

For next year, this money shuffling is even greater. To quote the Senate Budget Committee's February 1, 1999, analysis:

Conclusion: the President's budget, despite the rhetoric, not only spends all the non-Social Security surplus over the next five years, while providing no meaningful tax relief to American families, but also dips in the Social Security surplus for \$146 billion to pay for the President's spending priorities.

This kind of money shuffling must end. I cannot go back to Lenus Hill or Billy Yarberry and tell them that I stood by silently as the government devoted—spent half of their retirement money to paying for the President's new spending initiatives. We must stop the dishonest practice of hiding new government deficits with Social Security surpluses.

The Protect Social Security Benefits Act of 1999 is designed to cripple attempts to use surpluses in the Social Security Trust Funds to pay for deficits in the rest of the federal budget. Specifically, the bill states that it is out of order for the House and Senate to pass—or even debate—a budget that uses Social Security surpluses to finance new debt in the rest of the budget. This provision could only be overridden if three-fifths of the House or Senate openly vote to bypass this rule.

Three times Congress has passed laws that tried to take Social Security off-budget. These efforts have called for accounting statements that require the government to keep the financial status of Social Security separate from the rest of the budget. But these efforts are inadequate unless Congress puts in place safeguards that protect surpluses in Social Security from financing new government spending.

Right now, such procedures do not exist in current law or in senate rules. On the contrary, current law and senate rules create 21 separate points of order that apply to spending increases and tax increases, making it difficult to protect Social Security surpluses. But none actually stop these surpluses from paying for new budget deficits. We need a point of order protecting Social Security surpluses from irresponsible government raiding.

The Protect Social Security Benefits Act would create precisely such a point of order. This would prohibit the federal government from running a federal funds (on-budget) deficit without 60 votes, or what is known as a super-majority. With no on-budget deficit to finance, we would use the entire Social Security surplus to shrink the publicly-held federal debt. Reducing the publicly-held debt would cut annual interest costs that now cost \$200 billion and 15% of the entire federal government budget. Eliminating this interest cost would provide more flexibility to address the long-term financing difficulties Social Security now faces that could someday jeopardize payment of full benefits.

The only exception to this point of order would be in time of war. If Con-

gress were to declare war, and the government needed to go into deficit in order to protect our national security, then the point of order would not apply. It would remain in effect at all other times. In the event that the House or Senate did not pass a budget resolution, the point of order would apply to all appropriations bills passed after September 1. This fail-safe would ensure that the President and the Congress could not raid the Social Security fund for irresponsible spending, as they did last year to the tune of \$22 billion.

The Ashcroft Protect Social Security Benefits Act is the first provision in a multi-part Social Security package that will address vital issues relating to the management, investment, and taxation of Social Security. This plan is designed to protect the Social Security system. More importantly, it is designed to protect the American people—from debt, from bad investments, from misinformation, and from attempts to spend our retirement dollars on current government spending. While I value the Social Security system, I value the American people, people like Lenus Hill and the one million other Missourians who receive Social Security benefits, more. My primary responsibility is to them. My plan to protect the Social Security system will protect the American people first, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this plan.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 503. A bill designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the "Spanish Peaks Wilderness"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, wilderness is described in the law as lands that are, " \* \* \* in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, \* \* \* an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." With today's introduction of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness bill congressmen SCOTT MCINNIS, BOB SCHAFER and I are setting aside around 18,000 acres of land that more than meets the intent of the authors of the 1964 Wilderness Act. This land will be an important addition to wilderness in Colorado.

Spanish Peaks had been considered for inclusion in previous wilderness bills. However, because of unresolved issues it was not appropriate to designate it in the past. Those issues included various inholdings, the use of an old access road in the wilderness area, as well as the potential coal bed methane production on portions of the land. Those issues have either been resolved in this bill or they have been resolved through other methods. The resolution of these issues has maintained the integrity of the proposed wilderness area as well as protecting the needs of the local community.

Because of this, the legislation should have the backing of the local community, Colorado environmental groups, and the majority of the Colorado delegation. There is no reason why it cannot be passed quickly.

All Colorado wilderness bills should go through the process this bill went through. Congressman MCINNIS, Congressman SCHAFER and I decided that cooperation, consensus, and communication were essential to success. Therefore, we casted our net broadly for concerns, and when they were raised in good faith we actually sat down and worked them out. I have been struck by the fact that when people are given the opportunity to be part of the process they feel like they have a stake in the outcome and they try to be constructive in their criticisms. Because of constructive critics like the Huerfano County Commissioners, this legislation is better now than it was when they first looked at it.

While the legislation is complete, we are still seeking clarification on one point. The Huerfano County Commissioners are seeking to have a trail that is slightly inside the wilderness area, as designated in the legislation, excluded. My staff has spoken with the local Forest Service staffer and they appear to have no objection to this change. It is still uncertain whether we actually need to change the legislation to do this or whether the map can be adjusted by the Forest Service without any legislative changes. If it is the former than we will make that change prior to passing it out of the Senate. If it is the latter, we will exchange letters with the Forest Service to ensure we are talking about the same trail in the same place. This change should not be of concern. It is only slightly inside the boundaries and any changes we make to exclude it would be of only a slight impact on the entire designation.

I want to thank Congressman MCINNIS, Congressman SCHAFER, and the local community for working through this process. When the Colorado delegation works as a team they work the best for the State of Colorado.

By Mr. CLELAND:

S. 504. A bill to reform Federal election campaigns; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### THE FEDERAL ELECTION ENFORCEMENT AND DISCLOSURE REFORM ACT

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President. I rise today to address the important issue of campaign finance reform. As we begin the 106th Congress, campaign finance reform continues to be an important national need. Therefore, I am again introducing my Federal Election Enforcement And Disclosure Reform Act with the hope that this will be the year that Congress makes positive strides towards meaningful reform.

After participating in the Governmental Affairs Committee's extensive 1997 campaign finance hearings, it was apparent to me that there is a critical need for reform of our entire campaign finance system. What I witnessed, heard and read made me even more convinced that we must strengthen our campaign financing laws, and provide strong enforcement through the Federal Election Commission of these laws, or risk seeing our election process be swept away in a tidal wave of money. In spite of public support, and positive action in the House, the Senate failed last year to enact meaningful legislation addressing these problems, and we have now gone through yet another election cycle in which the abuses continued to persist. With the record high of \$1 billion spent in pursuit of federal office in 1996—a 73 percent increase since 1992, I had hoped that the 1998 election would at least reflect a natural decline from the grossly inflated figures. However, post-election reports filed with the FEC show that spending in Senate general election campaigns went from \$220.8 million in 1996, to \$244.3 in 1998, an 11% increase. It has been estimated that if these trends continue, by 2025 it will take \$145 million to finance an average Senate campaign. This absurd trend cannot continue.

Although the Senate failed last year to enact meaningful reform, I am hopeful that, with a new Congress, we will take up this important issue in earnest. The legislation I am re-introducing today, the Federal Election Enforcement and Disclosure Reform Act, addresses one of the most serious problems with our current system, the inability of the Federal Election Commission (FEC) to adequately enforce our existing campaign laws. I recently read a compelling article entitled "No Cop on the Beat," which appeared in the January 23, 1999 issue of the National Journal. The author, Eliza Newlin Carney, perhaps summarizes best the current judgment on the effectiveness of the FEC when she states that "[a] long-standing joke around town is that the commission is a government success story: It is precisely the weak and ineffective agency that Congress intended it to be."

The article was written following a December 1998 FEC hearing on the 1996 elections during which FEC auditors alleged that the national campaign committees of both major parties violated campaign finance rules with respect to broadcast advertising. Although party leaders maintained that the advertisements in question were legitimate "issue" ads appropriately paid for by millions of dollars in "soft" money, based on their investigation, the FEC auditors alleged that they were illegal ads which caused both major party Presidential campaigns to exceed the federal spending limit and, more importantly, allowed both campaigns to "essentially bilk . . . the federal Treasury out of no less than \$25

million." The auditors recommended that the campaigns repay the money. However, the commissioners unanimously rejected these recommendations and refused to specifically address the alleged grievous violations of federal campaign laws.

Although the author of the National Journal piece is very critical of the enforcement system, her criticism correctly does not end with the FEC. "[T]he FEC isn't the only cop that seems to have deserted the beat." According to the author, the FEC's refusal to enforce the campaign regulations has also had a chilling effect on the Justice Department's willingness to complete thorough investigations of the abuses in the 1996 election cycle. Furthermore, she points out that last year Congress again failed to enact new campaign finance laws to help correct the problems. She concludes by mentioning the movement by some politicians to totally deregulate the system—"By default, the no-holds-barred camp seems to be winning. Their deregulation model is starting to look an awful lot like the system we have today."

As we can see in the preliminary preparations already underway, the 2000 election cycle is likely to be heading in the same direction and I believe that this is the optimal time for us to act in order to prevent such abuses. Although my bill will not address all of the campaign finance system problems, it will revitalize the Federal Election Commission to enable it to more effectively enforce current campaign finance laws, and to close some loopholes in current campaign disclosure requirements in order to provide the American people with more comprehensive and more timely information on campaign finances.

As I made clear last year, I do not intend my legislation to fix all of the problems with the campaign finance system. It is my understanding that Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD also intend to re-introduce their important legislation, which I intend to again co-sponsor. I continue to believe that enactment of McCain-Feingold or similar legislation is an essential step for the Senate to take this year in beginning the process of repairing a campaign finance system which is totally out of control. Banning soft money and imposing disclosure and contribution requirements on sham issue ads aired close to an election, as provided for under McCain-Feingold, are absolutely vital reforms, without which the campaign finance system will only grow less accountable, and more vulnerable to the appearance, if not the fact, of undue influence by big money.

However, I want to broaden the scope of debate, and to begin the process of seeking common ground on important reforms which go beyond the problems of soft money and issue ads. As previously discussed, one of the most glaring deficiencies in our current federal campaign system is the ineffectiveness

of its supposed referee, the Federal Election Commission. The FEC, whether by design or through circumstance, has been beset by partisan gridlock, uncertain and insufficient resources, and lengthy proceedings which offer no hope of timely resolution of charges of campaign violations.

Thus, the first major element of my bill is to strengthen the ability of the Federal Election Commission to be an effective and impartial enforcer of federal campaign laws. Among the most significant FEC-related changes I am proposing are the following:

Alter the Commission structure to remove the possibility of partisan gridlock by establishing a 7-member Commission, appointed by the President based on qualifications, for single 7-year terms. The Commission would be composed of two Republicans, two Democrats, one third party member, and two members nominated by the Supreme Court.

Give the FEC independent litigating authority, including before the Supreme Court, and establish a right of private civil action to seek court enforcement in cases where the FEC fails to act, both of which should dramatically improve the prospects for timely enforcement of the law.

Provide sufficient funding of the FEC from a source independent of Congressional intervention by the imposition of filing fees on federal candidates, with such fees being adequate to meet the needs of the Commission—estimated to be \$50 million a year.

A second major component of the Federal Election Enforcement and Disclosure Reform Act is to create a new Advisory Committee on Federal Campaign Reform to provide for a body outside of Congress to continually review and recommend changes in our federal campaign system. The Committee would be charged, "to study the laws (including regulations) that affect how election campaigns for Federal office are conducted and the implementation of such laws and may make recommendations for change," which are to be submitted to Congress by April 15 of every odd-numbered year. As with the FEC, the Advisory Committee would receive independent and sufficient funding via the new federal candidate filing fees.

The impetus for the Advisory Committee is two-fold: (1) to build a "continuous improvement" mechanism into the Federal campaign system, and (2) to address the demonstrable fact that Congress responds slowly, if at all, to the need for changes and updates in our campaign laws. In both instances, the conclusion is the same: we cannot afford to wait twenty-five years or until a major scandal develops to adapt our campaign finance system to changing circumstances.

The final section of my bill seeks to enhance the effectiveness of campaign

contribution disclosure requirements. As Justice Brandeis observed, "Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants; electric light the most effective policeman." This is certainly true in the realm of campaign finance, and perhaps the most enduring legacy of the Watergate Reforms of a quarter-century ago is the expanded campaign and financial disclosure requirements which emerged. By and large, they have served us well, but as with everything else, they need to be periodically reviewed and updated in light of experience. Therefore, based in part on testimony I heard during the 1997 Governmental Affairs Committee investigation and in part on the FEC's own recommendations for improved disclosure, my bill will make several changes in current disclosure requirements.

Specifically, I am recommending two reforms which will make it more difficult for contributors and campaigns alike to turn a blind eye to current disclosure requirements by, first, preventing a campaign from depositing a contribution until all of the requisite disclosure information is provided; and second, requiring those who contribute \$200 or more to provide a signed certification that their contribution is not from a foreign national, and is not the result of a contribution in the name of another person.

In addition, my legislation adopts a number of disclosure recommendations made by the FEC in its 1997 report to Congress, including provisions: requiring all reports to be filed by the due date of the report; requiring all authorized candidate committee reports to be filed on a campaign-to-date basis, rather than on a calendar year cycle; and mandating monthly reporting for multi candidate committees which have raised or spent, or anticipate raising or spending, in excess of \$100,000 in the current election cycle.

It is easy to be pessimistic when considering campaign finance reform efforts especially after last year's inaction by the Senate. The public and the media are certainly expecting Congress to fail to take significant action to clean up the scandalous campaign system under which we now run. But ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I suggest that we cannot afford the luxury of complacency. We may think we will be able to win the next re-election because the level of outrage and the awareness of the extent of the vulnerability of our political system have perhaps not yet reached critical mass. But I am confident that it is only a matter of time, and perhaps the next election cycle—which will undoubtedly feature more unaccountable soft money, more sham issue ads of unknown parentage, more circumvention of the spirit and in some cases the letter of current campaign finance law—before the scales are decisively tilted in favor of reform.

We will have campaign finance reform. The only question is whether this

Congress will step up to the plate, and fulfill its responsibilities, to give the American people a campaign system they can have faith in and which can preserve and protect our noble democracy as we enter a new century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL ELECTION  
ENFORCEMENT AND DISCLOSURE REFORM ACT  
I. FEC REFORM

A. The Federal Election Commission (FEC) would be restructured as follows:

The Commission will be composed of 7 members appointed by the President who are specially qualified to serve on the Commission by reason of relevant knowledge: two Republican members appointed by the President; two Democratic members appointed by the President; one member appointed by the President from among all other political parties whose candidates received at least 3% of the national popular vote in the most recent Presidential or U.S. House or U.S. Senate elections; in the event no third party reached this threshold, the President may consider all third parties in making this appointment; and two members appointed by the President from among 10 nominees submitted by the U.S. Supreme Court. One of these two members would be chosen by the Commission to serve as Chairman.

Relevant knowledge (for purposes of qualification for appointment to the FEC) is defined to include:

A higher education degree in government, politics, or public or business administration, or 4 years of relevant work experience in the fields of government or politics, and

A minimum of two years experience in working on or in relation to Federal election law or other Federal electoral issues, or four years of such experience at the state level.

Commissioners will be limited to one 7 year term.

B. The FEC would be given the following additional powers:

Electronic filing of all reports required to be filed with the FEC would be mandatory, with a waiver permitted for candidates or other entities whose total expenditures or receipts fall below a threshold amount set by the Commission. The requirement for the submission of hard (paper) copies of such reports would be continued.

The Commission would be authorized to conduct random audits and investigations in order to increase voluntary compliance with campaign finance laws.

The FEC would be authorized to seek court enforcement when the Commission believes a substantial violation is occurring, failure to act will result in "irreparable harm" to an affected party, expeditious action will not cause "undue harm" to the interests of other parties, and the public interest would best be served by the issuance of an injunction.

The Commission would be authorized to implement expedited procedures for complaints filed within 60 days of a general election.

Penalties for knowing and willful violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act would be increased.

The Commission would be expressly granted independent litigating authority, including before the Supreme Court.

Private individuals or groups would be authorized to independently seek court enforcement when the FCC fails to act within 120 days of when a complaint is filed. A

"loser pays" standard would apply in such proceedings.

The Commission would be authorized to levy fines, not to exceed \$5,000, for minor reporting violations, and to publish a schedule for fines for such violations.

Candidates for the Senate would be required to file with the FEC rather than the Secretary of the Senate.

C. The FEC would be provided with resources in the following manner:

Consistent with its expanded duties, the FEC would be authorized to receive \$50 million in FY2000 and FY2001, with this amount indexed for inflation thereafter.

The funding would be derived from a "user fee" imposed on federal candidate and party committees. The FEC would establish a fee schedule and determine the requisite fee level to fund the operations of the FEC and the new Advisory Committee on Federal Campaign Reform. This determination will include a waiver for the first \$50,000 raised by campaigns.

II. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL  
CAMPAIGN REFORM

A. A new Advisory Committee on Federal Campaign Reform would be created.

B. The Committee would be composed of 9 members, who are specially qualified to serve on the Committee by reason of relevant knowledge, to be appointed as follows: 1 appointed by the President of the United States, 1 appointed by the Speaker of the House, 1 each appointed by the Majority and Minority Leaders of the U.S. House and Senate, 1 appointed by the Supreme Court, 1 appointed by the Reform Party (or whatever third party's candidate for President received the largest number of popular votes in the most recent Presidential election), and 1 appointed by the American Political Science Association. Committee members would elect the Chairman.

C. Committee members would each serve four-year terms, and would be limited to two consecutive terms.

D. The appointees by the Supreme Court, the Reform Party (or other third party), and the American Political Science Association must be individuals who, during the five years before their appointment, have not held elective office as a member of the Democratic or Republican Parties, have not received any wages or salaries from the Democratic or Republican Parties, or have not provided substantial volunteer services or made any substantial contribution to the Democratic or Republican Parties, or to a Democratic or Republican party public office-holder or candidate for office.

E. Relevant knowledge (for purposes of qualification for appointment to the Committee) is defined to include:

A higher education degree in government, politics, or public or business administration, or 4 years of relevant work experience in the fields of government or politics, and

A minimum of two years experience in working on or in relation to national campaign finance or other electoral issues, or four years of such experience at the state level.

F. The Committee would be authorized to spend \$1 million a year in its first year, indexed for inflation thereafter. Funding would be provided by the new campaign user fee discussed above.

G. The Committee would be required to monitor the operation of federal election laws and to submit a report, including recommended changes in law, to Congress by April 15 of every odd numbered year.

H. Congress would be required to consider the Committee's recommendations under "fast track" procedures to guarantee expeditious consideration in both houses of Congress.

## III. ENHANCED CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURE

A. Campaign would be prohibited from putting contributions which lack all requisite contributor information into any account other than an escrow account from which money cannot be spent. Contributions placed in such an account would not be subject to the current ten-day maximum holding period on checks.

B. A new requirement would be placed on contributions in excess of \$200 (aggregate): a written certification by the contributor that the contribution is not derived from any foreign income source, and is not the result of a reimbursement by another party.

C. The current option to file reports submitted by registered or certified mail based on postmark date would be deleted, thus requiring all reports to be filed by the due date of the report.

D. Authorized candidate committee reports would be required to be filed on a campaign-to-date basis, rather than on a calendar year cycle.

E. Monthly reporting would be mandated for multi candidate committees which have raised or spent, or anticipate raising or spending, in excess of \$100,000 in the current election cycle.

F. The requirement for filing of last-minute independent expenditures would be clarified to make clear that such report must be received within 24 hours after the independent expenditure is made.

G. Campaign disbursements to secondary payees who are independent subcontractors would have to be reported.

H. Political committees, other than authorized candidate committees, which have received or spent, or anticipate receiving or spending, \$100,000 or more in the current election cycle would be subjected to the same "last minute" contribution reporting requirements as candidate committees. (Under current law, all contributions of \$1,000 or more received after the 205th day, but before 48 hours, before an election must be reported to the FEC within 48 hours.)

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself,  
Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr.  
KERREY, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr.  
COCHRAN):

S. 506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the provisions which allow non-refundable personal credits to be fully allowed against regular tax liability; to the Committee on Finance.

## THE WORKING FAMILIES TAX RELIEF ACT

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to ensure that middle income working families receive the tax credits that Congress intended for them.

There are many absurdities in our tax code, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to reform and simplify our entire tax system. Today, however, I offer a small first step toward making our tax laws sensible. The legislation I am introducing will protect millions of working families by allowing taxpayers to deduct their non-refundable personal credits without having to include those credits in any determination of Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) liability. Tax laws created to deal with wealthy folks who overuse tax shelters simply should not apply to middle income families. This legislation is necessary, and it will actually remove language from the tax code

making it more simple and more user friendly.

Imagine for a moment two working parents in Arkansas making \$33,800. They work hard to spread their incomes far enough to pay their mortgage and care for their two school-age children and one in college. It may surprise you to know that this family falls under a tax burden that was created to ensure that the very wealthy pay their fair share of taxes. This family would have to pay the AMT.

While the threshold income limits of the AMT have been set since 1986, incomes have slowly crept up due to inflation. This, coupled with the inclusion of family tax credits in AMT liability determination, has led to the ironic situation that my legislation seeks to correct. The Alternative Minimum Tax must be changed so that a family will not be strapped with an added tax burden simply because they choose to have children or educate them.

Not only must we change the AMT, we must change it permanently. Last year, Congress provided a one year provision which removed the nonrefundable personal credits from AMT liability determination. I was pleased to see the President extend this provision for two more years in his budget. But we need to fix this problem permanently rather than using a band-aid approach of year-to-year alterations.

The AMT is a looming peril for a massive number of middle-income Americans. Two Treasury Department economists recently projected that the number of households earning from \$30,000 to \$50,000 that are subjected to the AMT will more than triple in the coming decade. Because the individual AMT parameters are not indexed for inflation, 2.8 million taxpayers will completely lose these important family credits by 2008. On top of this injustice, many unwitting taxpayers will owe penalties and interest on underpaid taxes. Such a situation cannot be allowed to exist. While Congress must soon address the issue of indexing the AMT for inflation, permanently removing the nonrefundable personal credits from the reach of the AMT is the first step to ensuring that America's middle-income taxpayers will receive the financial relief they deserve while avoiding the confusion and frustration of year-to-year tax legislation.

American families were given a child tax credit to help them raise their kids. Education credits were created to help make a college education more affordable for all Americans. These tax credits are good for families. They are important to working people and they are great for the long term future of our economy. As our law currently stands, however, many middle-income families will not be able to use these credits because they will be either totally eliminated or significantly reduced by the AMT. The education and child credits are not, however, the only credits that stand to be voided by the

growing menace of the AMT. People who bring children into their homes will lose the value of the adoption credit. The credit for the elderly and the disabled will lose its value, and the dependant care credit will be effectively canceled by the AMT. This is absurd and the problem must be rectified.

I would like to thank the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senate MOYNIHAN, and his very capable staffer, Stan Fendley, for working with me on this legislation. And I'd like to thank Senators MOYNIHAN, COCHRAN, BREAUX, KERREY, and LANDRIEU for signing on as original co-sponsors. I encourage our colleagues to join us in this common sense approach to helping working families.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed in the RECORD with these comments as well as the January 10, 1999 New York Times article by David Cay Johnston titled "Funny, They Don't Look Like Fat Cats."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 506

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

**SECTION 1. NONREFUNDABLE PERSONAL CREDITS FULLY ALLOWED AGAINST REGULAR TAX LIABILITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 26(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation based on amount of tax) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The aggregate amount of credits allowed by this subpart for the taxable year shall not exceed the taxpayer's regular tax liability for the taxable year.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1998.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1999]  
FUNNY, THEY DON'T LOOK LIKE FAT CATS  
(By David Cay Johnston)

Three decades ago, Congress, embarrassed by the disclosure that 155 wealthy Americans had paid no Federal income taxes, enacted legislation aimed at preventing the very rich from shielding their wealth in tax shelters.

Today, that legislation, creating the alternative minimum tax, is instead snaring a rapidly growing number of middle-class taxpayers, forcing them to pay additional tax or to lose some of their tax breaks.

Of the more than two million taxpayers who will be subject this year to the alternative minimum tax, or A.M.T., about half have incomes of \$30,000 to \$100,000. Some are single parents with jobs; some are people making as little as \$527 a week. Over all, the number of people affected by the tax is expected to grow 26 percent a year for the next decade.

But many of the wealthy will not be among them. Even with the A.M.T., the number of taxpayers making more than \$200,000 who pay no taxes has risen to more than 2,000 each year.

How a 1969 law aimed at the tax-shy rich became a growing burden on moderate earners illustrates how tax policy in Washington can be a fall of mirrors.

While some Republican Congressmen favor eliminating the tax, other lawmakers say such a move would be an expensive tax break for the wealthy—or at least would be perceived that way, and thus would be politically unpalatable. And any overhaul of the system would need to compensate for the \$6.6 billion that individuals now pay under the A.M.T. This year, such payments will account for almost 1 percent of all individual income tax revenue.

"This is a classic case of both Congress and the Administration agreeing that the tax doesn't make much sense, but not being able to agree on doing anything about it," said C. Eugene Steuerle, an economist with the Urban Institute, a nonprofit research organization in Washington.

Mr. Steuerle was a Treasury Department tax official in 1986, when an overhaul of the tax code set the stage for drawing the middle class into the A.M.T.

In eliminating most tax shelters for the wealthy, Congress decided to treat exemptions for children and deductions for medical expenses just like special credits for investors in oil wells, in they cut too deeply into a household's taxable income.

Congress decided that once these "tax preferences" exceeded certain amounts—\$40,000 for a married couple, for example—people would be moved out of the regular income tax and into the alternative minimum tax. At the time, the threshold was high enough to affect virtually no one but the rich. But it has since been raised only once—by 12.5 percent, to \$45,000 for a married couple—while the cost of living has risen 43 percent. And so the limits have sneaked up on growing numbers of taxpayers of more modest means.

"Everyone knew back then that it had problems that had to be fixed," Mr. Steuerle recalled. "They just said, 'next year.'"

But "next year" has never come—and it is unlikely to arrive in 1999, either. While tax policy experts have known for years that the middle class would be drawn into the A.M.T., few taxpayers have been clamoring for change.

Among those few, however, are David and Margaret Klaassen of Marquette, Kan. Mr. Klaassen, a lawyer who lives and works out of a farmhouse, made \$89,751.07 in 1997 and paid \$5,989 in Federal income taxes. Four weeks ago, the Internal Revenue Service sent the Klaassens a notice demanding \$3,761 more under the alternative minimum tax, including a penalty because the I.R.S. said the Klaassens knew they owed the A.M.T.

Mr. Klaassen acknowledges that he knew the I.R.S. would assert that he was subject to the A.M.T., but he says the law was not meant to apply to his family. "I've never invested in a tax shelter," he said. "I don't even have municipal bonds."

The Klaassens do, however, have 13 children and their attendant medical expenses—including the costs of caring for their second son, Aaron, 17, who has battled leukemia for years. It was those exemptions and deductions that subjected them to the A.M.T.

"What kind of policy taxes you for spending money to save your child's life?" Mr. Klaassen asked.

The tax affects taxpayers in three ways. Some, like the Klaassens, pay the tax at either a 26 percent or a 28 percent rate because they have more than \$45,000 in exemptions and deductions. Others do not pay the A.M.T. itself, but they cannot take the full tax breaks they would have received under the regular income tax system without running up against limits set by the A.M.T. The A.M.T. can also convert tax-exempt income from certain bonds and from exercising incentive stock options into taxable income.

It may be useful to think of the alternative minimum tax as a parallel universe to the

regular income tax system, similar in some ways but more complex and with its own classifications of deductions, its own rates and its own paperwork. The idea was that taxpayers who had escaped the regular tax universe by piling on credits and deductions would enter this new universe to pay their fair share. (Likewise, there is a corporate A.M.T. that parallels the corporate income tax.)

At first, the burden of the A.M.T. fell mainly on the shoulders of business owners and investors, said Robert S. McIntyre, executive director of Citizens for Tax Justice, a nonprofit group in Washington that says the tax system favors the rich. Based on I.R.S. data, Mr. McIntyre said he found that 37 percent of A.M.T. revenue in 1990 was a result of business owners using losses from previous years to reduce their regular income taxes; an additional 18 percent was because of big deductions for state and local taxes.

But that has begun to shift, largely as a result of the 1986 changes, which eliminated most tax shelters and lowered tax rates.

When President Reagan and Congress were overhauling the tax code, they could not make the projected revenues under the new rules equal those under the old system. Huge, and growing, budget deficits made it politically essential for the official estimates to show that after tax reform, the same amount of money would flow to Washington.

One solution, said Mr. Steuerle, the former Treasury official, was to count personal and dependent exemptions and some medical expenses as preferences to be reduced or ignored under the A.M.T., just as special credits for petroleum investments and other tax shelters are.

Mortgage interest and charitable gifts were not counted as preferences, according to tax policy experts who worked on the legislation, because they generated more money than was needed.

But the A.M.T. has not stayed "revenue neutral," in Washington parlance.

The regular income tax was indexed for inflation in 1984, so that taxpayers would not get pushed into higher tax brackets simply because their income kept pace with the cost of living.

The A.M.T. limits, however, have not been indexed. The total allowable exemptions before the tax kicks in have been fixed since 1993 at \$45,000 for a married couple filing jointly. For unmarried people, the total amount is now \$33,750, and for married people filing separately, it is \$22,500.

If the limit had been indexed since 1986, when the A.M.T. was overhauled, it would be about \$57,000 for married couples filing jointly—and most middle-income households would still be exempt.

Mr. Steuerle said he warned at the time that including "normal, routine deductions and exemptions that everyone takes" in the list of preferences would eventually turn the A.M.T. into a tax on the middle class.

That appears to be exactly what has happened.

For example, a married person who makes just \$27 a week and files her tax return separately can be subject to the tax, said David S. Hulse, an assistant professor of accounting at the University of Kentucky.

And the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, which allows a \$500-a-child tax credit as well as education credits, may make even more middle-class families subject to the A.M.T. by reducing the value of those credits.

Two Treasury Department economists recently calculated that largely because of the new credits, the number of households making \$30,000 to \$50,000 who must pay the alternative minimum tax will more than triple in the coming decade. The economists, Robert

Rebelein and Jerry Tempalski, also calculated that for households making \$15,000 to \$30,000 annually, A.M.T. payments will grow 25-fold, to \$1.2 billion, by 2008.

Last year, many more people would have been subject to the A.M.T. if Congress had not made a last-minute fix pushed by Representative Richard E. Neal, Democrat of Massachusetts, that—for 1998 only—exempted the new child and education credits. The move came after I.R.S. officials told Congress that the credits added enormous complexity to calculating tax liability. Figuring out how much the A.M.T. would reduce the credits was beyond the capacity of most taxpayers and even many paid tax preparers, the I.R.S. officials said.

EVEN if Congress makes a permanent fix to the problems created by the child and education credits, it will put only a minor drag on the spread of the A.M.T. as long as the tax is not indexed for inflation. The two Treasury economists calculated that revenues from the tax would climb to \$25 billion in 2008 without a fix, or to \$21.9 billion with one.

In 1999, if there is no exemption for the credits, a single parent who does not itemize deductions but who makes \$50,000 and takes a credit for the costs of caring for two children while he works, will be subject to the A.M.T., estimated Jeffrey Pretsfelder, an editor at RIA Group, a publisher of tax information for professionals.

If the tax laws are not changed, 8.8 million taxpayers will have to pay the A.M.T. a decade from now, the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation estimated last month. Add in the taxpayers who will not receive the full value of their deductions because they run up against the limits set by the A.M.T., and the total grows to 11.6 million taxpayers—92 percent of whom have incomes of less than \$200,000, the two Treasury economists estimated.

While many lawmakers and Treasury officials have criticized the impact of the tax on middle-class taxpayers, there are few signs of change, as Republicans and the Administration talk past each others.

Representative Bill Archer, the Texas Republican who as the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee is the chief tax writer, said the A.M.T. should be eliminated in the next budget.

"Unfortunately, the A.M.T. tax can penalize large families, which is part of the reason why Republicans for years have tried to eliminate it or at least reduce it," Mr. Archer said. "Unfortunately, President Clinton blocked our efforts each time."

Lawrence H. Summers, the Deputy Treasury Secretary, said the Administration was "very concerned that the A.M.T. has a growing impact on middle-class families, including by diluting the child credit, education credits and other crucial tax benefits, and we hope to address this issue in the President's budget."

"Subject to budget constraints, we look forward to working with Congress on this important issue," he continued.

That revenue concerns have thwarted exempting the middle class runs counter to the reason Congress initially imposed the tax.

"You need an A.M.T. because people who make a lot of money should pay some income taxes," said Mr. McIntyre, of Citizens for Tax Justice. "If you believe, like Mr. Archer and a lot of Republicans do, that the more you make the less in taxes you should pay, then of course you are against the A.M.T. But somehow I don't think some people see it that way."

The Klaassens, meanwhile, are challenging the A.M.T. in Federal Court. The United

States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit is scheduled to hear arguments in March on their claim that the tax infringes their religious freedom. The Klaassens, who are Presbyterians, said they believe children "are a blessing from God, and so we do not practice birth control," Mr. Klaassen said.

When Mr. Klaassen wrote to an I.R.S. official complaining that a \$1,085 bill for the A.M.T. for 1994 resulted from the size of his family, he got back a curt letter saying that his "analysis of the alternative minimum tax's effect on large families was interesting but inappropriate" and advising him that it was medical deductions, not family size, that subjected him to the A.M.T.

Under the regular tax system, medical expenses above 7.5 percent of adjusted gross income—the last line on the front page of Form 1040—are deductible. Under the A.M.T., the threshold is raised to 10 percent.

Still doubting the I.S.R.'s math, Mr. Klaassen decided to test what would have happened had he filed the same tax return, changing only the number of children he claimed as dependents. He found that if he has seven or fewer children, the A.M.T. would not have applied in 1994.

But the eighth child set off the A.M.T., at a cost of \$223. Having nine children raised the bill to \$717. And 10 children, the number he had in 1994, increased that sum to \$1,085—the amount the I.R.S. said was due.

"We love this country and we believe in paying taxes," Mr. Klaassen said. "But we cannot believe that Congress ever intended to apply this tax to our family solely because of how many children we choose to have. And I have shown that we are subject to the AMT solely because we have chosen not to limit the size of our family."

The IRS, in papers opposing the Klaassens, noted that tax deductions are not a right but a matter of "legislative grace."

Mr. Klaassen turned to the Federal courts after losing in Tax court. The opinion by Tax Court Judge Robert N. Armen Jr. was summed up this way by Tax Notes, a magazine that critiques tax policy: "Congress intended the alternative minimum tax to affect large families when it made personal exemptions a preference item."

Several tax experts said that Mr. Klaassen had little chance of success in the courts because the statute treating children as tax preferences was clear. They also said that nothing in the AMT laws was specifically aimed at his religious beliefs.

Meanwhile, for people who make \$200,000 or more, the AMT will be less of a burden this year because of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, which included a provision lowering the maximum tax rate on capital gains for both the regular tax and the AMT to 20 percent.

Mr. Rebelein and Mr. Tempalski, the Treasury Department economists, calculated recently that people making more than \$200,000 would pay a total of 4 percent less in AMT for 1998 because of the 1997 law. By 2008, their savings will be 9 percent, largely as a result of lower capital gains rates and changed accounting rules for business owners.

"This law was passed to catch people who use tax shelters to avoid their obligations," Mr. Klaassen said. "But instead of catching them it hits people like me. This is just nuts."

#### THREE WAYS TO DEAL WITH A TAXING PROBLEM

President Clinton, his tax policy advisers and the Republicans who control the tax writing committees in Congress all agree that the alternative minimum tax is a growing problem for the middle class. But there is no agreement on what to do. Here are some options that have been discussed.

Raise the exemption—Representative Bill Archer, the Texas Republican who is the

chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, two years ago proposed raising the \$45,000 AMT exemption for a married couple by \$1,000. But that would leave many middle-class families subject to the tax, because it would not fully account for inflation. To do that would require an exemption of about \$57,000, followed by automatic inflation adjustments. That is the most widely favored approach, drawing support from people like J.D. Foster, executive director of the Tax Foundation, a group supported by corporations, and Robert S. McIntyre, executive director of Citizens for Tax Justice, which is financed in part by unions and contends that the tax system favors the rich.

Exempt child and education credits—For 1998 only, Congress exempted the child tax credit and the education tax credits from the AMT. But millions of taxpayers will lose these credits, or get only part of them, unless Congress makes a fix each year or permanently exempts them.

Eliminate it—Mr. Archer and other Republicans want to get rid of the AMT but have not proposed how to make up for the lost revenue, which in a decade is expected to grow to \$25 billion annually. Recently, however, Mr. Archer has said that in a period of Federal budget surpluses, it may be time to scrap the budget rules that require paying for tax cuts with reduced spending or tax increases elsewhere.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BENNETT, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 507. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today legislation to reauthorize the civil works mission of the Corps of Engineers.

I am joined today by the Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senator CHAFEE; the Committee's Ranking Member, Senator BAUCUS; the new Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Senator VOINOVICH; Senator BENNETT, Senator LAUTENBERG, and Senator BOXER in cosponsoring this legislation.

Since 1986, it has been the policy and practice of the Congress to reauthorize Corps of Engineers civil works activities—projects for flood control, navigation, hurricane protection and erosion control, and environmental restoration—on a two-year cycle. Last year, the Senate passed S. 2131 by unanimous consent. Regrettably, the House was unable to consider companion legislation.

In an effort to keep these critically needed projects on schedule, I am pleased that the Chairman CHAFEE and Majority Leader LOTT have indicated their strong support for promptly considering this bill this year. The bill I am introducing today mirrors S. 2131 passed last year with updated cost esti-

mates and project revisions provided by the Corps of Engineers.

This legislation authorizes the construction of 37 new flood control, navigation, environmental restoration, hurricane protection and shoreline erosion control and recreation projects. It modifies 43 previously authorized projects and calls on the Corps of Engineers to conduct 29 studies to determine the economic justification of future water resource projects.

Mr. President, the landmark Water Resources Development Act of 1986 established the principle of cost-sharing of economically justified projects that have a federal interest. Local interests are required to share 35 percent of the cost of construction of flood control and hurricane protection and shoreline erosion control projects. The non-federal financial requirements for navigation projects depend on the depth of the project and range from 25 percent to 50 percent of the cost of construction.

The legislation we are introducing today is consistent with the cost sharing provisions of prior water resource laws. Also, the Committee has been consistent in requiring that every new construction project receive a completed project report by the Chief of Engineers before it is included in this legislation.

As the former Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I commend Chairman CHAFEE and Senator BAUCUS for standing firm in support of these cost-sharing and economic benefits tests. These policies have proven effective in authorizing projects that are worthy of federal investment and have the strong support of local sponsors. No other approach has been more effective in weeding out questionable projects than requiring either a state or the local government to contribute to the cost of engineering, design and construction of a project.

I am pleased that this financial commitments from local sponsors, that have been thoroughly evaluated and received a report from the Chief of Engineers, and have demonstrated that the economic benefits to be achieved by the project exceed the federal costs.

These fundamental requirements are applied to each project and only those that meet all of these tests are included in this legislation.

Mr. President, this legislation is critically important to many communities who have already contributed significant resources to prepare these projects for authorization. There is ample evidence to confirm that the federal investment in water resource projects is a wise investment of taxpayer dollars. In 1997 alone, Corps flood control projects prevented approximately \$45.2 billion in damages. The continued maintenance and deepening of our commercial waterways remains critical to the U.S. successfully competing in a one-world marketplace. The value of commerce on these waterways

totaled over \$600 billion in 1996, generating 15.9 million jobs.

It is important for the Committee to enact this bill prior to the appropriations cycle this year. I pledge to work with my colleagues so that the full Senate can soon consider this bill.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 507

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

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

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

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

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

**TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS**

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

**TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

- Sec. 201. Flood hazard mitigation and riverine ecosystem restoration program.  
Sec. 202. Shore protection.  
Sec. 203. Small flood control authority.  
Sec. 204. Use of non-Federal funds for compiling and disseminating information on floods and flood damages.  
Sec. 205. Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration.  
Sec. 206. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.  
Sec. 207. Beneficial uses of dredged material.  
Sec. 208. Voluntary contributions by States and political subdivisions.  
Sec. 209. Recreation user fees.  
Sec. 210. Water resources development studies for the Pacific region.  
Sec. 211. Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers enhancement project.  
Sec. 212. Outer Continental Shelf.  
Sec. 213. Environmental dredging.  
Sec. 214. Benefit of primary flood damages avoided included in benefit-cost analysis.  
Sec. 215. Control of aquatic plant growth.  
Sec. 216. Environmental infrastructure.  
Sec. 217. Watershed management, restoration, and development.  
Sec. 218. Lakes program.  
Sec. 219. Sediments decontamination policy.  
Sec. 220. Disposal of dredged material on beaches.  
Sec. 221. Fish and wildlife mitigation.  
Sec. 222. Reimbursement of non-Federal interest.  
Sec. 223. National Contaminated Sediment Task Force.  
Sec. 224. Great Lakes basin program.  
Sec. 225. Projects for improvement of the environment.  
Sec. 226. Water quality, environmental quality, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and navigation.  
Sec. 227. Irrigation diversion protection and fisheries enhancement assistance.  
Sec. 228. Small storm damage reduction projects.  
Sec. 229. Shore damage prevention or mitigation.
- TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS**
- Sec. 301. Dredging of salt ponds in the State of Rhode Island.

Sec. 302. Upper Susquehanna River basin, Pennsylvania and New York.

- Sec. 303. Small flood control projects.  
Sec. 304. Small navigation projects.  
Sec. 305. Streambank protection projects.  
Sec. 306. Aquatic ecosystem restoration, Springfield, Oregon.  
Sec. 307. Guilford and New Haven, Connecticut.  
Sec. 308. Francis Bland Floodway Ditch.  
Sec. 309. Caloosahatchee River basin, Florida.  
Sec. 310. Cumberland, Maryland, flood project mitigation.  
Sec. 311. City of Miami Beach, Florida.  
Sec. 312. Sardis Reservoir, Oklahoma.  
Sec. 313. Upper Mississippi River and Illinois waterway system navigation modernization.

- Sec. 314. Upper Mississippi River management.  
Sec. 315. Research and development program for Columbia and Snake Rivers salmon survival.  
Sec. 316. Nine Mile Run habitat restoration, Pennsylvania.  
Sec. 317. Larkspur Ferry Channel, California.  
Sec. 318. Comprehensive Flood Impact-Response Modeling System.  
Sec. 319. Study regarding innovative financing for small and medium-sized ports.  
Sec. 320. Candy Lake project, Osage County, Oklahoma.  
Sec. 321. Salcha River and Piledriver Slough, Fairbanks, Alaska.  
Sec. 322. Eyak River, Cordova, Alaska.  
Sec. 323. North Padre Island storm damage reduction and environmental restoration project.  
Sec. 324. Kanopolis Lake, Kansas.  
Sec. 325. New York City watershed.  
Sec. 326. City of Charlevoix reimbursement, Michigan.  
Sec. 327. Hamilton Dam flood control project, Michigan.  
Sec. 328. Holes Creek flood control project, Ohio.  
Sec. 329. Overflow management facility, Rhode Island.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.**

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

**TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS**

**SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(B) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—

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

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

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

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Implementation of the remaining downstream elements authorized pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be undertaken only after the Secretary, in consultation with affected Federal, State, regional, and local entities, has reviewed the elements to determine if modifications are necessary to address changes in the hydrologic conditions, any other changed conditions in the project area that have occurred since completion of the report referred to in subparagraph (A) and any design modifications for the Folsom Dam and Reservoir made by the Secretary in implementing the measures referred to in clause (ii), and has issued a report on the review.

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

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

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

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

cost of \$137,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$44,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$93,600,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(15) BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GEORGIA.—The project for navigation, Brunswick Harbor,

Georgia: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of \$50,717,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$32,966,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$17,751,000.

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

(17) AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH WATERSHED.—The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, East Baton Rouge Parish Watershed: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 23, 1996, at a total cost of \$112,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$73,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$39,500,000.

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

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

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

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and shore protection, New Jersey coastline, Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 28, 1998, at a total cost of \$56,503,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$36,727,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$19,776,000.

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

(21) PARK RIVER, NORTH DAKOTA.—

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

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

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

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO A FINAL REPORT.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accord-

ance with the plans, and subject to the conditions recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers as approved by the Secretary, if the report of the Chief is completed not later than December 31, 1999:

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

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

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

(4) OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.—

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

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

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

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation mitigation, shore protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Bay coastline: Delaware and New Jersey-Roosevelt Inlet-Lewes Beach, Delaware, at a total cost of \$3,393,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,620,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$773,000.

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

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

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

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of \$1,584,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$1,030,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$554,000.

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

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

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

(10) SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GEORGIA.—

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

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

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

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

(II) a selected plan for navigation and associated mitigation plan as required by section 906(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283); and

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

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

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

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

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation mitigation, ecosystem restoration, shore protection, and hurricane and storm damage reduction, Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey, at a total cost of \$15,952,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$12,118,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,834,000.

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

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

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

(B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.—Periodic nourishment is authorized for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of \$465,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$302,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$163,000.

(14) MEMPHIS HARBOR, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the project for navigation, Memphis Harbor, Memphis, Tennessee, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Develop-

ment Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4145) and deauthorized under section 1001(a) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 579a(a)) is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary.

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

(15) HOWARD HANSON DAM, WASHINGTON.—The project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Howard Hanson Dam, Washington, at a total cost of \$75,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$36,900,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$38,700,000.

#### SEC. 102. PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.

##### (a) PROJECTS WITH REPORTS.—

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

(2) WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood control, Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska, authorized by section 101(a)(19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665) is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the project in accordance with the Corps of Engineers report dated June 29, 1998, at a total cost of \$17,039,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,730,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$7,309,000.

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

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

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

(B) BERTHING AREAS AND OTHER LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES.—The non-Federal interests shall provide berthing areas and other local service facilities necessary for the project at an estimated cost of \$38,900,000.

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

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

sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, as applicable:

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

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Thornton Reservoir project, an element of the project for flood control, Chicagoland Underflow Plan, Illinois, authorized by section 3(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4013), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include additional permanent flood control storage attributable to the Thorn Creek Reservoir project, Little Calumet River Watershed, Illinois, approved under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

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

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

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

(E) REEVALUATION REPORT.—The Secretary shall determine the credits authorized by subparagraph (D) that are integral to the Thornton Reservoir project and the current total project costs based on a limited reevaluation report.

(2) WELLS HARBOR, WELLS, MAINE.—

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

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

(i) The portion of the 6-foot channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,992.00, E394,831.00, thence running south 83 degrees 58 minutes 14.8 seconds west 10.38 feet to a point N177,990.91, E394,820.68, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 47.7 seconds west 991.76 feet to a point N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds east 10.00 feet to a point N177,018.00, E394,628.00, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 22.8 seconds east 994.93 feet to the point of origin.

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

(iii) The portion of the 10-foot settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,107.78, E394,197.25, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 45.7 seconds west 10.00 feet to a point N177,109.82, E394,187.46, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 15.7 seconds west 300.00 feet to a point N176,816.13, E394,126.26, thence running south 78 degrees 12 minutes 21.4 seconds east 9.98 feet to a point N176,814.09, E394,136.03, thence running north

11 degrees 46 minutes 29.1 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

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

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

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

(ii) The portion of the 10-foot inner harbor settling basin the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N177,020.04, E394,618.21, thence running north 78 degrees 13 minutes 30.5 seconds west 160.00 feet to a point N177,052.69, E394,461.58, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 45.4 seconds west 299.99 feet to a point N176,759.02, E394,400.34, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 160 feet to a point N176,726.36, E394,556.97, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 44.0 seconds east 300.00 feet to the point of origin.

(iii) The portion of the 6-foot anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N178,102.26, E394,751.83, thence running south 51 degrees 59 minutes 42.1 seconds west 526.51 feet to a point N177,778.07, E394,336.96, thence running south 11 degrees 46 minutes 26.6 seconds west 511.83 feet to a point N177,277.01, E394,232.52, thence running south 78 degrees 13 minutes 17.9 seconds east 80.00 feet to a point N177,260.68, E394,310.84, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 24.8 seconds east 482.54 feet to a point N177,733.07, E394,409.30, thence running north 51 degrees 59 minutes 41.0 seconds east 402.63 feet to a point N177,980.98, E394,726.55, thence running north 11 degrees 46 minutes 27.6 seconds east 123.89 feet to the point of origin.

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

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

(3) NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NEW JERSEY.—The project for navigation, New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, Port Jersey, New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098), is modified to authorize the Secretary

to construct the project at a total cost of \$103,267,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$76,909,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$26,358,000.

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

(d) TOLCHESTER CHANNEL S-TURN, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.—The project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), is modified to direct the Secretary to straighten the Tolchester Channel S-turn as part of project maintenance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—In any fiscal year that the Corps of Engineers does not receive appropriations sufficient to meet expected project expenditures for that year, the Secretary shall accept from the city of Virginia Beach, Virginia, for purposes of the project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 501(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4136), such funds as the city may advance for the project.

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

(i) ELIZABETH RIVER, CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA.—Notwithstanding any other provision

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

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

(k) MIAMI DADE AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL LAND RETENTION PLAN AND SOUTH BISCAYNE, FLORIDA.—Section 528(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3768) is amended by adding at the end the following:

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

“(i) the Secretary determines that—

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

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

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

(l) LAKE MICHIGAN, ILLINOIS.—

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

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

(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of project costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in reconstructing the revetment structures protecting Solidarity Drive in Chicago, Illinois, before the signing of the project cooperation agreement, at an estimated total cost of \$7,600,000.

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

(n) PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, DUBUQUE, IOWA.—The project for navigation at Dubuque, Iowa, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 482), is modified to authorize the development of a

wetland demonstration area of approximately 1.5 acres to be developed and operated by the Dubuque County Historical Society or a successor nonprofit organization.

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

(p) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—The project for environmental infrastructure, Jackson County, Mississippi, authorized by section 219(c)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835) and modified by section 504 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757), is modified to direct the Secretary to provide a credit, not to exceed \$5,000,000, against the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the costs incurred by the Jackson County Board of Supervisors since February 8, 1994, in constructing the project, if the Secretary determines that such costs are for work that the Secretary determines was compatible with and integral to the project.

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

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

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—

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

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

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

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

(4) PERPETUAL STATUS.—

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

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

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

(6) FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION AGREEMENT.—

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

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

(F) LAND CONVEYANCE, CLARKSTON, WASHINGTON.—

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

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

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

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

(5) WHITE RIVER, INDIANA.—The project for flood control, Indianapolis on West Fork of the White River, Indiana, authorized by section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1586, chapter 688), as modified by section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake the riverfront alterations described in the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Plan, dated February 1994, for the Canal Development (Upper Canal feature) and the Beveridge Paper feature, at a total cost not to exceed \$25,000,000, of which \$12,500,000 is the estimated Federal cost and \$12,500,000 is the estimated non-Federal cost, except that no such alterations may be undertaken unless the Secretary determines that the alterations authorized by this subsection, in combination with the alterations undertaken under section 323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3716), are economically justified.

(T) FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.—The project for hurricane-flood protection, Fox Point, Providence, Rhode Island, authorized by section

203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 306) is modified to direct the Secretary to undertake the necessary repairs to the barrier, as identified in the Condition Survey and Technical Assessment dated April 1998 with Supplement dated August 1998, at a total cost of \$3,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$1,950,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,050,000.

#### SEC. 103. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

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

(b) BASS HARBOR, MAINE.—

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

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

(A) Beginning at a bend in the project, N149040.00, E538505.00, thence running easterly about 50.00 feet along the northern limit of the project to a point, N149061.55, E538550.11, thence running southerly about 642.08 feet to a point, N148477.64, E538817.18, thence running southwesterly about 156.27 feet to a point on the westerly limit of the project, N148348.50, E538737.02, thence running northerly about 149.00 feet along the westerly limit of the project to a bend in the project, N148489.22, E538768.09, thence running northwesterly about 610.39 feet along the westerly limit of the project to the point of origin.

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

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

(d) EAST BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE.—Section 364 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3731) is amended by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

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

#### SEC. 104. STUDIES.

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

to its terminus at high ground in the vicinity of Black Bayou, Louisiana.

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

(1) shall conduct a study for the project for navigation, Fields Landing Channel, Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California, to a depth of minus 35 feet (MLLW), and for that purpose may use any feasibility report prepared by the non-Federal sponsor under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231) for which reimbursement of the Federal share of the study is authorized subject to the availability of appropriations; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) GATEWAY TRIANGLE REDEVELOPMENT AREA, FLORIDA.—

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

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

(i) CITY OF PLANT CITY, FLORIDA.—

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

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

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

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

(l) CAMERON PARISH WEST OF CALCASIEU RIVER, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall con-

duct a study to determine the feasibility of a storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration project for Cameron Parish west of Calcasieu River, Louisiana.

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

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

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

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

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking ecosystem restoration and protection measures along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Chef Menteur to Sabine River, Louisiana.

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

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

(r) LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY SEAWALL RESTORATION, LOUISIANA.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking structural modifications of that portion of the seawall fronting protection along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain in Orleans Parish, Louisiana, extending approximately 5 miles from the new basin Canal on the west to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal on the east as a part of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Protection Project, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077).

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

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

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

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

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

(v) TUNICA LAKE WEIR, MISSISSIPPI.—

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

constructing an outlet weir at Tunica Lake, Tunica County, Mississippi, and Lee County, Arkansas, for the purpose of stabilizing water levels in the Lake.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(x) YELLOWSTONE RIVER, MONTANA.—

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

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

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

(y) LAS VEGAS VALLEY, NEVADA.—

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

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

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

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

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

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STUDY.—The Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the New York Harbor, printed in the House Management Plan of the Harbor Estuary Program, and other pertinent reports concerning the New York Harbor Region and the Port of New York-New Jersey, to determine the Federal interest in advancing harbor environmental restoration.

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

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

(1) STUDY.—

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

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

(i) options for stabilizing the erosion sites on the banks of the Missouri River between the Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe identified in the report developed by the North Dakota State Water Commission, dated December 1997, including stabilization through non-traditional measures;

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

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

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

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

(D) REPORT.—

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

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

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

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

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

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of undertaking flood damage reduction at East Lake, Vermillion and Chagrin, Ohio.

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

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

(ff) SANTEE DELTA WETLAND HABITAT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive

study of the ecosystem in the Santee Delta focus area of South Carolina to determine the feasibility of undertaking measures to enhance the wetland habitat in the area.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(jj) SANTA CLARA RIVER, UTAH.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(oo) ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCES STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct a study of the water supply needs of

States that are not currently eligible for assistance under title XVI of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study shall—

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

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

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

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

## TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—

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

(2) STUDIES.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall conduct studies to identify appropriate flood damage reduction, conservation, and restoration measures and may design and implement watershed management and restoration projects.

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

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

(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

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

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

(3) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal interests shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations necessary for the projects. The value of the land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations shall be credited toward the payment required under this subsection.

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

(c) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—

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

(A) will significantly reduce potential flood damages;

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) the Secretary provides to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written notification describing the project and the determinations made under subsection (c); and

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

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

(1) Le May, Missouri;

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

(3) Tillamook County, Oregon;

(4) Providence County, Rhode Island; and

(5) Willamette River basin, Oregon.

(f) **PER-PROJECT LIMITATION.**—Not more than \$25,000,000 in Army Civil Works appropriations may be expended on any single project undertaken under this section.

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

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

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

**SEC. 202. SHORE PROTECTION.**

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

(1) by striking “Costs of constructing” and inserting the following:

“(1) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Costs of constructing”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **PERIODIC NOURISHMENT.**—In the case of a project authorized for construction after December 31, 1999, or for which a feasibility study is completed after that date, the non-Federal cost of the periodic nourishment of projects or measures for shore protection or beach erosion control shall be 50 percent, except that—

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

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

**SEC. 203. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY.**

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended—

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

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$7,000,000”.

**SEC. 204. USE OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS FOR COM-PILING AND DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON FLOODS AND FLOOD DAMAGES.**

Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a(b)) is amended in the

third sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, but the Secretary of the Army may accept funds voluntarily contributed by such entities for the purpose of expanding the scope of the services requested by the entities”.

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

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

**SEC. 206. AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.**

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

(1) by striking “Construction” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Construction”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SEC. 209. RECREATION USER FEES.**

(a) **WITHHOLDING OF AMOUNTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—During fiscal years 1999 through 2002, the Secretary may withhold from the special account established under section 4(i)(1)(A) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)(1)(A)) 100 percent of the amount of receipts above a baseline of \$34,000,000 per each fiscal year received from fees imposed at recreation sites under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Army under section 4(b) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(b)).

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

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

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

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

(2) interpretation;

(3) signage;

(4) habitat or facility enhancement;

(5) resource preservation;

(6) annual operation (including fee collection);

(7) maintenance; and

(8) law enforcement related to public use.

(c) **AVAILABILITY.**—Each amount withheld by the Secretary shall be available for expenditure, without further Act of appropria-

tion, at the specific project from which the amount, above baseline, is collected.

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

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

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

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

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

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

(3) **PROJECT.**—The term “project” means the project authorized by this section.

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

(1) **PLAN.**—

(A) **DEVELOPMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan for a project to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat of the Missouri River and the middle Mississippi River.

(B) **ACTIVITIES.**—

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

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

(II) private property rights.

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

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

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

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

(IV) creation of riverine fish and wildlife habitat;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## (c) INTEGRATION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

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

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

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

- (1) providing advance notice of meetings;
- (2) providing adequate opportunity for public input and comment;
- (3) maintaining appropriate records; and
- (4) compiling a record of the proceedings of meetings.

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

## (f) COST SHARING.—

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

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

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

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

**SEC. 212. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.**

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

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

**SEC. 213. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.**

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

“(6) Snake Creek, Bixby, Oklahoma.”.

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

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

(1) in the heading of subsection (a), by striking “BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS” and inserting “ELEMENTS EXCLUDED FROM COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS”;

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

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

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

(4) in the first sentence of subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking “(b)” and inserting “(d)”.

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

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

(1) by inserting “Arundo dona,” after “water-hyacinth.”; and

(2) by inserting “tamarix” after “melaleuca”.

**SEC. 216. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) in subsection (d)—

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

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

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) Clear Lake watershed, California.  
“(15) Fresno Slough watershed, California.  
“(16) Hayward Marsh, Southern San Francisco Bay watershed, California.  
“(17) Kaweah River watershed, California.

“(18) Lake Tahoe watershed, California and Nevada.

“(19) Malibu Creek watershed, California.

“(20) Truckee River basin, Nevada.

“(21) Walker River basin, Nevada.

“(22) Bronx River watershed, New York.

“(23) Catawba River watershed, North Carolina.”;

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

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

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

**SEC. 218. LAKES PROGRAM.**

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

(1) in paragraph (15), by striking “and” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

“(19) Osgood Pond, Milford, New Hampshire, removal of excessive aquatic vegetation.”.

**SEC. 219. SEDIMENTS DECONTAMINATION POLICY.**

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

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

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

“(5) ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall assist the project to ensure

expeditious completion by providing sufficient quantities of contaminated dredged material to conduct the full-scale demonstrations to stated capacity.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section a total of \$22,000,000 to complete technology testing, technology commercialization, and the development of full scale processing facilities within the New York/New Jersey Harbor.”.

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

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

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

**SEC. 221. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.**

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

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

Section 211(e)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 701b-13(e)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “subject to amounts being made available in advance in appropriations Acts” and inserting “subject to the availability of appropriations”.

**SEC. 223. NATIONAL CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT TASK FORCE.**

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

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

## (c) REPORTING ON REMEDIAL ACTION.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of

1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) or other Federal or State law containing environmental remediation authority;

(B) any of the Water Resources Development Acts;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### SEC. 224. GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM.

(a) STRATEGIC PLANS.—

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

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

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

(B) environmental restoration activities;

(C) water level maintenance activities;

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

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

(F) flood damage reduction and shoreline erosion prevention;

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

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

(b) GREAT LAKES BIOHYDROLOGICAL INFORMATION.—

(1) INVENTORY.—

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

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

(i) ground and surface water hydrology;

(ii) natural and altered tributary dynamics;

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

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

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

(2) REPORT.—

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

(i) compile the inventories of information;

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

(iii) submit to Congress, the International Joint Commission, and the Great Lakes States a report that includes recommendations on ways to improve the information base on the biohydrological dynamics of the Great Lakes ecosystem as a whole, so as to support environmentally sound decisions regarding diversions and consumptive uses of Great Lakes water.

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

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

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

(ii) the 1993 Report of the International Joint Commission to the Governments of Canada and the United States on Methods of Alleviating Adverse Consequences of Fluctuating Water Levels in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Basin.

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

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

(1) encourage public participation; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(b) COST SHARING.—The costs”;

(3) in the third sentence—

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

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

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

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall—

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

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

### TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

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

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

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

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

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

#### SEC. 303. SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

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

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

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

#### SEC. 304. SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

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

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

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

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

#### SEC. 305. STREAMBANK PROTECTION PROJECTS.

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

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

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

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

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 Stat. 2309a) or other applicable authority, the Secretary shall conduct measures to address water quality, water flows and fish habitat restoration in the historic Springfield, Oregon, millrace through the reconfiguration of the existing millpond, if the Secretary determines that harmful impacts have occurred as the result of a previously constructed flood control project by the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

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

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

#### SEC. 308. FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH.

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

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

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

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

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control and other purposes, Cumberland, Maryland, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1936") (49 Stat. 1574, chapter 688), is modified to authorize the Secretary to undertake, as a separate part of the project, restoration of the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal substantially in accordance with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park, Cumberland, Maryland, Rewatering Design Analysis, dated February 1998, at a total cost of \$15,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$9,750,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$5,250,000.

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

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

(2) shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of project costs for design and construction work performed by the non-Federal

interest before execution of a project cooperation agreement and for land, easements, and rights-of-way required for the restoration and acquired by the non-Federal interest before execution of such an agreement.

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

#### SEC. 311. CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA.

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

#### SEC. 312. SARDIS RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA.

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.—In accordance with the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study, the Secretary shall proceed immediately to prepare engineering design, plans, and specifications for extension

of locks 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 on the Mississippi River and the LaGrange and Peoria Locks on the Illinois River, to provide lock chambers 110 feet in width and 1,200 feet in length, so that construction can proceed immediately upon completion of studies and authorization of projects by Congress.

**SEC. 314. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER MANAGEMENT.**

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

(1) in subsection (e)—  
(A) by striking “(e)” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(e) UNDERTAKINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

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

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

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

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

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

“(ii) include an outreach and education component; and

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

“(C) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall create an independent technical advisory committee to review projects, monitoring plans, and habitat and natural resource needs assessments.

“(D) HABITAT AND NATURAL RESOURCE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

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

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

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

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

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

“(B) describes the accomplishments of each program;

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

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

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (1)(A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)(i)”; and

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

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)(ii)”; and

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

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

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

“(6) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—

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

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

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “(i)” after “paragraph (1)(A)”;

(II) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and, in the case of any project requiring non-Federal cost sharing, the non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 35 percent”; and

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

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(A)”;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

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

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

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

“(a) SALMON SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES.—

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

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

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

“(B) juvenile and adult salmon passage;

“(C) light and sound guidance systems;

“(D) surface-oriented collector systems;

“(E) transportation mechanisms; and

“(F) dissolved gas monitoring and abatement.

“(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Additional research and development activities referred to in paragraph (1) may include research and development related to—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(b) ADVANCED TURBINE DEVELOPMENT.—

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

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

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

“(1) NESTING AVIAN PREDATORS.—In conjunction with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, and consistent with a management plan to be developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary shall carry out methods to reduce nesting populations of avian predators on dredge spoil islands in the Columbia River under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) STUDY.—The study shall include—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the results of the study and any related legislative recommendations for consideration by Congress.

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

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

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

(2) **PREVIOUS OWNER OF LAND.**—The term “previous owner of land” means a person (including a corporation) that conveyed, or a descendant of a deceased individual who conveyed, land to the Corps of Engineers for use in the Candy Lake project in Osage County, Oklahoma.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.

(b) **LAND CONVEYANCES.**—

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

(2) **PREVIOUS OWNERS OF LAND.**—

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

(B) **APPLICATION.**—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) **NOTICE.**—

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

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

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

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

(A) a copy of this section;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) **WATER SUPPLY.**—

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

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

(A) Financial terms of storage reallocation.

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

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

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

(b) **IN-KIND CREDIT.**—

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

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

**SEC. 325. NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join other members of the Committee on Environment and Public Works in introducing the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. This measure, similar to water resources legislation enacted in 1986, 1988, 1990, 1992, and 1996, is comprised of water resources project and study authorizations and policy modifications for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program.

The bill we are proposing today is virtually identical to legislation that was approved unanimously by the Senate last October. That measure, S. 2131,

was sent to the House late in the previous Congress and, despite and best efforts of our colleagues in the other body, went no further. As such, it is our desire to advance this year's bill as expeditiously as possible.

We have carefully reviewed each item within the bill and have included those that are consistent with the committee's traditional authorization criteria. Mr. President, let me take a few moments here to discuss these criteria—that is—the criteria used by the Committee to judge project authorization requests.

On November 17, 1986, President Reagan signed into law the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. Importantly, the 1986 act marked an end to the 16-year deadlock between Congress and the Executive Branch regarding authorization of the Army Corps Civil Works program.

In addition to authorizing numerous projects, the 1986 act resolved longstanding disputes relating to cost-sharing between the Army Corps and non-federal sponsors, waterway user fees, environmental requirements and, importantly, the types of projects in which Federal involvement is appropriate and warranted.

The criteria used to develop the legislation before us are consistent with the reforms and procedures established in the landmark Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

Is a project for flood control, navigation or some other purpose cost-shared in a manner consistent with the 1986 act?

Have all of the requisite reports and studies on economic, engineering and environmental feasibility been completed for a project?

Is a project consistent with the traditional and appropriate mission of the Army Corps?

Should the federal government be involved?

These, Mr. President, are the fundamental questions that we have applied to each and every project included here for authorization.

This legislation, only slightly modified from last year's Senate-passed bill, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to construct some 36 projects for flood control, navigation, and environmental restoration. The bill also modifies 43 existing Army Corps projects and authorizes 29 project studies. In total, this bill authorizes an estimated federal cost of 2.1 billion dollars. The only significant changes in this year's version are that we have extracted projects authorized in the FT99 Omnibus Appropriations Act.

Mr. President, this legislation includes other project-specific and general provisions related to Army Corps operations. Among them are two provisions sought by Senator BOND and others to enhance the environment along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. We have also included a modified version of the Administration's so-called Challenge 21 initiative to encourage more

non-structural flood control and environmental projects. In addition, we are recommending that the cost-sharing formula be changed for maintenance of future shoreline protection projects.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to indicate that we have encouraged our colleagues in the House of Representatives to try to resolve their differences on the proposed Sacramento, California, flood control project. It seems to me that there are legitimate concerns and issues on both sides, but I am optimistic that they will reach an agreement. I stand ready to do whatever I can to facilitate a successful resolution.

This legislation is vitally important for countless states and communities across the country. For economic and life-safety reasons, we must maintain our harbors, ports and inland waterways, our flood control levees and shorelines, and the environment. I ask for the cooperation of colleagues so that we can swiftly complete this unfinished business from 1998. It would be my strong desire to complete action on this bill within the next several weeks so that we can prepare for WRDA 2000.

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. COVERDELL):

S. 509. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Peace Corps and to join with my colleague Senator PAUL COVERDELL to introduce legislation to make technical modifications to the Peace Corps Act.

The changes made by this legislation are purely technical and largely designed to remove certain outmoded restrictions on Peace Corps activities. I would ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of this bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

Now let me turn to the general subject of the Peace Corps as today is the thirty eighth anniversary of its establishment. Thirty eight years ago, a young President recognized the power that American ingenuity, idealism and, most of all, volunteerism could have on the lives of people around the world. In order to harness that energy, President Kennedy formed a small army, not of soldiers to make war, but of volunteers to build peace through mutual understanding.

Since its inception in 1961, more than 151,000 Peace Corps volunteers have battled against the scourges of malnutrition, illiteracy and economic underdevelopment in 132 countries around the world. I can speak with some personal experience about the Peace Corps as I have had the privilege to serve as a volunteer. In fact, slightly more than thirty years ago, I arrived

back in the United States after spending two years as a Peace Corps Volunteer in a rural village in the Dominican Republic. Like many who heeded President Kennedy's call to do something larger than ourselves, to be a part of something greater than our own existence, my service in the Peace Corps remains one of the most important periods in my life.

When I served in the Peace Corps, nearly all of us volunteers had similar experiences. We worked in small isolated villages with little in the way of modern conveniences. The world since that time has changed and the Peace Corps has been evolving to meet new demands. Today's volunteers specialize in education, the environment, small business, agriculture and other fields. In 1996, the Peace Corps developed a "Crisis Corps" to provide short term emergency and humanitarian assistance in situations ranging from natural disasters to refugee crises. While many volunteers continue to live in remote villages, this is no longer an iron clad rule. Some now labor in urban areas, passing on the skills needed to start and run businesses.

The more than 6,500 volunteers who today serve in 87 nations are a more diverse group than the one I joined three decades ago. When I served, the Corps was mostly male and mostly young. Today, however, nearly sixty percent of all volunteers are women, a quarter are over 29, and six percent are over fifty. While the face and methods of the Peace Corps have changed over the years, its goal has remained constant: to help people of other countries meet their needs for trained personnel; to help promote understanding of the American people by those we serve; and to help promote better understanding among the American people about the world beyond our borders.

By building bridges between the United States and other countries, the Peace Corps advances our foreign policy by communicating America's values and ideas to other peoples around the globe.

It is an indication of the success of the Peace Corps that, while the current class of volunteers is providing new services and working in countries never served before, the demand continues to outpace supply. We need only look at a newspaper, Mr. President, to see where Peace Corps volunteers are needed. In the Caribbean countries ravaged by Hurricane Georges and Mitch, in formerly war-torn areas of Africa and in countries where the skills needed to start a business have been nearly erased by decades of communist rule. In order to meet these needs, Congress and President Clinton have set the admirable goal of reaching 10,000 Peace Corps volunteers by 2000.

The Peace Corps, Mr. President, stands as an example of what is great about the United States. Our volunteerism, humanity and sense of justice are proudly displayed in the face of each volunteer we send overseas. And