



## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF:

CECW-PD

12 DEC 2001

### MEMORANDUM FOR MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMANDERS

SUBJECT: Implementation of Projects Under Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 92), as Amended

1. AUTHORITY. Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, Environmental Infrastructure, as amended by Section 504 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 and Section 108 of the Departments of Labor, Health And Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001 (hereinafter "section 219") authorizes the Secretary of the Army to provide assistance to non-Federal interests for carrying out water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects including waste water treatment and related facilities and water supply, storage, treatment, and distribution facilities. A copy of section 219, as amended, is at Appendix A.

2. BACKGROUND. Prior to enactment of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2001 (P.L. 106-377), appropriations for Federal assistance under the authority of section 219 have been limited. However, the 2001 appropriation provides funding for ten projects and locations under section 219, as amended. To date, the Administration has not budgeted for section 219 projects. The significant funding for Federal assistance under section 219 in the Fiscal Year 2001 (FY 01) appropriation and the recent amendment of the section 219 authority requires this update of guidance on implementing section 219 assistance. The authority under section 219 is divided into technical and planning and design assistance for certain defined projects and locations with a total nationwide authorization of \$30 million and technical, planning and design, and construction assistance for defined projects and locations with specific amounts authorized for each location. There is no appropriation for technical and planning and design assistance in FY 01. Therefore this guidance is limited to projects authorized for technical, planning and design, and construction assistance. This guidance is limited to congressional authorization adds for FY 01 and subsequent fiscal years. If there is a decision to budget for comprehensive U.S. Army Corps of Engineers participation in planning, engineering, design and construction of environmental infrastructure projects under the authority of section 219, there may be a need for additional guidance.

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDERS, MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMANDS  
AND DISTRICT COMMANDS

SUBJECT: Implementation Guidance for Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Nonstructural Flood Control Projects

1. Purpose. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance for the analysis of nonstructural flood control projects in accordance with Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (WRDA 99). Section 73 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 requires consideration of nonstructural alternatives in flood damage reduction studies.
2. Applicability. All projects proposed after the date of enactment of WRDA 99 are required to use the procedures described in this guidance. This includes projects proposed for congressional authorization as well as Section 205 projects approved after the date of enactment of WRDA 99.
3. Section 219 (a) of WRDA 99 directs that the Corps calculate benefits for nonstructural flood damage reduction using methods similar to those used in calculating the benefits for structural projects, including similar treatment in calculating the benefits from losses avoided. It further states that in carrying out this directive, the Corps should avoid double counting of benefits. Nonstructural projects, such as floodproofing, raising homes and flood warning, already use the same method to calculate flood damage reduction benefits as structural projects and therefore no change is required in analytical procedures for these types of projects. However, Army Corps of Engineers Planning Guidance currently directs the use of only the externalized portion of flood damages prevented in calculating benefits for evacuation projects. For evacuation projects, the current guidance *explicitly* assumes that the internalized portion of flood damages is reflected in reduced market value of the properties used in the calculation of evacuation costs (i.e., the cost of buyout of the floodplain). This internalized portion includes uninsured losses, flood insurance premiums, any deductible and agent's fees. Typically, externalized flood damages are developed by calculating total flood damages using standard depreciated replacement cost techniques as in structural flood control projects. Then the internalized portion of flood damages are subtracted. The subtraction of the internalized portion of flood damages is intended to remove potential double counting from the benefit-cost calculation. The following new procedures will be used to implement section 219 (a):

SUBJECT: Implementation Guidance for Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Nonstructural Flood Control Projects

a. Benefit Calculation. Flood damage reduction benefits for evacuation projects will be calculated as the total flood damages reduced. No correction will be made to remove the internalized portion of flood damages in the benefit calculation.

b. Real Estate Costs. In order to avoid double counting of the internalized portion of flood damages reduced, adjustments need to be made to the real estate costs used in the benefit-cost calculation. Economic analysis for evacuation alternatives will henceforth use comparable flood-free land costs in the valuation of floodplain land. Flood-free land cost is the cost of comparable flood-free land but without the flood-risk (defined as outside the FIA-designated 100-year floodplain). For the purposes of this guidance, land costs are defined as the land and associated structures.

(1) Cost information developed by Real Estate personnel during the feasibility study should be used for this cost calculation. As part of the Real Estate Plan, the cost (market value) to acquire the floodplain property is determined by a gross appraisal. Additionally, for residential properties under Public Law 91-646, the amount by which the market value of a replacement dwelling (non-floodplain property) exceeds the market value of the displacement dwelling (floodplain property) also is determined. This cost (the market value of the floodplain property, land and structures, plus any additional amount to equal the market value of a comparable replacement dwelling outside the floodplain) is the flood-free property cost. A comparable replacement residential property under Public Law 91-646 means a dwelling that is decent, safe, and sanitary and one that is similar with respect to features, size and location. However, for purposes of this calculation, if the floodplain dwellings are not up to decent, safe, and sanitary standards, the incremental cost to upgrade to a decent, safe, and sanitary home is considered a betterment and must be subtracted from the flood-free cost. Also, where last resort housing is anticipated, the market value of a comparable home outside the floodplain should be used, without regard to whether the home is available for acquisition.

(2) Comparable flood-free estimates for non-residential properties are not developed for compliance with Public Law 91-646. However, this information will now be required and can be developed by comparing property characteristics with information available on a multiple listing service or similar service. Coordination and involvement of real estate personnel is essential in determining appropriate non-floodplain land values.

c. The determination of non-floodplain land values will be described and documented in all decision documents where evacuation plans are considered. Note that this adjustment in costs is intended for use in the economic evaluation only and should not otherwise affect the financial costs associated with evacuation of the floodplain.

SUBJECT: Implementation Guidance for Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Nonstructural Flood Control Projects

4. Section 219 (b) provides for the reevaluation of a previously authorized flood control project to consider nonstructural alternatives in light of the economic evaluation changes made by Section 219(a) of the Act if requested by a non-Federal interest. The following procedures will be used to implement section 219 (b).

a. In general, the reevaluation of authorized projects to consider nonstructural procedures shall be performed in a matter consistent with review of a completed project or restudy of a deferred project as described in the annual program EC. In all cases an initial appraisal and a reevaluation study at 50-50 cost sharing will be required. If the project has already been constructed, reevaluation will follow the procedures for "Review of a Completed Project" (Section 216) as described in the annual program EC. If the project is authorized but not yet constructed, an initial appraisal to determine whether the nonstructural alternative is justified is required. If the nonstructural alternative is justified, a cost-shared general reevaluation study would follow. Request for funding for such studies should follow normal budgetary procedures for a General Investigations new start.

b. Non-Federal interests must submit a written request for a reevaluation study to consider nonstructural alternatives through the District and Major Subordinate command (MSC). Districts will forward an assessment of the costs for the reevaluation along with the written request through MSC to HQUSACE (attn: CECW-B). Federal funds associated with the reevaluation will be subject to availability.

5. Section 219 (c) modifies Section 103(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to clarify cost sharing for nonstructural measures. The section requires that at any time during construction of a nonstructural project, if the Corps determines that the costs of land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations (LERRDs) for the project, in combination with other project costs contributed by the non-Federal sponsor, will exceed 35 percent, any additional costs for the project (not to exceed 65 percent of the total costs of the project) shall be a Federal responsibility and shall be contributed during construction as part of the Federal share. The purpose of this provision is to make clear that the Government should not wait until the final accounting is completed to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for costs it has contributed above its 35 percent share of total project costs.

a. Current Corps policy is that the Government, through reimbursements, direct financing of construction, and/or the assumption of LERRD financing responsibilities, becomes responsible for all additional project costs as soon as the Government determines that the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions has reached 35 percent of total project costs. This determination and the follow-on financial actions could take place during construction. Therefore, current Corps policy is consistent with section 219(c)'s requirement that costs above the non-Federal sponsor's 35 percent share

SUBJECT: Implementation Guidance for Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, Nonstructural Flood Control Projects

shall be contributed by the Government during construction, rather than as a reimbursement following completion of the final accounting.

b. The existing model PCA for Section 205 nonstructural projects may be used as the basis for developing the PCA for a specifically authorized nonstructural project. District offices should contact HQUSACE (attn: CECW-PC) with any questions concerning nonstructural flood control project PCAs.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

/s/

JAMES F. JOHNSON  
Chief, Planning and Policy Division  
Directorate of Civil Works

CECW-PD

SUBJECT: Implementation of Projects Under Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 92), as Amended

3. TECHNICAL, PLANNING AND DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 219(a), (e) AND (f) OF SECTION 219, AS AMENDED. The FY 01 program consists of the following locations and amounts:

- (1) Jackson County Water Supply, Mississippi - \$2,000,000
- (2) Desoto County, Mississippi - \$3,000,000
- (3) Harbor/South Bay Water Recycling, California - \$2,000,000.
- (4) Calumet Region, Indiana - \$300,000
- (5) St. Louis, Missouri - \$3,000,000
- (6) Lebanon, New Hampshire- \$1,500,000
- (7) Clinton County, Pennsylvania - \$500,000
- (8) Northeast Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania - \$4,000,000
- (9) Towamencin Township, Pennsylvania - \$1,000,000
- (10) Lakes Marion and Moultrie, South Carolina - \$4,000,000

4. CRITERIA FOR TECHNICAL, PLANNING AND DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.

a. General. The purpose of the program is to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments in carrying out water-related infrastructure projects. While sound judgment and prudent analytical approaches should be employed in any planning assistance to be provided, the specific requirements for conducting and reporting on economic and environmental procedures as outlined in Principles and Guidelines (P&G) and Corps regulations based on P&G will not be required. Because this is assistance to non-Federal parties the primary goal will be to identify increments of technical, planning and design, and construction assistance which can be accomplished by the Corps to assist local governments in meeting local water resources infrastructure and resource protection and development needs. Since the program to date consists of congressional adds with no assurance of follow-on funding, increments of work which can be accomplished within the fiscal year appropriation should be identified.

b. Environmental Analysis. Federal assistance for water related infrastructure is subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other environmental laws. Available environmental analysis prepared by non-Federal interests to meet Federal and State loan and grant and permitting requirements should be used to the extent possible to meet appropriate requirements of NEPA and other environmental laws.

CECW-PD

SUBJECT: Implementation of Projects Under Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 92), as Amended

c. Cost Sharing. Not less than a 25 percent non-Federal cost share will be required for all assistance under section 219. The 25 percent non-Federal share will take the form of cash and credit for lands, easements, rights of way, relocations and dredged material disposal areas (LERRD). Where the value of LERRD exceeds 25 percent of total project costs there will be no reimbursement of non-Federal share in excess of 25 percent but no cash contribution will be required. No work-in-kind is authorized for projects under the section 219 program except for the credit authorized for the Jackson County, Mississippi project under Section 331 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

d. Ability to Pay. Non-Federal cost sharing requirements under section 219, as amended, are subject to reductions under the ability to pay rule developed based on Section 103(m) of WRDA 1986, as amended. Under the current ability to pay rule published in 1995, cost sharing reductions only apply to the non-Federal share of project construction. However, based on an amendment to Section 103(m) by Section 204 of WRDA 2000, the non-Federal cost-sharing reductions will now apply to both feasibility studies and project construction. Under the 1995 rule, cost sharing reductions for environmental infrastructure were zero since the lowest non-Federal cost for feasible Federal projects is 25 percent which matches the standard cost sharing requirement for environmental infrastructure projects. The amendments in section 204 will require a new ability to pay rule to be developed which when finalized and published may allow reductions for qualifying areas below the 25 percent requirement for project construction and also allow feasibility cost sharing reductions. Until such time as a new ability to pay final rule is published, continued application of the existing 1995 rule is required.

e. LERRD. The non-Federal sponsor has the responsibility to provide LERRD. LERRD value is included in the total project cost of the section 219 project and the value of LERRD is credited against the required non-Federal share.

f. Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R). OMRR&R is a 100 percent non-Federal responsibility. All agreements for construction will state that, as between the Government and the non-Federal interest, the Government will have no responsibility for the OMRR&R of the project.

g. Design and Engineering Assistance. As required by section 219(a) any design or engineering assistance to carry out a section 219 project shall be obtained by procurement from private sources unless the service would require the use of a new technology unavailable in the

CECW-PD

SUBJECT: Implementation of Projects Under Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 92) as Amended

private sector or a solicitation or request for proposal has failed to attract two or more bids or proposals. This limitation does not apply to the analysis and documentation to address National Environmental Policy Act requirements.

## 5. AGREEMENTS.

a. General. An agreement between the Corps and a non-Federal sponsor must be executed prior to initiating any technical, planning and design, or construction assistance work. Up to \$25,000 of the amount appropriated may be used by the districts to prepare a letter report and negotiate the agreement. These pre-agreement costs will be 100 percent Federal.

b. Letter Report. A letter report should support each agreement. The letter report describes the proposed infrastructure assistance and the non-Federal infrastructure project it supports; identifies the non-Federal sponsor; addresses the implementation responsibilities of the parties; addresses the financial capability of the non-Federal sponsor to meet the cost sharing requirements; describes the status of environmental compliance; and presents information on the cost (including LERRD value) of the environmental infrastructure assistance. The Division Commander has approval authority for section 219 project letter reports and may delegate this authority to the District Commander. The letter report will generally follow the format of Appendix B.

c. Agreement Processing. Model agreements for construction and design/construction are under development. Until the authority to approve and execute the model agreements has been delegated to the Division Commander, agreements for construction or design/construction must be forwarded to HQUSACE for review and approval by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). The submittal should include six packages with each containing: draft agreement; list of deviations and detailed reasons for the deviations from the draft models; Certificate of Legal Review signed by District Counsel; Checklist (use checklist for specifically authorized projects); District Assessment of Sponsor's Financial Capability signed by the District Engineer; and Federal/Non-Federal Funds Allocation Table. Also submit one copy of the approved decision document and an electronic copy of the draft agreement to CECW-PC.

d. Agreements for Design. If the sponsor requests only to execute an agreement for design, the Model Design Agreement pursuant to 105(c) of WRDA 86 should be used. This model can

CECW-PD

SUBJECT: Implementation of Projects Under Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 92) as Amended

be found on the Office of Counsel Approved Model Agreements page. Delegation of approval and execution authority for this model is addressed in the CECW-AG memorandum, dated 3 August 1998, subject: Model Design Agreement.

FOR THE COMMANDER:



JAMES F. JOHNSON  
Chief, Planning and Policy Division  
Directorate of Civil Works

Encls

DISTRIBUTION:

Commander, Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, ATTN: CELRD

Commander, Mississippi Valley Division, ATTN: CEMVD

Commander, North Atlantic Division, ATTN: CENAD

Commander, Northwestern Division, ATTN: CENWD

Commander, Pacific Ocean Division, ATTN: CEPOD

Commander, South Atlantic Division, ATTN: CESAD

Commander, South Pacific Division, ATTN: CESP

Commander, Southwestern Division, ATTN: CESWD

## APPENDIX A

### Section 219

#### PUBLIC LAW 102-580 – OCT. 31 1992, As Amended

#### SEC. 219. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL. – The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance to non-Federal interests for carrying out water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects described in subsection (c), including waste water treatment and related facilities and water supply, storage, treatment, and distribution facilities. Such assistance may be in the form of technical and planning and design assistance. If the Secretary is to provide any design or engineering assistance to carry out a project under this section, the Secretary shall obtain by procurement from private sources all services necessary for the Secretary to provide such assistance, unless the Secretary finds that –

(1) The service would require the use of a new technology unavailable in the private sector; or

(2) A solicitation or request for proposal has failed to attract 2 or more bids or proposals.

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE. – The non-Federal share of the cost of projects for which assistance is provided under this section shall not be less than 25 percent, except that such share shall be subject to the ability of the non-Federal interest to pay, including the procedures and regulations relating to ability to pay established under section 103 (m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

(c) PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS. – The projects for which the Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) WASHINGTON, D.C AND MARYLAND. – Measures to alleviate adverse water quality impacts resulting from storm water discharges from Federal facilities in the Anacostia River watershed, Washington, D.C. and Maryland.

(2) ATLANTA, GEORGIA. - A combined sewer overflow treatment facility for the city of Atlanta, Georgia.

(3) HAZARD, KENTUCKY. - A water system (including a 13,000,000 gallon per day water treatment plant), intake structures, raw water pipelines and pumps, distribution lines, and pumps and storage tanks for Hazard, Kentucky.

(4) ROUGE RIVER, MICHIGAN. – Completion of a comprehensive streamflow enhancement project for the Western Townships Utility Authority, Rouge River, Wayne County, Michigan.

(5) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI. – Provision of alternative water supply for Jackson County, Mississippi.

(6) EPPING, NEW HAMPSHIRE.- Evaluation and assistance in addressing expanded and advanced wastewater treatment needs for Epping, New Hampshire.

(7) MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE. - Elimination of combined sewer overflows in the city of Manchester, New Hampshire.

(8) ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE. - Provision of advanced wastewater treatment for the city of Rochester, New Hampshire.

(9) PATERSON AND PASSAIC COUNTY, NEW JERSEY. – Drainage facilities to alleviate flooding problems on Getty Avenue in the vicinity of St. Joseph's Hospital for the city of Paterson, New Jersey, and Passaic County, New Jersey.

(10) STATE OF NEW JERSEY AND NEW JERSEY WASTEWATER TREATMENT TRUST. – The development of innovative beneficial use of sewage sludge and conventional and innovative facilities to dispose of sewage sludge for local government units that ceased the discharge of sewage sludge in the Atlantic Ocean.

(11) ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK. – A tunnel from North Buffalo, New York, to Amherst Quarry to relieve flooding and improve water quality.

(12) ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK. - A sludge processing disposal facility to serve the Erie County Sewer District 5, New York.

(13) OTSEGO COUNTY, NEW YORK. – A water storage tank and an adequate water filtration system for the Village of Milford, Ostego County, New York.

(14) CHENANGO COUNTY, NEW YORK. – A primary source water well and improvement of a water distribution system for New Berlin, Chenango County, New York.

(15) GREENSBORO AND GLASSWORKS, PENNSYLVANIA. – A sewage treatment plant for the borough of Greensboro, Pennsylvania, and the unincorporated village of Glassworks, Pennsylvania.

(16) LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA. – Alleviation of combined sewer overflows for Lynchburg, Virginia, in accordance with combined sewer overflow control plans adopted by, and currently being implemented by the non-Federal sponsor.

(17) RICHMOND, VIRGINIA. – Alleviation of combined sewer overflows for Richmond, Virginia, in accordance with combined sewer overflow control plans adopted by, and currently being implemented by, the non-Federal sponsor.

(18) COLONIAS ALONG UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER. - Wastewater treatment facilities, water systems (including water treatment plants), intake structures, raw water pipelines and pumps, distribution lines, and pumps and storage tanks for colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border.

(19) MARANA, ARIZONA. – Wastewater treatment and distribution infrastructure, Marana, Arizona.

(20) EASTERN ARKANSAS ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY, ARKANSAS. – Water-related infrastructure, Eastern Arkansas Enterprise Community, Cross, lee, Monroe, and St. Francis Counties, Arkansas.

(21) CHINO HILLS, CALIFORNIA. – Storm water and sewage collection infrastructure, Chino Hills, California.

(22) CLEAR LAKE BASIN, CALIFORNIA. – Water-related infrastructure and resource protection, Clear Lake Basin, California.

(23) DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA. – Resource protection and wastewater infrastructure, Desert Hot Springs, California.

(24) EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA. - Regional water-related infrastructure, Eastern Municipal Water District, California.

(25) HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA. – Water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Huntington Beach, California.

(26) INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA. – Water infrastructure, Inglewood, California.

(27) LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA. Wastewater infrastructure, Los Osos Community Service District, California.

(28) NORWALK, CALIFORNIA. - Water-related infrastructure, Norwalk, California.

(29) KEY BISCAYNE, FLORIDA. - Sanitary sewer infrastructure, Key Biscayne, Florida.

(30) SOUTH TAMPA, FLORIDA. – Water supply and aquifer storage and recovery infrastructure, South Tampa, Florida.

(31) FORT WAYNE, INDIANA. – Combined sewer overflow infrastructure and wetlands protection, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

(32) INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA. - Combined sewer overflow infrastructure, Indianapolis, Indiana.

(33) ST. CHARLES, ST. BERNARD, AND PLAUEMINES PARISHES, LOUISIANA. - Water and wastewater infrastructure, St. Charles, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines Parishes, Louisiana.

(34) ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST AND ST. JAMES PARISHES, LOUISIANA. – Water and sewer improvements, St. John the Baptist and St. James Parishes, Louisiana.

(35) UNION COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA. - Water infrastructure, Union County, North Carolina.

(36) HOOD RIVER, OREGON. - Water transmission infrastructure, Hood River, Oregon.

(37) MEDFORD, OREGON. - Sewer collection infrastructure, Medford, Oregon.

(38) PORTLAND, OREGON. - Water infrastructure and resource protection, Portland, Oregon.

(39) COUDERSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA. - Sewer system extensions and improvements, Coudersport, Pennsylvania.

(40) PARK CITY, UTAH. – Water supply infrastructure, park City, Utah.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TECHNICAL, PLANNING, AND DESIGN ASSISTANCE. – There is authorized to be appropriated for providing assistance under this section \$30,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE. – There are 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) \$25,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(2);
- (6) \$30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(9);
- (7) \$30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(16);
- (8) \$30,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(17);

(f) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.- The Secretary may provide assistance under subsection (a) and assistance for construction for the following:

(1) ATLANTA, GEORGIA.- The project described in is subsection (c)(2), modified to include \$25,000,000 for watershed restoration and development in the regional Atlanta watershed, including Big Creek and Rock Creek.

(2) PATERSON, PASSAIC COUNTY, AND PASSAIC VALLEY, NEW JERSEY. – The project described in subsection (c)(9), modified to include \$20,000,000 for drainage facilities to alleviate flooding problems on Getty Avenue in the vicinity of St. Joseph's Hospital for the city of Paterson , New Jersey, and Passaic County, New Jersey, and innovative facilities to manage and treat additional flows in the Passaic Valley, Passaic River basin, new Jersey.

(3) NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE. - \$20,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Nashua, New Hampshire.

(4) FALL RIVER AND NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS. \$35,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the cities of Fall River and New Bedford , Massachusetts.

(5) FINDLEY TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$11,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Findley Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

(6) DILLSBURG BOROUGH AUTHORITY, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Franklin Township, York County, Pennsylvania.

(7) HAMPDEN TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA. \$3,000,000for water sewer, and storm sewer improvements in Hampden Township, Pennsylvania.

(8) TOWAMENCIN TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$1,500,000 for sanitary sewer and water and wastewater infrastructure in Towamencin Township, Pennsylvania.

(9) DAUPHIN COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.- \$2,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows and water system rehabilitation for the city of Harrisburg, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. —

(10) EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA. - \$20,000,000 for water supply and wastewater infrastructure projects in the counties of Acomac, Northhampton, Lee, Norton, Wise, Russell, Dickenson, Buchanan, and Tazawell, Virginia.

(11) NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA. - \$20,000,000 for water related infrastructure in the counties of Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, Wayne, Sullivan, Bradford, and Monroe, Pennsylvania, including assistance for the Mountoursville Regional Sewer Authority, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania.

- (12) CALUMET REGION, INDIANA. - \$10,000,000 for water related infrastructure projects in the counties of Lake and Porter, Indiana.
- (13) CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$1,000,000 for water related infrastructure in Clinton County, Pennsylvania.
- (14) PATTON TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA. \$1,400,000 for water related infrastructure in Patton Township, Pennsylvania.
- (15) NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$500,000 for water related infrastructure in North Fayette Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.
- (16) SPRINGDALE BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$500,000 for water related infrastructure in Springdale Borough, Pennsylvania.
- (17) ROBINSON TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$1,200,000 for water related infrastructure in Robinson Township, Pennsylvania.
- (18) UPPER ALLEN TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$3,400,000 for water related infrastructure in Upper Allen Township, Pennsylvania.
- (19) JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP, GREENE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$1,000,000 for water related infrastructure in Jefferson Township, Greene County, Pennsylvania.
- (20) LUMBERTON, NORTH CAROLINA. \$1,700,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure projects in Lumberton, North Carolina.
- (21) BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA. \$20,000,000 for water related infrastructure for the parishes of East Baton Rouge, Ascension, and Livingston, Louisiana.
- (22) EAST SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. - \$25,000,000 for ground water recharge and conjunctive use projects in Stockton East Water District, California.
- (23) SACRAMENTO AREA, CALIFORNIA. \$25,000,000 for regional water conservation and recycling projects in Placer and El Dorado Counties and the San Juan Suburban Water District, California.
- (24) CUMBERLAND COUNTY, TENNESSEE.- \$5,000,000 for water supply projects in Cumberland County, Tennessee.
- (25) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA. \$15,000,000 for water supply treatment and distribution projects in the counties of Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Orangeberg, and Sumter, South Carolina.
- (26) BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT. - \$10,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Bridgeport, Connecticut.
- (27) HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.- \$10,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Hartford, Connecticut.
- (28) NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT. - \$10,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of New Haven, Connecticut.
- (29) OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN.- \$20,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the cities of Berkely, Ferndale,

Madison Heights, Royal Oak, Birmingham, Hazel Park, Oak Park, Southfield, Clawson, Huntington Woods, Pleasant Ridge, and Troy, and the village of Beverly Hills, and the Charter Township of Royal Oak, Michigan.

(30) DESOTO COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.- \$20,000,000 for a wastewater treatment project in the county of DeSoto, Mississippi.

(31) KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI. \$15,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Kansas City Missouri.

(32) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI. \$15,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of St. Louis, Missouri.

(33) ELIZABETH, NEW JERSEY. \$20,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Elizabeth, New Jersey.

(34) NORTH HUDSON, NEW JERSEY. \$10,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of North Hudson, New Jersey.

(35) INNER HARBOR PROJECT, NEW YORK, NEW YORK. \$15,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows for the inner harbor project, New York, New York.

(36) OUTER HARBOR PROJECT, NEW YORK, NEW YORK. - \$15,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows for the outer harbor project, New York, New York.

(37) LEBANON, NEW HAMPSHIRE. - \$8,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Lebanon, New Hampshire.

(38) ASTORIA, OREGON. - \$5,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of Astoria, Oregon.

(39) CACHE COUNTY, UTAH. - \$5,000,000 for a wastewater infrastructure project for Cache County, Utah.

(40) LAWTON, OKLAHOMA. - \$5,000,000 for a wastewater infrastructure project for the city of Lawton, Oklahoma.

(41) LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA. - \$1,500,000 for a project to provide water facilities for the Fox Field Industrial Corridor, Lancaster, California.

(42) SAN RAMON VALLEY, CALIFORNIA. - \$15,000,000 for a project for recycled water for San Ramon Valley, California.

(43) HARBOR/SOUTH BAY, CALIFORNIA. - \$35,000,000 for an industrial reuse project for the Harbor/South Bay area, California.

<sup>1</sup>(45) WASHINGTON, D.C., AND MARYLAND. - \$15,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(1), modified to include measures to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the Anacostia River watershed.

(46) DUCK RIVER, CULLMAN, ALABAMA. - \$5,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Duck Creek, Cullman, Alabama.

(47) UNION COUNTY, ARKANSAS. - \$52,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution, Union County, Arkansas.

---

<sup>1</sup> As numbered in Section 219(f), as amended. There is no project designated as (44) in Section 219(f).

- (48) CAMBRIA, CALIFORNIA. - \$10,300,000 for desalination infrastructure, Cambria, California.
- (49) LOS ANGELES HARBOR/TERMINAL ISLAND, CALIFORNIA. - \$6,500,000 for wastewater recycling infrastructure, Los Angeles Harbor/ Terminal Island, California.
- (50) NORTH VALLEY REGION, LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA. \$14,500,000 for water infrastructure, North Valley Region, Lancaster, California.
- (51) SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. - \$10,000,000 for water-related infrastructure, San Diego County, California.
- (52) SOUTH PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.- \$25,000,000 for water supply desalination infrastructure, South Perris, California.
- (53) AURORA, ILLINOIS. - \$8,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure to reduce or eliminate combined sewer overflows, Aurora, Illinois.
- (54) COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.- \$35,000,000 for water-related infrastructure and resource protection and development, Cook County, Illinois
- (55) MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, ILLINOIS. - \$10,000,000 for water and wastewater assistance, Madison and St. Clair Counties, Illinois.
- (56) IBERIA PARISH, LOUISIANA. - \$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Iberia Parish, Louisiana.
- (57) KENNER, LOUISIANA.- \$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Kenner, Louisiana.
- (58) BENTON HARBOR, MICHIGAN. - \$1,500,000 for water related infrastructure, City of Benton, Michigan.
- (59) GENESEE COUNTY, MICHIGAN. - \$ 6,700,000 for wastewater infrastructure assistance to reduce or eliminate sewer overflows, Genessee County, Michigan.
- (60) NEGAUNEE, MICHIGAN. - \$10,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure assistance, City of Negaunee, Michigan.
- (61) GARRISON AND KATHIO TOWNSHIP, MINNESOTA. - \$11,000,000 for a wastewater infrastructure project for the city of Garrison and Kathio Township, Minnesota.
- (62) NEWTON, NEW JERSEY. - \$7,000,000 for water filtration infrastructure, Newton, New Jersey.
- (63) LIVERPOOL, NEW YORK. - \$2,000,000 for water infrastructure, including a pump station, Liverpool, New York.
- (64) STANLY COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA. - \$8,900,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Stanley County, North Carolina.
- (65) YUKON, OKLAHOMA. - \$5, 500,000 for water -related infrastructure, including wells, storage tanks, and transmission lines, Yukon, Oklahoma.
- (66) ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVAN IA. - \$20,000,000 for water-related environmental infrastructure, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

(67) MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP AND CONEWAGO TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.-  
\$8,300,000 for water ad wastewater infrastructure, Mount Joy Township and  
Conewago Township, Pennsylvania.

(68) PHOENIXVILLE BOROUGH, CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. -  
\$2,400,000 for water and sewer infrastructure, Phoenixville Borough, Chester County,  
Pennsylvania.

(69) TITUSVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA. - \$7,300,000 for storm water separation  
and treatment plant upgrades, Titusville, Pennsylvania.

(70) WASHINGTON, GREENE, WESTMORELAND< AND FAYETTE  
COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA - \$8,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure,  
Washington, Greene, Westmoreland, and Fayette Counties, Pennsylvania.

APPENDIX B  
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE PROJECT  
LETTER REPORT

1. **SPONSOR.** Identify the sponsor by name and location. Identify type of non-Federal entity (i.e. city, county, water district, etc.). The proposal should include a map(s) depicting the location of the project area within the state.
2. **FINANCIAL CAPABILITY OF SPONSOR.** Describe the financial capability of the non-Federal sponsor to meet the local cooperation requirements of the environmental infrastructure project. Provide a brief description of the financing plan for the non-Federal share of project costs.
3. **DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT.** Describe the technical, planning and design, and/or construction assistance to be provided. It is anticipated that in most cases the work to be accomplished will be an increment of a locally planned project. The description should, therefore, include a description of the total local effort and how the proposed increment of assistance to be provided fits into the larger effort.
4. **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.** Describe the environmental compliance requirements for the proposed work and the status of the compliance with these requirements. National Environmental Policy Act compliance and receipt of State water quality certification must be completed prior to the execution of any agreement for construction.
5. **COST.** Indicate the cost of the proposed infrastructure assistance and the basis for the cost estimate. Real Estate should prepare the Real Estate cost estimate to a reconnaissance level of detail (see paragraph 4-12 of ER 405-1-12) unless the circumstances warrant a higher level.
6. **SCHEDULE.** Indicate the schedule for the proposed infrastructure assistance and if it is an increment of a larger local project how it fits within the overall project schedule.