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Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development: Overview

This 2020 Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development (2020 Annual Report) is in response to Section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014, as amended (33 U.S. Code § 2282d), which requires that the Secretary of the Army submit an annual report to Congress that identifies potential future water resources development studies and projects. The Annual Report is compiled based on signed Chief’s Reports recommending a water resources project for congressional authorization as well as non-Federally proposed feasibility studies and non-Federally proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects or studies.

Section 7001 requires a notice to be published in the Federal Register requesting proposals for proposed feasibility studies and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies to be submitted by non-Federal interests. Section 7001 stipulates that the Annual Report should only include those feasibility reports, proposed feasibility studies, and proposed modifications to authorized water resources development projects and feasibility studies that –

(i) are related to the missions and authorities of the Corps of Engineers;
(ii) require specific congressional authorization, including by an Act of Congress;
(iii) have not been congressionally authorized;
(iv) have not been included in any previous annual report;
(v) if authorized, could be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

On April 29, 2019, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) published the annual Federal Register notice for proposals from non-Federal interests. The deadline for submitting proposals was August 27, 2019 (120 days). The Federal Register notice for proposals was published on the Corps Headquarters website, with information distributed to all Corps Civil Works districts and divisions. The Corps hosted two public information sessions about the proposal process on July 16 and August 14, with each session’s information posted to the Corps Headquarters website.

This year, 52 proposals were received. All submitted proposals were evaluated against the five criteria in Section 7001 and are presented in one of two tables in the 2020 Annual Report. The first table, included in the main report, contains 21 non-Federal proposals that meet the five criteria and 15 signed Chief’s Reports recommending authorization of a water resources development project. The second table, included as an appendix, contains 29 non-Federal proposals that did not meet the five criteria with an explanation of which specific criteria were not met. Two of the non-Federal proposals received were also the subject of signed Chief’s Reports and therefore were not duplicated in the report tables. These included Adams and Denver Counties, Colorado and City of Norfolk, Virginia.

Of the 52 non-Federal proposals submitted for the 2020 Annual Report, 16 were proposals for new feasibility study authorization, 8 were proposals for a modification to existing study authority, 9 were proposals for new project authority, and 7 were for modifications to existing...
projects. In addition, 6 proposals were for modifications to environmental infrastructure program authorities and 6 proposals were for modifications to environmental infrastructure project authorities. All 52 proposals provided by non-Federal interests for the 2020 Annual Report are available on the Corps Headquarters website at http://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Project-Planning/Legislative-Links/wrrda2014/wrrda2014_proposals/.

The primary reason proposals are included in the Appendix is that authority already exists to perform the requested work. It is important to note that where authority already exists to undertake the efforts described in the proposals, inclusion in the Appendix to the 2020 Annual Report does not preclude the Army from carrying out either the study or construction.

There were no Non-Federal feasibility reports submitted for review to the Secretary of the Army under Section 203 of WRDA 1986, as amended (33 U.S.C. 2231).

As mandated by WRRDA 2014, the required reporting for sections 1046, 3017 and 4011 of WRRDA 2014 have also been included at the end of this report.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) certifies that, based on the information received from the non-Federal interests, each proposed feasibility study and proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project or feasibility study included in this main report meets the criteria established in Section 7001 of WRRDA 2014, as amended. The information contained in proposals provided by non-Federal interests has not been revised or developed by the Army and the proposals are not endorsed by the Army. This report is in response to the requirements of Section 7001 only and does not reflect program, policy, or budgeting priorities.

**Evaluation Criteria and Methodology**

In order to provide more transparency to non-Federal interests, the Federal Register notice and Corps Headquarters website details the process under which proposals would be evaluated against the criteria in developing the Annual Report.

How proposals were evaluated under each criteria is described below.

**Criteria 1. Related to the missions and authorities of the Corps**

Proposals are considered related to the missions and authorities of the Corps when they involve a proposed or existing Corps water resources project whose primary purpose is flood and storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, or aquatic ecosystem restoration. Proposals for related purposes, such as for recreation, hydropower, or water supply, may be eligible for inclusion if undertaken in conjunction with a project or effort involving one or more of those primary purposes.

Despite not being primarily a flood and storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, or aquatic ecosystem proposal, certain environmental infrastructure proposals (i.e., proposed
modifications for an environmental infrastructure program) may be included in the main report per Section 1157 (b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 that amends Section 7001 of WRRDA 2014.

Criteria 2. Require specific congressional authorization, including by an Act of Congress

Proposals seeking construction authorization for a water resources development project or modification to existing construction authorization require congressional authorization if the proposal is:

- The recommendation of a signed Chief’s Report;
- The recommendation of a non-Federal feasibility report submitted for review to the Secretary of the Army under Section 203 of WRDA 1986, as amended, under Administration review;
- The recommendation (tentatively selected plan) of an ongoing feasibility study that is expected to result in a Chief’s Report;
- A proposed modification to an environmental infrastructure project that was authorized prior to the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (December 16, 2016);
- A proposed modification to an environmental infrastructure program authority; or
- A proposed modification to an authorized water resources development project.

Proposals seeking study authorization or modification to study authorization require specific congressional authorization if the proposed study is:

- A new feasibility study without existing study authority; or
- A proposed modification to study authority that would require congressional modification of the existing study authority.

The following types of proposals are not considered eligible to be included in the Annual Report because they do not require specific congressional authorization, although they will be included in the appendix for transparency:

- Proposals for modifications to non-Federal projects where the Corps has provided previous technical assistance. Authorization to provide technical assistance does not provide authorization of a water resources development project.
- Proposals for construction of a new water resources development project that is not the subject of either a currently authorized Corps project or a completed or ongoing feasibility study.
- Proposals that do not include a request for a potential future water resources development project through completed feasibility reports, proposed feasibility studies, and proposed modifications to authorized projects or studies.

Criteria 3. Have not been congressionally authorized

A proposal is considered to have not been congressionally authorized if all the specific
elements contained in the proposal were not included in any previous authorization.

Criteria 4. Have not been included in the report table of any previous Annual Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development

Proposals included in the main report table in any previous Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development are not eligible to be included in the main report table in this report; they will be included in the appendix for transparency. Proposals previously included in the appendix of a previous report may be resubmitted for consideration for inclusion in subsequent reports.

Criteria 5. If authorized, could be carried out by the Corps

Unless some institutional impediment exists (e.g., state law), proposals meeting the other criteria are generally considered to be implementable by the Corps if authorized by Congress. As discussed below, additional steps are required before the Corps can begin implementation of any water resources development project.

Requirements for Project Implementation

The Federal Register notice identified specific requirements that all authorized water resources development projects must generally meet before the Corps can proceed to construction, whether the project is authorized following the Corps’ traditional Chief’s Report process or authorized with reference to the project’s inclusion in the Annual Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development.

Before the Corps can proceed to construct an authorized project: (1) the project must be authorized for construction by Congress; (2) the Secretary, or other appropriate official, has approved a current decision document with the Administration’s position on the project (this may occur prior to or subsequent to authorization), and, if appropriate, has transmitted that decision document to Congress; and (3) funds for construction have been appropriated for the project.

The Secretary’s approval of a current decision document is the basis for Administration support for budgeting decisions for projects. Current decision documents provide updated information on the scope of the potential project and demonstrate a clear Federal interest, including an assessment of whether the proposal is:

- Technically sound, economically viable and environmentally acceptable.
- Compliant with environmental and other laws including, but not limited to, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act.
- Compliant with statutes related to water resources development including, but not limited to, the various water resources provisions pertaining to the authorized cost of projects, level of detail, separable elements, fish and wildlife mitigation, project justification, matters to be addressed in planning, and the 1958 Water Supply Act.
Under the traditional authorization process, the Chief’s Report serves as the current decision document that is transmitted to Congress prior to authorization. Projects, or modifications to projects, authorized based on a proposal submitted under Section 7001 that do not have a completed and transmitted Corps decision document lack a basis for Administration support for implementation. Clearly identifying these requirements for implementation within the Annual Report to Congress (main report table) allows for a more transparent process should any of the non-Federal project, or project modification, proposals become authorized based on this Annual Report.

The Federal Register notice also noted two other important considerations for non-Federal sponsors preparing proposals. First, if Congressional authorization of a new feasibility study results from inclusion in this report, it is anticipated that such authorization would be for the study only and not for construction. Second, a Post Authorization Change Report (PACR) is required to be completed to support potential project modifications, updates to project costs, and increases to the maximum cost of a project established by section 902 of WRDA 1986, as amended (902 limit). Although PACRs may not include feasibility analysis, because these PACRs support project modifications they may be considered for inclusion in the report if the recommendations require authorization.

2020 Main Report Table:
- Signed Chief’s Reports
- Proposals from Non-Federal Interests meeting the criteria of WRRDA 7001

2020 Appendix Table:
- Proposals from Non-Federal Interests not meeting the criteria of WRRDA 7001
Section 1046 of WRRDA 2014

Reporting Requirement to be Included in Annual Report to Congress on Future Water Resources

Section 1046(d) of WRRDA 2014 amends the Water Supply Act of 1958, 43 U.S.C. 390b, to provide that, until January 1, 2016, the Secretary may accept from a State or local interest (the user) a plan for the conversion of future-use storage to present use within a 10-year timeframe. If the Secretary determines that a plan meets the requirements of Section 1046(d), the Secretary may recommend release of the user's rights to such storage. Subsection (d)(2) of Section 1046 requires that the Secretary to include any recommendation to release future water storage rights in the subsequent annual report developed under Section 7001 of WRRDA 2014. The Secretary does not have any recommendation on this provision at this time.
Section 3017 of WRRDA 2014

Reporting Requirement to be Included in Annual Report to Congress on Future Water Resources

Section 3017 of WRRDA 2014 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out measures on certain federally authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction projects to address consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum. Subsection (d) of Section 3017 provides for the inclusion of the following information in the annual report on future water resources development that the Corps prepares under Section 7001 of WRRDA 2014:

(1) any recommendations relating to the continued need for the authority provided under Section 3017;
(2) a description of the measures carried out under Section 3017;
(3) any lessons learned relating to the measures implemented under Section 3017; and
(4) best practices for carrying out measures to restore hurricane and storm damage reduction projects.

The Secretary does not have any recommendation on this provision at this time.
Section 4011 of WRRDA 2014

Reporting Requirement to be Included in Annual Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development

Section 4011 of WRRDA 2014 ("Louisiana Coastal Area") requires the Secretary to review the plan entitled “Louisiana’s Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast” prepared by the State of Louisiana and accepted by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board (CPRAB), including any subsequent amendments or revisions. Subsection (b)(3) of Section 4011 requires that the Secretary to include the following in the subsequent annual report developed under Section 7001 of WRRDA 2014:

(1) any proposed feasibility study initiated under this authority, and
(2) any feasibility report for a project identified under this authority.

The Secretary does not have any recommendation on this provision at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Report</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Non-federal Interest</th>
<th>Status Notes</th>
<th>Purpose (Summarized from Chief's Report)</th>
<th>Benefits (Summarized from Chief's Report)</th>
<th>Estimated Federal Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Non-Federal Cost</th>
<th>Total Estimated Costs (October 2018 price levels)</th>
<th>Requirements for Implementation (All must be authorized by Congress in law and receive appropriations in law)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska (Dutch) Harbor</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>City of Unalaska, Alaska</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To improve economic efficiencies of commercial navigation in Unalaska Bay for Dutch Harbor.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan is a dredged channel to a depth of -58 feet NWWL, including 14 feet of underwater clearance, providing one-way access for vessels with a draft up to 44 feet with waves up to 5.6 feet over the bar. The channel will be approximately 600 feet in length and 600 feet in width, and is designed to avoid or minimize environmental impacts, increase navigational safety, and improve economic efficiencies into and out of Dutch Harbor via Unalaska Bay.</td>
<td>$22,728,000</td>
<td>$14,269,950</td>
<td>$34,207,950</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba River Fish Passage (Englebright and Dague Pt Dams)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yuba County Water Agency</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To restore ecosystem structure and function in the Yuba River Basin.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan will provide restoration of approximately 179 acres of aquatic and riparian habitat in the Yuba River watershed.</td>
<td>$85,014,326</td>
<td>$35,000,286</td>
<td>$100,014,612</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams and Denver Counties</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Adams and Denver Counties</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review, A proposal was also submitted for the 2020 Annual Report.</td>
<td>To restore ecosystem function and reduce flood risk within Adams and Denver Counties.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan includes a nonstructural flood damage reduction plan for the Harvard Gulch watershed that would reduce the risk of flood damages in 176 structures throughout the community; improvements to approximately 2.75 miles of the Wair Gulk for flood damage reduction, including acquisition of 30 properties and recreational features; and habitat improvements along 6.5 miles of the South Platte River through downtown Denver, with additional recreation features.</td>
<td>$334,412,000</td>
<td>$200,406,000</td>
<td>$534,818,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande, Sandia Pueblos to Isleta Pueblos</td>
<td>CO, NM, TX</td>
<td>Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To restore ecosystem structure and function in the Middle Rio Grande in the vicinity of Albuquerque, New Mexico.</td>
<td>The recommended plan will provide restoration of approximately 261 acres of riparian forest habitat including measures to improve hydrologic connectivity between the Rio Grande and its floodplain by constructing high-flow channels, bank destabilization, bern removal, severe walls and embankments. It will also restore native habitat diversity through re-creation of historic habitat types lost to water management activity, creating new successional stages of existing habitat, exotic species reduction, and re-vegetation with native plant species.</td>
<td>$9,183,000</td>
<td>$8,703,000</td>
<td>$18,886,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware River Dredged Material Utilization, DE</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To provide coastal storm risk management along the Delaware Estuary coastline.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan includes constructing dunes and/or berms at seven locations along approximately 29 linear miles using dredged materials from two federal navigation projects.</td>
<td>$169,610,000</td>
<td>$162,320,000</td>
<td>$331,930,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study - Brandon Road, Will County, IL</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>State of Illinois (Department of Natural Resources)</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To provide ecosystem protection for controlling upstream transfer of aquatic nuisance species from the Mississippi River into the Great Lakes Basin through the Brandon Road Lock and Dam.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan includes structural and nonstructural options and technologies for the Brandon Lock and Dam site to prevent the upstream transfer of aquatic nuisance species from the Mississippi River into the Great Lakes Basin of aquatic pathways, while minimizing impacts on existing waterways and uses. For GLMRIS, GAAC has defined the term “prevent” to mean the reduction of risk to the maximum extent possible, because it may not be technologically feasible to achieve an absolute solution.</td>
<td>$501,148,000</td>
<td>$332,158,000</td>
<td>$833,306,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Louis Mississippi Riverfront</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Missouri Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To restore aquatic and riparian ecosystem structure and function in the Meramec River Basin.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan includes the restoration of approximately 1,600 acres of aquatic and riparian habitat in the Meramec River Basin. The plan consists of measures in and along the Big River that would reduce the excess mining derived sediment, reestablish riparian areas, and restore the channel to mimic a more natural and stable river. The plan would improve the habitat to potentially assist in the long term survival of several endangered freshwater mussels.</td>
<td>$80,124,000</td>
<td>$32,375,000</td>
<td>$112,499,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souris River Basin</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Souris River Joint Water Resources Board</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To reduce flood risk to the community in the City of Minot, North Dakota.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan will reduce flood stages on the Souris River in North Minot, North Dakota benefitting over 3,500 structures. This plan is proposed concurrently with a larger non-federal plan for flood risk management, the Souris River Enhanced Flood Protection Project (URREFP), which is being implemented by the Souris River Joint Water Resources Board (SRJRWB).</td>
<td>$89,041,750</td>
<td>$31,253,250</td>
<td>$119,295,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To provide hurricane and storm damage reduction for coastal communities located along the North Shore of Long Island Sound in Southold, New York.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan includes beach restoration with nourishment, the elevation of 15 existing structures and construction of 13 new piers, a composite seawall along the Atlantic Ocean Shorefront Planning Reach, and two separate high frequency flooding risk reduction features (HFRRFs) within the Jamaica Bay Planning Reach. Natural and restored features are included in the Milbrookausing HFRRF designs as an erosion control measure.</td>
<td>$604,303,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$604,303,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashamomuck Cove, NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To provide hurricane and storm damage reduction for coastal communities located along the North Shore of Long Island Sound in Southold, New York.</td>
<td>The Recommended Plan includes beach restoration in Hashamomuck Cove and adjacent east and west coasts. The total length of other proposed project is 1.5 miles. A total beach fill quantity of approximately 230,000 cubic yards (cy) is projected for the initial placement, including tolerance and overfill with 9 estimated renourishments over the 50 year period of analyses of approximately 78,300 cy per renourishment.</td>
<td>$35,030,500</td>
<td>$29,699,500</td>
<td>$64,730,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Report</td>
<td>State(s)</td>
<td>Non-federal Interest</td>
<td>Status Notes</td>
<td>Purpose (Summarized from Chief's Report)</td>
<td>Benefits (Summarized from Chief's Report)</td>
<td>Estimated Federal Cost</td>
<td>Estimated Non-Federal Cost</td>
<td>Total Estimated Costs (October 2019 price levels)</td>
<td>Requirements for Implementation (All must be authorized by Congress in law and receive appropriations in law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette River Basin Review</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To reallocate conservation storage in the Corps Willamette Valley Project reservoirs to meet municipal &amp; industrial, fish &amp; wildlife, and agricultural/irrigation water supply needs.</td>
<td>Estimated Federal Cost: $0 Estimated Non-Federal Cost: $0 Total Estimated Costs: $0 <strong>(October 2019 price levels)</strong></td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Intracoastal Waterway - Brazos River Flood Gates and Colorado River Locks</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To improve economic efficiencies of commercial navigation in the Brazos and Colorado Rivers region. At Brazos River, the Recommended Plan includes the removal of the existing gate on both sides of the river crossing, the construction of a 125-foot wide open channel on the west side and a new 125-foot wide sector gate on the east side. At Colorado River, the recommended plan includes the construction of new 125-foot sector gate structures on the east and west sides of the river crossing.</td>
<td>Estimated Federal Cost: $409,777,000 Estimated Non-Federal Cost: $0 Total Estimated Costs: $409,777,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County Shore Protection</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Jefferson County, TX and Sabine-Neches Navigation District</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To restore environmental resources on and behind the beach, in the area between Sabine Pass and the entrance to Galveston Bay. The Recommended Plan includes construction of 5,375 linear feet of armoring along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and restoration of 6,046 acres of braided marsh habitat utilizing dredged material from the federally authorized Sabine Neches Waterway navigation channel. The project will restore marsh and GINW shoreline features that stabilize and sustain critical marsh resources.</td>
<td>Estimated Federal Cost: $37,615,000 Estimated Non-Federal Cost: $20,254,000 Total Estimated Costs: $57,869,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matagorda Ship Channel</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Calhoun Port Authority, Calhoun County, TX</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review</td>
<td>To improve economic efficiencies of commercial navigation on the Matagorda Ship Channel. The Recommended Plan includes construction of a new 1,200-foot turning basin, as well as extending, deepening, and widening the entrance channel by 13,000 feet, 98 feet, and 55 feet, respectively. It will also deepen and widen the main channel by 47 feet and 100 feet, respectively, and dredge a 1,600-foot long sediment trap in the area of the offshore bar.</td>
<td>Estimated Federal Cost: $138,661,000 Estimated Non-Federal Cost: $79,664,000 Total Estimated Costs: $218,324,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>City of Norfolk, Virginia</td>
<td>Signed Chief's Report in Review. A proposal was also submitted for the 2020 Annual Report</td>
<td>To provide Coastal Storm Risk Management for the city of Norfolk, Virginia. The Recommended Plan will reduce the risk of flooding to the residential and transportation infrastructure of the city by including the construction of four surge barriers with associated pump stations and floodwalls, non-structural features to include acquisitions, raisings, floodproofing, and basement fills; and natural and nature-based features comprised of living shoreline and oyster reef.</td>
<td>Estimated Federal Cost: $996,040,000 Estimated Non-Federal Cost: $489,480,000 Total Estimated Costs: $1,385,520,000</td>
<td>To complete the feasibility study process, the Secretary will transmit the Chief's Report and accompanying documents, including the administration's position on the project, to Congress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of Proposal | State(s) | New Federal Interest | All proposals included in the Main Report demonstrated, to the extent practicable, local support and the financial ability to provide the new federal costs or shares | Proposal Type | Name of Proposal (Main Report) | Benefit (Proposed from Proposal) | Estimated Federal Cost* | Estimated Non-Federal Cost* | Total Estimated Cost* | Requirements for Implementation (Note: All proposals must be evaluated using WRDA language and the USACE’s appropriations in law)

**Visions Environmental Infrastructure**
- City of Buckeye, AZ
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The proposal would amend the Section 595 Environmental Infrastructure Program to allow for the state of Arizona to enter into agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct the Buckeye Irrigation Drainage System (BIDS), which would provide flood protection to an estimated 400,000 acres of farmland. The project would reduce peak flows into the Buckeye Drainage District, improving water quality and reducing the risk of flooding.

- Oklahoma City, OK
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Oklahoma City to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Las Vegas, NV
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would amend the Section 595 Environmental Infrastructure Program to allow the City of Las Vegas to enter into an agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct a flood control project in the Las Vegas Valley. The project would reduce the risk of flooding in the area and improve water quality.

- North Las Vegas, NV
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of North Las Vegas to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- El Paso, TX
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would amend the Section 595 Environmental Infrastructure Program to allow the City of El Paso to enter into an agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct a flood control project in the El Paso area. The project would reduce the risk of flooding in the area and improve water quality.

- Mount Vernon, IL
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Mount Vernon to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Santa Barbara, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would amend the Section 595 Environmental Infrastructure Program to allow the City of Santa Barbara to enter into an agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct a flood control project in the Santa Barbara area. The project would reduce the risk of flooding in the area and improve water quality.

- Redding, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Redding to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Central Valley, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the Central Valley, CA, to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Sacramento, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Sacramento to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- San Diego, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of San Diego to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Fresno, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Fresno to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Los Angeles, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Los Angeles to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- San Francisco, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of San Francisco to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- San Jose, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of San Jose to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Redding, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Redding to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- Stockton, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of Stockton to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.

- San Diego, CA
  - Modifications to an Existing Federal Infrastructure Program Authority
  - The project would modify an existing federal program authority for the City of San Diego to allow the city to reduce its funding requirements by $10 million. The modification would provide the city with greater flexibility in contract negotiations and allow for the city to retain control over the decision-making process.
To obtain Administration support for implementation, the Secretary, or other appropriate official, must approve a current decision document on the project, and, if appropriate, transmit the decision document and/or the Administration's position to Congress.

**Sections 208(5) and 219, Mississippi Infrastructure Information Program**

The proposal requests to increase the spending cap for the Mississippi Infrastructure Information Program (§ 208(5) and § 219). As amended, it is $200 million and $300 million. This proposal seeks to expand the authorized projects to include stormwater data and information and coastal and floodplain maps, and improve the existing stormwater models to produce flood estimates for Mississippi counties.

**Sections 571 and 572, Mid-Columbia River Turning Basins Water Quality Authority in the Columbia River Basin**

The project is approved, the project is receiving federal funds, and the project is receiving state funding. During extreme weather events, the area is often subject to flooding of roadways and rail/road crossings. Improvements to floodplain systems within the county could reduce flood risks due to the proposed solution.

**Modification to an existing USACE Environmental Infrastructure Program Authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

The project was approved, the project is receiving federal funds, and the project is receiving state funding. The project will improve property values, restore the ecological and historical significance of the wetland, and contribute to sustaining the economic value of the wetlands.

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE Environmental Infrastructure Program Authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

The project was approved, the project is receiving federal funds, and the project is receiving state funding. The project will improve property values, restore the ecological and historical significance of the wetland, and contribute to sustaining the economic value of the wetlands.

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE Environmental Infrastructure Program Authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

The project was approved, the project is receiving federal funds, and the project is receiving state funding. The project will improve property values, restore the ecological and historical significance of the wetland, and contribute to sustaining the economic value of the wetlands.

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

**Modification to an existing USACE project authority**

The project was approved, the project is receiving federal funds, and the project is receiving state funding. The project will improve property values, restore the ecological and historical significance of the wetland, and contribute to sustaining the economic value of the wetlands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Proposal</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Proposal Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Estimated Federal Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Non-Federal Cost</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost*</th>
<th>Requirements for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure Program - Section 340 - Authority Modification</td>
<td>WV West Virginia Region 2 Planning &amp; Development Council</td>
<td>Modifications to an existing USACE Environmental Infrastructure Program authority</td>
<td>The authorized ceiling of the Section 340 Program is limited to $40 million. While Section 340 has assisted 35 projects that provide clean water or sanitary sewer to over 4,200 homes and businesses, WV Infrastructure &amp; Jobs Development Council has identified over $1.1 billion in additional water and wastewater needs within southern WV. Extreme weather events and increasing demand are putting more pressure on existing systems - widening economic development. The current Section 340 funding limits the federal funding available to address infrastructure needs imperative to public health and environmental integrity in the region.</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>$26,666,667</td>
<td>$106,666,667</td>
<td>To obtain Administration support for implementation, the Secretary, or other appropriate official, must approve a current decision document, including obtaining the Administration's position on the project, and, if appropriate, transmit the decision document and/or the Administration's position to Congress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As identified by non-federal interests in their proposals
### 2020 Appendix Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Proposal or Report</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Non-Federal Interest</th>
<th>Proposal Type</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Proposed Cost (Directly)</th>
<th>Unmet Section 7001 Criteria / Reason in Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slides on the levee</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>White River Levee District</td>
<td>New feasibility study</td>
<td>The project seeks to add water supply as a project purpose to the Oauchita Black Navigation Project.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Creek Settling Basin feasibility study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>State of California Central Valley Flood Protection Authority</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The proposal seeks to add water supply as a project purpose to the Oauchita Black Navigation Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pico-Rivera Community Impact Study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>City of Pico Rivera</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The city is requesting $23 million to conduct its own study of impacts of the Whittier Narrows Dam Safety Modification to its recreation facilities on lands it leases from USACE at Whittier Narrows basin for recreation which would have a primary purpose of flood risk management. The study would document recreation impacts and find locations for replacement of $23 million.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cache Feasibility Study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>State of California Central Valley Flood Protection Authority</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The proposal requests additional appropriations so that USACE can complete the feasibility study, which is ongoing</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Feasibility Study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>State of California Central Valley Flood Protection Authority</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The proposal requests a General Reevaluation Report of the Merced rivers systems due to previous authorizations resulting in projects that the local sponsor says do not provide adequate flood protection.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Calf Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Flood Control District</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The proposal seeks to improve water resource management at Mojave Dam, through the development of a multi-purpose Master Plan that better integrates with and achieves import water. It will also allow storm water capture. A project could produce up to 1900 acre-feet of water.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor Deep-Draft Channel Feasibility Improvement Feasibility Study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Port of Oakland, CA</td>
<td>New feasibility study</td>
<td>The purpose of the project is to investigate opportunities to improve water resource management at the Oakland Deep-Draft Channel, which is a constructed facility specifically designed to meet the potential floods in the center of the Emeryville area.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor Deep-Draft Channel Turning Basin Improvement Feasibility Study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Port of Oakland, CA</td>
<td>New feasibility study</td>
<td>The purpose of the project is to evaluate modifications of the existing federal navigation project (Oakland Deep-Draft Channel) which was constructed specifically to divert flood flows from potential flood hazards.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Project</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Port of Stockton, CA and Contra Costa County</td>
<td>New feasibility study</td>
<td>The proposal is to conduct a feasibility study for a multi-purpose navigation and ecosystem restoration project to improve deep-draft navigation within the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel (San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Project), which the local sponsor says would successively increase new economic benefits due to reduced shipping costs and increased economic benefits.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Slip System Integrated Comprehensive Study</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency</td>
<td>Approval of a large-scale project is requested to better understand the complexity of the Yolo Bypass. An objective of the new study is the development of a Master Plan for multi-purpose management of the flood control system.</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 1 and 2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Information by non-federal interests was not verified, revised or developed by USACE, Army, or OMB.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Proposal or Report</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Non-federal Interest</th>
<th>Proposal Type</th>
<th>Purpose (Summarized from Proposal)</th>
<th>Benefits (Summarized from Proposal)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Costs from Proposal</th>
<th>(Directly) Unmet Section 7001 Criteria / Reason in Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Okeechobee Everglades Ecosystem Protection</td>
<td>FL, Okeechobee Utility Authority</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE Environmental Infrastructure Program authority</td>
<td>Proposed amendment to Section 219 of HRRDA 1992, Public Law 102-580, as amended by Section 518 of WRDA 2007, P.L. 110-114 to include the Okeechobee Utility Authority, which would allow them to pursue a project with USACE to replace spillway systems, drain fields, and small wastewater treatment plants for the purpose of improving environmental and aquatic ecosystems.</td>
<td>The project does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1).</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>The proposal does not meet the requirements of 7001(a), it is not a feasibility report, a proposed feasibility study, a modification to an authorized project, or a programmatic modification to an environmental infrastructure assistance program. Additionally, the proposal does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1). The proposal does not meet the requirements of Sections 7001(a) and 7001(e)(1) because it is not a proposed modification to an authorized project under an environmental infrastructure assistance program, but instead is a proposal for authority for a new environmental infrastructure project. The proposal is for environmental infrastructure in Okeechobee County, for the Okeechobee Utility Authority. The proposal work has no physical continuity with the authorized project, it is in a County that is not contiguous with South Seminole and North Orange Counties, and is for a different non-federal entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Priority USACE Safety Net Villages at Chattahoochee</td>
<td>FL, GA, City of Chattahoochee, FL</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The proposal is to modify an existing USACE campground by adding additional recreational vehicle sites for use by storm evacuees, disaster victims, veterans, and economically displaced individuals.</td>
<td>The proposal indicates that economical refuge shelters from storms could provide Life Safety benefits. The proposal does not quantify any benefits.</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>Proposed does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttle Creek Lake Sediment Management and Reservoir Sustainability Feasibility Study</td>
<td>KS, Kansas Water Office</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The primary issue this study will investigate is long-term sediment management at Tuttle Creek Lake, to evaluate alternatives and to create a recommended plan that supports the sustainability of meeting the authorized purposes of flood management, water supply, and navigation of Tuttle Creek Lake. A combination of sediment management technologies will be investigated. The investigation is important as current estimates indicate that since dam closure 122,047 acre-feet of storage for flood control and 209,047 acre-feet of storage for navigation, water supply, and other uses have been displaced by sediment accumulation. Sustaining the ability of Tuttle Creek Lake to provide project benefits into the future is crucial, as there is no feasible way to replace these benefits.</td>
<td>The project will provide benefits to flood risk, navigation, water supply, and ecosystem preservation and restoration by recommending a long-term sustainable plan for sediment management. The study will recommend a plan to provide improved NED benefits to the State and communities benefiting from the reservoir.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttle Creek Lake Water Injection Dredging (WID) Demonstration Project</td>
<td>KS, Kansas Water Office</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>To implement a WID field demonstration at Tuttle Creek Lake to promote sustainable long-term reservoir sediment management. Early estimates indicate that by 2050, the multi-purpose project will be 39% full of sediment and the flood control pool will be reduced to 76% of its original capacity. The purpose of the proposal is to construct a Water Injection Dredge prototype to demonstrate the use of the WID and monitor and evaluate both the operational and environmental results.</td>
<td>Anticipated benefits include: Continued prevention of flood damages; increased storage capacity and available water supplies; reduced costs of dredging and dredged material placement that would be required; improving public safety by increasing and sustaining water supply storage in Tuttle Creek Lake; Sustaining reservoir storage for navigation releases; Protecting, restoring, and creating aquatic ecosystem habitats through downstream releases during drought conditions; and promoting recreation through increased water depth in Tuttle Creek Lake resulting from the dredging to improve lake-based recreation.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River 2019 Flood – Review of 2019 Operations in Louisiana and Considerations for Future Management</td>
<td>LA, MS, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The feasibility study will consider future operations and potential construction features for the purpose of flood risk management within the Mississippi River and Tributaries Program. The study would include a review of the current operational regime including Bonnet Carre, Old River Control Complex, and the Mississippi Floodway.</td>
<td>Benefits derived from changes to the operational regime would have to be evaluated through the study effort. Modification to the operational regime is limited by current authorities. Depending on the outcome of the study, additional congressional authorization may be required.</td>
<td>$1,581,100,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangert Island Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study</td>
<td>MO, City of Saint Charles, Missouri</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The purpose of the proposal is to obtain authorization for an ecosystem restoration project on Bangert Island in Saint Charles, Missouri. Bangert Island was once an island on the Missouri River that was reprogrammed at the 41-street bluff by a side channel. Following construction of the Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project structures, the channel separating Bangert Island from the mainland shied in to the point of closure. An opportunity exists to reestablish a floodable aquatic habitat and flow diversity in the old channel and provide valuable aquatic habitat including wetland, riparian habitat, and deep water habitat for a variety of fish and wildlife species. There is not currently an authority sufficient to formulate a federally funded plan to address the problems.</td>
<td>The project is for ecosystem restoration and will potentially provide for riparian and aquatic habitat benefits due to restorative measures, and also specific areas of wetland restoration associated with riparian areas. There is situation of wetland and deepwater habitat and degradation of habitat due to the effects of the previously constructed USACE navigation structures. Restoration of wetland and deepwater habitat would provide valuable habitat for fish and aquatic wildlife species. The project will also provide ancillary benefits to recreation opportunities, as Bangert Island is operated as a County park with a network of natural trails.</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Modification for Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority New Mexico</td>
<td>NM, Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The proposal modifies existing Congressional authorities at Albuqaur, NCA, (P.L. 97-340 and P.L. 108-522) to allow more flexibility for concurrent storage of San Juan-Chama and Rio Grande water systems. The modification would also change the authorized water supply storage limit within the flood control space from a volume of 200,000 acre-feet of water (182.8 MGD) to increase the currently available space by approximately 50,000 acre-feet, thus increasing the storage space available for existing agreement holders. This modification would also increase the existing storage elevation of re-allocate existing flood space.</td>
<td>The Project Modification has significant nonmonetary benefits to include federal and non-federal water management flexibility, a greater ability to meet Rio Grande Compact obligations, and infrastructure needs for environmental purposes. The project modification would not require expenditure of federal funds. All costs associated with the project modification including for Water Control Manual updates and environmental compliance would be borne by the sponsor.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Proposal does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Proposal or Report</td>
<td>State(s)</td>
<td>Non-federal Interest</td>
<td>Proposal Type</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Costs From Proposal</td>
<td>(Directly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a Berm Around the Town of Westminster Wastewater Treatment Facility</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Town of Westminster, Rhode Island</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The project proposal requests the construction of a berm around the Town of Westminster Wastewater Treatment Facility. The facility is located within the FEMA 100-year flood plain and is within close proximity to the town. The project will reduce flood damages by approximately $5,615 homes and businesses. In addition, the facility has experienced catastrophic damage due to extreme flooding. The river overflowed and flooded the basement and the entire drainage as well as extensive damage to generation and pumping stations. Construction of the berm would protect the facility now, and would also ensure protection of future investments. Most importantly, the berm would also protect water quality for the area, as failure of the facility would result in the release of untreated wastewater.</td>
<td>This critical facility is located within the FEMA 100-year Flood Plain and is within close proximity to the Pawcatuck. If it currently serves approximately 4,615 homes and businesses (approximately 20,000 customers) in Westminster. Construction of a berm would prevent damage to the facility and reduce the risk of environmental damages due to the release of untreated wastewater.</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Hill Pond Restoration Project</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Town of Cumberland, RI</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The purpose of this project is to restore navigational channels that consist of decaying pilings and abandoned barges along the shoreline of the eastward approach to the restored navigational channel. The project seeks to restore the channel while enhancing public access to the shoreline while preserving the navigable areas of the upper Narragansett Bay. The deteriorating wood pilings and decaying barges are not only a safety hazard for the recreational and commercial users of the upper Narragansett Bay but also deterolates from the aesthetics of the harbor. The Upper Bay has been increasingly hazardous to navigate as debris piles deep, affecting water safety.</td>
<td>According to the Town, the project would have the Diamond Hill Pond environment and its inhabitants such as native species, birds, eagles, foxes, freshwater fish, fies, coyotes and other mammals. It will also preserve the rare nesting ducks, frogs, and plants that have a local habitat and importance.</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Point Bold Face Marine District and Abandoned Barge Removal</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>City of East Providence</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The purpose of the proposed project is to address chronic flooding along the Town of North Providence, RI. The Borough is located in the northeastern portion of the Town which originates in the Town itself. This project seeks to reduce flood damages by approximately 10% to 30% of the area affected by flooding.</td>
<td>The project would reduce damages to both residential and commercial property and eliminate disruption to schools, businesses and emergency services.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Bank and Wentworth Street Culvert Improvement Project</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Town of North Providence, Rhode Island</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The purpose of this proposal is to address chronic flooding along the Lincoln-Douglas Bank in the town of North Providence, RI. The Borough is located in the northeastern portion of the Town which originates in the Town itself. This project seeks to reduce flood damages by approximately 10% to 30% of the area affected by flooding.</td>
<td>The project proposal requests the construction of a berm around the Town of Westminster Wastewater Treatment Facility. The facility is located within the FEMA 100-year flood plain and is within close proximity to the town. The project will reduce flood damages by approximately $5,615 homes and businesses. In addition, the facility has experienced catastrophic damage due to extreme flooding. The river overflowed and flooded the basement and the entire drainage as well as extensive damage to generation and pumping stations. Construction of the berm would protect the facility now, and would also ensure protection of future investments. Most importantly, the berm would also protect water quality for the area, as failure of the facility would result in the release of untreated wastewater.</td>
<td>$438,750</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Rio Grande Valley Watershed Assessment</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Cameron County, Texas</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The proposed study would determine problems, needs and opportunities within the watershed by involving study partners, water-related resources, interests, resources agencies and the public. June 2008 brought devastating rainstorms to the area that resulted in floods caused by heavy rainfall. The proposed study would seek to develop a watershed assessment which would include a hydrologic and hydraulic assessment of the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) basin. Flood protection strategies for flood prone areas within the LRGV basin would be developed for potential future feasibility studies.</td>
<td>The project seeks to address the critical need to examine the potential for further reduction in flooding damages in the Lower Rio Grande Valley Watershed.</td>
<td>$506,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Brazos System Management, Phase II: Aquatic Water Supply Reapportionment Study</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Brazos River Authority</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE authority</td>
<td>Reallocation of flood storage to water supply storage at Aquilla Lake could produce additional water supply that could be used to the advantage of customers served by Aquilla Lake. If Aquilla Lake has sufficient supply to meet existing water supplies, contracts however, increased demand due to projected population growth, which is driven by the need for additional water supplies for new industrial development. The proposed study would seek to develop a re-allocation of flood storage to water supply storage at Aquilla Lake to be approximately 5,750,000 to 30,000 acres per year. USACE did not approve a previous request to reallocate 15,073,000 acre feet (AF) from RRM to pool conservation due to permanent loss of flood storage volume and that the 10,073,000 AF would not meet total demand.</td>
<td>The proposed study would develop feasible plans to re-allocate flood storage to water supply storage at Aquilla Lake. This study would examine the potential for additional water supply that could be used to the advantage of customers served by Aquilla Lake. If Aquilla Lake has sufficient supply to meet existing water supplies, contracts however, increased demand due to projected population growth, which is driven by the need for additional water supplies for new industrial development. The proposed study would seek to develop a re-allocation of flood storage to water supply storage at Aquilla Lake to be approximately 5,750,000 to 30,000 acres per year.</td>
<td>$128,400</td>
<td>Proposal does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1). Additionally, the project proposal does not require congressional authorization since authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Creek Basin Flood Risk Management Study</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Lower Neches Valley Authority</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The proposed study is to provide sustainable, long-term flood risk management to protect life and property along the Lower Neches River in Jefferson and Orange Counties. A secondary purpose is to identify potential opportunities to enhance flood risk management along the Lower Neches River. The area of Bridge City, Orange, and Port Arthur were devastated by Hurricane Harvey in 2017. This area is one to one of the largest petrochemical centers in the nation. Flooding and storm damage reduction are staggering major issue that regularly threaten life and damage homes, businesses, health care facilities, streets and bridges along the lower Neches River. The proposed study would determine the problems, needs and opportunities for flood risk management along the Lower Neches River and the impact of climate change on the region.</td>
<td>The selected project seeks to develop feasible plans to re-allocate flood storage to water supply storage at Aquilla Lake. The proposed project requires the construction of a berm around the Town of Westminster Wastewater Treatment Facility. The facility is located within the FEMA 100-year flood plain and is within close proximity to the town. The project will reduce flood damages by approximately $5,615 homes and businesses. In addition, the facility has experienced catastrophic damage due to extreme flooding. The river overflowed and flooded the basement and the entire drainage as well as extensive damage to generation and pumping stations. Construction of the berm would protect the facility now, and would also ensure protection of future investments. Most importantly, the berm would also protect water quality for the area, as failure of the facility would result in the release of untreated wastewater.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Does not require congressional authorization. Authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization Study of Whitney Lake</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Brazos River Authority</td>
<td>New feasibility study authority</td>
<td>The project proposal requests the construction of a berm around the Town of Westminster Wastewater Treatment Facility. The facility is located within the FEMA 100-year flood plain and is within close proximity to the town. The project will reduce flood damages by approximately $5,615 homes and businesses. In addition, the facility has experienced catastrophic damage due to extreme flooding. The river overflowed and flooded the basement and the entire drainage as well as extensive damage to generation and pumping stations. Construction of the berm would protect the facility now, and would also ensure protection of future investments. Most importantly, the berm would also protect water quality for the area, as failure of the facility would result in the release of untreated wastewater.</td>
<td>The project seeks to develop feasible plans to re-allocate flood storage to water supply storage at Aquilla Lake. The proposed project requires the construction of a berm around the Town of Westminster Wastewater Treatment Facility. The facility is located within the FEMA 100-year flood plain and is within close proximity to the town. The project will reduce flood damages by approximately $5,615 homes and businesses. In addition, the facility has experienced catastrophic damage due to extreme flooding. The river overflowed and flooded the basement and the entire drainage as well as extensive damage to generation and pumping stations. Construction of the berm would protect the facility now, and would also ensure protection of future investments. Most importantly, the berm would also protect water quality for the area, as failure of the facility would result in the release of untreated wastewater.</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>Proposal does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1). Additionally, the project proposal does not require congressional authorization since authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising Winter Pool Level and Expanding Hydroelectric Generation Capability at the Sunnyslope Hydroelectric Project on the Guadalupe River in Nicholas County, WV</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Sunnyslope Hydroelectric Project</td>
<td>Modification to an existing USACE project authority</td>
<td>The non-federal interest is proposing that USACE perform a feasibility study to consider raising the winter pool at the Sunnyslope Project to 1,300 feet above mean sea level. The purpose of this project is to enhance hydropower production at the Sunnyslope Project. The berm is to be constructed on the right bank of the Guadalupe River at the mouth of the Sunnyslope Project. The berm would be designed to hold the water back, allowing the USACE to use the water for hydropower production. The proposed study would seek to determine the benefits of raising the winter pool at the Sunnyslope Project.</td>
<td>The proposed project seeks to enhance hydropower production at the Sunnyslope Project by constructing a berm on the right bank of the Guadalupe River. The project would provide additional hydropower generation at the Sunnyslope Project.</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>Proposal does not relate to a primary USACE authority/mission area (Criteria 1). Additionally, the project proposal does not require congressional authorization since authority exists (Criteria 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>