reduction aspects of dam safety.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reduce the risks to life and property from dam failure in the United States through the establishment and maintenance of an effective national dam safety program to bring together the expertise and resources of the Federal and non-Federal communities in achieving national dam safety hazard reduction.

(c) DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—Public Law 92-367 (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the first section and inserting the following:

“SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘National Dam Safety Program Act.’”;

(2) by striking sections 5 and 7 through 14;

(3) by redesignating sections 2, 3, 4, and 6 as sections 3, 4, 5, and 11, respectively;

(4) by inserting after section 1 (as amended by paragraph (1)) the following:

“SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act:

“(1) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ means a National Dam Safety Review Board established under section 8(h).

“(2) DAM.—The term ‘dam’—

“(A) means any artificial barrier that has the ability to impound water, wastewater, or any liquid-borne material, for the purpose of storage or control of water, that—

“(i) is 25 feet or more in height from—

“(I) the natural bed of the stream channel or watercourse measured at the downstream toe of the barrier; or

“(II) if the barrier is not across a stream channel or watercourse, from the lowest elevation of the outside limit of the barrier;

to the maximum water storage elevation; or
 “(ii) has an impounding capacity for maximum storage elevation of 50 acre-feet or more; but

“(B) does not include—

“(i) a levee; or

“(ii) a barrier described in subparagraph (A) that—

“(I) is 6 feet or less in height regardless of storage capacity; or

“(II) has a storage capacity at the maximum water storage elevation that is 15 acre-feet or less regardless of height;

unless the barrier, because of the location of the barrier or another physical characteristic of the barrier, is likely to pose a significant threat to human life or property if the barrier fails (as determined by the Director).

“(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of FEMA.

“(4) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘Federal agency’ means a Federal agency that designs, finances, constructs, owns, operates, maintains, or regulates the construction, operation, or maintenance of a dam.

“(5) FEDERAL GUIDELINES FOR DAM SAFETY.—The term ‘Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety’ means the FEMA publication, numbered 93 and dated June 1979, that defines management practices for dam safety at all Federal agencies.

“(6) FEMA.—The term ‘FEMA’ means the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

“(7) HAZARD REDUCTION.—The term ‘hazard reduction’ means the reduction in the potential consequences to life and property of dam failure.

“(8) ICODS.—The term ‘ICODS’ means the Interagency Committee on Dam Safety established by section 7.

“(9) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the national dam safety program established under section 8.

“(10) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

“(11) STATE DAM SAFETY AGENCY.—The term ‘State dam safety agency’ means a State agency that has regulatory authority over the safety of non-Federal dams.

“(12) STATE DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—The term ‘State dam safety program’ means a State dam safety program approved and assisted under section 8(f).

“(13) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’, when used in a geographical sense, means all of the States.”;

(5) in section 3 (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) by striking “SEC. 3. As” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 3. INSPECTION OF DAMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—As”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) STATE PARTICIPATION.—On request of a State dam safety agency, with respect to any dam the failure of which would affect the State, the head of a Federal agency shall—

“(1) provide information to the State dam safety agency on the construction, operation, or maintenance of the dam; or

“(2) allow any official of the State dam safety agency to participate in the Federal inspection of the dam.”;

(6) in section 4 (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking “SEC. 4. As” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 4. INVESTIGATION REPORTS TO GOVERNORS.

“As”;

(7) in section 5 (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking “SEC. 5. For” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF DANGER TO HUMAN LIFE AND PROPERTY.

“For”;

(8) by inserting after section 5 (as redesignated by paragraph (3)) the following:

“SEC. 6. NATIONAL DAM INVENTORY.

“The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may maintain and periodically publish updated information on the inventory of dams in the United States.

“SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON DAM SAFETY.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Interagency Committee on Dam Safety—

“(1) comprised of a representative of each of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Labor, FEMA, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the United States Section of the International Boundary Commission; and

“(2) chaired by the Director.

“(b) DUTIES.—ICODS shall encourage the establishment and maintenance of effective Federal and State programs, policies, and guidelines intended to enhance dam safety for the protection of human life and property through—

“(1) coordination and information exchange among Federal agencies and State dam safety agencies; and

“(2) coordination and information exchange among Federal agencies concerning implementation of the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety.

“SEC. 8. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with ICODS and State dam safety agencies, and the Board shall establish and maintain, in accordance with this section, a coordinated national dam safety program. The Program shall—

“(1) be administered by FEMA to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (c);

“(2) involve, to the extent appropriate, each Federal agency; and

“(3) include—

“(A) each of the components described in subsection (d);

“(B) the implementation plan described in subsection (e); and

“(C) assistance for State dam safety programs described in subsection (f).

“(b) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

“(1) not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, develop the implementation plan described in subsection (e);

“(2) not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, submit to the appropriate authorizing committees of Congress the implementation plan described in subsection (e); and

“(3) by regulation, not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph—

“(A) develop and implement the Program;

“(B) establish goals, priorities, and target dates for implementation of the Program; and

“(C) to the extent feasible, provide a method for cooperation and coordination with, and assistance to, interested governmental entities in all States.

“(c) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Program are to—

“(1) ensure that new and existing dams are safe through the development of technologically and economically feasible programs and procedures for national dam safety hazard reduction;

“(2) encourage acceptable engineering policies and procedures to be used for dam site

investigation, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and emergency preparedness;

“(3) encourage the establishment and implementation of effective dam safety programs in each State based on State standards;

“(4) develop and encourage public awareness projects to increase public acceptance and support of State dam safety programs;

“(5) develop technical assistance materials for Federal and non-Federal dam safety programs; and

“(6) develop mechanisms with which to provide Federal technical assistance for dam safety to the non-Federal sector.

“(d) COMPONENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Program shall consist of—

“(A) a Federal element and a non-Federal element; and

“(B) leadership activity, technical assistance activity, and public awareness activity.

“(2) ELEMENTS.—

“(A) FEDERAL.—The Federal element shall incorporate the activities and practices carried out by Federal agencies under section 7 to implement the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety.

“(B) NON-FEDERAL.—The non-Federal element shall consist of—

“(i) the activities and practices carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector to safely build, regulate, operate, and maintain dams; and

“(ii) Federal activities that foster State efforts to develop and implement effective programs for the safety of dams.

“(3) FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) LEADERSHIP.—The leadership activity shall be the responsibility of FEMA and shall be exercised by chairing ICODS to coordinate Federal efforts in cooperation with State dam safety officials.

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The technical assistance activity shall consist of the transfer of knowledge and technical information among the Federal and non-Federal elements described in paragraph (2).

“(C) PUBLIC AWARENESS.—The public awareness activity shall provide for the education of the public, including State and local officials, in the hazards of dam failure, methods of reducing the adverse consequences of dam failure, and related matters.

“(e) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—The Director shall—

“(1) develop an implementation plan for the Program that shall set, through fiscal year 2001, year-by-year targets that demonstrate improvements in dam safety; and

“(2) recommend appropriate roles for Federal agencies and for State and local units of government, individuals, and private organizations in carrying out the implementation plan.

“(f) ASSISTANCE FOR STATE DAM SAFETY PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To encourage the establishment and maintenance of effective State programs intended to ensure dam safety, to protect human life and property, and to improve State dam safety programs, the Director shall provide assistance with amounts made available under section 12 to assist States in establishing and maintaining dam safety programs—

“(A) in accordance with the criteria specified in paragraph (2); and

“(B) in accordance with more advanced requirements and standards established by the Board and the Director with the assistance of established criteria such as the Model State Dam Safety Program published by FEMA, numbered 123 and dated April 1987, and amendments to the Model State Dam Safety Program.

“(2) CRITERIA.—For a State to be eligible for primary assistance under this subsection, a State dam safety program must be working toward meeting the following criteria, and for a State to be eligible for advanced assistance under this subsection, a State dam safety program must meet the following criteria and be working toward meeting the advanced requirements and standards established under paragraph (1)(B):

“(A) AUTHORIZATION.—For a State to be eligible for assistance under this subsection, a State dam safety program must be authorized by State legislation to include substantially, at a minimum—

“(i) the authority to review and approve plans and specifications to construct, enlarge, modify, remove, and abandon dams;

“(ii) the authority to perform periodic inspections during dam construction to ensure compliance with approved plans and specifications;

“(iii) a requirement that, on completion of dam construction, State approval must be given before operation of the dam;

“(iv)(I) the authority to require or perform the inspection, at least once every 5 years, of all dams and reservoirs that would pose a significant threat to human life and property in case of failure to determine the continued safety of the dams and reservoirs; and

“(II) a procedure for more detailed and frequent safety inspections;

“(v) a requirement that all inspections be performed under the supervision of a State-registered professional engineer with related experience in dam design and construction;

“(vi) the authority to issue notices, when appropriate, to require owners of dams to perform necessary maintenance or remedial work, revise operating procedures, or take other actions, including breaching dams when necessary;

“(vii) regulations for carrying out the legislation of the State described in this subparagraph;

“(viii) provision for necessary funds—

“(I) to ensure timely repairs or other changes to, or removal of, a dam in order to protect human life and property; and

“(II) if the owner of the dam does not take action described in subclause (I), to take appropriate action as expeditiously as practicable;

“(ix) a system of emergency procedures to be used if a dam fails or if the failure of a dam is imminent; and

“(x) an identification of—

“(I) each dam the failure of which could be reasonably expected to endanger human life;

“(II) the maximum area that could be flooded if the dam failed; and

“(III) necessary public facilities that would be affected by the flooding.

“(B) FUNDING.—For a State to be eligible for assistance under this subsection, State appropriations must be budgeted to carry out the legislation of the State under subparagraph (A).

“(3) WORK PLANS.—The Director shall enter into a contract with each State receiving assistance under paragraph (2) to develop a work plan necessary for the State dam safety program of the State to reach a level of program performance specified in the contract.

“(4) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Assistance may not be provided to a State under this subsection for a fiscal year unless the State enters into such agreement with the Director as the Director requires to ensure that the State will maintain the aggregate expenditures of the State from all other sources for programs to ensure dam safety for the protection of human life and property at or above a level equal to the average annual level of the expenditures for the 2 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year.

“(5) APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS.—

“(A) SUBMISSION.—For a State to be eligible for assistance under this subsection, a plan for a State dam safety program shall be submitted to the Director.

“(B) APPROVAL.—A State dam safety program shall be deemed to be approved 120 days after the date of receipt by the Director unless the Director determines within the 120-day period that the State dam safety program fails to substantially meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (3).

“(C) NOTIFICATION OF DISAPPROVAL.—If the Director determines that a State dam safety program does not meet the requirements for approval, the Director shall immediately notify the State in writing and provide the reasons for the determination and the changes that are necessary for the plan to be approved.

“(6) REVIEW OF STATE DAM SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Using the expertise of the Board, the Director shall periodically review State dam safety programs. If the Board finds that a State dam safety program has proven inadequate to reasonably protect human life and property, and the Director concurs, the Director shall revoke approval of the State dam safety program, and withhold assistance under this subsection, until the State dam safety program again meets the requirements for approval.

“(g) DAM SAFETY TRAINING.—At the request of any State that has or intends to develop a State dam safety program, the Director shall provide training for State dam safety staff and inspectors.

“(h) BOARD.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director may establish an advisory board to be known as the ‘National Dam Safety Review Board’ to monitor State implementation of this section.

“(2) AUTHORITY.—The Board may use the expertise of Federal agencies and enter into contracts for necessary studies to carry out this section.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall consist of 11 members selected by the Director for expertise in dam safety, of whom—

“(A) 1 member shall represent the Department of Agriculture;

“(B) 1 member shall represent the Department of Defense;

“(C) 1 member shall represent the Department of the Interior;

“(D) 1 member shall represent FEMA;

“(E) 1 member shall represent the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

“(F) 5 members shall be selected by the Director from among dam safety officials of States; and

“(G) 1 member shall be selected by the Director to represent the United States Committee on Large Dams.

“(4) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

“(A) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Each member of the Board who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to compensation received for the services of the member as an officer or employee of the United States.

“(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—Each member of the Board who is not an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation.

“(5) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of services for the Board.

“(6) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Com-

mittee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board.

“SEC. 9. RESEARCH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in cooperation with ICODS, shall carry out a program of technical and archival research to develop—

“(1) improved techniques, historical experience, and equipment for rapid and effective dam construction, rehabilitation, and inspection; and

“(2) devices for the continued monitoring of the safety of dams.

“(b) CONSULTATION.—The Director shall provide for State participation in research under subsection (a) and periodically advise all States and Congress of the results of the research.

“SEC. 10. REPORTS.

“(a) REPORT ON DAM INSURANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director shall report to Congress on the availability of dam insurance and make recommendations concerning encouraging greater availability.

“(b) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each odd-numbered fiscal year, the Director shall submit a report to Congress that—

“(1) describes the status of the Program;

“(2) describes the progress achieved by Federal agencies during the 2 preceding fiscal years in implementing the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety;

“(3) describes the progress achieved in dam safety by States participating in the Program; and

“(4) includes any recommendations for legislative and other action that the Director considers necessary.”;

(9) in section 11 (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) by striking “SEC. 11. Nothing” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 11. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

“Nothing”;

(B) by striking “shall be construed (1) to create” and inserting the following: “shall—“(1) create”;

(C) by striking “or (2) to relieve” and inserting the following:

“(2) relieve”;

(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; or

“(3) preempt any other Federal or State law.”; and

(10) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 12. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) FUNDING.—

“(1) NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.—

“(A) ANNUAL AMOUNTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to FEMA to carry out sections 7, 8, and 10 (in addition to any amounts made available for similar purposes included in any other Act and amounts made available under paragraphs (2) through (5)), \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1997, \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

“(B) ALLOCATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), for each fiscal year, amounts made available under this paragraph to carry out section 8 shall be allocated among the States as follows:

“(I) One-third among States that qualify for assistance under section 8(f).

“(II) Two-thirds among States that qualify for assistance under section 8(f), to each such State in proportion to—

“(aa) the number of dams in the State that are listed as State-regulated dams on the inventory of dams maintained under section 6; as compared to

“(bb) the number of dams in all States that are listed as State-regulated dams on the inventory of dams maintained under section 6.

“(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF ALLOCATION.—The amount of funds allocated to a State under this subparagraph may not exceed 50 percent of the reasonable cost of implementing the State dam safety program.

“(iii) DETERMINATION.—The Director and the Board shall determine the amount allocated to States needing primary assistance and States needing advanced assistance under section 8(f).

“(2) NATIONAL DAM INVENTORY.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 6 \$500,000 for each fiscal year.

“(3) DAM SAFETY TRAINING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 8(g) \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

“(4) RESEARCH.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 9 \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

“(5) STAFF.—There is authorized to be appropriated to FEMA for the employment of such additional staff personnel as are necessary to carry out sections 6 through 9 \$400,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

“(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available under this Act may not be used to construct or repair any Federal or non-Federal dam.”

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(2) of the Indian Dams Safety Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 3802(2)) is amended by striking “the first section of Public Law 92-367 (33 U.S.C. 467)” and inserting “section 2 of the National Dam Safety Program Act”.

SEC. 304. HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT UPGRATING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the maintenance, rehabilitation, and modernization of a hydroelectric power generating facility at a water resources project under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Secretary is authorized, to the extent funds are made available in appropriations Acts, to take such actions as are necessary to increase the efficiency of energy production or the capacity of the facility, or both, if, after consulting with the heads of other appropriate Federal and State agencies, the Secretary determines that the increase—

(1) is economically justified and financially feasible;

(2) will not result in any significant adverse effect on the other purposes for which the project is authorized;

(3) will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts; and

(4) will not involve major structural or operational changes in the project.

(b) EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITY.—This section shall not affect the authority of the Secretary and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration under section 2406 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 839d-1).

SEC. 305. FEDERAL LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS FOR FEDERAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a water resources project under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for which the non-Federal interests are responsible for performing the operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation of the project, or a separable element (as defined in section 103(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(f)) of the project, and for which the Federal Government is responsible for paying a portion of the operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation costs of the project or separable element, the Secretary may make, in accordance with this section and under terms and conditions acceptable to the Secretary, a payment of the estimated total Federal share of the costs to the non-Federal interests after completion of construction of the project or separable element.

(b) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount that may be paid by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be equal to the present value of the Federal payments over the life of the project, as estimated by the Federal Government, and shall be computed using an interest rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with maturities comparable to the remaining life of the project.

(c) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may make a payment under this section only if the non-Federal interests have entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary to perform the operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation of the project or separable element. The agreement shall—

(1) meet the requirements of section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b); and

(2) specify—

(A) the terms and conditions under which a payment may be made under this section; and

(B) the rights of, and remedies available to, the Federal Government to recover all or a portion of a payment made under this section if a non-Federal interest suspends or terminates the performance by the non-Federal interest of the operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation of the project or separable element, or fails to perform the activities in a manner that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) EFFECT OF PAYMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (c), a payment provided to the non-Federal interests under this section shall relieve the Federal Government of any obligation, after the date of the payment, to pay any of the operation, maintenance, replacement, or rehabilitation costs for the project or separable element.

SEC. 306. COST-SHARING FOR REMOVAL OF EXISTING PROJECT FEATURES.

After the date of enactment of this Act, any proposal submitted to Congress by the Secretary for modification of an existing authorized water resources development project (in existence on the date of the proposal) by removal of one or more of the project features that would significantly and adversely impact the authorized project purposes or outputs shall include the recommendation that the non-Federal interests shall provide 50 percent of the cost of any such modification, including the cost of acquiring any additional interests in lands that become necessary for accomplishing the modification.

SEC. 307. TERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 310 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2319) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “(b) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—”; and

(B) by striking “subsection” each place it appears and inserting “section”.

SEC. 308. CONDITIONS FOR PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “10” and inserting “5”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Before” and inserting “Upon official”; and

(3) in the last sentence, by inserting “the planning, design, or” before “construction”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 52 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-676; 102 Stat. 4044) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) (33 U.S.C. 579a note);

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (a) through (d), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated), by striking “or subsection (a) of this section”.

SEC. 309. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES.

Section 211 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701u) is repealed.

SEC. 310. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out research and development in support of the civil works program of the Department of the Army, the Secretary may utilize contracts, cooperative research and development agreements, and cooperative agreements with, and grants to, non-Federal entities, including State and local governments, colleges and universities, consortia, professional and technical societies, public and private scientific and technical foundations, research institutions, educational organizations, and nonprofit organizations.

(b) COMMERCIAL APPLICATION.—In the case of a contract for research or development, or both, the Secretary may—

(1) require that the research or development, or both, have potential commercial application; and

(2) use the potential for commercial application as an evaluation factor, if appropriate.

SEC. 311. INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may engage in activities in support of other Federal agencies or international organizations to address problems of national significance to the United States. The Secretary may engage in activities in support of international organizations only after consulting with the Secretary of State. The Secretary may use the technical and managerial expertise of the Army Corps of Engineers to address domestic and international problems related to water resources, infrastructure development, and environmental protection.

(b) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 to carry out this section. The Secretary may accept and expend additional funds from other Federal agencies or international organizations to carry this section.

SEC. 312. SECTION 1135 PROGRAM.

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

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and to determine if the operation of the projects has contributed to the degradation of the quality of the environment”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking the last two sentences;

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

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

“(c) MEASURES TO RESTORE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—If the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that operation of a water resources project has contributed to the degradation of the quality of the environment, the Secretary may carry out, with respect to the project, measures for the restoration of environmental quality, if the measures are feasible and consistent with the authorized purposes of the project.

“(d) FUNDING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of any modification or measure carried out pursuant to subsection (b) or (c)

shall be 25 percent. Not more than \$5,000,000 in Federal funds may be expended on any 1 such modification or measure.”.

(b) PINE FLAT DAM FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION, CALIFORNIA.—In accordance with section 1135(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(b)), the Secretary shall carry out the construction of a turbine bypass at Pine Flat Dam, Kings River, California.

(c) LOWER AMAZON CREEK RESTORATION, OREGON.—In accordance with section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), the Secretary may carry out justified environmental restoration measures with respect to the flood reduction measures constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers, and the related flood reduction measures constructed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, in the Amazon Creek drainage. The Federal share of the restoration measures shall be jointly funded by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in proportion to the share required to be paid by each agency of the original costs of the flood reduction measures.

SEC. 313. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

Section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-640; 33 U.S.C. 1252 note) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 314. FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 105(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “during the period of such study”;

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “During the period of the study, the non-Federal share of the cost of the study shall be not more than 50 percent of the estimate of the cost of the study as contained in the feasibility cost sharing agreement. The cost estimate may be amended only by mutual agreement of the Secretary and the non-Federal interests. The non-Federal share of any costs in excess of the cost estimate shall, except as otherwise mutually agreed by the Secretary and the non-Federal interests, be payable after the project has been authorized for construction and on the date on which the Secretary and non-Federal interests enter into an agreement pursuant to section 101(e) or 103(j).”; and

(3) in the last sentence, by striking “such non-Federal contribution” and inserting “the non-Federal share required under this paragraph”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding any feasibility cost sharing agreement entered into by the Secretary and non-Federal interests, and the Secretary shall amend any feasibility cost sharing agreements in effect on the date of enactment of this Act so as to conform the agreements with the amendments. Nothing in this section or any amendment made by this section shall require the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interests for funds previously contributed for a study.

SEC. 315. OBSTRUCTION REMOVAL REQUIREMENT.

(a) PENALTY.—Section 16 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 March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 411), is amended—

(1) by striking “sections thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen” and inserting “section 13, 14, 15, 19, or 20”; and

(2) by striking “not exceeding twenty-five hundred dollars nor less than five hundred dollars” and inserting “of not more than \$25,000 for each day that the violation continues”.

(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 20 of the Act (33 U.S.C. 415) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Under emergency” and inserting “SUMMARY REMOVAL PROCEDURES.—Under emergency”; and

(B) by striking “expense” the first place it appears and inserting “actual expense, including administrative expenses.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “cost” and inserting “actual cost, including administrative costs.”; and

(B) by striking “(b) The” and inserting “(c) LIABILITY OF OWNER, LESSEE, OR OPERATOR.—The”;

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

“(b) REMOVAL REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 24 hours after the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating issues an order to stop or delay navigation in any navigable waters of the United States because of conditions related to the sinking or grounding of a vessel, the owner or operator of the vessel, with the approval of the Secretary of the Army, shall begin removal of the vessel using the most expeditious removal method available or, if appropriate, secure the vessel pending removal to allow navigation to resume. If the owner or operator fails to begin removal or to secure the vessel pending removal in accordance with the preceding sentence or fails to complete removal as soon as possible, the Secretary of the Army shall remove or destroy the vessel using the summary removal procedures under subsection (a).”.

SEC. 316. LEVEE OWNERS MANUAL.

Section 5 of the Act entitled “An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes”, approved August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) LEVEE OWNERS MANUAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary shall prepare a manual describing the maintenance and upkeep responsibilities that the Army Corps of Engineers requires of a non-Federal interest in order for the non-Federal interest to receive Federal assistance under this section. The Secretary shall provide a copy of the manual at no cost to each non-Federal interest that is eligible to receive Federal assistance under this section.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.—The preparation of the manual shall be carried out under the personal direction of the Secretary.

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

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) MAINTENANCE AND UPKEEP.—The term ‘maintenance and upkeep’ means all maintenance and general upkeep of a levee performed on a regular and consistent basis that is not repair and rehabilitation.

“(B) REPAIR AND REHABILITATION.—The term ‘repair and rehabilitation’—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii), means the repair or rebuilding of a levee or other flood control structure, after the structure has been damaged by a flood, to the level of protection provided by the structure before the flood; and

“(ii) does not include—

“(I) any improvement to the structure; or

“(II) repair or rebuilding described in clause (i) if, in the normal course of usage, the structure becomes structurally unsound and is no longer fit to provide the level of protection for which the structure was designed.

“(C) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Army.”.

SEC. 317. RISK-BASED ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall obtain the services of an independent consultant to evaluate—

(1) the relationship between—

(A) the Risk-Based Analysis for Evaluation of Hydrology/Hydraulics and Economics in Flood Damage Reduction Studies established in an Army Corps of Engineers engineering circular; and

(B) minimum engineering and safety standards;

(2) the validity of results generated by the studies described in paragraph (1); and

(3) policy impacts related to change in the studies described in paragraph (1).

(b) TASK FORCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the independent evaluation under subsection (a), the Secretary, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall establish a task force to oversee and review the analysis.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The task force shall consist of—

(A) the Assistant Secretary of the Army having responsibility for civil works, who shall serve as chairperson of the task force;

(B) the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(C) the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture;

(D) a State representative appointed by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Association of State Floodplain Managers;

(E) a local government public works official appointed by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by a national organization representing public works officials; and

(F) an individual from the private sector, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) COMPENSATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a member of the task force shall serve without compensation.

(B) EXPENSES.—Each member of the task force shall be allowed—

(i) travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of services for the task force; and

(ii) other expenses incurred in the performance of services for the task force, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) TERMINATION.—The task force shall terminate 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF METHODOLOGY.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending 2 years after that date, if requested by a non-Federal interest, the Secretary shall refrain from using any risk-based technique required under the studies described in subsection (a) for the evaluation and design of a project carried out in cooperation with the non-Federal interest unless the Secretary, in consultation with the task force, has provided direction for use of the technique after consideration of the independent evaluation required under subsection (a).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 318. SEDIMENTS DECONTAMINATION TECHNOLOGY.

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

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following: "The goal of the program shall be to make possible the development, on an operational scale, of 1 or more sediment decontamination technologies, each of which demonstrates a sediment decontamination capacity of at least 2,500 cubic yards per day."; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 1996, and September 30 of each year thereafter, the Administrator and the Secretary shall report to Congress on progress made toward the goal described in paragraph (2)."; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "\$5,000,000" and inserting "\$10,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "1992" and inserting "1996".

SEC. 319. MELALEUCA TREE.

Section 104(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(a)) is amended by inserting "melaleuca tree," after "milfoil".

SEC. 320. FAULKNER ISLAND, CONNECTICUT.

In consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary shall design and construct shoreline protection measures for the coastline adjacent to the Faulkner Island Lighthouse, Connecticut, at a total cost of \$4,500,000.

SEC. 321. DESIGNATION OF LOCK AND DAM AT THE RED RIVER WATERWAY, LOUISIANA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Lock and Dam numbered 4 of the Red River Waterway, Louisiana, is designated as the "Russell B. Long Lock and Dam".

(b) LEGAL REFERENCES.—A reference in any law, regulation, document, map, record, or other paper of the United States to the lock and dam referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Russell B. Long Lock and Dam".

SEC. 322. JURISDICTION OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION, LOUISIANA.

The jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission established by the Act of June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37, chapter 43; 33 U.S.C. 641 et seq.), is extended to include all of the area between the eastern side of the Bayou Lafourche Ridge from Donaldsonville, Louisiana, to the Gulf of Mexico and the west guide levee of the Mississippi River from Donaldsonville, Louisiana, to the Gulf of Mexico.

SEC. 323. WILLIAM JENNINGS RANDOLPH ACCESS ROAD, GARRETT COUNTY, MARYLAND.

The Secretary shall transfer up to \$600,000 from the funds appropriated for the William Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland and West Virginia, project to the State of Maryland for use by the State in constructing an access road to the William Jennings Randolph Lake in Garrett County, Maryland.

SEC. 324. ARKABUTLA DAM AND LAKE, MISSISSIPPI.

The Secretary shall repair the access roads to Arkabutla Dam and Arkabutla Lake in Tate County and DeSoto County, Mississippi, at a total cost of not to exceed \$1,400,000.

SEC. 325. NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to make capital improvements to the New York State canal system, the Secretary, with the consent of appropriate local and State entities, shall enter into such arrangements, contracts, and leases with public and private entities as may be necessary for the purposes of rehabilitation, renovation, preservation, and maintenance of the New York State canal system and related facilities, including trailside facilities and other recreational projects along the waterways referred to in subsection (c).

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of capital improvements under this section shall be 50 percent. The total cost is \$14,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$7,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,000,000.

(c) DEFINITION OF NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM.—In this section, the term "New York State canal system" means the Erie, Oswego, Champlain, and Cayuga-Seneca Canals in New York.

SEC. 326. QUONSET POINT-DAVISVILLE, RHODE ISLAND.

The Secretary shall replace the bulkhead between piers 1 and 2 at the Quonset Point-Davisville Industrial Park, Rhode Island, at a total cost of \$1,350,000. The estimated Federal share of the project cost is \$1,012,500, and the estimated non-Federal share of the project cost is \$337,500. In conjunction with this project, the Secretary shall install high mast lighting at pier 2 at a total cost of \$300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$225,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$75,000.

SEC. 327. CLOUTER CREEK DISPOSAL AREA, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer to the Secretary administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 1,400 acres of land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy that comprise a portion of the Clouter Creek disposal area, Charleston, South Carolina.

(b) USE OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—The land transferred under subsection (a) shall be used by the Department of the Army as a dredge material disposal area for dredging activities in the vicinity of Charleston, South Carolina, including the Charleston Harbor navigation project.

(c) COST SHARING.—Nothing in this section modifies any non-Federal cost-sharing requirement established under title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 et seq.).

SEC. 328. NUISANCE AQUATIC VEGETATION IN LAKE GASTON, VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA.

Section 339(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-580; 106 Stat. 4855) is amended by striking "1993 and 1994" and inserting "1995 and 1996".

SEC. 329. WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY CUSTOMER.—The term "non-Federal public water supply customer" means—

- (A) the District of Columbia;
- (B) Arlington County, Virginia; and
- (C) the City of Falls Church, Virginia.

(2) WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.—The term "Washington Aqueduct" means the Washington Aqueduct facilities and related facilities owned by the Federal Government as of the date of enactment of this Act, including—

- (A) the dams, intake works, conduits, and pump stations that capture and transport raw water from the Potomac River to the Dalecarlia Reservoir;
- (B) the infrastructure and appurtenances used to treat water taken from the Potomac River to potable standards; and
- (C) related water distribution facilities.

(b) REGIONAL ENTITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress encourages and grants consent to the non-Federal public water supply customers to establish a public or private entity or to enter into an agreement with an existing public or private entity to—

(A) receive title to the Washington Aqueduct; and

(B) operate, maintain, and manage the Washington Aqueduct in a manner that ade-

quately represents all interests of non-Federal public water supply customers.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—An entity receiving title to the Washington Aqueduct that is not composed entirely of the non-Federal public water supply customers shall receive consideration for providing equity for the Aqueduct.

(3) PRIORITY ACCESS.—The non-Federal public water supply customers shall have priority access to any water produced by the Aqueduct.

(4) CONSENT OF CONGRESS.—Congress grants consent to the non-Federal public water supply customers to enter into any interstate agreement or compact required to carry out this section.

(5) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not preclude the non-Federal public water supply customers from pursuing any option regarding ownership, operation, maintenance, and management of the Washington Aqueduct.

(c) PROGRESS REPORT AND PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works in the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the House of Representatives on any progress in achieving a plan for the transfer of ownership, operation, maintenance, and management of the Washington Aqueduct to a public or private entity.

(d) TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b)(2) and any terms or conditions the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, the Secretary may, with the consent of the non-Federal public water supply customers and without consideration to the Federal Government, transfer all rights, title, and interest of the United States in the Washington Aqueduct, its real property, facilities, and personalty, to a public or private entity established or contracted with pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) ADEQUATE CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary shall transfer ownership to the Washington Aqueduct under paragraph (1) only if the Secretary determines, after opportunity for public input, that the entity to receive ownership of the Aqueduct has the technical, managerial, and financial capability to operate, maintain, and manage the Aqueduct.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary shall not transfer title under this subsection unless the entity to receive title assumes full responsibility for performing and financing the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, and necessary capital improvements of the Washington Aqueduct so as to ensure the continued operation of the Washington Aqueduct consistent with Aqueduct's intended purpose of providing an uninterrupted supply of potable water sufficient to meet the current and future needs of the Aqueduct's service area.

(e) INTERIM BORROWING AUTHORITY.—

(1) BORROWING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States such amounts for fiscal years 1997 and 1998 as is sufficient to cover any obligations that the United States Army Corps of Engineers is required to incur in carrying out capital improvements during fiscal years 1997 and 1998 for the Washington Aqueduct to ensure continued operation of the Aqueduct until such time as a transfer of title of the Aqueduct has taken place.

(B) LIMITATION.—The amount borrowed by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) may not exceed \$29,000,000 for fiscal year 1997 and \$24,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

(C) AGREEMENT.—Amounts borrowed under subparagraph (A) may only be used for capital improvements agreed to by the Army

Corps of Engineers and the non-Federal public water supply customers.

(D) TERMS OF BORROWING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the funds borrowed under subparagraph (A) under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Treasury determines to be necessary and in the public interest and subject to the contracts required in paragraph (2).

(ii) SPECIFIED TERMS.—The term of any amounts borrowed under subparagraph (A) shall be for a period of not less than 20 years. There shall be no penalty for the prepayment of any amounts borrowed under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTRACTS WITH PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY CUSTOMERS.—

(A) CONTRACTS TO REPAY CORPS DEBT.—To the extent provided in appropriations Act, and in accordance with paragraph (1), the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers may enter into a series of contracts with each public water supply customer under which the customer commits to repay a pro-rata share (based on water purchase) of the principal and interest owed by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1). Any customer, or customers, may prepay, at any time, the pro-rata share of the principal and interest then owed by the customer and outstanding, or any portion thereof, without penalty. Under each of the contracts, the customer that enters into the contract shall commit to pay any additional amount necessary to fully offset the risk of default on the contract.

(B) OFFSETTING OF RISK OF DEFAULT.—Each contract under subparagraph (A) shall include such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may require so that the value to the Government of the contracts is estimated to be equal to the obligational authority used by the Army Corps of Engineers for modernizing the Washington Aqueduct at the time that each series of contracts is entered into.

(C) OTHER CONDITIONS.—Each contract entered into under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) provide that the public water supply customer pledges future income only from fees assessed to operate and maintain the Washington Aqueduct;

(ii) provide the United States priority in regard to income from fees assessed to operate and maintain the Washington Aqueduct; and

(iii) include other conditions not inconsistent with this section that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be appropriate.

(3) EXTENSION OF BORROWING AUTHORITY.—If no later than 24 months from the date of enactment of this Act, a written agreement in principle has been reached between the Secretary, the non-Federal public water supply customers, and (if one exists) the public or private entity proposed to own, operate, maintain, and manage the Washington Aqueduct, then it shall be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1999 borrowing authority, and the Secretary shall borrow, under the same terms and conditions noted in this subsection, in an amount sufficient to cover those obligations which the Army Corps of Engineers is required to incur in carrying out capital improvements that year for the Washington Aqueduct to ensure continued operations until the transfer contemplated in subsection (b) has taken place, provided that this borrowing shall not exceed \$22,000,000 in fiscal year 1999; provided also that no such borrowings shall occur once such non-Federal public or private owner shall have been established and achieved the capacity to borrow on its own.

(4) IMPACT ON IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consulta-

tion with other Federal agencies, shall transmit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works in the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the House of Representatives a report that assesses the impact of the borrowing authority referred to in this subsection on the near term improvement projects in the Washington Aqueduct Improvement Program, work scheduled during this period and the financial liability to be incurred.

(f) DELAYED REISSUANCE OF NPDES PERMIT.—In recognition of more efficient water-facility configurations that might be achieved through various possible ownership transfers of the Washington Aqueduct, the United States Environmental Protection Agency shall delay the reissuance of the NPDES permit for the Washington Aqueduct until Federal fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 330. CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(2) FORM.—The assistance shall be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects affecting the Chesapeake Bay estuary, including projects for sediment and erosion control, protection of eroding shorelines, protection of essential public works, wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, and beneficial uses of dredged material, and other related projects that may enhance the living resources of the estuary.

(b) PUBLIC OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned, and will be publicly operated and maintained.

(c) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for—

(A) the development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications and an estimate of expected resource benefits; and

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

(d) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)(B), the Federal share of the total project costs of each local cooperation agreement entered into under this section shall be 75 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(A) VALUE OF LANDS, EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, AND RELOCATIONS.—In determining the non-Federal contribution toward carrying out a local cooperation agreement entered into under this section, the Secretary shall provide credit to a non-Federal interest for the value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest, except that the amount of credit provided for a project under this paragraph may not exceed 25 percent of the total project costs.

(B) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS.—The non-Federal share of the costs of oper-

ation and maintenance of carrying out the agreement under this section shall be 100 percent.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS AND AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section waives, limits, or otherwise affects the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(2) COOPERATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall cooperate fully with the heads of appropriate Federal agencies, including—

(A) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(B) the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(C) the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

(D) the heads of such other Federal agencies and agencies of a State or political subdivision of a State as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(f) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary shall establish at least 1 project under this section in each of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. A project established under this section shall be carried out using such measures as are necessary to protect environmental, historic, and cultural resources.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, together with a recommendation concerning whether or not the program should be implemented on a national basis.

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

SEC. 331. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE SALMON SURVIVAL.

(a) SALMON SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accelerate ongoing research and development activities, and is authorized to 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 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) marine mammal predation on salmon;

(B) studies of juvenile salmon survival in spawning and rearing areas;

(C) estuary and near-ocean juvenile and adult salmon survival;

(D) impacts on salmon life cycles from sources other than water resources projects; 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 Act, the Secretary shall transmit 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 are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out research and development activities under subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (3).

(b) ADVANCED TURBINE DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary shall accelerate efforts toward developing innovative, efficient, and environmentally safe hydropower turbines, including design of "fish-friendly" turbines, for use on the Columbia River hydro system.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

(c) 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. 332. RECREATIONAL USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 210(b)(4) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. 460d-3(b)(4)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall be used for the purposes specified in section 4(i)(3) of the Act at the water resources development project at which the fees were collected".

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report, with respect to fiscal year 1995, on—

(1) the amount of day-use fees collected under section 210(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. 460d-3(b)) at each water resources development project; and

(2) the administrative costs associated with the collection of the day-use fees at each water resources development project.

SEC. 333. SHORE PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426e(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking "damage to the shores" and inserting "damage to the shores and beaches"; and

(2) by striking "the following provisions" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: "this Act, to promote shore protection projects and related research that encourage the protection, restoration, and enhancement of sandy beaches, including beach restoration and periodic beach nourishment, on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprises. In carrying out this policy, preference shall be given to areas in which there has been a Federal investment of funds and areas with respect to which the need for prevention or mitigation of damage to shores and beaches is attributable to Federal navigation projects or other Federal activities."

(b) DEFINITION OF SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT.—Section 4 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426h), is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the word 'shores' includes all the shorelines" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

"In this Act:

"(1) SHORE.—The term 'shore' includes each shoreline of each"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT.—The term 'shore protection project' includes a project for beach nourishment, including the replacement of sand."

SEC. 334. SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEMONSTRATION.

(a) NATIONAL SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426e et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 5. NATIONAL SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) EROSION CONTROL PROGRAM.—The term 'erosion control program' means the national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program established under this section.

"(2) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers.

"(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF EROSION CONTROL PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and conduct a national shoreline erosion control development and demonstration program for a period of 8 years beginning on the date that funds are made available to carry out this section.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The erosion control program shall include provisions for—

"(A) demonstration projects consisting of planning, designing, and constructing prototype engineered and vegetative shoreline erosion control devices and methods during the first 5 years of the erosion control program;

"(B) adequate monitoring of the prototypes throughout the duration of the erosion control program;

"(C) detailed engineering and environmental reports on the results of each demonstration project carried out under the erosion control program; and

"(D) technology transfers to private property owners and State and local entities.

"(2) EMPHASIS.—The demonstration projects carried out under the erosion control program shall emphasize, to the extent practicable—

"(A) the development and demonstration of innovative technologies;

"(B) efficient designs to prevent erosion at a shoreline site, taking into account the life-cycle cost of the design, including cleanup, maintenance, and amortization;

"(C) natural designs, including the use of vegetation or temporary structures that minimize permanent structural alterations;

"(D) the avoidance of negative impacts to adjacent shorefront communities;

"(E) in areas with substantial residential or commercial interests adjacent to the shoreline, designs that do not impair the aesthetic appeal of the interests;

"(F) the potential for long-term protection afforded by the technology; and

"(G) recommendations developed from evaluations of the original 1974 program established under the Shoreline Erosion Control Demonstration Act of 1974 (section 54 of Public Law 93-251; 42 U.S.C. 1962d-5 note), including—

"(i) adequate consideration of the subgrade;

"(ii) proper filtration;

"(iii) durable components;

"(iv) adequate connection between units; and

"(v) consideration of additional relevant information.

"(3) SITES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Each demonstration project under the erosion control program shall be carried out at a privately owned site with substantial public access, or a publicly owned site, on open coast or on tidal waters.

"(B) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall develop criteria for the selection of sites for the demonstration projects, including—

"(i) a variety of geographical and climatic conditions;

"(ii) the size of the population that is dependent on the beaches for recreation, protection of homes, or commercial interests;

"(iii) the rate of erosion;

"(iv) significant natural resources or habitats and environmentally sensitive areas; and

"(v) significant threatened historic structures or landmarks.

"(C) AREAS.—Demonstration projects under the erosion control program shall be carried out at not fewer than 2 sites on each of the shorelines of—

"(i) the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts;

"(ii) the Great Lakes; and

"(iii) the State of Alaska.

"(d) COOPERATION.—

"(1) PARTIES.—The Secretary shall carry out the erosion control program in cooperation with—

"(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly with respect to vegetative means of preventing and controlling shoreline erosion;

"(B) Federal, State, and local agencies;

"(C) private organizations;

"(D) the Coastal Engineering Research Center established under the first section of Public Law 88-172 (33 U.S.C. 426-1); and

"(E) university research facilities.

"(2) AGREEMENTS.—The cooperation described in paragraph (1) may include entering into agreements with other Federal, State, or local agencies or private organizations to carry out functions described in subsection (c)(1) when appropriate.

"(e) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the conclusion of the erosion control program, the Secretary shall prepare and submit an erosion control program final report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives. The report shall include a comprehensive evaluation of the erosion control program and recommendations regarding the continuation of the erosion control program.

"(f) FUNDING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Federal share of the cost of a demonstration project under the erosion control program shall be determined in accordance with section 3.

"(2) RESPONSIBILITY.—The cost of and responsibility for operation and maintenance (excluding monitoring) of a demonstration project under the erosion control program shall be borne by non-Federal interests on completion of construction of the demonstration project."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of the first section of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1056, chapter 960; 33 U.S.C. 426e(e)), is amended by striking "section 3" and inserting "section 3 or 5".

SEC. 335. REVIEW PERIOD FOR STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Paragraph (a) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 701-1(a)), is amended—

(1) in the ninth sentence, by striking "ninety" and inserting "30"; and

(2) in the eleventh sentence, by striking "ninety-day" and inserting "30-day".

SEC. 336. DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The construction of all dredged material disposal facilities associated with Federal navigation projects for harbors and inland harbors, including diking and other improvements necessary for the proper disposal of dredged material, shall be considered to be general navigation features of the projects and shall be cost-shared in accordance with subsection (a).

"(2) COST SHARING FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of operation and maintenance of each disposal facility to which paragraph (1) applies shall be determined in accordance with subsection (b).

"(B) SOURCE OF FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of construction of dredged material disposal facilities associated with the operation and maintenance of Federal navigation projects for harbors and inland harbors shall be—

"(i) considered to be eligible operation and maintenance costs for the purpose of section 210(a); and

"(ii) paid with sums appropriated out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund established by section 9505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(3) APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDING.—The Secretary shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that—

"(A) funding requirements for operation and maintenance dredging of commercial navigation harbors are considered fully before Federal funds are obligated for payment of the Federal share of costs associated with the construction of dredged material disposal facilities under paragraph (1); and

"(B) funds expended for such construction are equitably apportioned in accordance with regional needs.

"(4) APPLICABILITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply to the construction of any dredged material disposal facility for which a contract for construction has not been awarded on or before the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(B) AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may, with the consent of the non-Federal interest, amend a project cooperation agreement executed before the date of enactment of this subsection to reflect paragraph (1) with respect to any dredged material disposal facility for which a contract for construction has not been awarded as of that date.

"(5) NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS.—Nothing in this subsection shall impose, increase, or result in the increase of the non-Federal share of the costs of any existing dredged material disposal facility authorized to be provided before the date of enactment of this subsection."

(b) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.—Section 214(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2241(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "dredging and disposal of contaminated sediments that are in or that affect the maintenance of a Federal navigation channel, mitigation for storm damage and environmental impacts resulting from a Federal maintenance activity, and operation and maintenance of a dredged material disposal facility".

SEC. 337. APPLICABILITY OF COST-SHARING PROVISIONS.

Section 103(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "For the purpose of the preceding sentence, physical construction shall be considered to be initiated on the date of the award of a construction contract."

SEC. 338. SECTION 215 REIMBURSEMENT LIMITATION PER PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The last sentence of section 215(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5a(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$3,000,000" and inserting "\$5,000,000"; and

(2) by striking the second period at the end.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REIMBURSEMENT LIMITATION FOR SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 215(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5a(a)) and the agreement executed on November 7, 1992, by the Secretary and the San Antonio River Authority, Texas, the Secretary shall reimburse the San Antonio River Authority in an amount not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000 for the work carried out by the Authority under the agreement, including any amounts paid to the Authority under the terms of the agreement before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 339. WAIVER OF UNECONOMICAL COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.

The first sentence of section 221(a) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b(a)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "except that no such agreement shall be required if the Secretary determines that the administrative costs associated with negotiating, executing, or administering the agreement would exceed the amount of the contribution required from the non-Federal interest".

SEC. 340. PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES.

Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ", watersheds, and ecosystems" after "basins";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "\$6,000,000" and inserting "\$10,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$300,000" and inserting "\$500,000".

SEC. 341. RECOVERY OF COSTS FOR CLEANUP OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.

Any amount recovered under section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) for any response action taken by the Secretary in support of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers, and any amount recovered by the Secretary from a contractor, insurer, surety, or other person to reimburse the Secretary for any expenditure for environmental response activities in support of the civil works program, shall be credited to the trust fund account to which the cost of the response action has been or will be charged.

SEC. 342. CITY OF NORTH BONNEVILLE, WASHINGTON.

Section 9147 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-396; 106 Stat. 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9147. CITY OF NORTH BONNEVILLE, WASHINGTON.

"(a) CONVEYANCES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The project for Bonneville Lock and Dam, Columbia River, Oregon and Washington, authorized by the Act of August 20, 1937 (commonly known as the

'Bonneville Project Act of 1937') (50 Stat. 731, chapter 720; 16 U.S.C. 832 et seq.), and modified by section 83 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-251; 88 Stat. 35), is further modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of North Bonneville, Washington (referred to in this section as the 'city'), at no further cost to the city, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to—

"(A) any municipal facilities, utilities, fixtures, and equipment for the relocated city, and any remaining lands designated as open spaces or municipal lots not previously conveyed to the city, specifically Lots M1 through M15, M16 (known as the 'community center lot'), M18, M19, M22, M24, S42 through S45, and S52 through S60, as shown on the plats of Skamania County, Washington;

"(B) the lot known as the 'school lot' and shown as Lot 2, Block 5, on the plats of relocated North Bonneville, recorded in Skamania County, Washington;

"(C) Parcels 2 and C, but only on the completion of any environmental response activities required under applicable law;

"(D) that portion of Parcel B lying south of the city boundary, west of the sewage treatment plant, and north of the drainage ditch that is located adjacent to the northerly limit of the Hamilton Island landfill, if the Secretary of the Army determines, at the time of the proposed conveyance, that the Department of the Army has taken all actions necessary to protect human health and the environment;

"(E) such portions of Parcel H as can be conveyed without a requirement for further investigation, inventory, or other action by the Secretary of the Army under the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.); and

"(F) such easements as the Secretary of the Army considers necessary for—

"(i) sewer and water line crossings of relocated Washington State Highway 14; and

"(ii) reasonable public access to the Columbia River across such portions of Hamilton Island as remain in the ownership of the United States.

"(2) TIMING OF CONVEYANCES.—The conveyances described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (E), and (F)(i) of paragraph (1) shall be completed not later than 180 days after the United States receives the release described in subsection (b)(2). All other conveyances shall be completed expeditiously, subject to any conditions specified in the applicable subparagraph of paragraph (1).

"(b) EFFECT OF CONVEYANCES.—

"(1) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—The conveyances authorized by subsection (a) are intended to resolve all outstanding issues between the United States and the city.

"(2) ACTION BY CITY BEFORE CONVEYANCES.—As prerequisites to the conveyances, the city shall—

"(A) execute an acknowledgment of payment of just compensation;

"(B) execute a release of all claims for relief of any kind against the United States arising from the relocation of the city or any Federal statute enacted before the date of enactment of this subparagraph relating to the city; and

"(C) dismiss, with prejudice, any pending litigation involving matters described in subparagraph (B).

"(3) ACTION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—On receipt of the city's acknowledgment and release described in paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

"(A) dismiss any pending litigation arising from the relocation of the city; and

"(B) execute a release of all rights to damages of any kind (including any interest on the damages) under Town of North Bonneville, Washington v. United States, 11 Cl. Ct.

694, aff'd in part and rev'd in part, 833 F.2d 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 485 U.S. 1007 (1988).

"(4) ACTION BY CITY AFTER CONVEYANCES.—Not later than 60 days after the conveyances authorized by subparagraphs (A) through (F)(i) of subsection (a)(1) have been completed, the city shall—

"(A) execute an acknowledgment that all entitlements to the city under the subparagraphs have been fulfilled; and

"(B) execute a release of all claims for relief of any kind against the United States arising from this section.

"(C) AUTHORITY OF CITY OVER CERTAIN LANDS.—Beginning on the date of enactment of paragraph (1), the city or any successor in interest to the city—

"(1) shall be precluded from exercising any jurisdiction over any land owned in whole or in part by the United States and administered by the Army Corps of Engineers in connection with the Bonneville project; and

"(2) may change the zoning designations of, sell, or resell Parcels S35 and S56, which are designated as open spaces as of the date of enactment of this paragraph."

SEC. 343. COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS.

Section 401(a) of Public Law 100-581 (102 Stat. 2944) is amended—

(1) by striking "(a) All Federal" and all that follows through "Columbia River Gorge Commission" and inserting the following:

"(a) EXISTING FEDERAL LANDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—All Federal lands that are included within the 20 recommended treaty fishing access sites set forth in the publication of the Army Corps of Engineers entitled 'Columbia River Treaty Fishing Access Sites Post Authorization Change Report', dated April 1995,"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary of the Army, in consultation with affected tribes, may make such minor boundary adjustments to the lands referred to in paragraph (1) as the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out this title."

SEC. 344. TRI-CITIES AREA, WASHINGTON.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make the conveyances to the local governments referred to in subsection (b) of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b).

(b) PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) BENTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to Benton County, Washington, is the property in the county that is designated "Area D" on Exhibit A to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-81-43.

(2) FRANKLIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to Franklin County, Washington, is—

(A) the 105.01 acres of property leased under Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20 as executed by Franklin County, Washington, on April 7, 1977;

(B) the 35 acres of property leased under Supplemental Agreement No. 1 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20;

(C) the 20 acres of property commonly known as "Richland Bend" that is designated by the shaded portion of Lot 1, Section 11, and the shaded portion of Lot 1, Section 12, Township 9 North, Range 28 East, W.M. on Exhibit D to Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20;

(D) the 7.05 acres of property commonly known as "Taylor Flat" that is designated by the shaded portion of Lot 1, Section 13, Township 11 North, Range 28 East, W.M. on Exhibit D to Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20;

(E) the 14.69 acres of property commonly known as "Byers Landing" that is designated by the shaded portion of Lots 2 and 3, Section 2, Township 10 North, Range 28 East, W.M. on Exhibit D to Supplemental Agreement No. 2 to Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-20; and

(F) all levees in Franklin County, Washington, as of the date of enactment of this Act, and the property on which the levees are situated.

(3) CITY OF KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to the city of Kennewick, Washington, is the property in the city that is subject to the Municipal Sublease Agreement entered into on April 6, 1989, between Benton County, Washington, and the cities of Kennewick and Richland, Washington.

(4) CITY OF RICHLAND, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to the city of Richland, Washington, is the property in the city that is subject to the Municipal Sublease Agreement entered into on April 6, 1989, between Benton County, Washington, and the cities of Kennewick and Richland, Washington.

(5) CITY OF PASCO, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to the city of Pasco, Washington, is—

(A) the property in the city of Pasco, Washington, that is leased under Army Lease No. DACW-68-1-77-10; and

(B) all levees in the city, as of the date of enactment of this Act, and the property on which the levees are situated.

(6) PORT OF PASCO, WASHINGTON.—The property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to the Port of Pasco, Washington, is—

(A) the property owned by the United States that is south of the Burlington Northern Railroad tracks in Lots 1 and 2, Section 20, Township 9 North, Range 31 East, W.M.; and

(B) the property owned by the United States that is south of the Burlington Northern Railroad tracks in Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in each of Sections 21, 22, and 23, Township 9 North, Range 31 East, W.M.

(7) ADDITIONAL PROPERTIES.—In addition to properties described in paragraphs (1) through (6), the Secretary may convey to a local government referred to in any of paragraphs (1) through (6) such properties under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the Tri-Cities area as the Secretary and the local government agree are appropriate for conveyance.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The conveyances under subsection (a) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY.—The property described in subsection (b)(2)(F) shall be conveyed only after Franklin County, Washington, enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that provides that the United States shall continue to operate and maintain the flood control drainage areas and pump stations on the property conveyed and that the United States shall be provided all easements and rights necessary to carry out the agreement.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR CITY OF PASCO.—The property described in subsection (b)(5)(B) shall be conveyed only after the city of Pasco, Washington, enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that provides that the United States shall continue to operate and maintain the flood control drainage areas and pump stations on the property conveyed and that the United States shall be provided all easements and rights necessary to carry out the agreement.

(4) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—A local government to which property is conveyed under this section shall pay all administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

(B) PARK AND RECREATION PROPERTIES.—Properties to be conveyed under this section that will be retained in public ownership and used for public park and recreation purposes shall be conveyed without consideration. If any such property is no longer used for public park and recreation purposes, title to the property shall revert to the United States.

(C) OTHER PROPERTIES.—Properties to be conveyed under this section and not described in subparagraph (B) shall be conveyed at fair market value.

(d) LAKE WALLULA LEVEES.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF MINIMUM SAFE HEIGHT.—

(A) CONTRACT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall contract with a private entity agreed to under subparagraph (B) to determine, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the minimum safe height for the levees of the project for flood control, Lake Wallula, Washington. The Secretary shall have final approval of the minimum safe height.

(B) AGREEMENT OF LOCAL OFFICIALS.—A contract shall be entered into under subparagraph (A) only with a private entity agreed to by the Secretary, appropriate representatives of Franklin County, Washington, and appropriate representatives of the city of Pasco, Washington.

(2) AUTHORITY.—A local government may reduce, at its cost, the height of any levee of the project for flood control, Lake Wallula, Washington, within the boundaries of the area under the jurisdiction of the local government to a height not lower than the minimum safe height determined under paragraph (1).

SEC. 345. DESIGNATION OF LOCKS AND DAMS ON TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following locks, and locks and dams, on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, located in the States of Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee, are designated as follows:

(1) Gainesville Lock and Dam at Mile 266 designated as Howell Heflin Lock and Dam.

(2) Columbus Lock and Dam at Mile 335 designated as John C. Stennis Lock and Dam.

(3) The lock and dam at Mile 358 designated as Aberdeen Lock and Dam.

(4) Lock A at Mile 371 designated as Amory Lock.

(5) Lock B at Mile 376 designated as Glover Wilkins Lock.

(6) Lock C at Mile 391 designated as Fulton Lock.

(7) Lock D at Mile 398 designated as John Rankin Lock.

(8) Lock E at Mile 407 designated as G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery Lock.

(9) Bay Springs Lock and Dam at Mile 412 designated as Jamie Whitten Lock and Dam.

(b) LEGAL REFERENCES.—A reference in any law, regulation, document, map, record, or other paper of the United States to a lock, or lock and dam, referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the designation for the lock, or lock and dam, provided in the subsection.

SEC. 346. DESIGNATION OF J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the Red River, Louisiana, from new river mile 0 to new river mile 235 shall be known and designated as the "J. Bennett Johnston Waterway".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, map, record, or other paper of the United States to the portion of the Red River described in subsection

(a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J. Bennett Johnston Waterway".

SEC. 347. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND RECREATION PROJECTS.—Section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2325(b)) is amended by striking "(8662)" and inserting "(8862)".

(b) CHALLENGE COST-SHARING PROGRAM.—The second sentence of section 225(c) of the Act (33 U.S.C. 2328(c)) is amended by striking "(8662)" and inserting "(8862)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 640 and insert the text of H.R. 3592, as passed the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3592) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3592 and S. 640, the bills just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

OSCAR GARCIA RIVERA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 885) to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, NY, as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 885

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the legislation before us, H.R. 885,

was approved unanimously by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This legislation, designating the U.S. Post Office Building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, NY as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building," was introduced by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. SERRANO], and was cosponsored by his full State delegation, as required by committee policy.

H.R. 885 honors the first Puerto Rican to be elected to public office in the continental United States. Oscar Garcia Rivera was born in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico on November 6, 1900. He came to the mainland after graduating from high school and worked part time in a Brooklyn factory. He pursued his studies while working and was assigned to the post office in City Hall. He was instrumental in organizing and establishing the Association of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Employees within the post office department. Mr. Garcia Rivera received his law degree from St. John's University, New York in 1930 and was elected assemblyman in the State of New York in March 1937 by the 14th District, which then included Harlem. He was reelected the following year and served until 1940. Soon thereafter, Mr. Garcia Rivera returned to Mayaguez where he continued to be known for his commitment to protecting the rights of manual laborers and remained a role model and a community leader. He dies in his hometown in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 885 and urge our colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, rather than reiterate the points that my colleague from New York has already made, let me just say that I rise in support of H.R. 885, which designates the U.S. post office in New York City as the Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office.

This measure was introduced, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] said, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and supported by the whole New York congressional delegation pursuant to the committee rules.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this tribute to a pioneer whose work marked the beginning of Puerto Rican leadership in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, with passage of this bill, we not only pay tribute to a great American but we recognize in a small way the great culture and tradition of the Puerto Rican people.

This bill is the first step in the process of renaming the Hellgate Post Office in my congressional district in East Harlem after Oscar Garcia Rivera, the first Puerto Rican elected to public office on the mainland of the United States.

Born in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, Mr. Rivera personified all the virtues of hard work, dedication, and commitment to the service of his country that Americans hold dear. After migrating to New York City, he worked in a factory in Brooklyn while studying at night at my own alma mater, St. John's Law School.

Like so many minorities of his generation and still today, he found work in the post office, where he later helped establish the Association of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Employees of the U.S. Postal Service.

In 1937, he made history by becoming the first Puerto Rican elected to public office in the continental United States. His election to represent what was then the 14th State assembly district was unprecedented. His decision to run was courageous as well in a city in which, in those days, Puerto Ricans were a distinct minority and a Puerto Rican official of any kind was unheard of.

Though he served only until 1940, Mr. Rivera was a trailblazer for the more than 400 Hispanic Members of Congress, State Representatives, and judges who serve today throughout these United States. Today that representation—like that of African Americans—is under attack. But I am confident that the spirit of leaders such as Oscar Garcia Rivera will ultimately prevail.

During his short time of service in the New York State Assembly, Rivera made lasting contributions, not only to the Puerto Rican community but the labor movement. He defended minimum wage laws, fought for regulated work hours, was a dedicated champion of manual laborers. On the national level—he joined with fellow fighters against Jim Crow and racism by supporting a successful campaign for legislation to outlaw lynching.

Oscar Garcia Rivera holds a special place in the hearts of many of my older constituents in East Harlem. While I doubt that many of our younger contemporaries would recognize his name, this simple monument—a post office on east 110th Street—will give him a permanent place in the history of New York.

Oscar Garcia Rivera was a source of pride for his people back in the 1930's and '40's. The recognition that we offer today is well deserved not only by him but by all Puerto Ricans. In wartime they have fought bravely, and many have died to defend our country. They have made contributions large and small to American culture—in the arts, in music, in politics, and in law.

Oscar Garcia Rivera reminds us that like all Americans, the people of Puerto Rico are not only entitled but have earned respect. Their culture, their language, their communities, their choices of political leadership should be embraced and never challenged.

I wish to congratulate Jose Serrano, my dear friend and colleague from New York who has provided the leadership that has made passage of this bill possible. With his commitment and determination, he clearly walks in the footsteps of Oscar Garcia Rivera.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 885, a bill I introduced with Mr. RANGEL to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, NY, as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building" and to celebrate the 59th anniversary of the first Puerto Rican elected to public office in the continental United States.