



H.R. _____, Water Resources Development Act of 2026 – House Bill Section-by-Section Analysis

Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure (“T&I Committee”) | Markup Draft, June 26, 2026

Titles of Bill:

- **Title I – General Provisions** (Policy reforms, new program offices, and implementation fixes affecting how the Corps plans, delivers, and manages projects across all mission areas)
- **Title II -- Studies and Reports**: New feasibility study authorizations, expedited completions, and directed reports covering hundreds of specific projects and locations nationwide.
- **Title III -- Deauthorizations and Modifications**: Reauthorizations, conveyances, land exchanges, specific deauthorizations, environmental infrastructure, and modifications to existing programs and authorities.
- **Title IV -- Water Resources Infrastructure**: Construction authorizations for 10 projects that have completed technical review and expedited completion directives for previously authorized projects.
- **Title V -- Dam Safety**: Amendments to the National Dam Safety Program including Board expansion, grant program extension, and low-head dam regulatory adjustments.

Need for Appropriations Advocacy to Realize the Benefits of Many of the WRDA Bill’s Authorizations: It should be noted that WRDA legislation is *authorizing* legislation. Once a final WRDA 2026 is enacted into law, many of the authorizations for projects, activities, or some other provisions contained in the WRDA on their own are not enough for the Corps to proceed. Once Congress authorizes an activity in a WRDA, the Corps must still receive appropriations funding for that activity. In order to realize the benefits from many of the provisions in the House or Senate WRDA bills, there will be a need for subsequent appropriations advocacy in Congress.

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
Title I – General Provisions			
Sec. 1	Provides the title of the bill as the 'Water Resources Development	Standard short title and table of contents provision.	<i>Standard title used in most past WRDA bills.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Short Title; Table of Contents</i>	Act of 2026' and the table of contents.		
Sec. 2 <i>Secretary Defined</i>	Provides that the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Army.	Standard definitional provision applicable throughout the Act.	<i>Standard definitional provision also used in past WRDA bills.</i>
Sec. 101 <i>Program Offices within the Directorate of Civil Works</i>	Directs the Secretary to establish the following offices in the Directorate of Civil Works: Office of Inland Navigation Construction; Office of Water Supply, Water Conservation, and Drought Resiliency; Office on Technical Assistance and Community Outreach; and Office on Alternative Delivery Methods.	<p>This section creates <u>four</u> new program offices within the Directorate of Civil Works, each with a dedicated program manager reporting to the Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Emergency Operations, to be established within 180 days of enactment.</p> <p>Office of Inland Navigation Construction Management: Oversees inland waterways construction and major rehabilitation projects, coordinates and validates funding, including transactions of the Inland Waterway Trust Fund, conducts in-progress project design and construction reviews, and annually updates projects in accordance with the capital investment strategy authorized in Sec. 302 of WRDA 1986. Provides updates at every meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board. The</p>	<i>The proposed creation of these new Offices (including creation of a dedicated Office on Technical Assistance and Community Outreach) appears to be aimed at improving outreach, education, communications, and coordination (transparency) with non-Federal interests, which has long been a concern of NWC members and other stakeholders. Some past NWC comments have given support for efforts and initiatives aimed at improving Corps – non-Federal interest communications, outreach, and tech assistance. These provisions could provide non-Federal interests with greater</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>provisions include requirement to report back to Congress on progress in establishing the office; status of every inland waterway construction and major rehabilitation project in the most recent capital investment strategy, including delays or cost overruns; and recommendations for operational improvement of the office.</p> <p>Office of Water Supply, Water Conservation, and Drought Resiliency: Centralizes the Corps' water supply mission by identifying opportunities to promote water supply, conservation, and drought resiliency at Corps projects; providing guidance on storage reallocation, surplus water contracts, and Water Supply Act of 1958 and WRDA 2024 implementation; clearing backlogs on reallocation studies; and serving as liaison between the Corps and non-Federal interests on water supply agreements and issues. Reports a report back to Congress in two years on progress in establishing the office; and status of each water supply study or project submitted under the office's programs, including start date, estimated completion date,</p>	<p><i>opportunities to engage with, and provide input and recommendations to, the Corps on the development and implementation of program decisions and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>It is uncertain how the creation of an Office on Technical Assistance and Community Outreach would interrelate and be coordinated with the public awareness, education, outreach, and engagement requirements of Sec. 8117 of WRDA 2022, and the related provisions in Sec. 1101 of WRDA 2024, which aimed to improve outreach and access related to water resources development projects and ensure that non-Federal interests are informed of their roles, responsibilities, and financial commitments before initiating feasibility studies, including by</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>and any significant impediments or obstacles affecting the timeline.</p> <p>Office on Technical Assistance and Community Outreach: Assists non-Federal interests in accessing Corps programs and technical and financial assistance, including, but not limited to, continuing authority programs, Planning Assistance to States, and Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act programs. Prioritizes outreach to rural, Tribal, and underserved communities. Required to develop an online interactive portal to guide non-Federal interests through available program options.</p> <p>Office on Alternative Delivery Methods: Assists non-Federal interests in accessing alternative project delivery options under various Corps authorities, coordinates review standards and timelines for non-Federal-led studies and projects, and supports broader use of design-build, public-private partnership, and other delivery approaches. Includes a requirement to report back to Congress in two years on progress</p>	<p><i>requiring the designation of community project advisors in each Corps district and division office to assist with project inquiries and responsibilities.</i></p> <p><i>Creating offices with a focus on inland navigation, with water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency, and with alternative project delivery methods appears to be aimed at increasing the attention/priority/resources given to these important issue areas.</i></p> <p><i>NWC provided testimony in December 2025 and supplemental input in February 2026 to the House T&I Committee on NWC member concerns and suggestions to consider related to the above issues, including the importance of meaningful Corps technical</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>in establishing the office; number of staff assigned; and implementation status of alternative delivery programs.</p>	<p><i>assistance, outreach, consultation, and communications with non-Federal interests and the need for strengthening and clarifying non-Federal sponsor project delivery authorities. These provisions appear to be in part aimed at addressing NWC's input to the Committee.</i></p> <p><i>It is unclear at this point whether the ASACW/Corps leadership support these proposed organizational (and implementation) changes.</i></p> <p><i>It also is unclear at this point how these proposed organizational (and implementation) changes might influence/affect budgeting and funding of Corps program areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 102 <i>Contracting Efficiency</i></p>	<p>Includes a Sense of Congress that the Corps should maximize efficiency through use of multiyear or continuing contracts. Also requires the Comptroller General to study the benefits of using such contracts.</p>	<p>This section includes a Sense of Congress that the Corps of Engineers should maximize contracting efficiency through multiyear or continuing contracts, which provide cost savings by combining work across multiple projects and accounts and increase project reliability.</p> <p>Also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to complete a review within 1 year of enactment examining: existing statutory authorities and limitations for multiyear or continuing contracts; prior instances where the Corps or other Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, have used such contracts for large-scale infrastructure construction; the Corps' response to prior Comptroller General recommendations on multiyear contract management; potential cost savings and benefits including accelerated construction completion; and safeguards to minimize inefficient reprogramming of appropriated funds. The Comptroller General must report findings and any legislative recommendations to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I)</p>	<p><i>These provisions (and particularly the requirement for a GAO study) appear to be aimed at determining/evaluating and addressing some of the potential causes of Corps project delivery delays and cost overruns.</i></p> <p><i>NWC provided testimony in December 2025 and supplemental input in February 2026 to the House T&I Committee on NWC member concerns and suggestions to consider related to the above issues. Such suggestions included evaluating and implementing means for more effective and efficient delivery of projects, including shortening and making contracting timelines more efficient; modernizing project contractor involvement, design and construction management, and delivery approaches; and enabling</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee upon completion.</p>	<p><i>the Federal government to more easily adopt commercial practices. These provisions in Sec.102 of the bill appear to be in part aimed at addressing NWC's input to the Committee.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 103 <i>Removal or Remediation of Contaminated Sediment</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Secretary to develop a joint plan, in coordination with the non-Federal interest and approved by EPA, to carry out covered projects with contaminated sediment concerns.</p>	<p>This section provides Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) liability protection for the Secretary when carrying out dredging projects involving contaminated sediment, provided a joint plan is developed in coordination with the non-Federal interest and approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The joint plan must protect human health and the environment and include relevant National Contingency Plan (NCP) requirements. In developing the joint plan, the Secretary must consult with interested Federal, state, and local government officials and provide an opportunity for public comment.</p>	<p><i>This section is based on H.R. 7268 (the "Coordinated Leadership for Environmental and Aquatic Needs–Unified Planning Act" or the "CLEAN–UP Act"), a bipartisan bill introduced in the House of Representatives on January 27, 2026 by Reps. Nellie Pou (NJ-9) and Nicole Malliotakis (NY-11).</i></p> <p><i>H.R. 7268 was referred to the House Energy & Commerce (E&C) Committee, in addition to the T&I Committee, when that bill was introduced. It is unclear whether and how this CERCLA-related</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>provision, by being included in Sec. 103 of the House WRDA 2026 bill, might open the House WRDA 2026 bill to E&C Committee jurisdiction, thereby potentially complicating advancement of the House WRDA 2026 bill through the House.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 104 <i>Levee Owners Board</i></p>	<p>Establishes a Levee Owners Board to develop recommendations regarding levee system reliability, flood risk management projects submitted to Congress, and the Corps' levee safety program.</p>	<p>This section establishes an 11-member Levee Owners Board composed of Federal levee system owner-operators, appointed by the Secretary to represent various regions of the country, with at least 1 member from each of the 8 Corps of Engineers divisions. Members serve 3-year terms and may be reappointed. Members elect a chairperson from among themselves. The Secretary and the EPA Administrator may each designate a representative to serve as an observer.</p> <p>The Board must meet at least semiannually to develop and make recommendations to the Secretary and Congress on levee system</p>	<p><i>This provision is another attempt at establishing a Levee Owners Board, which is supported by many levee interests.</i></p> <p><i>There were similar provisions in the House and Senate WRDA 2024 bills that would have established a Levee Owner Board. [See House Section 154 (Establishment of Levee Owners Board), and Senate Section 114 (Corps of Engineers Levee Owners Advisory Board), of WRDA 2024.] These provisions were supported by some, but apparently</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>reliability. Specifically, the Board shall: provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary on overall levee system reliability prior to development of the President's budget proposal; provide advice and recommendations to Congress on any feasibility report for a flood risk management project submitted to Congress; provide advice and recommendations to Congress on flood risk management project construction and rehabilitation priorities and corresponding spending levels, no later than 60 days after the President's budget is submitted to Congress; provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary and Congress on the effectiveness of the Corps' levee safety program, including comments on Corps activity and expenditure reports; and provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary, Congress, and the EPA Administrator on the effectiveness of the levee safety initiative. All advice and recommendations must reflect the independent judgment of the Board.</p>	<p><i>not completely by some other, levee interests, which led to the Levee Owner Board provisions <u>not</u> being included in the final WRDA 2024 conference legislation.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>The Secretary must designate an Executive Secretary to assist the chairperson, provide the Board with detailed semiannual reports on Corps activities and expenditures related to flood risk management and levees, and submit copies of completed flood risk management feasibility reports to the Board.</p>	
<p>Sec. 105 <i>Categorical Permissions</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to promulgate a rulemaking to establish 'categorical permissions' for activities in the Corps' Section 408 program.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 14(a) of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 408) to require the Secretary to establish, by rulemaking, categorical permissions for categories of activities for which Section 408 permission applications are regularly submitted. A categorical permission may only be established for activities that are: similar in nature to activities for which applications are regularly submitted under Section 408; will cause only minimal adverse environmental effects when carried out individually; and will cause only minimal cumulative adverse environmental effects.</p>	<p><i>NWC has been actively engaged on Section 408 reform for years, and this provision directly responds to recommendations NWC has made through both formal comments and Congressional testimony.</i></p> <p><i>In September 2022, NWC submitted formal stakeholder comments to the Corps specifically recommending expanded use of categorical permissions to streamline repetitive, routine, and minor Section 408 activities. NWC urged the Corps to develop</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>In establishing categorical permissions, the Secretary must consider: the type and similarity of activities in each category; the geographic area of applicability; the type and similarity of the public works involved; the effects on public works and on environmental and cultural resources; any additional Federal regulatory requirements that apply; and an appropriate period of validity for each categorical permission.</p> <p>The section includes public input requirements. The Secretary must solicit input from non-Federal interests including landowners, hydropower operators, and resource agencies through a scoping process, and must make all draft categorical permissions -- including associated analyses and documentation -- available for public review and comment for at least 30 days. All finalized categorical permissions must be published on a Corps website with full transparency, identifying: the types of activities covered; any circumstances that would disqualify an activity from coverage; the geographic area of</p>	<p><i>categorical permissions at the district, division, and national level for activities that are repetitive, regular, or standard in nature -- the bill's mandate for a formal rulemaking with defined eligibility criteria, scoping factors, public input, and transparency requirements reflects that approach. NWC also called for stakeholder input in developing categorical permissions and for transparency in how they are implemented -- both are expressly required here. The integration of categorical permission assessment into the application completeness review is consistent with NWC's recommendation for a more streamlined, comprehensive review process.</i></p> <p><i>In December 2025 testimony before the House T&I Committee, NWC</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>applicability; the types of public works covered; and the period of validity.</p> <p>Non-Federal entities may identify applicable categorical permissions in their Section 408 applications, and the Secretary must assess whether a categorical permission applies -- including any identified by the applicant and any others the Secretary determines appropriate -- as part of the application completeness determination. Nothing in this section affects the Secretary's authority to grant or deny permission under Section 408, or any obligation to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), or the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Secretary must publish a proposed rule establishing categorical permissions within 180 days of enactment.</p>	<p><i>members continued to identify Section 408 review requirement concerns, including delays and inconsistency, as a significant barrier to project delivery, noting major variation in Section 408 expectations across Corps districts and unpredictable timelines that disrupt local contracting, permitting, and grant obligation deadlines.</i></p> <p><i>This provision, by requiring a uniform national rulemaking with public input and published categorical permissions, directly addresses the consistency and transparency concerns NWC raised.</i></p> <p><i>However, several issues raised in NWC's 2022 comments and 2025 testimony are not addressed by this section. The bill does not establish an appeal or dispute resolution</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>process for Section 408 decisions -- a significant gap NWC identified given how formal and burdensome the program has become. It does not address retroactive application of Section 408 to legacy projects, which has created hardship for non-Federal sponsors. It does not provide dedicated funding for the Section 408 program or make it easier for non-Federal entities to pay for reviews. It does not resolve whether Section 408 should apply to local flood protection projects historically governed by the Federal Flood Control Regulations -- an issue NWC has identified as a potential overreach of Corps authority. And it does not address NWC's suggestion that certified non-Federal engineers be allowed to perform Section 408-certified analyses under Corps standards to improve timeliness. These remain</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>open matters for NWC to pursue through oversight, the ongoing Corps rulemaking process, and future legislative vehicles.</i></p> <p><i>[Note: A separate Corps proposed rulemaking on Section 408 is ongoing. Comments were received but a final rule has not been issued. This statutory provision requiring categorical permissions by rule may intersect with or accelerate that rulemaking process.]</i></p>
<p>Sec. 106 <i>Contributions by Non-Federal Interests</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Corps to accept non-Federal funds for a project that has exceeded or is expected to exceed its authorized maximum cost threshold, pursuant to a written agreement.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 902(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280(b)) to allow the Secretary to accept contributed funds from a non-Federal interest when a project has exceeded or is expected to exceed its Section 902 maximum cost limit.</p> <p>Two conditions must be met: first, the Chief of Engineers must make a formal determination</p>	<p><i>This proposed provision is a meaningful but narrowly structured fix. It does not raise or waive the Section 902 limit -- it only creates a pathway for non-Federal interests to voluntarily contribute funds to keep a project moving when the cap has been hit, without triggering a full reauthorization, as long as</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>under Section 8155(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (WRDA 2022) that the cost ceiling has been or is expected to be exceeded; and second, the contributed funds must be accepted pursuant to a written agreement under Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970. The Secretary may then use those funds to carry out the project, provided that doing so does not increase the Federal share of project costs.</p>	<p><i>the Federal cost share does not increase.</i></p> <p><i>NWC's December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee directly identified Section 902 cost limits and construction pauses as a significant member concern, noting that projects approaching or exceeding the Section 902 limit can stall for a year or longer while a Post-Authorization Change Report (PACR) is prepared and new Congressional authorization is sought. This concern for project construction pauses was flagged as a significant factor in creating project delivery delays and further cost increases.</i></p> <p><i>NWC members specifically suggested allowing non-Federal sponsors to pre-authorize contributed funds within the</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), with Corps concurrence, so contracts can be awarded when bids come in slightly above the Section 902 limit without waiting for new legislation. This provision moves in that direction by creating a contributed-funds pathway, though it still requires a formal Chief of Engineers determination and a written agreement, which may add time. NWC should monitor implementation to assess whether the process is streamlined enough to provide meaningful relief for projects in the field.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 107 <i>Electronic Submission and Tracking of Permit Applications</i></p>	<p>Requires the Secretary to use an electronic system for project permit application preparation, submission, and tracking.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 2040 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345) to significantly expand the Corps' existing electronic permitting system to cover Federal environmental review documents in addition to permit applications.</p>	<p><i>NWC's December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee highlighted the need for clear, predictable timelines and better communication between the Corps, non-Federal sponsors, and</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Specifically, the section requires the Secretary to implement an electronic system enabling: electronic preparation and submission of applications for permits and jurisdictional determinations; and tracking of documents related to Federal environmental reviews for projects under Corps jurisdiction or for which the Corps is designated as the lead Federal agency. Non-Federal interests must be able to use the system to submit information related to Federal environmental review documents for their projects and to track the status of those environmental reviews.</p> <p>The section also requires the Secretary to use the electronic system to enhance interagency coordination in the preparation of Federal environmental review documents to the maximum extent practicable. Federal environmental review documents must be retained in the system and made available to the public. Record retention requirements apply to all</p>	<p><i>Congress on project status and implementation. The expansion of the electronic system to cover Federal environmental review tracking directly supports sponsors' ability to monitor project progress and plan accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>Importantly, the deadline for full implementation of the electronic system is reset to 1 year after enactment of WRDA 2026. The reset of the implementation deadline to 1 year after enactment of WRDA 2026 signals that the prior WRDA 2022 deadline was not met. NWC should monitor Corps implementation closely and be prepared to flag non-compliance if the system is not operational within the new deadline.</i></p> <p><i>[A similar provision addressing Electronic Submission and Tracking</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Federal environmental review documents prepared after enactment.</p> <p>The deadline for full implementation of the electronic system is reset to 1 year after enactment of WRDA 2026 -- the prior deadline tied to WRDA 2022 having apparently not been met. The section also directs the Secretary to take into consideration the results of the permitting portal study conducted under the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (the E-NEPA study) in carrying out these requirements.</p>	<p><i>of Permit Applications was included in Section 107 of the House WRDA 2024 bill, but was <u>not</u> included in the final WRDA 2024 conference legislation.]</i></p>
<p>Sec. 108 <i>Project Study Schedule and Cost Estimate</i></p>	<p>Provides a non-Federal interest greater control over feasibility study schedules and costs within the existing four-year, \$5 million goal and requires notifications to Congress when a study is extended or terminated.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA 2014) and Section 905(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986) to give non-Federal interests significantly more influence over feasibility study scheduling and cost management, within the existing statutory goal of completing feasibility studies within 4 years and \$5 million in Federal costs.</p>	<p><i>NWC's December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee identified cost overruns, schedule delays, and design maturity expectations as major member concerns, noting that non-Federal sponsors operate within fixed or voter-approved revenue structures and must plan years in advance based on anticipated scopes, schedules, and</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>On the conduct of feasibility studies, the Secretary must: complete feasibility studies as efficiently and expeditiously as practicable; align the study scope with the goals of the non-Federal interest to the extent practicable; and ensure that Corps district, division, and headquarters personnel conduct their reviews concurrently rather than sequentially. The Chief's Report must include sufficient information for Congress to fully review the study, which may include details on remaining project cost uncertainties appropriate to the maturity of the project design at the time of submission -- a meaningful accommodation for studies that have not reached full design maturity.</p> <p>On scheduling, the District Engineer must establish milestone deadlines and a total cost estimate for each feasibility study in collaboration with the non-Federal interest, taking into account the non-Federal interest's goals, statutory requirements, study complexity, and other factors identified jointly. Study complexity is formally defined and includes project type, size,</p>	<p><i>cost estimates. The requirement that District Engineers collaborate with non-Federal interests in setting milestone deadlines -- and extend deadlines at their request -- directly responds to those concerns.</i></p> <p><i>Improving the Corps' outreach, communications, collaboration, and coordination with non-Federal interests has long been a concern of NWC members and other stakeholders, and could help address some of the challenges stemming from the cumulative effects of extended feasibility studies, evolving design assumptions, gaps in project delivery, and other project delay factors.</i></p> <p><i>The concurrent review requirement across district, division, and headquarters levels addresses the</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>location, scope, and projected cost; use of innovative design or construction techniques; need for significant action by other Federal, state, or local agencies; and the degree of public dispute regarding the project's nature, effects, or economic and environmental costs and benefits. The District Engineer must extend any milestone deadline at the request of the non-Federal interest, including beyond the 4-year goal.</p> <p>The Secretary must submit an annual report to Congress listing all detailed project schedules established in the fiscal year; identifying any study expected to exceed the 4-year goal; identifying any study expected to exceed the \$5 million Federal cost cap with an explanation; and explaining any missed deadlines or extensions. The report must be made publicly available within 14 days of submission to Congress.</p> <p>On terminations, the Secretary must provide written notice to Congress whenever a feasibility study is terminated or proposed to be terminated, including the reasons for termination</p>	<p><i>sequential review bottleneck that NWC's testimony identified as a key driver of schedule slippage.</i></p> <p><i>The flexibility on design maturity in Chief's Reports also aligns with NWC's position that one size does not fit all for project cost estimating. The retroactive applicability provision -- allowing ongoing studies to opt into the new framework on request -- is particularly significant for non-Federal interests currently stuck in studies initiated under the prior, less flexible framework.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>and any alternatives the non-Federal interest may pursue.</p> <p>The amendments apply to studies initiated on or after enactment. For ongoing studies that have not yet received a final Chief of Engineers report, the non-Federal interest may request that the new requirements be applied retroactively.</p>	
<p>Sec. 109 <i>Continuing Authority Programs</i></p>	<p>Establishes two new continuing authority programs (CAPs), one for drought resiliency and another for improving completed flood risk management projects. Also modifies authorizations for the Corps' existing CAPs.</p>	<p>This section establishes 2 new continuing authority programs (CAPs) and updates funding limits for several existing CAPs.</p> <p>New CAP 1 -- Project Modifications for Improvements to Flood Risk Management (Sec. 109(a)): Creates a new CAP allowing the Secretary to study and carry out modifications to the structure or operations of existing Corps flood risk management projects, or projects eligible for assistance under Public Law 84-99, where modifications are needed to improve flood risk management or meet applicable Federal standards including levee accreditation standards.</p>	<p><i>NWC's December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee highlighted non-Federal delivery tools and the importance of CAPs as mechanisms that allow non-Federal sponsors with technical capacity and local resources to advance projects more quickly than the standard Federal process allows. The 2 new CAPs created here -- particularly the flood risk management improvement CAP -- are directly relevant to NWC's levee and flood control members who need a</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Studies must include all benefit-cost calculations required under WRDA 2007 and an assessment of geographical transfers of flood risk within and beyond the project boundaries. Projects may proceed if modifications are feasible, consistent with authorized purposes, in the public interest, cost effective, and any flood risk increases are offset within the project boundaries. The non-Federal interest must provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations (LERRDs), which are credited toward the non-Federal share. Cost share is 50/50 for studies (with the first \$100,000 at Federal expense) and 75% non-Federal / 25% Federal for construction. The total Federal expenditure cap per project is \$15 million. Annual appropriations of \$50 million are authorized. Deferred maintenance by the non-Federal interest is explicitly excluded from eligible project scope, and the as-built condition of the project serves as the baseline for determining modifications.</p> <p>New CAP 2 -- Studies and Projects for Drought Resiliency (Sec. 109(c)): Rewrites Section 155 of</p>	<p><i>streamlined pathway to modify existing Corps projects to meet current accreditation standards or improve performance. The drought resiliency CAP is significant for western water supply members facing increasing drought conditions.</i></p> <p><i>The increases to existing CAP funding limits, while modest, reflect cost escalation since prior authorizations and are consistent with NWC's longstanding position that CAP funding levels should keep pace with project cost realities. The explicit exclusion of deferred maintenance from the flood risk management improvement CAP is worth monitoring -- non-Federal sponsors should be aware that this CAP cannot be used as a substitute for addressing their own operation and maintenance backlogs.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (WRDA 2020) to establish a comprehensive drought resiliency CAP. Eligible study and project activities include water conservation measures, sediment management for increased water storage, mitigation of nonnative species that exacerbate drought such as salt cedar, planting of native species to reduce drought risk, construction of small water storage projects (defined as new projects with storage capacity between 2,000 and 30,000 acre-feet, or enlargements of 1,000 to 30,000 acre-feet), and other drought resiliency actions. The Secretary must incorporate natural and nature-based features (NNBFs) to the maximum extent practicable. Cost share is 50/50 for studies (with the first \$100,000 at Federal expense) and 35% non-Federal / 65% Federal for construction, except small water storage projects follow the standard cost-share framework under Section 103 of WRDA 1986 (100% non-Federal for municipal and industrial water supply; 35% non-Federal for agricultural water supply; 50% non-Federal for recreation). The total Federal expenditure cap per</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>project is \$10 million. Annual appropriations of \$35 million are authorized. The Secretary may also provide technical assistance to non-Federal interests for comprehensive, system-wide operations and maintenance approaches accounting for changing conditions from extreme weather events.</p> <p>Updates to Existing CAP Funding Limits (Sec. 109(d)-(g)): Raises the annual program funding caps for 4 existing CAPs: Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection (Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946) increases from \$50 million to \$62.5 million; Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948) increases from \$90 million to \$100 million; Removal of Obstructions and Clearing Channels increases from \$15 million to \$19 million; and Project Modifications for Improvement of Environment or Drought Resiliency (Section 1135 of WRDA 1986) increases from \$62 million to \$75 million.</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Both new CAPs are added to the statutory definition of continuing authority programs under WRRDA 2014.</p>	
<p>Sec. 110 <i>Dredged Material Management Plans</i></p>	<p>Requires dredged material management plans to identify dredged material placement capacity for a minimum of 10 years.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to provide for a minimum of 10 years of dredged material placement capacity when developing a dredged material management plan for an authorized water resources development project. An exception applies if the Secretary finds that meeting the 10-year minimum is not feasible due to complexity, controversy, or other compelling factors. The exception is discretionary and fact-specific -- it is not a general waiver -- but the "other compelling factors" language gives the Corps meaningful flexibility to avoid the requirement where circumstances warrant.</p>	<p><i>Long-range dredged material placement capacity planning is a persistent challenge for navigation sponsors, particularly in the Great Lakes and along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts where upland placement capacity is increasingly constrained. A 10-year planning horizon, if enacted, would strengthen the ability of non-Federal interests to plan maintenance dredging cycles with greater predictability.</i></p> <p><i>However, the exception for complexity, controversy, or other compelling factors is broad enough that it could be applied inconsistently across districts,</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>potentially undermining the planning period requirement and the planning discipline Congress intends. NWC should consider whether the exception language needs to be tightened as the bill moves forward.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 111 <i>Dredging Coordination</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to consult with non-Federal interests, state and local governments, and other stakeholders on scope and timelines when entering into or modifying contracts for maintenance dredging.</p>	<p>This section amends the Corps' maintenance dredging contracting process in 3 ways.</p> <p>First, on consultation: For any maintenance dredging contract entered into on or after the date of enactment, the Secretary must consult with stakeholders -- including the non-Federal interest, relevant Federal and state entities, and to the extent practicable other non-Federal entities that utilize or rely on the project -- when determining the scope and performance timeline of the contract. An exception applies when the Secretary determines an emergency exists or there is an important national interest at stake, in</p>	<p><i>This section appears to be aimed at promoting transparency and coordination between the Corps and applicable non-Federal interests. NWC may wish to consider whether to weigh in on the scope of the emergency exception to the consultation requirement, including whether the exception is potentially so broad that it could be applied inconsistently across districts, potentially undermining the consultation requirement and the</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>which case the Secretary may proceed without stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>Second, on communication: If the Secretary receives information from a dredging contractor about changes affecting contract performance, the Secretary must within 3 business days determine whether those changes are reasonably likely to affect the period of performance, and if so, notify the applicable non-Federal interest.</p> <p>Third, on capability numbers: Upon request, the Secretary must make available to the applicable non-Federal interest the Corps' estimate of the amount of funding it could reasonably expend in a fiscal year on a given maintenance dredging activity.</p>	<p><i>planning discipline that Congress intends.</i></p> <p><i>NWC also may wish to consider whether to weigh in on whether 3 business days is sufficient notification time for non-Federal interests to respond to contract performance changes.</i></p> <p><i>The section's provision allowing an applicable non-Federal interest access to Corps capability numbers for maintenance dredging funding estimates could provide greater transparency for the non-Federal interest's maintenance dredging planning efforts.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 112 <i>Federal Standard for Dredged Material</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to update regulations related to the Federal standard for dredged material management, to align with</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to update the Federal standard regulations governing dredged material disposal or placement (chapter II of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations) to align with 3</p>	<p><i>This section directly addresses a long-standing gap in dredged materials management. Congress has directed the Corps through</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Disposal or Placement</i></p>	<p>requirements in prior Water Resources Development Acts.</p>	<p>prior statutory directives that have not yet been fully incorporated into regulation: Section 1130 of WRDA 2024 on beneficial use; Section 125(a) of WRDA 2020, which requires that economic benefits and efficiencies from beneficial use be included in Federal standard determinations and establishes a national goal of beneficially using not less than 70 percent by volume of suitable dredged material obtained from construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects; and Section 1122 of WRDA 2016 on dredged material placement flexibility.</p> <p>In updating the regulations, the Secretary must take into consideration: the capacity of confined aquatic disposal (CAD) facilities to store dredged material including contaminated material; monetary value creation attributable to beneficial use; environmental and coastal resiliency benefits of beneficial use; the demand on the Corps for environmental and ecological restoration in coastal areas; and any incremental costs borne by non-Federal interests in implementing beneficial placement separately from a project. The</p>	<p><i>multiple WRDAs to prioritize beneficial use and incorporate its economic benefits into Federal standard determinations, but the underlying regulations have not been updated to reflect those directives. The 6-month rulemaking initiation deadline is notable.</i></p> <p><i>NWC may wish to consider weighing in on the rulemaking process once initiated, particularly on the 70 percent beneficial use goal, the treatment of incremental non-Federal costs, or the consideration of confined aquatic disposal capacity in Federal standard determinations.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		Secretary must initiate a rulemaking within 6 months of enactment.	
<p>Sec. 113 <i>Levee Certifications</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to initiate a rulemaking to establish the methodology or process by which the Secretary conducts risk assessments of levees.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 3014 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA 2014) to require the Secretary to initiate a rulemaking within 180 days of enactment establishing the methodology or process for conducting levee risk assessments under the Corps' levee certification program. The rulemaking is to be carried out in coordination with the Administrator -- which, based on the definitions incorporated from Section 9002 of WRDA 2007 into the underlying levee safety statutory framework, refers to the FEMA Administrator -- and the Committee on Levee Safety established under Section 9003 of WRDA 2007.</p> <p>In developing the rule, the Secretary must evaluate multiple risk assessment methodologies -- specifically both deterministic and probabilistic methods -- and assess significant differences</p>	<p><i>NWC has an established position on risk-informed decision-making in the levee safety context. In February 2023 comments on the proposed Public Law (P.L.) 84-99 rulemaking, NWC raised significant concerns that the Corps was attempting to incorporate risk-informed decision-making approaches into eligibility determinations without clearly articulating what "risk-informed decision-making" means, how it is to be applied, or under what statutory authority it is being promoted. NWC argued that no objective or externally peer-reviewed criteria or standards existed for such approaches, and that the Corps had not adequately</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>between them across 6 dimensions: cost; reproducibility of results; level of confidence in results; how each method accounts for flood risk assessment and management implications including risk to human life and property; economic impacts; and other relevant factors. A public notice and comment period of not less than 90 days is required.</p> <p>The bill provides statutory definitions for both methodologies. A deterministic method is a physical-criteria-based evaluation that determines compliance with the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event standard by measuring levee performance against specific fixed physical margins -- including freeboard, embankment protection, closure devices, and structural stability -- to produce a binary determination of structural adequacy. A probabilistic method is a statistical-inference-based evaluation used as an alternative or supplement to the deterministic methodology, determining the likelihood of levee failure or overtopping through system response or fragility curves, Monte Carlo simulations or</p>	<p><i>engaged non-Federal sponsors in developing them.</i></p> <p><i>Numerous levee interests also have expressed concerns that the Corps and FEMA (the Agencies) have, in recent years, been internally shifting their levee accreditation policy away from long-established "deterministic" accreditation standards (a set of rule-based physical requirements for levee accreditation that FEMA established in 44 CFR § 65.10, which provided local sponsors with objective, verifiable criteria) towards informal, internally-developed and unverified "risk-informed" probabilistic methodologies, which have not been validated and vetted through a formal rulemaking process. These levee interests are concerned that any change to levee evaluation</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>similar stochastic modeling, and catastrophe models or proprietary risk-rating algorithms used for flood insurance premiums or levee safety action classifications.</p>	<p><i>and accreditation standards should have to go through the transparency and economic scrutiny of formal rulemaking to ensure that the standards the Agencies adopt are vetted, transparent, and grounded in scientific reality.</i></p> <p><i>Section 113 responds in part to the foregoing concerns of levee interests by requiring the Corps to establish the risk assessment methodology to be used for evaluating levees through a formal rulemaking, with a 90-day public comment period, and by requiring the Secretary to evaluate and compare both deterministic and probabilistic methodologies across defined criteria, including cost, reproducibility, confidence in results, and economic impacts.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>The statutory definitions of both methodologies provided in this section also address NWC's concern that "risk-informed decision-making" has been an undefined, moving target.</i></p> <p><i>The choice between deterministic and probabilistic methodologies has major practical consequences for non-Federal levee owners -- probabilistic methods can result in different levee safety action classifications and accreditation outcomes, with direct implications for FEMA flood mapping, flood insurance rates, and eligibility for Corps assistance programs. Not all of NWC's levee and flood control members will view this provision the same way.</i></p> <p>NWC may wish to consider developing a formal position on the</p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>relative merits of deterministic versus probabilistic levee risk assessment methodologies in advance of the rulemaking required under this section.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 114 <i>Allocations from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund</i></p>	<p>Clarifies Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) allocation requirements from the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (WRDA 2020). Requires an annual report from the Corps on HMTF allocations by category and variations between required and actual allocations.</p>	<p>This section addresses two distinct issues with the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) full-funding framework established in the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (WRDA 2020).</p> <p>First, a Sense of Congress reaffirms that the Secretary should annually allocate all funds made available for harbor and inland harbor operations and maintenance -- including funds appropriated from the HMTF and costs of expanded uses at eligible harbors -- in accordance with the allocation requirements of Section 102(a)(1) of WRDA 2020.</p> <p>Second, and more substantively, the section amends Section 102(a) of WRDA 2020 to</p>	<p><i>The removal of "to the extent practicable" and "to the extent there are identifiable needs" from the WRDA 2020 HMTF allocation framework is a meaningful strengthening of the spending requirements -- it converts what were aspirational directives into mandatory ones. The new corrective plan reporting requirement adds accountability when the Corps fails to comply.</i></p> <p><i>The separate issue NWC raised in December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee regarding stranded HMTF authority during continuing</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>strengthen the allocation requirements by removing two qualifying phrases -- "to the extent practicable" and "to the extent there are identifiable needs" -- that had allowed the Corps discretion to avoid full compliance with the allocation framework. Their removal makes the allocation requirements mandatory rather than aspirational.</p> <p>The section also replaces the existing annual reporting requirement with a more detailed one, requiring the Secretary to report annually to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee on: total expenditures made in each allocation category under WRDA 2020; a project-by-project list of expenditures; and, critically, an explanation for any failure to comply with the allocation requirements along with a corrective plan for the subsequent fiscal year.</p>	<p><i>resolutions -- approximately \$316 million in FY 2025 -- is a distinct problem that falls outside the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and would need to be addressed through the appropriations process or through the Ways and Means Committee.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 115 <i>Soo Lock Operator Wage Rates</i></p>	<p>Establishes a normalized wage rate for Corps employees at the Soo Locks in Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding any other law, rule, or regulation, this section requires that nonsupervisory, leader, and supervisory wage employees of the Corps of Engineers at the navigation locks at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan -- including those operating lock and dam equipment and those who repair and maintain navigation lock and dam operating machinery -- be paid from special wage schedules with rates identical to the regular wage schedule authorized for the Detroit District Office. This effectively standardizes and normalizes Soo Lock operator compensation to align with Detroit District wage rates.</p>	<p><i>The Soo Locks are among the most strategically critical navigation infrastructure in the country -- a failure or prolonged closure would significantly disrupt Great Lakes iron ore, steel, and grain shipments with national economic consequences. Workforce retention and recruitment at the Soo Locks has been a concern for the navigation community.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 116 <i>Beneficial Use of Dredged Material from Harbors in Ohio</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite execution of agreements with non-Federal sponsors for the design, construction, or operation of facilities providing for beneficial use of dredged material from Federally authorized harbors in Ohio.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to expedite review of requests from non-Federal interests to enter into partnership agreements under Section 217(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (WRDA 1996) for the design, construction, or operation of facilities demonstrating beneficial uses of dredged</p>	<p><i>Dredged material placement capacity is a persistent challenge for Great Lakes harbors, where open-lake disposal has faced increasing regulatory and environmental constraints. The proposed provisions in this section aim to promote the design,</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>material from Federally authorized harbors in Ohio.</p> <p>Three additional provisions accompany the expedited review requirement. First, on user fees: Agreements entered into after expedited review may allow the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interest for funds it contributed through subsequent user fees, treating the non-Federal interest as though it were a private entity under Section 217(d)(2) of WRDA 1996 -- a meaningful financing flexibility. Second, on dredged material management plans: If the Secretary determines that timely completion of a dredged material management plan is not feasible due to complexity, controversy, or other compelling factors, the Secretary may enter into the partnership agreement before the plan is complete, removing a potential sequencing barrier. Third, on practices and procedures: Prior to entering into an agreement, the Secretary may apply the practices and procedures under 33 C.F.R. Part 337 to the proposed facility.</p>	<p><i>construction, and operation of dredged material placement facilities in the region.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 117 <i>Minimum Real Estate Interest</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to revise or update the Corps' policy and guidance documents related to identifying and approving the appropriate minimum real estate interest for water resources development projects.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to revise or update Corps policy and guidance documents -- specifically including Chapter 12 of Engineering Regulation 405-1-12, the Real Estate Handbook -- related to identifying and approving the minimum real estate interest necessary to support a water resources development project, within 180 days of enactment, consistent with Section 1104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (WRDA 2024). All changes to policy and guidance documents must be made publicly available on a Corps website.</p> <p>The section also amends Section 1104 of WRDA 2024 directly to add a delegation of approval authority provision, requiring the Secretary to delegate approval of minimum real estate interest determinations to the District Commander of the relevant Corps district to the maximum extent practicable. This delegation requirement is designed to push decision-making down to the district level and reduce the delays associated with elevation to division or</p>	<p><i>This provision directly addresses one of the most prominent issues in NWC's December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee, which identified minimum necessary real estate interests and lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas (LERRDs) practices as a top member concern. The testimony specifically noted that Section 1104 of WRDA 2024 -- which this section now requires to be implemented within 180 days -- had not yet been implemented, and that Corps districts were continuing to require fee simple title or perpetual easements where lesser interests would suffice.</i></p> <p><i>The 180-day implementation deadline and the public availability requirement are both responsive to NWC member concerns about</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>headquarters for routine minimum interest determinations.</p>	<p><i>delayed and inconsistent implementation. The delegation of approval authority to District Commanders is also directly responsive to testimony concerns about decisions being elevated unnecessarily to division or headquarters, causing delays.</i></p> <p>NWC should consider going on record in support of this provision.</p> <p><i>[See also Section 138, Sense of Congress Regarding Evaluation of Flood Risk Management Projects, which states that the Secretary should review and communicate to the non-Federal interest the minimum real estate interest necessary for completed flood risk management projects to maintain project benefits and process non-Federal requests for alterations.]</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 118 <i>Real Estate Appraisal Validity</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to review and update all policies and guidance applicable to the real estate appraisal process for civil works projects to identify efficiencies and align durations for appraisal and certified cost estimate validity.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 210 days of enactment, to complete a review of all Corps policies and guidance applicable to the real estate appraisal process for civil works projects, with the goal of identifying efficiencies including in the review and approval of appraisals, and to issue revised policies and guidance based on that review to ensure efficient project delivery and avoid delays during feasibility study review and approval, to the extent practicable.</p> <p>In carrying out the review, the Secretary must develop: guidelines for determining appraisal validity throughout the period from receipt of the appraisal through expiration of the certified total project cost estimate for the applicable project; standard timeframes for appraisal review; and standard delegations of authority to approve appraisals, for use at the Secretary's discretion.</p> <p>Within 30 days of completing the review, the Secretary must report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and</p>	<p><i>Real estate appraisal validity periods and the timing of certified cost estimates have been a practical source of project delivery delays -- appraisals can expire before acquisition is complete, requiring costly re-appraisals that further extend schedules. Standardizing review timeframes and delegating approval authority to the district level could reduce bottlenecks in the appraisal process.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Public Works (EPW) Committee describing the findings, identifying any policy and guidance revisions made, and identifying any additional recommendations for legislative action to further improve the real estate appraisal process.</p>	
<p>Sec. 119 <i>Watershed and River Basin Assessments</i></p>	<p>Includes additional locations for watershed-based studies under section 729 of WRDA 1986.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 729 of WRDA 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a) in 2 ways. First, it expands the scope of watershed assessments under subsection (a)(5) to explicitly include projected water supply needs for municipal, domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes -- clarifying that water supply planning is an eligible component of Section 729 watershed assessments. Second, it adds 8 new locations to the authorized list of watersheds and river basins eligible for Section 729 studies: Eightmile River Watershed, Connecticut; Central Florida watersheds; Muskegon River Watershed, Michigan; Great Egg Harbor River Watershed, New Jersey; Middle Rio Grande Watershed, New Mexico; the Upper Ohio River Basin; the Rio</p>	<p><i>The explicit addition of projected water supply needs to the Section 729 assessment scope clarifies that water supply planning is an eligible component of watershed assessments. The 8 new locations reflect member and Congressional district priorities.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		Grande Basin, Texas; and the Great Salt Lake Basin.	
<p>Sec. 120 <i>Prohibition on Diversion of Water from Missouri River</i></p>	<p>Prohibits the diversion of water from the Missouri River or any of its tributaries to a state outside of the watershed, unless approved by the Governor of each of the Missouri River states.</p>	<p>This section prohibits the diversion or export of water from the Missouri River or any of its tributaries for use outside a Missouri River state unless approved by the Governors of all 10 Missouri River states: Colorado, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Wyoming.</p> <p>The prohibition extends to feasibility studies -- the Secretary may not undertake or fund any study of the feasibility of diverting or exporting Missouri River water outside the basin without the approval of all 10 Governors. A savings clause preserves any diversions or exports authorized with respect to express or implied Federal reserved water rights on or before January 1, 2025.</p>	<p><i>This is a politically significant provision for Missouri River basin states, reflecting longstanding tensions between basin states and potential out-of-basin water users. The unanimous Governor approval requirement is a high bar. The extension of the prohibition to feasibility studies -- not just actual diversions -- is noteworthy, as it prevents the Corps from even studying out-of-basin transfers without full basin-state consent.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 121</p>	<p>Increases the authorized amount for the Secretary to contract with</p>	<p>This section amends Section 120(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C.</p>	<p><i>This is an increase in authorized funding levels (not appropriations).</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Law Enforcement at Water Resources Development Projects</i></p>	<p>state or local governments for law enforcement services at Corps' facilities.</p>	<p>1962d-5d(b)) to increase the authorized ceiling for reimbursable agreements between the Corps and state or local law enforcement agencies for security services at Corps facilities from \$10 million to \$20 million.</p>	
<p>Sec. 122 <i>Disaster Debris Removal</i></p>	<p>Includes a Sense of Congress that Corps emergency debris removal contracts should expedite removal and minimize harmful impacts to property or wildlife. Requires the Secretary to evaluate certain factors when determining standard terms for emergency debris removal contracts.</p>	<p>This section includes a Sense of Congress that standard terms and provisions used by the Corps in emergency debris removal contracts should facilitate effective and expedient removal of disaster-generated debris that poses a risk to public safety, while maximizing taxpayer value and minimizing unnecessary debris removal that harms property, natural systems, or wildlife.</p> <p>The section also requires the Secretary to evaluate 3 factors in determining standard contract terms for emergency debris removal: the various contract and fee structures utilized by the Corps and the impact of each on total cost and work quality, including an assessment of structures tied to the volume of debris removed; the addition of terms requiring coordination</p>	<p><i>The provisions in this section appear to be driven, in part, by issues that have arisen during Corps emergency debris removal efforts at recent major natural disaster (e.g., extreme weather, flooding, wildfire) event locations.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>between the Corps, contractors, Federal, state, and local agencies and officials, and other relevant experts prior to removing debris to ensure protection of healthy vegetation, important habitats, and vulnerable wildlife; and other terms and measures to protect private property, habitat, and wildlife during emergency debris removal activities.</p>	
<p>Sec. 123 <i>Wildfire Contingency Strategies</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to, at the request of a non-Federal sponsor, develop wildfire contingency strategies identifying wildfire risk and mitigation plans for water resources development projects.</p>	<p>At the request of a non-Federal interest, the section requires the Secretary to develop a wildfire contingency strategy for a water resources development project consisting of 2 components: a wildfire risk assessment and a wildfire mitigation plan.</p> <p>The wildfire risk assessment must identify: risks to the project from wildfires that may affect project operations and the ability to carry out authorized purposes -- including navigation, flood control, irrigation, hydropower, water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation -- as well as risks to life and private property in the project</p>	<p><i>The provisions in this section appear to be driven, in part, by increased concerns for wildfires prevention and response as a result of recent major wildfire events around the nation.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>vicinity; and risks of post-wildfire sediment, debris, and associated runoff into the project.</p> <p>The wildfire mitigation plan must include: a strategy identifying actions the Secretary or non-Federal interest may take to reduce or eliminate wildfire impacts, including hazardous fuels management, fuel or fire breaks, invasive species and vegetation treatments, aquatic ecosystem restoration to increase wildfire resistance, and operational changes including updates to water control manuals; a summary of resources and capabilities to implement the plan; a timeline for implementation; and any other information the Secretary determines necessary.</p> <p>The Secretary must consult with other Federal agencies, states, Tribal governments, local governments, and relevant stakeholders in developing strategies, and must prioritize requests from projects in areas with considerable wildfire risk or that have experienced recent wildfires. A report to Congress on implementation status is due within 18 months of enactment.</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 124 <i>Reservoir Sediment Pilot Program</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to establish a pilot program to allow states to remove sediment from Corps-owned reservoirs to restore storage capacity.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to establish, within 180 days of enactment using available funds, a pilot program under which states may provide sediment removal services at Corps-owned dams and reservoirs to restore authorized storage capacity.</p> <p>Key program requirements: the Secretary must review state services to ensure consistency with the project's authorized purposes; the state must indemnify the United States against adverse project impacts or enter into an approved agreement to address them; and the state must conduct sediment surveys before and after completing services to document the sediment profile and quality.</p> <p>The Secretary may decline to accept state services if, after consulting with the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary determines acceptance is not advantageous to the United States -- with written notice to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate</p>	<p><i>Sediment removal from reservoirs can be a critical maintenance process that restores water storage capacity, mitigates flood risks, and prolongs the lifespan of reservoirs and their dams. Entities with an interest in sediment removal could include water and power utilities, and flood control and other government agencies.</i></p> <p><i>The section includes a pilot program involving location or regional specific projects.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee required if services are declined. Prior to accepting any state services, the Secretary must also provide advance written notice to both committees.</p> <p>A written agreement among the Secretary, the state, and the non-Federal interest must be executed before services begin. The agreement must authorize the Secretary to provide credit to the non-Federal interest for operation and maintenance of the project for the value of services the Secretary determines are integral to the project.</p> <p>The pilot program prioritizes 4 specific locations: John Redmond Reservoir, Kansas; Kanopolis Lake, Kansas; Tuttle Creek Lake, Kansas; and Sardis Lake reservoir, Oklahoma. The pilot program terminates 10 years after enactment.</p>	
Sec. 125	Includes an additional location for remediation of contaminated	This section amends Section 8127(a) of WRDA 2022 to add the navigation project for the Ipswich	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Environmental Dredging</i>	sediment under section 8127(a) of WRDA 2022.	River, Massachusetts -- authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1968 -- to the list of locations eligible for environmental dredging and contaminated sediment remediation under that program.	
Sec. 126 <i>Expenses for Control of Aquatic Plant Growths and Invasive Species</i>	Authorizes certain indirect costs as eligible uses of funds available for control of aquatic plants and invasive species.	This section amends Section 104(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(a)) to explicitly authorize the use of funds appropriated for aquatic plant and invasive species control to pay reasonable and necessary indirect costs associated with those activities, including administrative expenses, overhead, and other costs not directly attributable to a specific project.	<i>This section follows up on provisions in Sec. 1361 of WRDA 2024, which reduced the non-Federal cost share for controlling aquatic plant growths and invasive species from 50% to 35%, lessening the financial burden on local entities. It appears this section is also aimed at potentially lessening the financial burden on local entities.</i>
Sec. 127 <i>Feasibility Studies; Review of Shoreline and</i>	Adds shoreline protection and emergency streambank protection projects to the requirements established in WRDA 2020 for developing feasibility studies.	This section amends Section 116(b) of WRDA 2020 to add shoreline protection and emergency streambank protection to the categories of projects subject to the feasibility study development requirements established in that	<i>Section 116(b) of WRDA 2020 required the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, to include in each feasibility report developed under section 905 of</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Streambank Protection</i></p>		<p>section, alongside the existing flood risk reduction category.</p>	<p><i>WRDA 1986 for a project that contains a flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction element, a summary of the natural or nature-based feature alternatives, along with their long-term costs and benefits, that were evaluated in the development of the feasibility report, and, if such alternatives were not included in the recommended plan, an explanation of why such alternatives were not included in the recommended plan.</i></p> <p><i>Section 127 focuses on shoreline protection and emergency streambank protection measures that are also to be considered in studying projects containing flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction elements.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 128 <i>Harmful Algal Bloom Demonstration Program</i></p>	<p>Includes additional locations for the management of harmful algal blooms under section 128 of WRDA 2020 and requires annual reports to Congress on the status of the program.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 128 of WRDA 2020 in 2 ways. First, it adds 4 new locations to the Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) demonstration program: Putnam Lake, New York; Ross Island Lagoon, Oregon; lakes and reservoirs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including Blue Marsh Lake; and the Rio Grande River Basin, Texas.</p> <p>Second, it adds a new annual reporting requirement directing the Secretary to provide the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee with an annual update on the status of the HAB demonstration program, beginning no later than 1 year after enactment and continuing annually thereafter.</p>	<p><i>Harmful algal blooms are an increasing water quality challenge at Corps reservoirs and related waterways, with public health, recreation, and water supply implications.</i></p> <p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific projects, and adds a new annual reporting requirement to enable Congress to track the Corps' implementation of the HAB demonstration program.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 129 <i>Shoreline and Riverine Protection and Restoration</i></p>	<p>Includes additional locations for projects to reduce flood hazards and restore rivers under section 212(e) of WRDA 1999.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 212(e)(2) of WRDA 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332(e)(2)) to add 4 new locations to the shoreline and riverine protection and restoration program: the shoreline of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; the Blackstone</p>	<p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific projects/areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		River, Rhode Island; the Rio Grande watershed bordering counties, Texas; and the Passumpsic River, Vermont.	
<p>Sec. 130 <i>Fish and Oyster Habitat Restoration</i></p>	<p>Modifies the program established by section 704(b) of WRDA 1986 to include projects related to the restoration of habitat for native oysters in several rivers in New York.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 704(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986) (33 U.S.C. 2263(b)(2)) to add a new category of eligible projects for the restoration and rehabilitation of habitat for fish, including native oysters, in the East River, Flushing Bay and River, and Bronx River in New York. Eligible activities under this new category include: construction of oyster bars and reefs; rehabilitation of existing marginal habitat and oyster reef sites; use of appropriate alternative substrate material in oyster bar and reef construction; construction and upgrading of oyster hatcheries; and activities to increase the output of native oyster broodstock for seeding and monitoring of restored sites to ensure ecological success.</p>	<p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific projects/areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 131 <i>Benefits and Costs Attributable to Certain Measures</i></p>	<p>Creates a pilot program for an alternative cost-justification analysis of natural and nature-based features. The pilot program consists of 10 projects and sunsets in five years.</p>	<p>This section establishes a limited pilot under which the Secretary must treat benefits attributable to natural features or nature-based features (NNBFs) -- as defined in Section 1184(a) of WRDA 2016 -- as at least equal to the costs of those measures in the benefit-cost evaluation of an authorized water resources development project. This alternative cost-justification approach may be applied to no more than 10 projects.</p> <p>Two (2) projects are specifically designated as priority projects for this authority: the New York and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries flood and storm damage reduction project; and a recommendation for mitigation of hot spot erosion on an authorized coastal storm risk management project in New Jersey developed under Section 1217 of WRDA 2024.</p> <p>The Secretary must report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee within 4 years of</p>	<p>NWC <u>testified before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee in June 2021</u> on natural and nature-based features. NWC's longstanding position has been that natural and nature-based features should be a tool in the toolbox, but not the only mandated tool. This provision is consistent with that position in that it creates an alternative cost-justification pathway for projects using natural and nature-based features (NNBFs) without mandating their use -- the pilot is limited to 10 projects and sunsets in 5 years.</p> <p>NWC may wish to revisit the June 2021 testimony to assess whether any specific positions taken there bear directly on this provision.</p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>enactment on the results of each evaluation carried out under this authority. The authority to initiate new evaluations under this section sunsets 5 years after enactment.</p>	
<p>Sec. 132 <i>Policy on Utilization of All Corps Authorities and Missions</i></p>	<p>Establishes the policy that the Corps maximize use of the full array of its authorities and mission areas, including addressing local water resource challenges, developing economic and environmental benefit analyses, and maximizing development of project alternatives.</p>	<p>This section establishes as United States policy that the Corps of Engineers, consistent with applicable statutory authorities, shall: fully utilize the programmatic, technical and planning assistance, and project-specific authorities provided by Congress in addressing its mission areas; maximize use of the full array of authorities and mission areas to comprehensively address local water resources challenges consistent with the goals of the applicable non-Federal interest; fully identify and analyze National Economic Development (NED) benefits, regional economic development benefits, environmental quality benefits, and other societal effects of proposed water resources development activities and projects; ensure that the Corps receives and allocates sufficient funding to address the varied local water resources challenges of diverse</p>	<p><i>NWC provided testimony in December 2025 to the House T&I Committee on the importance of recognizing and advancing multi-use benefits in the evaluation and implementation of Corps projects. The testimony pointed out that, among other things, when multi-use benefits are not recognized or counted, projects may appear less cost-effective at the Federal level even though they deliver significant regional and national value. This can limit the use of innovative solutions, discourage integrated project designs, and reduce the ability of sponsors to pursue the most resilient and sustainable</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>geographic regions; and maximize the development, evaluation, and recommendation of project alternatives that produce comprehensive project benefits.</p> <p>The mission areas covered by this policy are: navigation, including coastal and inland waterways navigation; flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, including non-structural, natural, or nature-based features and stormwater management; environmental and ecosystem restoration and protection; municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency; recreation, including recreational navigation; hydropower; aquatic plant and species control; emergency response; and research and development.</p> <p>The Secretary must give full consideration to requests and proposals from non-Federal interests that align with the authorized programmatic, technical and planning assistance, and project-specific authorities and mission areas described in this section.</p>	<p><i>approaches. Multi-use solutions often represent the most efficient way to meet overlapping community needs, and improved recognition of these benefits would better align Corps practices with modern integrated water management.</i></p> <p><i>This section aims to recognize and address the importance of recognizing and advancing multi-use benefits in the evaluation and implementation of Corps projects.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 133 <i>Comprehensive Feasibility Studies and Approaches for Flood Risk Management and Coastal Storm Risk Management</i></p>	<p>Clarifies that the Corps' flood risk management and coastal storm risk management missions should address all types of flooding and utilize both structural and nonstructural approaches.</p>	<p>This section makes 3 sets of substantive amendments to existing law:</p> <p>First, amends the Declaration of Policy in the Flood Control Act of 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701a) to: expand the scope of flood control policy to cover other water bodies and shorelines in addition to rivers; explicitly recognize that destructive floods can originate from or be augmented by a variety of drivers, including riverine discharges, extreme weather events, coastal and tidal flooding, sea level rise, subsidence, and stormwater; clarify that flood control includes reduction of comprehensive flood risk from the isolated and compound effects of all such drivers; and add a Sense of Congress that structural and nonstructural features must be given equal consideration in every feasibility study for flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and that implementation of nonstructural features is part of the primary mission of the Corps for those purposes.</p>	<p><i>The substantive legal changes in this section -- expanding the statutory definition of flood control to cover all flood drivers, and requiring feasibility studies to address all flood drivers within a study area including stormwater -- are significant expansions of study scope that could affect project costs and timelines for non-Federal sponsors.</i></p> <p><i>NWC's may wish to assess member views on the comprehensive flood risk framework established here.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Second, amends the definition of flood control in the Flood Control Act of 1944 (33 U.S.C. 701a-1) to: include reduction of comprehensive flood risk from the isolated and compound effects of the full range of flood drivers identified in Section 8106(a) of WRDA 2022.</p> <p>Third, amends Section 8106(a) of WRDA 2022 to: require that feasibility studies include in their scope any effects of all flood drivers within the geographic study area -- not just the primary flood type -- and explicitly include stormwater flooding associated with flows below 800 cubic feet per second for the 10-percent flood event. It also adds a requirement that if the Secretary determines that a project alternative identified by the non-Federal interest is feasible, the Secretary must incorporate that alternative in the recommended plan as a project feature with costs shared as construction.</p>	
Sec. 134	Directs the Secretary to realign the boundaries of certain districts.	This section requires the Secretary to realign 2 specific Corps district boundaries within 90 days	<i>It is unclear at this point whether the ASACW/Corps leadership</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Realignment of Certain Corps of Engineers Districts</i>		of enactment: Atchison County, Missouri and Holt County, Missouri shall be transferred to the Kansas City District; and Northeast Missouri shall be transferred from the Rock Island District to the St. Louis District.	<i>support these proposed realignments of Corps districts.</i>
Sec. 135 <i>Update of Corps Policy</i>	Requires the Secretary to update any policies or guidance documents required to ensure consistency with and to implement the amendments made in this Act.	This section requires the Secretary, within 120 days of enactment, to take 1 of 2 actions with respect to all Corps policies and guidance documents: issue any new policy or guidance documents necessary to implement this Act; or revise or update any existing Corps policies and guidance documents to bring them into compliance with this Act and its amendments. Subsection (b) adds an automatic revocation provision: any Corps policy or guidance document that remains out of compliance with this Act at the 120-day mark is revoked by operation of law, without any additional Congressional or secretarial action required.	<i>The Corps will need to develop/update, as appropriate, Corps policies and implementation guidance, as called for in this section. (This should go without saying.) However, this has been increasingly <u>not</u> happening in a timely manner, or at all.</i> <i>This section reflects clear Congressional frustration with the Corps' track record of not implementing WRDA provisions in a timely manner -- as of the drafting of this bill, only a handful of WRDA 2024 provisions had been implemented by the Corps. [This is</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>despite an explicit requirement included in Sec. 1102 of WRDA 2024, which among other things, directed the Secretary to develop a plan for implementing the provisions of WRDA 2024, prior WRDAs, and the amendments made by the Act; provide written notice to Congress detailing the status of implementing provisions from prior WRDA laws and identifying those not yet fully implemented, along with explanations for delays; and provide regular briefings to Congress every 90 days until all provisions of WRDA 2024 and prior WRDA laws are fully implemented.]</i></p> <p><i>The automatic revocation mechanism in subsection (b) attempts to give the 120-day deadline real teeth.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>However, several significant questions arise about the practical enforceability of this provision:</i></p> <p><i>Who is the determiner? The bill does not identify who decides which specific Corps policies and guidance documents are out of compliance with the Act. There is no designated arbiter -- not the Secretary, not Congress, not an Inspector General, not a court -- assigned to make that determination.</i></p> <p><i>Who enforces it? Even if a policy or guidance document is deemed non-compliant and therefore revoked, there is no enforcement mechanism in the bill. If the Corps continues operating under revoked guidance, nothing in this section compels them to stop.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>What fills the gap? If existing guidance is automatically revoked but no replacement has been issued, Corps districts may have no governing policy on a particular topic. That vacuum could itself cause confusion, inconsistency, and delays in the field -- the opposite of what Congress intends.</i></p> <p><i>Is it judicially enforceable? A non-Federal interest harmed by Corps reliance on guidance that should have been revoked could theoretically challenge it in court, but that is a lengthy, uncertain, and expensive path that most non-Federal sponsors cannot practically pursue.</i></p> <p><i>The bottom line is that, while this provision is a stronger statement of Congressional intent than prior WRDAs have included, its practical</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>effect depends entirely on the Corps' willingness to comply -- which is precisely the problem Congress is trying to solve.</i></p> <p><i>NWC may wish to flag these implementation questions to committee staff and explore whether additional accountability mechanisms should be added to the bill.</i></p> <p><i>[See also Section 142, Reporting and Oversight, which directs the Secretary to provide a status update to Congress on reports required in previous WRDAs and requires the Secretary to issue guidance documents as required by previous WRDAs.]</i></p>
Sec. 136	Sense of Congress regarding availability of project information,	This section contains 3 components:	<i>This section directly responds to the communication concerns NWC</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Availability of Project Information</i></p>	<p>including feasibility studies, Chief's Reports, project justification and scope, authorization and implementation status, estimated costs and schedules, and operational capabilities.</p>	<p>First, a Sense of Congress that the Corps of Engineers, including each district, should maintain open communications with each office of a Member of Congress.</p> <p>Second, a binding requirement that, at the request of the Chairman or Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee or the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee, the Secretary and the Chief of Engineers shall provide, as expeditiously as possible, information or technical assistance relating to water resources development projects -- including feasibility studies, Chief's Reports, project justification and scope, authorization and implementation status, estimated project costs and schedules, operational capabilities, and other project-related information.</p> <p>Third, a rule of construction providing that nothing in this section shall be construed to grant the Secretary or the Chief of Engineers authority to deny a request for information related to a water resources development project.</p>	<p><i>raised in its December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee, which specifically identified the October 2025 Pentagon (Department of War) directive requiring Corps districts to obtain approval from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of War for Legislative Affairs before engaging with Federal or state elected officials or their staff.</i></p> <p><i>The binding requirement that the Secretary and Chief of Engineers provide information to committee chairmen and ranking members as expeditiously as possible -- and the rule of construction explicitly prohibiting the Secretary from using this section as authority to deny information requests -- are direct Congressional pushback against that directive. The open communications Sense of Congress</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>reinforces the same point, though as a Sense of Congress it carries no legal weight on its own. The binding provisions in subsections (b) and (c) are the operative provisions here.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 137 <i>Fish and Wildlife Mitigation</i></p>	<p>Clarifies the mitigation requirements for all Corps projects and enables use of alternative delivery methods, including third-party instruments, to meet such requirements, in addition to establishing transparency and coordination requirements.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986) (33 U.S.C. 2283) to make several changes to fish and wildlife mitigation requirements for Corps projects.</p> <p><u>On mitigation planning: The Secretary may not approve any proposal related to a water resources project unless a report containing a mitigation plan has been prepared.</u> The Secretary must consult with the non-Federal interest and other stakeholders to identify mitigation implementation practices and accepted assessment methodologies used in the project region and incorporate them into the mitigation plan, and to identify unconstructed projects or</p>	<p><i>The expansion of third-party mitigation instrument eligibility to include future delivery credits and the treatment of credit-based mitigation as a separable element are practical improvements that could reduce project delivery delays associated with mitigation requirements.</i></p> <p><i>[A similar provision addressing fish and wildlife mitigation was included in Section 110 of the House WRDA 2024 bill, but was <u>not</u> included in the final WRDA 2024 conference legislation.]</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>concepts from other mitigation plans that may meet the project's restoration or mitigation needs.</p> <p><u>On third-party mitigation instruments:</u> The bill expands eligibility for mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs to include future delivery of credits -- not just immediate delivery -- and requires that mitigation plans either identify the specific instrument to be used or describe the requirements for a third-party mitigation instrument that would be developed if a contract for future delivery of credits is used.</p> <p><u>On separable elements:</u> Mitigation of fish and wildlife losses provided in the form of credit is deemed a separable element of a project without requiring further evaluation, streamlining the treatment of credit-based mitigation in project accounting.</p> <p><u>On transparency:</u> The Secretary must make mitigation requirements for each project publicly available on the Corps headquarters</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>website, including project location, anticipated mitigation schedule, type and amount of mitigation required, and remaining mitigation needs. Mitigation plans must also be publicly available. All information must be updated regularly, and carrying out these transparency requirements is considered a project expense.</p> <p><u>On coordination:</u> The Secretary must ensure that the Corps' project delivery team and regulatory team work in coordination to carry out mitigation efforts.</p>	
<p>Sec. 138 <i>Sense of Congress Regarding Evaluation of Flood Risk Management Projects</i></p>	<p>Sense of Congress that the Secretary should review and communicate to the non-Federal interest the minimum real estate interest necessary for completed flood risk management projects to maintain project benefits and process non-Federal requests for alterations.</p>	<p>This section provides a Sense of Congress -- non-binding -- expressing that, for each completed Corps flood risk management project for which a real estate interest is required, the Secretary should: review and if necessary update the minimum real estate interest necessary for the project based on as-built drawings, to maintain project benefits, comply with applicable levee owner manual requirements under Public Law 84-99, and support any Section 408 permissions</p>	<p><i>As a Sense of Congress, this provision carries no legal weight, but it reinforces the Congressional direction in Section 117 of this bill regarding minimum real estate interests. The connection to Section 408 permissions is noteworthy -- the review of minimum real estate interests for completed projects is explicitly linked to ensuring non-</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>required for anticipated construction, operation and maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, or replacement; provide a summary of that review to the non-Federal interest or levee operator, including identification of any additional real estate interest the non-Federal interest must acquire; and develop a streamlined process through which the Secretary may update project boundaries upon request to reflect any updated minimum real estate interest determination.</p>	<p><i>Federal interests can obtain the Section 408 permissions they need for ongoing operations.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 139 <i>Recreational Access</i></p>	<p>Sense of Congress that the Secretary should minimize impacts or disruption to public recreational amenities during implementation of a water resources development project.</p>	<p>This section contains 2 components. First, a Sense of Congress (in subsection (a)) that, when public recreational amenities -- including parks, trails, green spaces, recreational waterways, and other public open spaces -- are affected by Corps construction, the Secretary should maintain equivalent recreational access including through alternative access where necessary, and minimize temporary disruptions through project planning and coordination with affected communities.</p>	<p><i>The binding requirement for feasibility studies in subsection (b) goes beyond the non-binding Sense of Congress in subsection (a) -- it requires an affirmative recreational access preservation plan as part of every feasibility study recommendation, to the maximum extent practicable. This is a new requirement for feasibility studies of projects with a recreation component.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Second, a binding requirement (in subsection (b)) that, as part of any feasibility study, the Secretary must, to the maximum extent practicable, review the potential impact of project construction on existing public recreational amenities -- including hiking, biking, walking, and waterborne recreation facilities -- and include in any final project recommendation a plan to minimize disruptions and maintain recreational access during and after construction.</p>	
<p>Sec. 140 <i>Sense of Congress on Munitions Disposal</i></p>	<p>Sense of Congress that the Secretary should collaborate with the Secretary of Defense to identify the agency responsible for remediation of explosive ordnance and unexploded ordnance disposal.</p>	<p>This section provides a Sense of Congress -- non-binding -- expressing that the Secretary should collaborate with the Secretary of Defense to identify the agency responsible for remediation of explosive ordnance and unexploded ordnance (UXO) disposal, in accordance with the authority provided in Section 1027 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA 2014) (33 U.S.C. 426e-2).</p>	<p><i>Involves the Corps' role in the remediation of explosive ordnance and unexploded ordnance disposal.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 141</p>	<p>Sense of Congress that the Corps should maintain a workforce</p>	<p>This section contains 2 components.</p>	<p>NWC's <u>December 2025 testimony to the T&I Committee identified</u></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Corps of Engineers Workforce</i></p>	<p>sufficient to achieve its missions, including through apprenticeship and mentoring programs, and requires a National Academy of Public Administration study on Corps workforce needs.</p>	<p>First, a Sense of Congress that the Corps should maintain a professional workforce capable of addressing its statutory responsibilities in a timely manner -- including technical expertise for navigation, flood and storm risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, water supply, hydropower, and recreation; the ability to partner with state and local governments and Tribal nations on technical and planning assistance; emergency response personnel; and regulatory expertise for statutory reviews and approvals. The Sense of Congress also calls on the Corps to improve recruiting, offer clear pathways to Federal internships and careers, promote use of volunteers, and provide meaningful training, mentoring, and apprenticeship opportunities.</p> <p>Second, a binding requirement that the Secretary seek to contract with the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) to conduct a comprehensive workforce review covering: evaluation of professional workforce needs necessary to meet the Corps' statutory responsibilities, including fully staffing positions</p>	<p><i>Corps workforce and capacity issues as contributing factors to project delivery delays, noting that districts are sometimes unable to make timely decisions or process reviews because of staffing constraints. The NAPA workforce review is directly responsive to that concern. Notably, the review must examine how increased non-Federal delivery of study, planning, design, and construction affects future Corps workforce needs -- a question directly relevant to NWC members who use alternative delivery tools.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>that are inherently governmental, related to public safety, navigational capacity, or national security, or necessary for timely statutory reviews; challenges related to recruitment, retention, reductions-in-force, retirements, credentialing, and professional development; how increased use of public-private partnerships and non-Federal delivery of study, planning, design, and construction affects future Corps workforce needs; an assessment of existing Corps technology and recommendations for improvements; and recommendations to improve Corps workforce capacity and project delivery efficiency. The Secretary must submit the NAPA findings and a detailed agency response to Congress within 180 days of receiving the review.</p>	
<p>Sec. 142 <i>Reporting and Oversight</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to provide a status update to Congress on reports required in previous WRDAs and requires the Secretary to issue guidance documents as required by previous WRDAs.</p>	<p>This section contains 2 binding requirements reflecting Congressional frustration with Corps implementation delays.</p> <p>First, within 90 days of enactment, the Secretary must submit a status report to the House</p>	<p><i>This section, like Section 135, reflects direct Congressional frustration with the Corps' failure to implement prior WRDA provisions. The 45-day guidance deadline and 90-day reporting</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) and Appropriations Committees and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) and Appropriations Committees on 10 specific previously directed reports that have not yet been completed, covering: the WRDA 2024 reporting requirement under Section 1150(a)(1); the Willamette Valley turbidity report under WRDA 2024 Section 1205(b); the ice jam prevention and mitigation report under WRDA 2024 Section 1205(k); the Whittier Narrows Dam excess lands report under WRDA 2022 Section 8213; the Great Lakes recreational boating report under WRDA 2022 Section 8218; the Willamette Valley hydropower disposition study report under WRDA 2022 Section 8220(b); the real estate administrative fees implementation report under WRDA 2024 Section 1120; the benefit-cost ratio comparison report for covered communities under WRDA 2024 Section 1148(d); the dredge capacity report under WRDA 2022 Section 8205; and the Lake O' the Pines, Texas land exchange report under WRDA 2024 Section 1222.</p>	<p><i>deadline are notably short -- particularly the 45-day guidance requirement, which covers 5 statutory provisions including the ability-to-pay provision under Section 103(m) of WRDA 1986 and the WRDA 2024 provisions that NWC's December 2025 testimony specifically identified as not yet implemented. The inclusion of both Appropriations Committees -- not just the authorizing committees -- as recipients of the status report is also notable, as it brings the funding committees into the oversight loop. The same enforceability questions raised in the Remarks for Section 135 apply here: if the Corps misses these deadlines, the bill does not specify a consequence.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>For each report, the status report must include: initiation status; funds made available and funds required to complete; a detailed summary of resources, procedures, and expected completion timeline; and any other relevant information.</p> <p>Second, within 45 days of enactment, the Secretary must issue guidance on 5 specific previously directed statutory provisions that have not yet received implementing guidance: Section 103(m) of WRDA 1986 on ability to pay; Section 444 of WRDA 1996; Section 8132 of WRDA 2022; Section 1129 of WRDA 2024; and Section 1148 of WRDA 2024.</p>	
<p>Sec. 143 <i>Ability to Pay</i></p>	<p>Includes additional studies and projects for the Secretary to determine the non-Federal interest's ability to pay under section 1139(c) of WRDA 2024 and section 103(m) of WRDA 1986.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 1139(c) of WRDA 2024 in 2 ways. First, it expands the scope of the provision to cover studies in addition to projects - - ensuring that ability-to-pay determinations can be made at the study stage, not just at construction.</p>	<p><i>The expansion of ability-to-pay determinations to cover studies as well as projects is a meaningful procedural improvement -- it allows economically disadvantaged non-Federal interests to receive cost-share relief earlier in the project</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Second, it adds 6 specific projects and studies to the list of those for which the Secretary must make an ability-to-pay determination: the Big Island Local Flood Protection Project, Illinois; the Hickman Bluff Stabilization shoreline erosion management project, Kentucky; the Lower Osage River Basin ecosystem restoration study, Missouri; the Lower Blackstone River ecosystem restoration project, Rhode Island; the Aquilla Lake water supply storage reallocation study, Texas; and the Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management modification study, Virginia.</p>	<p><i>development process rather than waiting until construction.</i></p> <p><i>This section in part involves the addition of location or regional specific projects or studies/areas.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 144 <i>Pilot Program Prioritization</i></p>	<p>Includes additional flood risk management and coastal storm risk management projects for the Secretary to consider under section 118 of WRDA 2020.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 118(h) of WRDA 2020 to add 2 projects to the list of projects eligible for prioritized consideration under the WRDA 2020 pilot program: the Big Island Local Flood Protection Project, Illinois; and the Passumpsic River watershed shoreline and riverine protection and restoration project, Vermont.</p>	<p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific projects/areas.</i></p>

Title II – Studies and Reports

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 201 <i>Authorization of Proposed Feasibility Studies</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Secretary to carry out new feasibility studies.</p>	<p>This section authorizes the Secretary to conduct feasibility studies for 131 projects -- 107 new projects and 24 project modifications -- as identified in reports submitted to Congress pursuant to Section 7001 of WRRDA 2014 or otherwise reviewed by Congress. New study authorizations do not guarantee funding; they establish eligibility for appropriations.</p> <p>New project feasibility studies (107):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Africatown, Alabama -- ecosystem restoration, Mobile County 2. Big Creek Lake, Alabama -- ecosystem restoration, Mobile County 3. Mobile County, Alabama -- ecosystem restoration, Chickasaw Creek, Hog Bayou, Three Mile Creek, and Mobile River vicinity 4. Galena, Alaska -- flood risk management 5. Russian Creek, Alaska -- flood risk management including riverbank stabilization, Kodiak Island Borough 6. Scow Bay, Alaska -- navigation, Borough of Petersburg 	<p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific studies.</i></p> <p><i>New (or modified) study authorizations do not guarantee funding; they establish eligibility for appropriations.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Sitka, Alaska -- coastal storm risk management 8. Dudleyville, Arizona -- flood risk management 9. Carmel River, California -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Monterey County 10. El Monte, California -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration 11. Hayward, California -- coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration 12. Pasadena, California -- flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Lower Arroyo Seco 13. Redwood City, California -- flood risk management 14. San Clemente Shoreline, California -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline erosion protection 15. Sweetwater Reservoir, California -- flood risk management including sediment management, San Diego County 16. Capitol Region, Connecticut -- flood risk management, Connecticut River vicinity 	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>17. Coginchaug River, Connecticut -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Durham and Middlefield</p> <p>18. Delaware River, Delaware -- flood risk management, shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, recreation, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>19. New Castle, Delaware -- flood risk management</p> <p>20. Boggy Creek Watershed, Florida -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including sediment and debris management</p> <p>21. Broward County, Florida -- flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration, back bay system</p> <p>22. Eatonville, Florida -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Lake King vicinity</p> <p>23. Flagler County, Florida -- coastal storm risk management including back bays and open-coast shorelines</p> <p>24. Horseshoe Beach, Florida -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>25. Lake Hart Watershed, Florida -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including sediment and debris management</p> <p>26. Little Wekiva Watershed, Florida -- flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Orange County, including Lake Lawne and Lake Orlando</p> <p>27. Lower Withlacoochee River Watershed, Florida -- ecosystem restoration</p> <p>28. Pasco County, Florida -- ecosystem restoration and water supply</p> <p>29. Shingle Creek Watershed, Florida -- flood risk reduction and ecosystem restoration including Lake Fran and Lake Richmond</p> <p>30. St. Petersburg, Florida -- flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration including canals</p> <p>31. Elkhorn Lake, Letcher County, Kentucky -- flood risk management and water supply</p> <p>32. Gwinnett County, Georgia -- flood risk management</p> <p>33. South River Watershed, Georgia -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>34. Honolulu, Hawaii -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management including shoreline erosion protection, Waikīkī Natatorium War Memorial, Kaimana and Waikīkī beaches</p> <p>35. Port Allen, Kaua'i County, Hawaii -- flood risk management, navigation, and coastal storm risk management</p> <p>36. Little Soap Creek Watershed, Iowa -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Appanoose and Davis Counties</p> <p>37. Lower Des Moines River Watershed, Iowa -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Appanoose, Davis, Marion, Monroe, and Wapello Counties</p> <p>38. Comite River, Louisiana -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including sediment and debris management, East Baton Rouge and East Feliciana Parishes</p> <p>39. Saint Charles Parish, Louisiana -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including water and sediment management</p> <p>40. Scott's Bluff, Louisiana -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>including shoreline erosion prevention, City of Baton Rouge</p> <p>41. Rockville, Maryland -- flood risk management, Rockville Water Treatment Plant vicinity</p> <p>42. Island End River, Massachusetts -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Chelsea and Everett</p> <p>43. Provincetown, Massachusetts -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation</p> <p>44. Winthrop, Massachusetts -- navigation, Winthrop Town Pier vicinity</p> <p>45. Bay City, Michigan -- flood risk management, Saginaw River</p> <p>46. Gladwin and Midland Counties, Michigan -- ecosystem restoration and streambank erosion prevention</p> <p>47. Oakland County, Michigan -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Caddell Drain</p> <p>48. Wayne County, Michigan -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Lakeshore Drive seawall vicinity</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>49. Mississippi Sound Beaches, Mississippi -- ecosystem restoration and coastal storm risk management, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties</p> <p>50. St. Louis, Missouri -- flood risk management, navigation, recreation, and ecosystem restoration, Laclede's Landing vicinity</p> <p>51. Bergen County, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>52. Bogota, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>53. Camden and Gloucester Counties, New Jersey -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Delaware River riverine areas</p> <p>54. Cresskill, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>55. Garwood, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>56. Gloucester City, New Jersey -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Proprietors Park vicinity</p> <p>57. Overpeck Creek Watershed, New Jersey -- flood risk management including debris management, Borough of Tenafly</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>58. Pascack Brook, New Jersey -- flood risk management including debris management, Montvale and Park Ridge</p> <p>59. Pascack Valley, New Jersey -- flood risk management, Hackensack River, Pascack Brook, and Musquapsink Brook, Bergen County</p> <p>60. West Orange, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>61. Rio Grande Basin, New Mexico -- water supply and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>62. Amity Harbor, New York -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management</p> <p>63. Atlantic Beach, New York -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management</p> <p>64. Bayport, New York -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline erosion protection</p> <p>65. Davis Park, Fire Island, New York -- flood risk and coastal storm risk management including shoreline erosion protection</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>66. Lawrence, New York -- flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and navigation, Bannister Bay and Village of Lawrence vicinity</p> <p>67. Mattituck Inlet, Southold, New York -- navigation, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>68. Mohawk River and Erie Canal, New York -- ecosystem restoration including aquatic invasive species management, City of Rome vicinity</p> <p>69. Nissequogue River, New York -- flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, navigation, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Stony Brook Harbor vicinity</p> <p>70. Peconic Bay, New York -- navigation and coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, Peconic Bay and connected harbors and inlets</p> <p>71. Point O' Woods, Fire Island, New York -- flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>72. Port Washington, New York -- navigation, Tom's Point vicinity</p> <p>73. South Shore, Long Island, New York -- ecosystem restoration, flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and navigation, Nassau and Suffolk Counties</p> <p>74. Spring Valley, New York -- flood risk management, Memorial Park vicinity</p> <p>75. Cape Fear River, North Carolina -- water supply and ecosystem restoration, Cumberland County vicinity</p> <p>76. Fayetteville, North Carolina -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Cross Creek</p> <p>77. Topsail Beach, North Carolina -- flood risk management</p> <p>78. Whiteville, North Carolina -- flood risk management, City of Whiteville</p> <p>79. Whiteville, North Carolina -- flood risk management, Waccamaw River basin</p> <p>80. Maumee River, Ohio -- flood risk management, riverbank stabilization,</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Glass City Riverwalk vicinity</p> <p>81. Hood River County, Oregon -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including sediment management</p> <p>82. Saucon Creek, Pennsylvania -- flood risk management, Borough of Hellertown vicinity</p> <p>83. Ceiba, Puerto Rico -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>84. Fajardo, Puerto Rico -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>85. Loíza, Puerto Rico -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>86. Naguabo, Puerto Rico -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>87. Río Antón Ruíz, Puerto Rico -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, adjacent levees in Humacao</p> <p>88. Vega Baja, Puerto Rico -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management including sediment management, Puerto Nuevo Lagoon (also known as Quintín Valle Lagoon)</p> <p>89. Yabucoa, Puerto Rico -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>90. Easton Pond, Rhode Island -- coastal storm risk management, ecosystem restoration, and water supply, City of Newport</p> <p>91. Westland, Rhode Island -- flood risk management, West River watershed</p> <p>92. Cumberland County, Tennessee -- water supply</p> <p>93. Duck River, Tennessee -- flood risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and recreation</p> <p>94. Enka Dam, Tennessee -- ecosystem restoration, Newport vicinity</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>95. Arroyo Colorado River, Texas -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including shoreline erosion protection, City of Rio Hondo</p> <p>96. Bell and McLennan Counties, Texas -- water supply</p> <p>97. Cameron County, Texas -- flood risk management, water supply, and ecosystem restoration, Sweeney Lake and Resaca de los Fresnos vicinity</p> <p>98. Escobares, Texas -- flood risk management</p> <p>99. Nueces County Shoreline, Texas -- coastal storm risk management including shoreline erosion protection</p> <p>100. Odessa, Texas -- water supply</p> <p>101. Parker County, Texas -- water supply</p> <p>102. Roma, Texas -- flood risk management</p> <p>103. Upper San Jacinto River Basin, Texas -- flood risk management and water supply, Liberty, Montgomery, and San Jacinto Counties vicinity</p> <p>104. Winn Park, Texas -- flood risk management, City of Farmers Branch</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>105. Lower Spanish Fork River, Utah -- ecosystem restoration</p> <p>106. Clinch River, Virginia -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Town of Richlands</p> <p>107. Nooksack River, Washington -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration including shoreline erosion, Whatcom County</p> <p>Project modification feasibility studies (24):</p>	
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lowell Creek Tunnel, Seward, Alaska -- modifications to the flood diversion project in Lowell Canyon for environmental mitigation 2. Morro Bay, California -- modifications to the harbor development project for navigation improvements and ecosystem restoration 3. Naugatuck River, Torrington, Connecticut - - modifications to the structural flood damage reduction project to improve flood risk management and reduce 	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>erosion within the Naugatuck River Flood Damage Reduction System</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Assawoman Canal, Delaware -- modifications to the navigation project for flood risk management 5. Pensacola Harbor, Florida -- modifications to the navigation project for recreation and additional deepening to 40 feet and widening 6. Tampa Harbor, Florida -- modifications to the navigation project, Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties, for additional deepening to 47 feet 7. Lake Sidney Lanier, Gwinnett County, Georgia -- modifications to the flood protection, power production, water supply, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife management project to improve flood risk management, navigation safety, hydropower reliability, and water supply 8. Chicago Harbor Lock, Illinois -- modifications to the navigation project to add recreation as an authorized purpose 	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>9. Saylorville Reservoir, Iowa -- modifications to the flood control project to include water supply and sediment management</p> <p>10. Lawrence on Kansas River, Kansas -- modifications to the flood protection project to study raising levees on the Kansas River north of Bowersock Dam</p> <p>11. Buckhorn Lake, Leslie and Perry Counties, Kentucky -- modifications to the flood control project to include sediment and debris management</p> <p>12. Louisville Metropolitan Flood Protection System Reconstruction, Jefferson and Bullitt Counties, Kentucky -- modifications to the flood risk management project to expand project scope and incorporate features identified in the June 2017 20-Year Comprehensive Facility Plan</p> <p>13. Curtis Creek Channel, Maryland -- modifications to the Baltimore Harbor and Channels navigation project to expand the Federal channel to include the Curtis Creek Channel to a depth of 29 feet</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>14. Boston Harbor, Massachusetts -- modifications to the navigation project for additional deepening and widening</p> <p>15. Grenada Lake, Yazoo River and Tributaries, Mississippi -- modifications to the flood control project to add recreation as a project purpose on the Yalobusha River including at Grenada Lake</p> <p>16. New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, New Jersey -- modifications to the navigation project to reroute the waterway near Ventnor City</p> <p>17. Rahway River Basin, New Jersey -- modifications to the hurricane and storm damage risk reduction project to improve flood risk management for municipalities subject to repetitive flooding</p> <p>18. Port of New York and New Jersey -- modifications to the navigation project to improve navigation south of the Elizabeth Port Authority Marine Terminal</p> <p>19. Allegheny River, Pennsylvania -- modifications to the navigation and</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>ecosystem restoration project to add recreation as a project purpose</p> <p>20. Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, Pennsylvania -- modifications to the Delaware River navigation project and the Schuylkill River navigation project to improve navigation for large commercial vessels near the confluence of the two rivers</p> <p>21. Charleston Peninsula, South Carolina -- modifications to the coastal storm risk management project to include features for tidal- and inland-related flood risk management measures</p> <p>22. Lake Aquilla, Brazos River Basin, Texas -- modifications to the water supply, flood risk management, and recreation project for reallocation of water supply storage</p> <p>23. James River, Virginia -- modifications to the navigation project to include additional portions at the Appomattox River and add flood risk management as a purpose</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>24. Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Virginia -- modifications to the navigation project to improve navigation in the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River.</p>	
<p>Sec. 202 <i>Expedited Completion</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite completion of various studies and projects that have been previously authorized.</p>	<p>This section directs the Secretary to expedite completion of previously authorized feasibility studies and general reevaluation reports (GRRs) across 6 categories. If a study or GRR determines a project is justified, the Secretary may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design (PED).</p> <p>Feasibility studies and GRRs (53 projects):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Storm damage prevention and reduction, coastal erosion, and ice and glacial damage -- statewide, Alaska 2. Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas -- water supply storage reallocation 3. Homer Navigation Improvements, Alaska - - flood control and allied purposes 	<p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific studies and GRRs.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Port of Nome Modifications, Alaska -- navigation 5. Cave Buttes Dam, Phoenix, Arizona -- flood risk management 6. McMicken Dam and Trilby Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona -- flood risk management 7. Rio Salado Oeste, Phoenix, Arizona -- ecosystem restoration 8. Yavapai County, Cottonwood vicinity, Arizona -- flood risk management 9. Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and tributaries, California -- flood control and other purposes 10. Chowchilla River, Ash Slough, and Berenda Slough, Madera County, California -- flood risk management, water supply, and ecosystem restoration 11. Coyote Valley Dam, California -- flood control, water conservation, environmental restoration, water supply, and related purposes 	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>12. Eastman Lake, California -- ecosystem restoration and water supply conservation and recharge</p> <p>13. Murrieta Creek, California -- flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation</p> <p>14. City of Petaluma, California -- ecosystem restoration</p> <p>15. Pine Flat Dam, Fresno County, California -- ecosystem restoration, water supply, and recreation</p> <p>16. Redbank and Fancher Creeks, California -- flood control</p> <p>17. Salinas River, California -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>18. San Diego Bay, California -- flood risk management including sea level rise</p> <p>19. City of San Mateo, California -- flood risk management including stormwater runoff reduction</p> <p>20. Lake Okeechobee Watershed Restoration, Central and South Florida -- ecosystem restoration, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>21. Lake Istokpoga, Florida -- flood risk management, water supply, ecosystem restoration, recreation, and related purposes</p> <p>22. Lake Runnymede, Florida -- ecosystem restoration</p> <p>23. Lake Tohopekaliga, Florida -- ecosystem restoration and flood risk management</p> <p>24. MacDill Air Force Base vicinity, City of Tampa, Florida -- hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>25. Port Tampa Bay including McKay Bay, Florida -- hurricane and storm damage risk reduction</p> <p>26. Shingle Creek and Kissimmee River, Osceola County, Florida -- flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and water storage</p> <p>27. Volusia County, Florida -- hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and coastal storm risk management</p> <p>28. Hanapēpē River, island of Kaua'i, Hawaii -- local flood protection</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>29. Kaiaka-Waialua watershed, O'ahu, Hawaii -- flood risk management</p> <p>30. County of Kaua'i, Hawaii -- flood risk management and coastal storm risk management</p> <p>31. County of Maui, Hawaii -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>32. Wailupe Stream, 'Āina Haina, Honolulu, Hawaii -- flood control and allied purposes</p> <p>33. Waimea River, County of Kaua'i, Hawaii -- flood risk management</p> <p>34. Hoosic River, Massachusetts -- flood risk management, environmental restoration, streambank stabilization, watershed management, and floodplain management</p> <p>35. Saginaw River, Michigan -- navigation</p> <p>36. Tittabawassee River, Chippewa River, Pine River, and Tobacco River, Michigan -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>37. Lower Osage River Basin, Missouri -- ecosystem restoration</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>38. Mississippi River alluvial valley, Head of the Passes to Cape Girardeau, Missouri -- flood control</p> <p>39. Berry's Creek, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>40. Fleischer Brook, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>41. Great Falls Raceway, Paterson, New Jersey -- flood risk management and hydropower</p> <p>42. Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey -- flood risk management (GRR)</p> <p>43. Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet, Cape May County, New Jersey -- hurricane and storm damage (GRR)</p> <p>44. Ho-Ho-Kus Brook and Saddle River, Village of Ridgewood, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>45. Passaic River Basin, Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, and Passaic Counties, New Jersey -- flood risk management and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>46. Passaic River, Paterson, New Jersey -- navigation and flood risk management</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>47. Borough of Paulsboro, New Jersey -- navigation</p> <p>48. Peckman River Basin, Verona, Cedar Grove, and West Caldwell, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>49. Whippany River Watershed, Morris County, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>50. Wolf Creek, New Jersey -- flood risk management</p> <p>51. Long Beach, New York -- storm damage reduction including additional replacement of beach groins</p> <p>52. Great Salt Lake, Utah -- ecosystem restoration</p> <p>53. Virginia Coastal Storm Risk Management, Virginia -- coastal storm risk management</p> <p>Study reports for authorization consideration (11 projects):</p> <p>1. Selma Flood Risk Management and Bank Stabilization, Alabama -- flood risk management</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Salt River (Va Shly' Ay Akimel), Maricopa County, Arizona -- ecosystem restoration 3. Dardanelle Lock and Dam slope stabilization, Arkansas -- repairs to recontour and stabilize slope 4. Los Angeles River, California -- ecosystem restoration and recreation 5. San Francisco Bay, California -- flood risk reduction 6. Central Everglades Planning Project, Central and South Florida -- ecosystem restoration, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program 7. Port Everglades, Florida -- navigation 8. Lower Missouri Jefferson City L-142 Flood Risk Management Study, Missouri -- flood risk management and resiliency, Lower and Upper Missouri River Comprehensive Flood Protection 9. New York and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries -- flood and storm damage reduction 10. Matagorda Ship Channel Improvement Project, Port Lavaca, Texas -- navigation 	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>11. Chincoteague Island, Virginia -- hurricane and storm damage reduction, navigation, and ecosystem restoration</p> <p>Watershed and river basin assessment (1):</p> <p>1. Lower Rouge River Watershed, Michigan</p> <p>Dredged material management plans (3):</p> <p>1. Homer Small Boat Harbor, Homer, Alaska 2. Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio 3. Cleveland Harbor, Ohio</p> <p>Water control manual update (1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terminus Dam and Lake Kaweah Project, Kaweah River, California <p>Issues evaluation study (1):</p> <p>1. Black Butte Lake, Stoney Creek, California</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 203 <i>Expedited Modification of Existing Feasibility Studies</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite the completion of certain modifications of previously authorized feasibility studies.</p>	<p>This section modifies two existing feasibility studies and directs expedited completion of both, with authority to proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design if a project is determined to be justified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The feasibility study for navigation at Unalaska (Dutch Harbor) Channels, Alaska -- authorized in WRDA 2020 -- is modified to add coastal storm risk management and shoreline erosion protection as authorized study purposes. 2. The feasibility study for flood control, navigation, wetland conservation and restoration, wildlife habitat, commercial and recreational fishing, saltwater intrusion, and freshwater and sediment diversion in the area drained by the West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee from Alexandria, Louisiana to the Gulf of Mexico -- authorized under Committee Resolution 2535 and modified in WRDA 	<p><i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific studies.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		2024 -- is further modified to include Vermilion Bay.	
Sec. 204 <i>Expedited Completion of Other Feasibility Studies</i>	Directs the Secretary to expedite the review and coordination of feasibility studies performed by non-Federal interests.	This section directs the Secretary to expedite the Corps' review and coordination of 4 feasibility studies carried out by non-Federal interests under Section 203(b) of WRDA 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Cedar Port Navigation and Improvement District Channel Deepening Project, Baytown, Texas (navigation); 2. The Raymondville Drain Project, Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas (flood control); 3. The Sabine-Neches Waterway Navigation Improvement Project, Texas (navigation); and 4. The Central and Southern Florida Resiliency Study -- Broward Basins, Southern Florida Water Management District, Florida (flood risk management). 	<i>This section involves the addition of location or regional specific studies.</i>
Sec. 205	Directs the Secretary to develop various reports to Congress,	This section requires the Secretary to submit 8 reports to the House Transportation and	<i>This section directs the Secretary to develop specified reports to</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Corps of Engineers Reports</i></p>	<p>including on future project formulation; commercial and industrial water use impacts; shoreline stabilization technologies; forecast-informed reservoir operations; floating cabin easements; hurricane and storm damage easements; beneficial use of dredged material; architectural and engineering fee limits; and moving the Little Rock District to the Mississippi Valley Division.</p>	<p>Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee:</p> <p>(a) Report on water resources development project formulation procedures: Within 1 year of enactment, and biennially for 10 years, a report on the use of part 234 of title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations for feasibility study formulation, including a project-by-project accounting of studies using those procedures, outcomes of the procedures, and a summary of stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>(b) Report on commercial and industrial water supply impacts: Within 1 year, a report on the effects of new commercial and industrial water users on Corps water supply and water conservation projects.</p> <p>(c) Report on forecast-informed reservoir operations (FIRO): Within 1 year, a report on FIRO implementation at all applicable Corps reservoirs, including a list of projects where FIRO has been implemented or evaluated, an</p>	<p><i>Congress, addressing various issues.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>assessment of effectiveness in improving water supply and flood risk management, barriers to implementation, and legislative recommendations.</p> <p>(d) Report on floating cabin recreational access: Within 1 year, a report on authorities and procedures for managing floating cabins on Corps waters, barriers to expanded use, and recommendations for changes including estimated costs and effects on Corps operations and recreation mission.</p> <p>(e) Report on hurricane and storm damage reduction easements: Within 1 year, a report on implementation of easement authorities under WRDA 2024 Section 1145(d), including administrative actions taken, use of each authority, and any additional legislative authorities needed.</p> <p>(f) Beneficial use strategic plan: Within 180 days, the Secretary must submit the strategic plan required by WRDA 2022 Section 8130(a) in</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>accordance with the 70 percent beneficial use goal under WRDA 2020. If the deadline is missed, the Secretary must submit within 225 days an explanation for the failure, a status update, and a projected submission date.</p> <p>(g) Report on architectural and engineering (A&E) fee caps: Within 1 year, a report on statutory, regulatory, and policy limitations on A&E service fees for Corps civil works projects, including the authority for each limitation and an assessment of effects on project cost and schedule.</p> <p>(h) Report on Little Rock District realignment: Within 1 year, a report on the implications and feasibility of transferring the Little Rock District's responsibilities to the Mississippi Valley Division.</p>	
<p>Sec. 206 <i>Report on the Inland</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive study to evaluate and recommend local and systematic measures to</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive study of the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States -- as defined in Section 206 of the Inland Waterways</p>	<p><i>This is a highly relevant provision for NWC's inland navigation members. A comprehensive system-wide condition and</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Waterways System</i></p>	<p>strengthen, modernize, and preserve the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States.</p>	<p>Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804) -- and submit a report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee within 12 months of enactment.</p> <p>The study must: examine the waterways and their ability to meet U.S. needs including emergency and defense needs; investigate the reliability and effectiveness of Corps projects within those waterways with respect to commerce, navigation, environment, and recreation; assess the condition of flood control structures including locks, levees, and dams to determine structural importance and identify necessary repairs; assess the effectiveness of ecosystem restoration and mitigation efforts; evaluate projects and separable elements that would reduce recurring dredging requirements and prevent channel migration; assess the funding needed to improve reliability and effectiveness; and identify project components whose failure would likely have significant impacts on waterway function.</p>	<p><i>reliability study of the inland waterway system is long overdue -- the inland waterways lock and dam infrastructure is aging, with many structures well beyond their design life, and recurring dredging requirements and channel migration issues affect navigation reliability on key waterways.</i></p> <p><i>The 12-month reporting deadline is ambitious given the scope. The explicit inclusion of emergency and defense needs in the study scope reflects the national security dimension of inland waterway infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>NWC may wish to consider whether to formally engage in this study process if the bill is enacted, given the direct relevance to inland navigation members.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 207 <i>GAO Studies</i></p>	<p>Directs the Comptroller General to initiate studies, including on cost-sharing for recreational facilities, beach renourishment, coordination with fish and wildlife agencies, and architectural and engineering design services.</p>	<p>This section directs the Comptroller General of the United States to initiate 4 reviews, each to be initiated within the specified deadline with a report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee upon completion.</p> <p>(a) Study on cost-sharing for recreation facilities: Within 1 year, a review of the Secretary's efforts to share costs of managing recreation facilities and natural resources at Corps projects with non-Federal public entities and private nonprofit entities under Section 225 of WRDA 1992, including an evaluation of joint management and cooperative agreements, their effectiveness in reducing Federal costs and improving facilities, barriers to expanded use, and legislative or administrative recommendations.</p> <p>(b) Study on beach renourishment: Within 1 year, an analysis of statutory authorities and programs available to the Secretary for beach renourishment cycles including initial</p>	<p><i>GAO studies: This section contains directives for the GAO to study specified issues. The GAO is tasked with reporting its findings and recommendations to Congress within specified timeframes.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>construction, periodic renourishment, and emergency renourishment; financial, regulatory, and technical barriers causing delays; the Corps' process for evaluating beneficial use of dredged material for beach renourishment; and recommendations to address barriers and improve efficiency, predictability, and effectiveness.</p> <p>(c) Study on architectural and engineering (A&E) design services: Within 1 year, a review of how the Corps performs A&E design services, including analysis of private sector contract procurement versus in-house performance by Corps employees, and a comparative cost-benefit assessment of both approaches.</p> <p>(d) Review of compliance with fish and wildlife recommendations: Within 180 days, a review of the Corps' compliance with requirements and recommendations under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, State coastal zone management programs under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and State wildlife restoration plans</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>under the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act, including an assessment of the extent to which Corps feasibility studies and operations plans incorporate agency recommendations and, where they do not, a detailed explanation and legal justification.</p>	
<p>Sec. 208 <i>Inspector General Reports</i></p>	<p>Directs the Engineer Inspector General of the Corps to submit two reports: one on policies related to the inherently governmental functions of Corps park rangers, and one on Corps policies and programs relating to Tribal communities.</p>	<p>This section directs the Engineer Inspector General (IG) of the Corps of Engineers to submit 2 reports to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee, both within 2 years of enactment.</p> <p>(a) Report on Inherently Governmental Functions: Examines Corps policies related to identifying the inherently governmental function status of Corps park rangers, including: an assessment of Corps policies, guidance, and practices for classifying environmental management, public safety, and enforcement functions, and their compliance with the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 and other</p>	<p><i>Directives for the Engineer Inspector General of the Corps (IG) to submit two reports to Congress on specified issues, within specified timeframes (2 years after the date of enactment for each report).</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>applicable law; an assessment of risks to environmental management, public safety, enforcement, or governmental decision-making from potential misclassification of park ranger functions; an assessment of Corps policies for distinguishing functions that must be performed by Federal employees from those that may be performed by contractors; an assessment of any policy deficiencies, staffing practices, or organizational structures that may impair compliance; and any recommendations for administrative or legislative action.</p> <p>(b) Report on Tribal Policies and Programs: Examines Corps implementation of policies and programs relating to Tribal communities, including uniformity of application across all Corps districts. Must include: an assessment of the Tribal Liaison position established under WRDA 2022 Section 8112 and how each applicable district has implemented it; implementation status of Section 203 of WRDA 2000, Section 1141 of WRDA 2024, and Section 8115 of WRDA 2022; an assessment of the</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Secretary's alignment with Section 112 of WRDA 2020 requirements related to Tribal communities; an assessment of whether Corps guidance aligns with Congressional intent on Tribal communities; and an evaluation of barriers within the Corps that hinder successful Tribal engagement, consultation, or partnership.</p>	
<p>Sec. 209 <i>Acceleration of Emergency Inland Navigation Projects</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite rehabilitation of any inland navigation projects operating under a declared emergency to ensure continued navigation functionality and structural integrity.</p>	<p>This section directs the Secretary to expedite completion of any modification, repair, or rehabilitation of an authorized inland navigation project that is subject to an emergency declaration issued by the Secretary, including any non-breach emergency, to ensure continued navigation functionality and structural integrity. Expedited completion includes expediting any required investigations, engineering and design, and construction activities necessary to resolve the emergency conditions.</p>	<p><i>This provision is directly relevant to NWC's inland navigation members. Inland waterway lock and dam emergencies -- including lock gate failures, unplanned outages, and structural issues at aging facilities - - can result in extended navigation closures with significant economic consequences for shippers, carriers, and port communities. The explicit inclusion of non-breach emergencies is noteworthy, as it extends the expedited authority beyond catastrophic structural</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<i>failures to a broader range of emergency conditions.</i>
<p>Sec. 210 <i>Assessment of Commercial Fish Landings Data</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to provide Congress with results of the corrective action plan developed in response to a GAO study on the use of commercial fishing data in budget prioritization.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 90 days of enactment, to provide to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee the results of the corrective action plan developed in response to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report published April 28, 2025, titled "Army Corps of Engineers: Commercial Fishing Data Could Help Inform Budget Process" (GAO-25-107447).</p>	<p><i>The underlying GAO report examined how the Corps uses -- or fails to use -- commercial fishing landing data in prioritizing harbor maintenance dredging budgets.</i></p> <p><i>This is relevant to commercial fishing ports and harbor communities that have raised concerns about how dredging funding decisions are made.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 211 <i>Assessment of Dryland Stream Technologies and Shoreline Stabilization Technologies</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to conduct research and develop activities on natural infrastructure in dryland streams technologies in arid, semi-arid, and drought-prone areas.</p>	<p>Contains 2 components, each directed through the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC).</p> <p>(a) First, on dryland stream technologies: the Secretary, acting through the ERDC Director, must carry out research and development activities on, and test the effectiveness of, natural</p>	<p><i>The dryland stream component is primarily relevant to western water supply and drought resiliency interests.</i></p> <p><i>The shoreline stabilization component is relevant to coastal areas concerned about coastal</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>infrastructure technologies in dryland streams in arid, semi-arid, and drought-prone areas. Research must be geographically diverse and must include human-made infrastructure that mimics natural infrastructure such as rock check dams, beaver dam analogs, gabions, and weirs. Based on findings, the Secretary must assess the potential uses and effectiveness of such infrastructure for restoring dryland ecosystems, enhancing flood risk reduction, and enhancing water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency. The Secretary may consult with other Federal agencies and appropriate state agencies in arid or semi-arid states. A written summary of activities and tests must be submitted to Congress and made publicly available within 2 years of enactment.</p> <p>(b) Second, on shoreline stabilization and erosion control technologies: the Secretary, acting through the ERDC Director and in consultation with other Federal agencies and coastal states as appropriate, must carry out research and development activities on, and test</p>	<p><i>storm damage/risk reduction and resilience measures, as well as navigation and port members concerned with erosion impacts and shoreline stabilization on harbor approaches and channel banks.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>the effectiveness of, shoreline stabilization, erosion control, and wave energy reduction technologies applicable to coastal areas exposed to flooding and erosion, including tidally influenced portions of rivers, bays, and estuaries. Research must be geographically diverse and must include testing of natural and nature-based features (NNBFs) as defined in WRDA 2016 Section 1184(a), including engineered technologies that mimic natural processes or combine natural and engineered elements. A written summary must be submitted to Congress and made publicly available within 2 years of enactment.</p>	
<p>Sec. 212 <i>Assessment of Nonstructural Approaches to Flood Risk Management and Hurricane</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to submit a report to Congress on the status of nonstructural approaches for certain authorized water resources development projects.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 6 months of enactment, to submit a report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee on the status of nonstructural approaches to flood risk management and coastal storm risk management for 5 specific projects:</p>	<p><i>This section involves the status of location or regional specific projects/areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>and Storm Risk Reduction</i>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, and Passaic Counties, New Jersey, including as it relates to buyouts in the Township of Wayne, Passaic County 2. Flood risk management, Township of Denville, New Jersey, carried out under Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 3. Flood control, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey 4. Hurricane and storm damage reduction, New Jersey Back Bays, Cape May, Ocean, Atlantic, Monmouth, and Burlington Counties 5. Hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York 	
Sec. 213 <i>Post-Disaster Watershed</i>	Includes additional locations for post-disaster watershed assessments under section 3025	This section directs the Secretary to carry out post-disaster watershed assessments under Section 3025 of WRRDA 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2267b)	<i>This section involves assessments of location or regional specific projects/areas.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Assessment for Impacted Areas</i>	of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA 2014) and requires a report to Congress on the status of these assessments.	<p>for 3 specific areas, all impacted by recent wildfires in New Mexico: areas of Catron and Grant Counties impacted by the June 2025 wildfires; areas of Valencia County impacted by the June 2025 wildfires; and areas near Ruidoso impacted by the June 2024 wildfires.</p> <p>The Secretary must submit a report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee within 18 months of enactment on the status of the post-disaster watershed assessments carried out under this section.</p>	<i>Post-wildfire watershed assessments are important for identifying flood risk, sedimentation, and water quality impacts on downstream water resources infrastructure -- including Corps projects -- following major wildfire events.</i>
Sec. 214 <i>Updated Plan on Federal Hopper Dredge Recapitalization</i>	Directs the Secretary to update the plan and timeline included in the Corps report 'Hopper Dredge Recapitalization Analysis' and notify Congress.	This section requires the Secretary, within 90 days of enactment, to update the recapitalization plan and timeline included in the Corps' "Hopper Dredge Recapitalization Analysis" (published June 20, 2017) for Federal hopper dredges owned and operated by the Corps as of the date of enactment, and to notify Congress of the updated plan and timeline.	<i>The aging Federal hopper dredge fleet is a well-documented constraint on the Corps' ability to maintain deep-draft navigation channels, particularly on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. The 2017 recapitalization analysis is now nearly a decade old, and fleet</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>conditions, procurement timelines, and cost estimates have changed significantly. The 90-day deadline for an updated plan is notable given the complexity of Federal ship procurement.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 215 <i>Choctawhatchee and Pea River Basins, Alabama and Florida</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to develop a scope of work, in consultation with non-Federal project sponsors and state, local, and tribal governments, for carrying out the previously authorized study for the Choctawhatchee and Pea River basins.</p>	<p>For purposes of carrying out a previously authorized study of improvements for flood control, water quality, water supply, drought management, and fish and wildlife enhancement in the Choctawhatchee and Pea River Basins, Alabama and Florida -- authorized by Congressional Committee Resolutions adopted in April and August 1990 -- the Secretary must: develop a scope of work including a communications plan in collaboration with the non-Federal interest, in accordance with the intent of the authorizing documents and meeting the non-Federal interest's objectives to the extent practicable; include the entire Choctawhatchee River basin and Pea River basin and all hydrologically connected downstream receiving</p>	<p><i>This section involves studies of location or regional specific projects/areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>waters in both Alabama and Florida within the study area; and coordinate with relevant state, local, and Tribal entities in both states and with appropriate Federal agencies.</p>	
<p>Sec. 216 <i>Mobile Harbor Land Use Assessment</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to assess the long-term viability of existing dredged material placement areas for Mobile Harbor, including state-owned upland disposal facilities.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to carry out an assessment of the long-term viability of existing dredged material placement areas for Mobile Harbor, including state-owned upland dredged material disposal facilities. The assessment must also include recommendations for the beneficial use of dredged materials from Mobile Harbor, specifically including the viability of using dredged materials at locations on Pinto Island and Blakeley Island in Mobile, Alabama.</p>	<p><i>This section involves an assessment of a location or regional specific project area.</i></p> <p><i>Mobile Harbor is a significant deep-draft port on the Gulf Coast. Dredged material placement capacity is a critical long-term planning issue for major harbors, and the explicit inclusion of beneficial use recommendations -- particularly for Pinto Island and Blakeley Island -- reflects local interest in habitat restoration or other productive uses of dredged material.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 217 <i>Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to submit an update to Congress on the status of the Honolulu Harbor modification study, including assessment of benefits for disaster resilience and national security through DoD harbor utilization.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 30 days of enactment, to submit to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee an update on the status of the study to modify the Honolulu Harbor navigation project, authorized by the Act of March 3, 1905, including the status of the assessment of the benefits of the project modification for disaster resiliency and enhanced national security from Department of Defense utilization of the harbor, as required by WRDA 2024 Section 1202(3).</p>	<p><i>This section involves an assessment of a location or regional specific project area.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 218 <i>Chicago Area Waterway System</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to provide Congress an assessment of the Calumet Harbor Dredged Material Disposal Facility.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 90 days of enactment, to provide the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee an assessment of the Calumet Harbor Dredged Material Disposal Facility -- also known as the Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) -- authorized pursuant to Section 123 of the River and Harbor</p>	<p><i>This section involves an assessment of a location or regional specific project area.</i></p> <p><i>The Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) is a 43-acre site in Chicago used to contain contaminated sediment dredged from local waterways, including the</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Act of 1970. The assessment must include: a description of work related to ongoing and future dredging of the Calumet River and Harbor; a plan for carrying out closure activities for the Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility within 1 year of enactment, including remediation, capping, seeding, and other measures necessary to stabilize the facility and prepare the site for authorized post-closure use; a plan of actions to ensure conveyance of the facility to the Chicago Park District in a timely fashion after closure activities are complete; and a plan of actions to ensure the Secretary coordinates with state and local governments throughout implementation.</p>	<p><i>Calumet River and Cal-Sag Channel. The Corps has scrapped plans to expand the disposal facility. The site is slated for remediation, capping, and transfer to the local community to become a new lakefront public park.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 219 <i>Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Project, Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to submit a report to Congress on the results of the contaminated sediment assessment for the Brandon Road project authorized by section 401(5) of WRDA 2020.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 1 year of enactment, to submit a report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee that includes: the results of an assessment to identify any contaminated sediments associated with the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study -- Brandon Road project in Will County, Illinois,</p>	<p><i>This section involves an assessment of a location or regional specific project area.</i></p> <p><i>The Brandon Road project is the primary aquatic invasive species barrier project designed to prevent Asian carp and other invasive species from entering the Great</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>authorized by WRDA 2020 Section 401(5); and a plan, developed in coordination with the non-Federal interest, to remediate such sediments simultaneously with construction of the project.</p>	<p><i>Lakes from the Mississippi River basin via the Chicago Area Waterway System. The contaminated sediment assessment and simultaneous remediation plan requirement addresses a potential complication in project construction that could affect schedule and cost. This project is likely of significant interest to the Great Lakes navigation and ecosystem community.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 220 <i>Columbia Lock and Dam, Louisiana</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to submit a report to Congress on the Columbia Lock and Dam, including structural concerns, actions taken, recommended remediation, and timeline and cost estimate.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 180 days of enactment, to submit a report to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee regarding the Columbia Lock and Dam, Louisiana, that includes: a description of the nature and extent of the structural concerns that resulted in the Secretary's declaration of a non-breach</p>	<p><i>This section involves an assessment and report of a location or regional specific project area.</i></p> <p><i>The Columbia Lock and Dam on the Red River in Louisiana was declared a non-breach emergency by the Secretary in August 2024 due to significant structural concerns. This</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>emergency at the lock and dam in August 2024; a summary of actions taken by the Corps to address those concerns, including interim operational or emergency measures; recommended permanent remedial actions necessary to ensure continued navigation functionality and structural integrity; an evaluation of whether the recommended permanent remedial actions may be implemented as discrete, segmented projects or phases, including assessments of technical feasibility of segmentation, potential cost efficiencies or risk reduction associated with phased implementation, and the extent to which segmentation could accelerate completion of critical repairs; and an estimated schedule and cost range for implementation of the recommended permanent remedial actions, including any segmented or phased approach.</p>	<p><i>is an active inland navigation emergency with direct implications for waterway commerce in the Red River system. The explicit requirement to evaluate phased or segmented remediation approaches -- including potential cost efficiencies and schedule acceleration -- is a practical recognition that full rehabilitation may be a multi-year effort.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 221 <i>Lower Mississippi River Comprehensive</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite the Lower Mississippi River basin comprehensive study under section 213 of WRDA 2020.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to expedite completion of the Lower Mississippi River Comprehensive Management Study, authorized</p>	<p><i>This section involves expediting a comprehensive study of a regional specific project area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Management Study</i>		by Section 213 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (WRDA 2020).	<i>The Lower Mississippi River Comprehensive Management Study examines system-wide flood risk, navigation, and ecosystem issues in one of the country's most critical waterway corridors.</i>
Sec. 222 <i>Disposition Study for Cape Cod Canal, Massachusetts</i>	Directs the Secretary to conduct a disposition study for lands on the Cape Cod Canal project.	This section requires the Secretary to carry out a disposition study under Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the deauthorization of a portion of the Cape Cod Canal navigation project -- authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 -- that the Secretary determines is not needed to carry out the authorized purposes of the project and could be conveyed to the Town of Sandwich or the Town of Bourne, Massachusetts, for the construction of a new wastewater treatment plant. The Secretary must submit a report on the status of the disposition study to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee within 18 months of enactment.	<i>This section involves a disposition study of a location or regional specific project area.</i> <i>The Cape Cod Canal is one of the few remaining Corps-owned and -operated sea-level canals in the country and a significant navigation asset for commercial and recreational vessel traffic between Cape Cod Bay and Buzzards Bay. The disposition study is narrowly scoped to identify excess land that could support local wastewater infrastructure needs, and does not affect the navigation project itself.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 223 <i>New England Regional Confined Aquatic Disposal Facilities</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite completion of the confined aquatic disposal facility assessment in the Corps New England District under section 8121(c) of WRDA 2022.</p>	<p>This section contains 3 components:</p> <p>First, requires the Secretary to expedite completion of the assessment of the availability of confined aquatic disposal (CAD) facilities in the New England District region, as required by WRDA 2022 Section 8128(c), and to submit the results to the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee upon completion.</p> <p>Second, authorizes the Secretary to conduct a study for the construction of confined aquatic disposal facilities in the Massachusetts Bay and Ipswich Bay region for the disposal of contaminated dredged material in that region.</p> <p>Third, authorizes the Secretary to conduct any other study recommended by the Secretary in the assessment completed under the first component above -- meaning the assessment itself could</p>	<p><i>This section involves expediting the completion of a comprehensive assessment of regional and location specific areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		generate additional study authorizations beyond the Massachusetts Bay and Ipswich Bay study.	
Sec. 224 <i>Assateague Island, Maryland and Virginia</i>	Increases the authorized amount for Assateague Island restoration work in Ocean City, Maryland under section 534 of WRDA 1996.	This section amends Section 534(c) of WRDA 1996 to increase the authorized cost ceiling for the Assateague Island restoration project from \$35 million to \$45 million, reflecting increased project costs since the original authorization.	<i>This section involves a straightforward cost ceiling update for a regional specific coastal restoration project. The \$10 million increase reflects cost escalation since the 1996 authorization.</i>
Sec. 225 <i>Big Sandy Lake, Minnesota</i>	Directs the Secretary to establish a shoreline management plan at Big Sandy Lake and conduct a disposition study for excess easements or land exchange.	<p>This section contains 3 components.</p> <p>First, on shoreline management: requires the Secretary to establish a shoreline management plan for the Big Sandy Lake project within 18 months of enactment. Upon establishment of the plan, the Secretary is authorized to issue shoreline use permits to adjacent landowners, upon request and consistent with the plan, for activities relating to existing or new structures on Corps-held land adjacent to the owner's property.</p>	<i>This section involves the development of a location or regional specific management plan and disposition study.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Second, on disposition study: requires the Secretary to carry out a disposition study under Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements or excess land held for the Big Sandy Lake project. The study must, for each segment of Corps-owned shoreline property corresponding to the width of an adjacent private property plot, identify the appraised value and provide a legal description and acreage of the segment. The study must also develop recommendations for any restrictions or conditions on conveyed shoreline property necessary to sustain the authorized purposes of the Big Sandy Lake project.</p> <p>Third, on reporting: the Secretary must submit a report on the disposition study to Congress within 18 months of enactment.</p>	
Sec. 226	Directs the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive study on sedimentation issues in the Upper	This section requires the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive study to identify core sedimentation issues in the Upper Missouri River	<i>This section involves a comprehensive regional specific study of sedimentation issues.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Upper Missouri River Basin Sedimentation</i></p>	<p>Missouri River Basin and develop recommendations to address sedimentation.</p>	<p>Basin, with a total cost cap of \$25 million and a 65% Federal / 35% non-Federal cost share. The Secretary may develop recommendations for: construction of new water resources development projects; structural or operational modifications to existing projects; monitoring or adaptive management measures; additional geographically focused studies; management plans and actions by responsible Federal agencies; and further research where data or technology does not yet allow immediate solutions. Continuation studies recommended by the Chief of Engineers or spun off from the primary study are authorized and considered part of the same study effort. The Secretary must make maximum use of existing data from Federal, state, local, Tribal, non-Federal, and multistate monitoring sources. A report with findings and recommendations must be submitted to Congress within 5 years of enactment.</p> <p>One significant limitation: the Secretary is explicitly prohibited from considering any changes to the Missouri River Basin Mainstem</p>	<p><i>The core sedimentation issues in the Upper Missouri River Basin (UMRB) include reservoir siltation and storage loss, downstream channel degradation, and are primarily driven by river modifications and altered natural flows (including involving a network of dams and bank stabilization projects) aimed at moderating adverse effects of flooding, and meeting demands for reliable water supplies for irrigation and for cities, hydropower production, and a reliable navigation channel.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual in conducting this study or any continuation studies.	
<p>Sec. 227 <i>Table Rock Lake Disposition Study, Missouri and Arkansas</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to conduct a disposition study at Table Rock Lake for the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements or land.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to carry out a disposition study under Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements or excess land held for flood risk management and operation of the Table Rock Lake project in Missouri and Arkansas, authorized as part of the multipurpose White River Basin reservoir system.</p> <p>In carrying out the study, the Secretary must ensure that the relevant non-Federal interest for the Table Rock Lake project is provided right of first refusal for any potential release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements, and must work alongside the non-Federal interest to identify opportunities for land exchanges where possible. A report on the status of the</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific disposition study, and is related to the project involved in the next section (Sec. 228) of this bill.</i></p> <p><i>The right of first refusal provision for the non-Federal interest involved with this project is notable -- it gives the local partner priority access to any excess easements or lands before they could be conveyed to other parties.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		disposition study must be submitted to Congress within 18 months of enactment.	
<p>Sec. 228 <i>Table Rock Lake, Missouri and Arkansas</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to permit the ongoing presence of certain eligible structures at Table Rock Lake in Missouri and Arkansas.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 1323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (WRDA 2024) to expand and clarify the Corps' obligation to permit the ongoing presence of existing structures and sewer or septic systems at the Table Rock Lake project.</p> <p>For eligible structures -- defined as structures for human habitation, sheds, retaining walls, decks, patios, gazebos, driveways, fences, or similar structures located on Corps fee land or flowage easement land as of the date of enactment of WRDA 2026 -- the Secretary must permit their ongoing presence until the structure is abandoned.</p> <p>For eligible sewer or septic systems -- a new category added by this section, defined as privately owned sewer or septic systems located on Corps fee land or flowage easement land as of</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project, and is related to the project involved in the previous section (Sec. 227) of this bill.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>the date of enactment that do not impact the reservoir level, water quality, or operations of the Table Rock Lake project -- the Secretary must permit their ongoing presence until the system is abandoned or faces imminent failure.</p>	
<p>Sec. 229 <i>Evaluation of Atomic Contamination at Cochiti Lake, Sandoval County, New Mexico</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to assess lands around Cochiti Lake to determine eligibility for addition to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program and report findings to Congress.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 90 days of enactment, to initiate -- in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the People of Cochiti Pueblo -- an evaluation of the lands adjacent to and including Cochiti Lake, Sandoval County, New Mexico, in relation to the early atomic energy program of the United States, including the Manhattan Engineering District, to determine whether the area is eligible for addition to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) of the Corps of Engineers. Within 1 year of enactment, the Secretary must notify the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee of the evaluation results, including whether the area contains contamination from the early atomic energy</p>	<p><i>This section involves an evaluation study of a location or regional specific area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>program, whether further remedial action is needed, and if eligible, the timeline for adding the area to FUSRAP.</p>	
<p>Sec. 230 <i>National Academy of Sciences Study on Upper Rio Grande Basin</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to provide regular updates to Congress on completion of the report on enhancing resiliency for Corps dams and reservoirs in the Upper Rio Grande Basin, authorized by section 1230 of WRDA 2024.</p>	<p>This section amends WRDA 2024 Section 1230 to require the Secretary to submit a status update to Congress within 30 days of enactment, and annually thereafter until complete, on implementation of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study on enhancing resiliency for Corps dams and reservoirs in the Upper Rio Grande Basin.</p>	<p><i>This section involves directing the Secretary to provide a status update on a NAS study of a location or regional specific area.</i></p> <p><i>Section 1230 of WRDA 2024, involving a National Academy of Sciences study on Upper Rio Grande Basin, directed the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the NAS and prepare a report studying the dams and reservoirs in the Upper Rio Grande Basin and recommendations for future management and operation strategies to enhance resiliency.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 231</p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to conduct a study on water supply, water</p>	<p>This section authorizes the Secretary, in coordination with relevant Federal and state</p>	<p><i>This section involves a regional specific study area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Arbuckle-Timbered Hills, Oklahoma</i></p>	<p>storage capacity, and drought resiliency for regions overlaying the Arbuckle-Timbered Hills aquifer.</p>	<p>agencies and non-Federal interests, to conduct a study on water supply, water storage capacity, and drought resiliency for the regions overlaying the Arbuckle-Timbered Hills Aquifer in Oklahoma. The study must identify infrastructure needs to support increased water storage in and around the aquifer.</p>	
<p>Sec. 232 <i>Disposition and Cost Allocation Study of Willamette Valley, Oregon</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to issue the report on the Willamette Valley hydropower project required under section 8220 of WRDA 2022, including a cost allocation review.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, within 180 days of enactment, to issue the long-overdue report required by WRDA 2022 Section 8220 on the Willamette Valley hydropower project. The report must now also include: a review of the cost allocation for fish passage capital investments constructed or proposed after September 30, 2025, and associated operation and maintenance expenses; and a description of the relative public value of continued hydropower operations at the Willamette Valley hydropower project compared to flood control and other authorized purposes.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific disposition and cost allocation study.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 233</p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to conduct a disposition study at Foster Joseph</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to carry out a disposition study under Section 216 of the Flood</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific disposition study.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Foster Joseph Sayers Reservoir and Dam, Pennsylvania</i></p>	<p>Sayers Reservoir and Dam for release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements or land.</p>	<p>Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for excess easements and land at Foster Joseph Sayers Reservoir and Dam on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania. The study must identify the minimum real property needed for project operation and maintenance, evaluate the effects of conveyance on flood control and recreation missions, and identify exact legal descriptions and acreage of property interests suitable for conveyance. A report on study status is due to Congress within 18 months of enactment.</p>	
<p>Sec. 234 <i>Humphreys County, Tennessee</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to coordinate with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to expedite completion of watershed planning assistance to Humphreys County.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to coordinate with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to expedite completion of watershed planning assistance to Humphreys County, Tennessee, pursuant to the agreement entered into between the Secretary and the NRCS Chief on November 30, 2022.</p>	<p><i>This section involves location or regional specific planning assistance to a non-Federal interest.</i></p> <p><i>Humphreys County, Tenn. experienced catastrophic flooding in August 2021.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 235 <i>Sam Rayburn Reservoir, Texas</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary, at the request of and in coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture, to assess the condition of the Harvey Creek boat ramp at Sam Rayburn Reservoir and provide technical assistance regarding repairs.</p>	<p>Upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture, this section requires the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, to jointly assess the condition of the Harvey Creek boat ramp at Sam Rayburn Reservoir, San Augustine County, Texas, and identify any necessary repairs. The Secretary must also provide technical and design assistance to the Forest Service for any repairs determined necessary based on the joint assessment.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 236 <i>Columbia River, Washington</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to conduct a disposition study for conveyance of land to non-Federal interests and transfer of land to the Secretary of the Interior to be held in trust for Federally recognized tribes along the Columbia River in the Tri-Cities area.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to carry out 2 disposition studies under Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 for Corps-owned shoreline and adjacent lands along the Columbia River in the Tri-Cities area of Washington State.</p> <p>The first study covers conveyance of approximately 1,953 acres across 6 areas to non-Federal public entities -- the cities of Kennewick (approximately 465 acres), Pasco (approximately 350 acres), and Richland (approximately 640 acres); Benton County (approximately 370 acres);</p>	<p><i>This section involves location or regional specific disposition studies.</i></p> <p><i>This is a significant land disposition effort involving nearly 2,000 acres of Corps-held land in the Tri-Cities area and a separate tribal trust land transfer. The scope and complexity of the required studies reflect the range of stakeholder interests along this stretch of the Columbia River.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Franklin County (approximately 520 acres); and the Port of Pasco (approximately 8 acres).</p> <p>The second study covers transfer of covered lands to the Secretary of the Interior to be held in trust for covered Tribal entities, including approximately 200 acres within the Umatilla Indian Reservation, approximately 160 acres within the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and any additional areas the Secretary determines appropriate. Covered Tribal entities include the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and other federally recognized Tribes as determined by the Secretary.</p> <p>Both studies must: consult with covered entities and Tribal entities to identify exact land locations; review effects on authorized project purposes; identify all Federal easements and flood control infrastructure; identify any new authorities needed; identify rights-of-way and other legal instruments needed to maintain flood control</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>operations; review existing agreements between the Corps and non-Federal entities; and identify any restrictions necessary to sustain authorized project purposes. A report on the status of both studies is due to Congress within 18 months.</p>	
<p>Sec. 237 <i>Tri-Cities Area, Washington</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite land conveyances in the Tri-Cities area authorized by section 501(i) of WRDA 1996 and provide an update to Congress.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary to expedite the property conveyances authorized under Section 501(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (WRDA 1996), which have been pending for nearly 30 years. If any property has not been conveyed to the appropriate non-Federal entity within 18 months of enactment, the Secretary must notify the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee identifying which property has not been conveyed, why, and the timeline for completion.</p>	<p><i>This section involves expediting location or regional specific property conveyances.</i></p>

Title III – Deauthorizations and Modifications

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 301 <i>Deauthorization of Inactive Projects</i></p>	<p>Establishes a process for the deauthorization of certain water resources development projects or elements of such projects that lack local support, lack funding, or no longer have a relevant or feasible authorized purpose.</p>	<p>This section amends Section 301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (WRDA 2020) (33 U.S.C. 579d-2) in 3 ways.</p> <p>First, expands the stated purposes of the deauthorization process to include addressing the backlog of authorized but unconstructed Corps projects -- adding this as an explicit goal alongside the existing purposes of the program.</p> <p>Second, updates the reference to the most recent WRDA from WRDA 2024 to WRDA 2026 in the eligibility criteria for projects subject to deauthorization review, effectively resetting the lookback period to capture projects authorized through the current bill.</p> <p>Third, adds a new ongoing update requirement: after the Secretary submits the final deauthorization list and appendix to Congress, the Secretary must review and update the list and appendix as necessary, and must provide updated lists to Congress and publish them in the Federal Register at least every 6 months.</p>	<p><i>This section of the bill is based on and updates the House’s typical general deauthorizations provision that has been included in recent WRDAs.</i></p> <p><i>The semi-annual update requirement is a meaningful addition -- it converts the deauthorization list from a one-time submission into a living document that Congress and the public can track on an ongoing basis. Non-Federal sponsors should review the deauthorization list carefully once published, as projects with active local support or pending study activity may be inadvertently included.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 302 <i>General Reauthorizations</i></p>	<p>Reauthorizes or increases the authorized amounts for eleven Corps programs.</p>	<p>This section amends 11 existing Corps programs by adding new locations or increasing authorized funding levels:</p> <p>(a) Lakes Program (Section 602 of WRDA 1986): Adds 5 new lakes -- Lake Waumpi, Orange County, Florida; Lake Becerra, Glendale Heights, Illinois; Electric Lake (Mill Pond), Park Ridge, New Jersey; Ponside Park pond, Harrington Park, New Jersey; and Putnam Lake, Putnam County, New York -- and increases the program authorization from \$40 million to \$60 million.</p> <p>(b) Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery Program (Section 704(b)(1) of WRDA 1986): Increases the authorization from \$120 million to \$150 million.</p> <p>(c) Civil Works Research and Development (Section 7(c)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988): Extends the program authorization through 2030, from the prior expiration of 2028.</p>	<p><i>This section includes updates to several existing authorizations of Corps programs. Some of the provisions in this section of the bill are location or regionally specific, while others are programmatic.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>(d) Rehabilitation of Corps-Constructed Dams (Section 1177(f) of WRDA 2016): Increases the authorization from \$60 million to \$80 million.</p> <p>(e) Chattahoochee River Program (Section 8144(k) of WRDA 2022): Increases the authorization from \$40 million to \$50 million.</p> <p>(f) Columbia River Basin (Section 8309(c)(2) of WRDA 2022): Extends the authorization period from fiscal years 2026-2027 through fiscal years 2026-2030.</p> <p>(g) Lower Missouri River Streambank Erosion Control Evaluation and Demonstration Program (Section 8350(f) of WRDA 2022): Extends the program duration from 5 years to 8 years.</p> <p>(h) Non-Federal Implementation of Feasibility Studies (Section 1043(a) of WRRDA 2014): Extends the program sunset from 5 years after enactment of WRRDA 2014 to September 30,</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>2030, and updates the authorization year from 2019 to 2030.</p> <p>(i) Acequias Irrigation System (Section 1113(e) of WRDA 1986): Increases the authorization from \$90 million to \$120 million.</p> <p>(j) Monitoring and Assessment Program for Saline Lakes in the Great Basin (Section 8143(f) of WRDA 2022): Increases the authorization from \$10 million to \$12.5 million.</p> <p>(k) Non-Federal Interest Dredging Authority (Section 1113(g) of WRDA 2016): Extends the authority from 10 to 14 pilot projects.</p>	
<p>Sec. 303 <i>Conveyances</i></p>	<p>Authorizes multiple conveyances of property or easements from the Secretary to non-Federal entities, pursuant to certain requirements.</p>	<p>This section authorizes 4 specific property conveyances, all without consideration unless otherwise noted, subject to generally applicable provisions requiring: acreage and legal description to be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary; the receiving entity to bear all reasonable and necessary conveyance</p>	<p><i>These are location/site-specific conveyances with no broader policy implications. The Umatilla County conveyance is the only one that requires fair market value payment; the others are without consideration.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>costs; the receiving entity to hold the United States harmless for post-conveyance activities while the United States retains responsibility for pre-conveyance activities; and the Secretary to impose additional terms and conditions as necessary to protect Federal interests.</p> <p>The 4 conveyances are:</p> <p>City of Corona, California: The Secretary may convey approximately 48 acres at 2205 Railroad Street, Corona, California, for public water reclamation, wastewater treatment, environmental management, or related municipal purposes. The Secretary must retain easements necessary to protect the Prado Dam Basin flood control project. Reversion to the United States applies if the property is not used for the authorized purpose.</p> <p>Town of Duck, North Carolina: The Secretary shall convey approximately 4.02 acres at 1259 Duck Road, Duck, North Carolina, for the purpose of housing a fire station and public safety facility.</p>	<p><i>The section provides some standard, generally applicable provisions addressing surveys to obtain legal descriptions for conveyances, applicability of screening provisions, costs of conveyance, liability/holding the U.S. harmless, and additional terms and conditions that may be necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the U.S.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Reversion applies if not used for the authorized purpose.</p> <p>City of Toledo, Ohio: The Secretary may convey Grassy Island in Maumee Bay at the mouth of the Maumee River, for public benefit including parks and recreation. Reversion applies if not used for the authorized purpose.</p> <p>County of Umatilla, Oregon: The Secretary may convey approximately 25 acres (Tax Lot 1301 in its entirety and approximately 12 acres of Tax Lot 1001) in Umatilla County, Oregon, for public benefit, at fair market value by quitclaim deed. The Secretary must retain easements necessary to protect the John Day Dam flood control project and must identify and transfer existing agreements and encumbrances on the property to the County of Umatilla.</p>	
Sec. 304	Directs the Secretary to release certain Federal easements on land owned by The St. Joe Company in	This section authorizes a land exchange between the Corps and The St. Joe Company in the Florida panhandle. Upon The St. Joe Company conveying	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Land Exchange, Walton and Bay Counties, Florida</i></p>	<p>Bay and Walton Counties, Florida, in exchange for The St. Joe Company conveying certain lands to the Corps.</p>	<p>approximately 103.49 acres in Bay County to the United States, the Secretary must release all Federal interests in easements on approximately 79.60 acres in Bay and Walton Counties, retaining only 3 easements: a channel maintenance and operations easement, an ingress and egress easement, and a drainage trench easement. Consideration equals the difference in fair market value between the interests released and the land conveyed. Exchange must be completed within 180 days of enactment. The St. Joe Company bears all costs and holds the United States harmless for post-conveyance activities.</p>	
<p>Sec. 305 <i>Port Canaveral, Florida</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to review and identify excess Corps land for conveyance, grant of easements, or land exchange to the Canaveral Port Authority.</p>	<p>Upon written request from the Canaveral Port Authority, this section requires the Secretary to review Corps-owned "USACOE TRACT 100" land associated with the Canaveral Harbor navigation project, identify any portions no longer needed for project purposes, and convey such land at fair market value or exchange it for property of equal value, or grant easements, to the Canaveral Port Authority. Any conveyance must not interfere</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		with authorized navigation projects. The Canaveral Port Authority bears all conveyance costs.	
<p>Sec. 306 <i>Specific Deauthorizations</i></p>	<p>Deauthorizes certain projects or portions of projects.</p>	<p>This section deauthorizes or partially deauthorizes 8 specific projects or project elements, effective on the date of enactment:</p> <p>(a) Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California: Deauthorizes 33 named flood channels within the Los Angeles County Drainage Area project that are operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. The Secretary must seek an agreement within 90 days with the District requiring it to continue operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, and replacing the channels in perpetuity at no cost to the United States, maintain public ownership of all required real property, allow the Corps to continue operating any appurtenant structures such as gauges, and hold the United States harmless. The Secretary may accept funds from</p>	<p><i>This section addresses specific deauthorizations of location or regional specific projects.</i></p> <p><i>The Los Angeles County Drainage Area deauthorization is the most substantive provision in this section -- it involves 33 named flood channels and a complex agreement requirement to ensure continued flood protection without Federal operation and maintenance responsibility. Non-Federal sponsors in the Los Angeles Basin should review this carefully.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>the District to cover administrative costs of the agreement.</p> <p>(b) Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries, California: Deauthorizes the 3.76-mile Dos Rios Levee along the right bank of the San Joaquin River between River Mile 88 and River Mile 85.</p> <p>(c) Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Clarifies that the Secretary retains ownership of and operation and maintenance responsibility for the underwater cutoff wall constructed on the riverbed near St. Anthony Falls, notwithstanding prior WRDA provisions. Requires the Secretary to complete and transmit a condition assessment of the cutoff wall to the State of Minnesota and Congress within 1 year.</p> <p>(d) Harlem River Federal Navigation Channel, New York: Deauthorizes 2 specific areas of the Harlem River navigation project defined by metes and bounds coordinates, consisting of areas north and south of the Macombs Dam Bridge.</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>(e) Hudson River Channel, New York: Deauthorizes a portion of the Hudson River Channel navigation project defined by 4 geographic coordinates.</p> <p>(f) Newtown Creek Federal Navigation Channel, New York: Modifies the Newtown Creek navigation project to reduce authorized channel dimensions to specific depths at defined locations, and deauthorizes 3 portions of the project: the area adjacent to the turning basin including Maspeth Creek; the upstream portion of English Kills; and Dutch Kills.</p> <p>(g) Charleston, South Carolina: Upon completion of a pending feasibility study, deauthorizes a specific portion of the Charleston Harbor project defined by geographic coordinates.</p> <p>(h) Shot Pouch Creek, South Carolina: Deauthorizes the project for flood protection on Shot Pouch Creek, South Carolina.</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 307 <i>Environmental Infrastructure</i></p>	<p>Provides new authorizations and modifies existing authorities for the Secretary to partner with non-Federal interests on environmental infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>This Section 307 amends Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 1992) to add almost 200 new environmental infrastructure project authorizations (numbered from item 599 through item 790) covering water and wastewater infrastructure, stormwater management, environmental restoration, water supply, and related projects across dozens of states. Each authorization identifies a specific locality and dollar amount.</p> <p>The section also modifies approximately 86 existing Section 219 program provisions, including expanding eligible project types and updating funding authorizations for specific existing programs including the Rio Grande Environmental Management Program, with an increase in authorization from \$15 million to \$20 million per fiscal year through 2030, and a new 5-year reporting requirement.</p>	<p><i>This section amends Section 219 of WRDA 1992 to authorize funding for environmental infrastructure projects across various locations or regional areas around the nation. Environmental infrastructure may include water or wastewater infrastructure, including sewers, water supply, storage, and distribution systems, stormwater management, water treatment, water conservation and reclamation, green infrastructure, ecosystem restoration, and resiliency projects.</i></p> <p><i>New authorizations do not guarantee funding; they establish eligibility for appropriations.</i></p> <p><i>The full project authorization (new and modified) list can be found in the draft bill beginning at page 242 and running through page 299.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 308 <i>Forecast-Informed Reservoir Operations</i></p>	<p>Identifies additional opportunities for FIRO at Corps projects by adding New Hogan Dam and Lake and Shasta Dam Lake to the WRDA 2024 report requirement, and the Pend Oreille River Basin to the WRDA 2018 report requirement.</p>	<p>This section contains 2 components.</p> <p>First, the section requires the Secretary to include New Hogan Dam and Lake on the Calaveras River, California, and Shasta Dam and Lake on the Sacramento River, California, in the forecast-informed reservoir operations (FIRO) assessment required under Section 1162(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (WRDA 2024).</p> <p>Second, the section amends Section 1222(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (WRDA 2018) to add the Pend Oreille River Basin to the FIRO program alongside the existing Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin.</p>	<p><i>Section 1162 of WRDA 2024 (Forecast-informed reservoir operations) directed the Secretary to incorporate forecast-informed reservoir operations (FIRO) into updates of water control manuals for reservoirs constructed, owned, or operated by the Corps, subject to available appropriations. The Secretary was required to issue guidelines for implementing FIRO and assess reservoirs in diverse regions, prioritizing those in the South Pacific, Northwestern, and South Atlantic Divisions. The Secretary was required to consult with Federal, state, and non-Federal stakeholders during this process. A savings clause ensured no preemption or alteration of state water law, interstate</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<p><i>compacts, or other relevant authorities.</i></p> <p><i>Both additions expand the FIRO program to new reservoirs and basins. Forecast-informed reservoir operations can improve water supply yield and flood risk management performance at Corps reservoirs by using weather and snowpack forecasts and other climatic information to optimize reservoir storage and release decisions.</i></p> <p><i>FIRO has been of importance to many Western water resources, water supply, and drought interests.</i></p> <p><i>Both location or regional specific project/area additions to the FIRO list made by Section 308 of this bill</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<i>expand the FIRO program to new reservoirs and basins.</i>
<p>Sec. 309 <i>Floodplain Management Services</i></p>	<p>Expands the types of assistance the Secretary can provide under the Floodplain Management Services program to include supporting states' development of integrated floodplain management programs. Also adds rural communities as a priority for technical assistance.</p>	<p>This section amends 2 provisions governing the Floodplain Management Services program.</p> <p>First, amends Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) in 2 ways: expands the program's stated purpose to explicitly include supporting state efforts to establish and implement integrated floodplain management programs that both reduce flood risk and protect and restore floodplain functions; and converts the program's funding authority from a spending cap to a standard authorization of appropriations.</p> <p>Second, the section amends Section 111(b) of WRDA 2020 to expand eligibility for flood risk resiliency technical assistance to include rural communities, in addition to the existing eligible recipients.</p>	<p><i>The addition of rural communities as explicitly eligible recipients for flood risk resiliency technical assistance addresses a longstanding gap, as rural areas often lack the planning capacity to access Federal technical assistance programs.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 310 <i>Planning Assistance to States</i></p>	<p>Expands the types of technical assistance the Secretary may provide under the Planning Assistance to States program established by section 22 of WRDA 1974.</p>	<p>The Planning Assistance to States program under Section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 authorizes the Corps to provide technical assistance to states, municipalities, and other non-Federal entities for comprehensive planning for the development, utilization, and conservation of water and related land resources. The program is cost-shared, with the Corps providing up to 50 percent of the cost of the assistance.</p> <p>This section replaces Section 22(a)(2)(B) in its entirety to enumerate 4 specific authorized types of technical assistance: provision and integration of hydrologic, economic, and environmental data and analyses; assessment of the structural integrity of a water resources development project; development of integrated floodplain management programs that both reduce flood risk and protect and restore floodplain functions; and title research for abandoned structures.</p>	<p><i>The prior language in Section 22(a)(2)(B) did not enumerate these specific types of assistance, leaving the scope of eligible technical assistance less defined. This amendment both clarifies and expands the program by explicitly authorizing structural integrity assessments and title research for abandoned structures as eligible activities.</i></p> <p><i>The structural integrity assessment authority is particularly relevant for states and localities seeking Corps technical assistance in evaluating aging water resources infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>The title research for abandoned structures authority addresses a practical barrier in floodplain management -- abandoned structures often complicate land</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<i>acquisition and floodplain restoration efforts, and title research is frequently a necessary first step.</i>
Sec. 311 <i>Mendenhall Glacier Outburst Flooding, Alaska</i>	Directs the Secretary to expedite completion of the Mendenhall Glacier Outburst Flood Technical Report and develop recommendations for permanent flood control mitigation for glacial lake outburst floods.	This section requires expedited action on the Mendenhall Glacier flooding assessment and directs development of permanent flood control solutions for glacial lake outburst floods affecting Juneau, Alaska -- a growing climate-related flood hazard.	<i>This section involves an expedite directive for a location or regional specific project/area study.</i>
Sec. 312 <i>Hansen Dam, Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, California</i>	Directs the Secretary to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles to identify recreational opportunities while evaluating and implementing the water control manual update at the Hansen Dam project.	This section requires the Corps to work with Los Angeles to protect recreational opportunities at Hansen Dam while updating its water control manual, balancing public recreation access with updated flood operation protocols.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 313 <i>Morro Bay, California</i>	Directs the Secretary to repair or maintain breakwaters, revetments, or seawalls that are	This section requires the Corps to address maintenance needs at Morro Bay harbor	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
	part of the harbor maintenance project at Morro Bay.	structures, including breakwaters and revetments that protect harbor navigation.	
Sec. 314 <i>Oceanside, California</i>	Directs the Secretary to coordinate with the City of Oceanside on the scope and recommendations of the authorized shoreline protection study.	This section requires Corps coordination with Oceanside on the study scope for the city's shoreline protection project, ensuring local input in the study process.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 315 <i>Pajaro River, California</i>	Authorizes the Secretary to utilize fee simple title for the Pajaro River project authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966.	At the request of the non-Federal interest, this section authorizes the Secretary to acquire any interest in real property required for the Pajaro River flood protection project in California -- authorized by Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 -- in fee simple title. This gives the Corps authority to acquire property interests directly on behalf of the non-Federal interest when requested.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 316 <i>Rio Grande Environmental Management</i>	Modifies the Rio Grande Environmental Management Program under section 5056 of WRDA 2007 to clarify eligible	This section amends Section 5056 of WRDA 2007 to expand eligible project types under the Rio Grande Environmental Management Program to include drought, wildfire, flooding, and natural	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Program, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas</i></p>	<p>projects and require periodic updates to Congress on program activities.</p>	<p>disaster resiliency mitigation; fish and wildlife habitat protection and restoration; sedimentation and salinity management; water resources infrastructure improvements; and aquatic invasive species control. Increases the annual authorization from \$15 million through 2029 to \$20 million per fiscal year for fiscal years 2026 through 2030. Adds a 5-year reporting requirement beginning December 31, 2027 covering program evaluation, future projects, basin needs assessment, and recommended adjustments.</p>	
<p>Sec. 317 <i>Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interest for advanced funds contributed for the Federal share of the Miami Harbor navigation project.</p>	<p>This section requires the Secretary, in accordance with the Act of October 15, 1940 (33 U.S.C. 701h-1), to repay the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of any funds advanced by the non-Federal interest for the Miami Harbor navigation project in Miami-Dade County, Florida. The Secretary may not require a new start determination before providing such repayment.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p> <p><i>The prohibition on requiring a new start determination before repayment addresses a Corps administrative practice that has delayed reimbursement to non-Federal interests who advanced</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<i>Federal funds to keep projects moving.</i>
Sec. 318 <i>Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana</i>	Authorizes the Secretary to accept easements to satisfy property requirements for the ecosystem restoration project at Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet under section 7013(a)(4) of WRDA 2007.	In carrying out the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet ecosystem restoration project in Louisiana, authorized by WRDA 2007 Section 7013(a)(4), this section directs the Secretary to allow the non-Federal interest to satisfy project real property requirements through easements where feasible, notwithstanding any plan requirement that the non-Federal interest provide land in fee simple title.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 319 <i>Pilottown Anchorage Area, Louisiana</i>	Authorizes the Secretary to operate and maintain the Pilottown anchorage area on the Mississippi River in Louisiana.	Pursuant to Section 106 of WRDA 2020 (33 U.S.C. 635), this section authorizes the Secretary to operate and maintain at Federal expense the Pilottown anchorage area on the Mississippi River above Head of Passes, Louisiana, extending from River Mile 6.7 to Mile 1.5 above Head of Passes, as established by the United States Coast Guard.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area. This provision is aimed at clarifying/confirming the Corps' authority to operate and maintain at Federal expense the Pilottown anchorage area.</i> <i>The Pilottown anchorage area serves vessels transiting the Lower</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
			<i>Mississippi River and is critical to safe navigation operations near the Head of Passes. Federal operation and maintenance authority clarifies responsibility for this anchorage facility.</i>
Sec. 320 <i>Jack Hubbard Memorial Breakwater, Burt Township, Michigan</i>	Names the breakwater at Grand Marais Harbor, Michigan, the 'Jack Hubbard Memorial Breakwater.'	This section is a naming provision honoring Jack Hubbard at Grand Marais Harbor, Michigan.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 321 <i>Sardis Lake, Panola County, Mississippi</i>	Requires the Secretary to convey lands to the City of Sardis, as authorized by section 8377 of WRDA 2022, within 180 days of enactment.	This section sets a firm 180-day deadline for completing the land conveyance to the City of Sardis authorized in WRDA 2022, which has apparently not yet been executed.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 322 <i>Hydraulic Evaluation of the</i>	Clarifies how FEMA shall use data derived from the study authorized by section 8219 of WRDA 2022	This section amends Section 8219 of WRDA 2022 (33 U.S.C. 652 note) to add a new coordination provision restricting the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) from using hydraulic	<i>This provision involves a location or regional specific project/area, and addresses concerns that FEMA could use Corps hydraulic modeling</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Upper Mississippi River</i></p>	<p>with respect to any area of the Upper Mississippi River.</p>	<p>information developed under the Upper Mississippi River hydraulic evaluation except in accordance with a Congressionally authorized project described in a final Chief of Engineers report for a study conducted under WRDA 2024 Section 1227, including any spinoff studies under that section.</p>	<p><i>data developed for the Upper Mississippi River to revise flood insurance rate maps or floodplain designations in ways that are inconsistent with or ahead of Congressionally authorized flood risk management projects in the area. The restriction ties FEMA's use of the data to the Congressional authorization and study framework.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 323 <i>Lower Missouri River Comprehensive Flood Protection</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Secretary to establish a program to design and construct flood risk management projects in the Lower Missouri River as identified in the Lower Missouri Flood Risk and Resiliency System Plan.</p>	<p>This section authorizes the Secretary to carry out flood risk management projects in the Lower Missouri River identified in the Lower Missouri Flood Risk and Resiliency System Plan (System Plan), if determined feasible. Compatible environmental and recreation measures may be included if feasible, consistent with the System Plan, beneficial to the community, not detrimental to flood protection, and supported by state and local partners. Spinoff studies from the System Plan may be carried out as continuations</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>of the Lower Missouri Basin study under WRDA 2020 Section 216(a). The Secretary must coordinate Lower Missouri activities with other Missouri River Basin activities.</p> <p>The System Plan may be updated as projects are implemented and new data developed. Projects not currently in the System Plan may be studied and added if found feasible and consistent with System Plan goals.</p> <p>A \$60 million per-project Federal cost cap applies in Missouri, with an exception for larger projects or those within the Lower Missouri Basin study scope -- but those require a feasibility determination submitted to Congress and specific Congressional authorization before construction.</p> <p>The Secretary may not carry out projects to address deferred or incomplete maintenance or upkeep except where attributable to changed conditions or design standards and consistent with PL 84-99 emergency repair authority.</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
Sec. 324 <i>Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee</i>	Requires that the Chair of the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee be elected by the Committee's members.	This section amends Section 5018 of WRDA 2007 in 2 ways: adds a provision requiring the Chair of the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee to be elected by the Committee's members rather than appointed; and updates the reference to the Federal Advisory Committee Act from the prior citation to the current codification at Chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 325 <i>Great Lakes Commission</i>	Authorizes appropriations for Fiscal Years 2027 through 2030 for the Great Lakes Commission to support water resources development projects.	This section authorizes \$5 million per fiscal year for fiscal years 2027 through 2030 to the Executive Director of the Great Lakes Commission, established under Article IV of the Great Lakes Basin Compact, to support water resources development efforts related to Compact execution carried out in collaboration with the Secretary.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 326 <i>Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration</i>	Establishes a Federal expenditure limit for projects carried out under the Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration program under section 506 of WRDA 2000.	This section amends Section 506 of WRDA 2000 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-22) to add a \$20 million per-project cap on Federal expenditures for projects carried out under the Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration program.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p>Sec. 327 <i>Truckee River and Tributaries, Nevada</i></p>	<p>Deauthorizes the flood protection project for Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, as authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954.</p>	<p>This section deauthorizes, effective on the date of enactment, all features within the State of Nevada of the flood protection project on the Truckee River and tributaries in California and Nevada, authorized by Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area. It appears that these provisions only apply to the Nevada portion of the project, and that the California features of the project are not affected.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 328 <i>Cooperative Agreements, New Mexico</i></p>	<p>Expands the authorized purposes of cooperative agreements under section 3117 of WRDA 2007 to include recreational management and stewardship activities.</p>	<p>This section allows cooperative agreements in New Mexico under the existing WRDA 2007 authority to cover recreational management and stewardship activities, expanding the types of partnerships available in that state.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 329 <i>Kinzua Dam Safety Modification Study, Allegheny River, New York</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary, in carrying out the Kinzua Dam safety modification study, to identify property not needed for project operation and convey such property to the Seneca Nation of Indians.</p>	<p>This section requires the Corps to identify and convey excess Kinzua Dam project lands to the Seneca Nation during the dam safety study process, recognizing tribal interests in these lands.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>and Pennsylvania</i>			
Sec. 330 <i>Surf City and North Topsail Beach, North Carolina</i>	Deauthorizes a portion of the authorized hurricane and storm damage risk reduction project in Surf City and North Topsail Beach, North Carolina.	This section deauthorizes a specific portion of the Surf City / North Topsail Beach storm damage project, likely reflecting changes in local interest or project feasibility for that project element.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 331 <i>Massillon Local Protection Project, Tuscarawas River, Ohio</i>	Directs the Secretary to carry out rehabilitation work at the sluice gates of the Massillon Local Protection Project on the Tuscarawas River.	This section requires the Corps to rehabilitate deteriorating sluice gates at the Massillon Local Protection Project, maintaining flood control infrastructure on the Tuscarawas River in Ohio.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 332 <i>Toussaint River Federal Navigation Project, Carroll Township, Ohio</i>	Directs the Secretary to align the cost share requirements for operation and maintenance of the Toussaint River navigation project with section 101(b)(1) of WRDA 1986.	This section corrects a cost-sharing discrepancy for the Toussaint River navigation project, aligning its operation and maintenance (O&M) cost share with the standard framework established in WRDA 1986.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 333 <i>Rio Puerto Nuevo Flood Risk</i>	Directs the Secretary to carry out a general reevaluation report for certain elements of the Rio Puerto	This section requires the Corps to conduct a general reevaluation report (GRR) for specific elements of the Rio Puerto Nuevo project in San	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Management Project, San Juan, Puerto Rico</i>	Nuevo flood risk management project.	Juan, re-examining project scope and viability for components that may need updating.	
Sec. 334 <i>Buffalo Bayou Tributaries and Resiliency Study, Texas</i>	Directs the Secretary to expedite the Buffalo Bayou Tributaries and Resiliency Study and Chief's report, and to develop and analyze only alternatives that are acceptable to the non-Federal interest.	This section requires expedited completion of the Buffalo Bayou study and Chief's report, with a significant provision requiring that only alternatives acceptable to the non-Federal interest (Harris County Flood Control District) be analyzed.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i> <i>This section's provision requiring that only alternatives acceptable to the non-Federal interest (Harris County Flood Control District) be analyzed is unusual, in that it provides an unusual degree of non-Federal control over the alternatives development process.</i>
Sec. 335 <i>Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties, Texas, Expedited</i>	Clarifies that certain lands and easements are part of the conveyance required under section 1327 of WRDA 2024.	This section amends Section 1327(a) of WRDA 2024 to explicitly include portions of Spilman Island and Pelican Island owned by or subject to a United States easement within the scope of the real estate review required for the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration project in Chambers,	<i>Section 1327 of WRDA 2024 (Chambers, Galveston, and Harris counties, Texas) directed the Secretary to review and potentially convey or release land and easements associated with the</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>Real Estate Transfers</i></p>		<p>Galveston, and Harris Counties, Texas. The amendment clarifies that the review must determine whether such land or easements are no longer required for project purposes, and makes a conforming clarification to the disposition authority in paragraph (2).</p>	<p><i>Houston Ship Channel project, provided the properties are no longer required for Federal purposes and conveyances protect U.S. interests.</i></p> <p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 336 <i>Coastal Virginia</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Secretary to analyze alternatives on Federally-owned property as part of the feasibility study for the Virginia Coastal project.</p>	<p>For analyses of measures benefitting Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of another Federal agency, carried out as part of the Coastal Virginia flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and navigation feasibility study authorized by WRDA 2018, Section 1201(9), this section authorizes the Secretary to use either funds available for water resources development investigations or funds contributed by the head of the benefitting Federal agency.</p> <p>The Secretary must carry out such analyses at Federal expense, except that, for analyses related to measures reducing risk to a military installation, the Secretary may accept cost-share</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>contributions from the non-Federal interest pursuant to the existing study agreement. A savings clause preserves all cost-sharing requirements applicable to other Federal agencies for any construction that results from the study.</p>	
<p>Sec. 337 <i>Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management, Virginia</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Secretary to analyze alternatives on Federally-owned property as part of the feasibility study for the modification of the Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management project.</p>	<p>This section is identical in structure to Section 336, above.</p> <p>For analyses of measures benefitting Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of another Federal agency, carried out as part of the feasibility study modification for the Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management project authorized by WRDA 2020 Section 401(3), this section authorizes the Secretary to use either funds available for water resources development investigations or funds contributed by the head of the benefitting Federal agency. The Secretary must carry out such analyses at Federal expense, except that for analyses related to measures reducing risk to a military installation, the</p>	<p><i>This section 337 involves a regional specific project/area that is related to the project addressed in Section 336, above, and contains identical project provisions.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		Secretary may accept cost-share contributions from the non-Federal interest pursuant to the existing study agreement. A savings clause preserves all cost-sharing requirements applicable to other Federal agencies for any construction resulting from the study.	
Sec. 338 <i>Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration, Washington</i>	Modifies the authorized funding amount for projects under the Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration program established by section 544 of WRDA 2000.	This section amends Section 544(f) of WRDA 2000 to replace the existing limitation with a \$20 million per-project cap on total Federal expenditures for critical restoration projects carried out under the Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration program.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 339 <i>Lower Columbia River</i>	Allows construction related to dredged material structures for the Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers navigation project to be considered as operation and maintenance costs.	This section provides that the total cost of constructing dredged material stabilization and retaining structures related to maintenance dredging for the Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers navigation project -- from Portland, Oregon to the sea -- shall be considered eligible operation and maintenance costs assigned to commercial navigation under Section 210(a)(2) of WRDA 1986	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i> <i>This section provides a meaningful clarification for the Port of Portland and Lower Columbia River navigation interests. By designating dredged material stabilization and retaining structure costs as eligible</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		(33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)), making them eligible for Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) funding.	<i>Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) operation and maintenance costs assigned to commercial navigation, this provision resolves a long-standing cost allocation question that has complicated maintenance dredging planning for the Lower Columbia River navigation channel.</i>
Sec. 340 <i>Lower Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Restoration Assessment</i>	Directs the Secretary to assess the lower Columbia River Basin to identify opportunities and measures to support fish habitat restoration.	This section requires the Secretary to conduct an assessment of the lower Columbia River Basin to identify opportunities to carry out cost-effective projects and measures to support salmon and steelhead restoration through: restoring, improving, and reconnecting aquatic and riparian habitat; and providing cold water refugia for native anadromous fish species.	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i>
Sec. 341 <i>Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem</i>	Directs the Secretary to consider the removal, relocation, and replacement of certain structures when implementing the Puget	In carrying out the Puget Sound ecosystem restoration project authorized by WRDA 2016 Section 1401(4), this section requires the Secretary to treat the removal, relocation, and	<i>This section involves location or regional specific project/areas.</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<i>Restoration, Washington</i>	Sound nearshore ecosystem restoration project.	replacement of 4 specific road and bridge sites as project features with costs shared as construction: the Highway 101 causeway and bridge over the Lilliwaup Estuary of Hood Canal; the NE North Shore Road roadway and bridge over the Tahuya Estuary of Hood Canal; the Highway 101 causeway and bridge over Snow Creek and Salmon Creek at the head of Discovery Bay; and county and local roads and bridges over the Nooksack and Lummi Rivers and Tennant Creek at the Nooksack Estuary of Northern Puget Sound.	
Sec. 342 <i>Washington Metropolitan Area, Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia</i>	Directs the Secretary to carry out a second phase of the study authorized by section 8201(a)(14) of WRDA 2022 to identify a secondary water source for the region.	This section requires the Secretary to carry out a second phase of the Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia water supply feasibility study authorized by WRDA 2022 Section 8201(a)(14), focused on identifying a secondary water source and additional water storage capability or other long-term and large-scale backup water supply solutions necessary to meaningfully reduce the structural water supply risk of the region. The second phase is treated as a continuation of the	<i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i> <i>The Washington Metropolitan Area faces long-term structural water supply vulnerability, particularly during low-flow periods on the Potomac River. The second phase focus on large-scale backup supply</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>first phase -- no new investment decision is required and the study proceeds without interruption.</p>	<p><i>solutions reflects the scale of the challenge.</i></p>
<p>Sec. 343 <i>Federal Triangle Area, Washington, D.C.</i></p>	<p>Authorizes the Secretary to analyze alternatives on Federally-owned property as part of the feasibility study for flood risk management in the Federal Triangle Area of Washington, D.C.</p>	<p>This section is similar in structure to Sections 336 and 337, above.</p> <p>For analyses of measures benefitting Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of another Federal agency, carried out as part of the Federal Triangle Area flood risk management feasibility study authorized by WRDA 2022 Section 8201(a)(12), this section authorizes the Secretary to use either funds available for water resources development investigations or funds contributed by the head of the benefitting Federal agency. The Secretary must carry out such analyses at Federal expense. A savings clause preserves all cost-sharing requirements applicable to other Federal agencies for any construction resulting from the study.</p>	<p><i>This section involves a location or regional specific project/area.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Unlike Sections 336 and 337, this section does not include a military installation exception.</p>	
Title IV – Water Resources Infrastructure			
<p>Sec. 401 <i>Project Authorizations</i></p>	<p>Authorizes 10 projects for construction that have completed technical review by the Corps and are recommended by the Chief of Engineers.</p>	<p>This section authorizes the Secretary to carry out 10 water resources development projects substantially in accordance with the plans and conditions described in the respective Chief of Engineers reports or decision documents.</p> <p>Projects are organized into 5 categories:</p> <p>Navigation (1 Project): Columbia River Turning Basins, Washington and Oregon -- Chief's Report dated September 26, 2025; Federal cost \$16,408,000; non-Federal cost \$5,489,000; total \$21,897,000.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management (1 Project): Kentucky River, Beattyville Flood Risk Management Project, Lee County, Kentucky -- Chief's Report dated March 24, 2025; Federal cost</p>	<p><i>This section involves authorizations for construction of location or regional specific projects.</i></p> <p><i>The Chickamauga Lock Replacement Project at \$1.57 billion is by far the largest single project authorization in this bill and reflects decades of deferred action on one of the most critical bottlenecks on the Tennessee River inland waterway system.</i></p> <p><i>The Kentucky Lock Addition on the Lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers is also a long-awaited authorization for inland navigation.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>\$7,979,000; non-Federal cost \$4,562,000; total \$12,541,000.</p> <p>Ecosystem Restoration (1 Project): Little Goose Creek, Sheridan, Wyoming -- Chief's Report dated June 4, 2025; Federal cost \$45,333,000; non-Federal cost \$35,601,000; total \$80,934,000.</p> <p>Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction (1 Project): Surf City, Onslow and Pender Counties, North Carolina, Coastal Storm Risk Management -- Chief's Report dated July 15, 2025; initial Federal cost \$121,750,000; initial non-Federal cost \$76,863,000; initial total \$198,613,000; renourishment Federal cost \$171,007,000; renourishment non-Federal cost \$191,297,000; renourishment total \$362,304,000.</p> <p>Modifications and Other Projects (6 Projects):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona -- decision document dated June 12, 2025; total cost \$244,633,000. 	<p><i>The Port of Long Beach deep draft navigation project reflects continued investment in major coastal port infrastructure.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="892 386 1493 548">2. Port of Long Beach Deep Draft Navigation, Los Angeles County, California -- decision document dated June 11, 2025; total cost \$255,811,000. <li data-bbox="892 565 1493 824">3. Central and Southern Florida, Canal 111 (C-111) South Dade Project, Florida -- decision document dated October 14, 2025; Federal cost \$477,280,500; non-Federal cost \$477,280,500; total \$954,561,000. <li data-bbox="892 841 1493 1101">4. Kentucky Lock Addition, Lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers, Kentucky -- decision document dated June 11, 2025; Federal cost \$47,341,000; non-Federal cost \$25,491,000; total \$72,832,000. <li data-bbox="892 1117 1493 1312">5. Memphis Metropolitan Stormwater -- North DeSoto County Feasibility Study, DeSoto County, Mississippi -- decision document dated March 10, 2025; total cost to be determined. <li data-bbox="892 1328 1493 1409">6. Chickamauga Lock Replacement Project, Chickamauga Lake, Hamilton County, 	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		Tennessee -- decision document dated June 11, 2025; total cost \$1,566,787,000.	
<p>Sec. 402 <i>Expedited Completion of Projects and Activities</i></p>	<p>Directs the Secretary to expedite completion of various projects and activities that have been previously authorized.</p>	<p>This section directs the Secretary to expedite completion of projects and activities across 3 categories.</p> <p>(a) Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) projects (8 program types):</p> <p>(1) <u>Section 14 emergency streambank erosion and shoreline protection</u>: County Creek, Bartlett, Illinois; Ohio River, Brandenburg, Kentucky; Falmouth, Massachusetts; Muskegon Heights, Michigan; Old Mission Peninsula, Michigan; Euclid Creek, Euclid, Ohio; Little Miami River, Milford, Ohio; Mountain Creek, Macungie, Pennsylvania.</p> <p>(2) <u>Section 3 beach erosion and storm damage reduction</u>: Bolongo Bay, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.</p>	<p><i>This section involves location or regional specific projects/areas.</i></p>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>(3) <u>Section 205 flood control</u>: Ak-Chin Levee, Pinal County, Arizona; Lower Santa Cruz River, Arizona; McCormick Wash, Globe, Arizona; Rose and Palm Garden Washes, Douglas, Arizona; Beseck Lake, Connecticut; Woodbridge, Connecticut; Little Wekiva River, Florida; Peachtree and Nancy Creek watersheds, Atlanta, Georgia; Golconda, Illinois; Traverse City, Michigan; Marshall County, Minnesota; Peckman River, Verona, New Jersey; Third River, Clifton, New Jersey; Nanny Hagen Brook, Pleasantville, New York; McKenzie River, Springfield, Oregon; 42nd Street Levee, Springfield, Oregon; Medina Colonia, Zapata County, Texas.</p> <p>(4) <u>Section 107 navigation</u>: Kodiak Harbor, Alaska; Laupahoehoe Harbor, Hawaii; Black River and Lake Huron, Alcona Township, Michigan.</p> <p>(5) <u>Section 204 beneficial use of dredged material</u>: New Jersey Meadowlands (Hackensack Meadowlands), New Jersey.</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>(6) <u>Section 206 aquatic ecosystem restoration</u>: El Corazón de los Tres Ríos del Norte, Pima County, Arizona; North Haven, Connecticut; Savannah River below Augusta, Georgia; Waimea 400 Wetlands, Kaua'i, Hawaii; Marshall County, Minnesota; Polk Swamp, Dorchester County, South Carolina; Ficklen Island Dam, Fredericksburg, Virginia.</p> <p>(7) <u>Section 1135 environmental modification and drought resiliency</u>: Wayne County, Iowa; Wild Rice River, Minnesota; Lower Pearl River, Mississippi; Rio Chama and Rio Grande between Abiquiu and Cochiti Reservoirs, New Mexico.</p> <p>(8) <u>Section 1108 of WRDA 2024 stormwater control and reuse</u>: Klondike Canyon, Rancho Palos Verdes, California; City of Lompoc, California; Lake Avondale, Avondale Estates, Georgia; Falmouth including Woods Hole, Massachusetts; Waveland, Mississippi.</p> <p>(b) Other previously authorized projects (16 Projects): Little Colorado River, Navajo County,</p>	

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
		<p>Arizona; Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona; Tres Rios, Arizona; Surfside Sunset and Newport Beach, Orange County, California; Westminster and East Garden Grove, California; Greenwich Harbor, Connecticut (maintenance dredging); Southport Harbor, Connecticut (maintenance dredging); Indian River Lagoon, Florida; Northern Estuaries Ecosystem, Florida; Chicago Harbor Lock, Illinois; Naval Weapons Station Earle Oyster Reef Restoration, New Jersey; Times Beach dike wall repair, Buffalo Harbor, New York; Tillamook Bay, Oregon (maintenance dredging); Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania; Lower Blackstone River, Rhode Island; Two Rivers Harbor, Wisconsin (maintenance dredging).</p> <p>(c) Tribal Partnership Program (1 Project): Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project, Gila River Indian Community, Arizona.</p>	
Title V – Dam Safety			
Sec. 501	Reauthorizes the Federal Emergency Management Agency's	This section amends the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) in 3 ways:	<i>The extension of the State Dam Safety Grant Program through</i>

Section	T&I Summary	NWC Description / Analysis	Remarks
<p><i>National Dam Safety Program Amendments</i></p>	<p>(FEMA) High Hazard Potential Dam Program (HHPD) through 2031. Also makes additional changes to the HHPD and National Dam Safety programs, including ensuring non-state regulated dams such as low-head dams are not included in formulas related to the National Dam Safety Program.</p>	<p>increases the number of public representatives on the National Dam Safety Review Board from 2 to 7; extends the authorization of the Dam Safety State Assistance Grant Program from 2026 to 2031; and removes lowhead dams from 2 subcategories of dam safety criteria under Section 14(a)(2)(A)(ii), effectively separating lowhead dam considerations from the broader dam safety framework addressed in those subcategories.</p>	<p><i>2031 and the expansion of public representation on the Review Board are the most substantive changes. The removal of lowhead dams from specific subcategories may reflect ongoing policy discussions about how lowhead dams are classified and regulated under the National Dam Safety Program.</i></p>