



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

Overview of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Infrastructure (EI) Assistance

Updated August 2, 2024

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

R47162



R47162

August 2, 2024

Anna E. Normand
Specialist in Natural
Resources Policy

Overview of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Infrastructure (EI) Assistance

Congress has authorized and appropriated funding for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) *environmental infrastructure (EI) assistance* for the design and construction of certain infrastructure in specified municipalities, counties, and states. This assistance supports different projects at publicly owned and operated facilities. Projects include construction of water distribution works, stormwater management, surface water protection, and environmental restoration, among others. EI assistance authorities generally fall into one of three categories:

- **Section 219 EI.** Assistance at specific geographic locations (e.g., city, county, multiple counties) authorized under Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 1992; P.L. 102-580), as amended.
- **Non-Section 219 EI Projects.** Projects authorized in provisions other than Section 219 of WRDA 1992.
- **EI Programs.** EI programs authorized for broader geographic areas (e.g., states or regions of states), with various eligible types of assistance authorized in provisions of the authority.

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) reviewed enacted legislation since WRDA 1986 (P.L. 99-662), likely to include EI assistance authorities and deauthorization lists to identify over 400 EI assistance authorities with cumulative authorizations of appropriations totaling approximately \$12.8 billion. In the 117th Congress, WRDA 2022 (Division H, Title LXXXI of P.L. 117-263) amended EI assistance authorities and enacted new EI assistance authorities, which provided a combined increase in authorization of appropriations of \$6.6 billion. The authorizations of appropriations for these authorities vary widely, from \$100,000 for a water monitoring station to \$1 billion for a seven-state EI program. CRS identified authorized EI assistance in at least 46 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands. CRS did not identify authorities for EI assistance in Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, Rhode Island, or the remaining territories.

USACE evaluates an activity's eligibility for assistance by identifying whether an EI assistance authorization exists for the project's geographic area, and whether the proposed work is an eligible type of assistance provided for in the authorization. The authorization's specifics determine the nature of USACE's involvement and the nonfederal cost share. USACE is authorized to perform design and/or construction work with USACE funds and, for certain programmatic authorities, may use appropriated funds to reimburse nonfederal sponsors for work they perform. Most USACE EI assistance requires cost sharing at 75% federal and 25% nonfederal, and the nonfederal sponsor—the owner of constructed facilities—is responsible for operations and maintenance. Unlike traditional USACE water resource projects, EI assistance is not subject to the USACE planning process (e.g., it does not require a feasibility study); however, other federal laws apply to EI assistance, including the National Environmental Policy Act.

Congress typically funds EI assistance through USACE's Construction account in annual Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies appropriations acts. The FY2024 President's budget request included \$5 million for EI assistance; this was the first time an Administration had requested EI assistance funding. In FY2024, Congress provided \$197.7 million for USACE EI assistance authorities. The explanatory statement accompanying Division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118-42), included recommendations to fund \$179.8 million for EI assistance specifically requested by Members as Community Project Funding or Congressionally Directed Spending proposals (48 requests were funded). In addition, the act recommended \$17.9 million for USACE to allocate to EI assistance authorities in an agency work plan; USACE allocated this funding to eight authorities. The FY2025 President's budget did not request funding for EI assistance.

Considerations for Congress may include whether to amend, add, or deauthorize EI assistance authorities and, if so, how to address those provisions. For example, WRDA 2024 bills in the 118th Congress would amend and add EI assistance authorities: H.R. 8812 would increase authorization of appropriations for EI assistance by \$4.7 billion, and S. 4367 would increase authorization of appropriations for EI assistance by \$1.0 billion. Congress also may weigh its support for USACE's EI assistance activities generally, in view of other federal programs that provide assistance for similar projects and activities. Another consideration for Congress may include how funding is allocated among EI assistance authorities, whether based on Member requests, certain criteria, or other considerations. Finally, Congress may conduct oversight of USACE's EI assistance activities and whether the activities are meeting Congress's expectations; for example, how efficient is USACE at implementing the EI assistance funds and how effective is USACE's EI assistance in accomplishing the authorized EI assistance purposes.

Contents

Environmental Infrastructure Assistance.....	1
Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities.....	1
Evolution of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities	3
EI Assistance in House and Senate WRDA 2024 Bills.....	5
Funding for Environmental Infrastructure Assistance.....	6
FY2020 and FY2021 Appropriations.....	7
FY2022 Through FY2024 Appropriations.....	7
Analysis of Funding from FY2020 Through FY2024	8
Considerations for Congress	11
Adding, Amending, or Deauthorizing EI Assistance Authorities	11
Funding EI Assistance Authorities.....	11
Oversight of EI Assistance Activities.....	12

Figures

Figure 1. Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Funding by State	10
--	----

Tables

Table 1. Funding for Environmental Infrastructure Assistance, FY2020-FY2024.....	7
Table B-1. Summary of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities	23
Table C-1. New EI Assistance Authorities in WRDA 2024 Bills.....	37
Table C-2. Amendments to EI Assistance Authorities in WRDA 2024 Bills	44

Appendixes

Appendix A. Examples of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities.....	14
Appendix B. Summary of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities.....	23
Appendix C. EI Assistance Authorities in WRDA 2024 Bills.....	37

Contacts

Author Information.....	50
-------------------------	----

Environmental Infrastructure Assistance

Congress has authorized and funded the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to assist with the design and construction of certain infrastructure in specified municipalities, counties, and states. This assistance supports projects at publicly owned and operated facilities, such as design and construction of water distribution works, stormwater collection efforts, surface water protection projects, and environmental restoration projects, among others. This USACE assistance is broadly referred to as *environmental infrastructure (EI) assistance*. Aside from EI assistance, USACE has water resources development authorities for navigation, flood risk reduction, and aquatic ecosystem restoration activities.¹

Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities

Congress first authorized USACE to perform EI assistance in 1992. Congress typically authorizes USACE activities in omnibus authorization laws, often titled Water Resources Development Acts (WRDAs).² WRDA 1992 (P.L. 102-580) contained the first EI assistance authorities. Following WRDA 1992, Congress authorized new or amended EI assistance authorities in subsequent WRDAs and in some appropriations acts (i.e., in acts aside from WRDAs), as described in “Evolution of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities.” **Appendix A** provides the legislative text of example EI assistance authorities.

EI assistance authorities generally fall into one of three categories:

- **Section 219 EI.** Assistance at specific geographic locations (e.g., city, county, multiple counties) authorized under Section 219 of WRDA 1992, as amended.³
- **Non-Section 219 EI Projects.** Projects authorized in provisions other than Section 219 of WRDA 1992.⁴
- **EI Programs.** EI programs authorized for broader geographic areas (e.g., states or regions of states), with generally multiple types of assistance authorized.⁵ Some EI programs focus more on restoration than on other types of assistance.

¹ For more information on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) civil works activities, see CRS Report R47946, *Process for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Projects*, by Nicole T. Carter and Anna E. Normand.

² For more information on Water Resources Development Acts (WRDAs), see CRS In Focus IF11322, *Water Resources Development Acts: Primer and Action in the 118th Congress*, by Nicole T. Carter and Anna E. Normand.

³ These authorities range from covering single municipalities to covering multiple counties in a state to covering a state or territory.

⁴ One USACE non-Section 219 environmental infrastructure (EI) project authority has statutory roots that precede WRDA 1992 (P.L. 102-580). In Section 1113 of WRDA 1986 (P.L. 99-662), as amended, Congress authorized USACE to “carry out, without regard to economic analysis, such measures as are necessary to protect and restore the river diversion structures and associated channels attendant to the operations of the community ditch and Acequia systems in New Mexico that—(1) are declared to be a political subdivision of the State; or (2) belong to an Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).” USACE has allocated funds that Congress appropriated for EI assistance to activities authorized by Section 1113. No other non-Section 219 EI project authority has received funding in recent fiscal years.

⁵ EI assistance program authorities state that the authority is for a program, with criteria defining what type of projects or type of assistance are eligible for assistance under the authority. These programmatic authorities also include direction on how to operate the authority as a program (e.g., provisions on credit toward the nonfederal cost share) and most include the ability for USACE to reimburse the nonfederal sponsor for work performed by the sponsor. By contrast, EI assistance authorities for projects generally may be for more specific projects, may provide less direction on executing the authority than programmatic EI assistance authorities, and do not allow for reimbursement to the nonfederal sponsor.

Based on a review of enacted legislation since WRDA 1986 (P.L. 99-662) likely to include EI assistance authorities, and a review of deauthorization lists,⁶ the Congressional Research Service (CRS) identified over 400 EI assistance authorities with cumulative authorizations of appropriations totaling approximately \$12.8 billion (see **Appendix B**).⁷ The authorizations for these activities vary widely, from \$100,000 for a water monitoring station to \$1 billion for a seven-state EI program. These authorizations are at a fixed level (i.e., not indexed for inflation).⁸ CRS identified EI assistance authorities in at least 46 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands. CRS did not identify authorities for EI assistance in Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, Rhode Island, or the remaining territories.

An authorization's specifics determine the nature of USACE's involvement and applicable nonfederal cost share. A project's eligibility for assistance is based on whether an EI assistance authorization exists for the project's geographic area and whether the proposed work is an eligible type of assistance provided for in the authorization. USACE is authorized to perform design and/or construction work with appropriated funds and, generally for programmatic authorities, may use appropriated funds to reimburse nonfederal sponsors for work they perform. Most USACE EI assistance requires cost sharing at 75% federal and 25% nonfederal.⁹ The nonfederal sponsor is the owner of constructed facilities and is responsible for 100% of operations and maintenance. USACE and nonfederal sponsors sign an agreement before USACE provides assistance.¹⁰ Unlike traditional USACE water resource projects, EI assistance is not subject to the USACE planning process (e.g., it does not require a feasibility study). However, projects that

⁶ USACE published lists in the *Federal Register* to deauthorize certain USACE authorities pursuant to direction in WRDA 1986 and in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA 2014; P.L. 113-121). For more information, see the report section on "Deauthorization Processes."

⁷ Neither Congress nor USACE has defined *environmental infrastructure*, but authorities that receive appropriations for EI assistance have some characteristic authorizing language. This report and its tables may reference authorities that some may not consider to be EI assistance and may not reference authorities that some consider to be EI assistance. The Congressional Research Service (CRS) included authorities that direct the Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to provide assistance to nonfederal interests and that include *environmental infrastructure* in the authority or name of the authority. CRS also included assistance authorities that do not explicitly include the phrase *environmental infrastructure* but describe similar activities (e.g., water supply, wastewater or sewage treatment, stormwater management) and have similar characteristics (e.g., 25% nonfederal cost share for assistance and 100% nonfederal operation and maintenance responsibilities) to assistance authorities with the phrase *environmental infrastructure*. These inclusions are generally for some non-Section 219 project authorities. The "Corps of Engineers Environmental Infrastructure Projects" spreadsheet that USACE provided to CRS in 2012 also identified some authorities related to environmental restoration activities; some of these are included as EI assistance in this report, while others are not. For example Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program (Section 510 of WRDA 1996 [P.L. 104-303], as amended) was included in the USACE spreadsheet, but USACE has allocated funding for aquatic ecosystem restoration to the authority, thus CRS does not label it as an EI assistance authority. Although Section 542 of WRDA 2000 (P.L. 106-541), as amended, for Lake Champlain, VT and NY, was not included in the USACE spreadsheet, USACE has allocated EI funding in work plans to the program; for this reason, CRS included that authority as EI assistance.

⁸ Section 584 of WRDA 1996 (P.L. 104-303), as amended, authorized the water monitoring station and Section 595 of WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53), as amended, authorized the Western Rural Water seven-state EI program.

⁹ The nonfederal sponsor must provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and disposal areas (LERRD) necessary for construction, operation and maintenance of a project; these may credit toward the value of the nonfederal sponsor's cost share. Section 8149 of WRDA 2022 (Division H, Title LXXXI; P.L. 117-263) amended 33 U.S.C. §2222, an authority regarding the use of other federal funds for nonfederal cost shares for USACE studies or projects. The amendment would expand the provision to include "a study or project under an environmental infrastructure assistance program" and potentially expand the eligibility of other federal funds for nonfederal cost shares. It is unclear if the reference to EI assistance program includes non-Section 219 EI projects and Section 219 EI assistance authorities.

¹⁰ Model agreements are located at USACE, "Models for Environmental Infrastructure," https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Project-Partnership-Agreements/model_env-inf/.

receive EI assistance are required to comply with other federal laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. §§4321 et seq.). Generally, this results in USACE preparing an environmental assessment (EA) for the project and ultimately signing a Finding of No Significant Impact in order to proceed with the project.¹¹

Evolution of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities

Since 1992, Congress has authorized EI assistance for specific geographic areas, amended existing EI authorities, and established processes that deauthorized some EI authorities. Originally, Section 219 of WRDA 1992 authorized design assistance for 18 projects. Other sections of WRDA 1992 authorized design and construction assistance for EI assistance projects and programs in selected geographic areas (e.g., Section 340, Southern West Virginia). WRDA 1996 (P.L. 104-303) added construction assistance for certain Section 219 authorities. In subsequent WRDAs through WRDA 2007 (P.L. 110-114) and in selected appropriations laws (e.g., Appendix D of Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001; P.L. 106-554), Congress authorized new and amended existing USACE EI assistance authorities. For example, WRDA 2007 added approximately \$2.7 billion in authorization of appropriations for EI assistance.

Authority Modifications from 2014 to 2020

Congress did not provide for new EI assistance authorizations in WRDAs from 2014 through 2020, but modified certain EI authorities in these WRDAs. Among other reasons, Congress did not enact new authorities during this time due to policies restricting congressionally directed authorization and appropriations (i.e., *earmarks*) in the 112th-116th Congresses.

Congress provided a process for nonfederal sponsors to propose modifications to EI assistance authorities when WRDA 2016 (P.L. 114-322, Title I) expanded Section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA 2014; P.L. 113-121).¹² Through the *Section 7001 proposal process*, nonfederal sponsors may propose modifications to existing EI assistance authorizations (e.g., expand the location, amend eligible project types, or adjust the authorization of appropriations).¹³ This process requires USACE to annually submit a report to Congress identifying proposals by nonfederal interests that meet certain criteria. Congress may consider these proposals as part of WRDA deliberations. For example, in WRDA 2020 (P.L. 116-260, Division AA), Congress amended 14 EI assistance authorities to increase their authorizations of appropriations as proposed through the 7001 process. For four of the EI authorities, WRDA 2020 expanded the authorized geographic scope or types of eligible activities.

¹¹ For instance, USACE has developed Program Implementation Guidance for the Central West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure and Resource Protection and Development Program, authorized by Section 571 of WRDA 1999, as amended. The guidance states: “Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires the development and coordination of an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact or an Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision, as appropriate.” The guidance also states that the nonfederal sponsor is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and licenses. USACE, *Central West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure and Resource Protection and Development Program, Program Implementation Guidance*, December 20, 2002, <https://usace.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/api/collection/p16021coll11/id/4822/download>.

¹² See 33 U.S.C. §2282d.

¹³ For more information on the Section 7001 proposal process, see CRS Insight IN11118, *Army Corps of Engineers: Section 7001 Report on Future Studies and Projects*, by Anna E. Normand.

Deauthorization Processes

In WRDAs, Congress has authorized various processes to deauthorize existing authorities meeting certain criteria. In two instances, these processes have resulted in the deauthorization of EI assistance authorities.¹⁴

- In Section 1001(b)(2) of WRDA 1986, as amended (33 U.S.C. §579a(b)(2)), Congress enacted a deauthorization process that USACE used in 2009 to deauthorize certain EI assistance authorities.¹⁵
- In WRRDA 2014, Congress enacted a one-time deauthorization process (i.e., the authority was for developing one list) that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASACW) used in 2016 to deauthorize certain EI assistance authorities.¹⁶

Congress enacted other one-time deauthorization processes in WRDA 2016 and WRDA 2018. In WRDA 2020, Congress repealed the ASACW's existing deauthorization process authorities and enacted new deauthorization provisions, including a one-time deauthorization authority (33 U.S.C. §579d-2) that excluded EI assistance authorities. This WRDA 2020 process was to conclude with automatic deauthorization of projects after a two-year period for congressional review of a deauthorization project list transmitted by the ASACW to Congress. WRDA 2022 (Division H, Title LXXXI; P.L. 117-263) amended the WRDA 2020 process in various ways. The WRDA 2022 amendments to 33 U.S.C. §579d-2 conclude the deauthorization authority with the ASACW's submission of the deauthorization list to Congress for review of the list (i.e., no automatic deauthorization).¹⁷ Unlike in WRDA 2020, the WRDA 2022 provision does not specifically exclude EI assistance authorities from the amended one-time deauthorization list process.

New Authorities and Authority Modifications in WRDA 2022

Congressional interest in expanding EI assistance continued in the 117th Congress, which included new and amended EI assistance authorities in WRDA 2022. Due to changes in policies that previously restricted congressionally directed authorizations, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (EPW) and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (T&I) both considered Member proposals to add or amend EI assistance authorities and proposals transmitted by the Administration (e.g., nonfederal proposals to amend EI assistance authorities included in a Section 7001 report) when developing WRDA 2022. EI provisions in the enacted WRDA 2022 varied by the type of infrastructure eligible for assistance (e.g., wastewater management, groundwater recharge, water recycling, coastal flooding, environmental restoration), the geographic area covered (e.g., city, multiple cities, county, multiple counties, state/territory, multiple states, river basin), and the authorization of appropriations (e.g., less than \$1 million, over \$100 million). In total, WRDA 2022 increased the authorization of appropriations for EI by \$6.6 billion, more than doubling the amount of authorization of appropriations previously provided by EI authorities. Specifically, WRDA 2022 included the following sections that provided new or amended EI assistance authorities:¹⁸

¹⁴ CRS did not identify any enacted provisions where Congress has deauthorized individual EI assistance authorities.

¹⁵ See the deauthorization list published in 74 *Federal Register* 31713-31715, July 2, 2009.

¹⁶ See the deauthorization list published in 81 *Federal Register* 16147-16153, March 25, 2016.

¹⁷ See Section 8301 of WRDA 2022.

¹⁸ In addition, Section 8376 amended the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program (Section (continued...))

- Section 8311 amended the Acequias Irrigation Systems EI assistance authority (Section 113 of WRDA 1986, as amended);
- Sections 8319, 8353, and 8359 authorized new programmatic EI assistance authorities for Los Angeles County, CA; Northern Missouri; and Southwestern Oregon, respectively;
- Sections 8373 and 8374 amended two programmatic EI assistance authorities for West Virginia;
- Section 8375 amended 24 Section 219 EI assistance authorities, including 2 that were reauthorized, and added 132 new Section 219 assistance authorities with various eligible assistance activities and geographic areas ranging from cities to multi-county areas to territories and states; and
- Section 8376 amended 12 programmatic EI assistance authorities.

EI Assistance in House and Senate WRDA 2024 Bills

In the 118th Congress, the House and Senate passed WRDA 2024 bills—H.R. 8812 and S. 4367, respectively—which both contain provisions to add and amend EI assistance authorities.¹⁹ As with WRDA 2022 development, Senate EPW and House T&I both considered Member proposals to add or amend EI assistance authorities and proposals transmitted by the Administration (e.g., nonfederal proposals to amend EI assistance authorities included in a Section 7001 report) when developing their respective bills.

EI assistance provisions in H.R. 8812:

- Section 311 would amend the Acequias Irrigation Systems EI assistance authority;
- Section 339 would authorize a new programmatic EI assistance authority for Western Washington State, WA, and deauthorize Section 219(f)(404) for Western Washington State, WA;
- Section 340(a) would authorize 166 new Section 219 EI assistance authorities; and
- Section 340(b)(2) would amend 47 Section 219 EI assistance authorities and 12 programmatic EI assistance authorities.

EI assistance provisions in S. 4367:

- Section 302(a) would authorize 41 new Section 219 EI assistance authorities;
- Section 302(b)(2) would amend 20 Section 219 EI assistance authorities;
- Section 302(c) would amend the nonfederal cost share for Section 219 EI assistance projects that benefit economically disadvantaged communities from

510 of WRDA 1996 [P.L. 104-303], as amended), to include eligible activities that are similar to other EI assistance authority activities. USACE has allocated funding for aquatic ecosystem restoration to this program (i.e., the program does not receive EI assistance funding). WRDA 2022 also authorized a Chattahoochee River Program at \$40.0 million (§8144) and Lower Mississippi River Demonstration Program at \$40.0 million (§8145); both program authorities have similarities to the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program and EI assistance authorities, but CRS could not determine if Congress or USACE would consider the programs as EI assistance authorities or aquatic ecosystem restoration authorities.

¹⁹ On July 22, 2024, the House passed H.R. 8812 under suspension of the rules. On August 1, 2024, the Senate passed S. 4367 by unanimous consent.

- 25% to 10% and would direct USACE to determine nonfederal cost shares based on the ability of nonfederal interests to pay such cost shares;
- Sections 303, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, and 312 would amend 7 programmatic EI assistance authorities;
 - Section 304 would amend the Acequias Irrigation Systems EI assistance authority; and
 - Sections 306 and 311 would authorize new programmatic EI assistance authorities—Kentucky and West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure and Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.²⁰

H.R. 8812 would increase authorization of appropriations for EI assistance by \$4.7 billion, and S. 4367 would increase authorization of appropriations for EI assistance by \$1.0 billion. New authorization of appropriations for EI assistance authorities in the bills range from \$170,000 to \$242.0 million, and amendments to EI assistance authorizations in the bills include increasing authorization of appropriations for those authorities in the range of \$1.4 million to \$120.0 million. New EI assistance authorities in the bills include authorities pertaining to a specific water district, cities, counties, and states. S. 4367 would add two new programmatic EI assistance authorities. H.R. 8812 would repeal a Section 219 EI assistance authority for Western Washington State, WA, and instead authorize EI assistance for the region under a programmatic authority. Most provisions in both bills would authorize eligible activities that are similar to existing EI authorities. However, H.R. 8812 includes natural and nature-based infrastructure and drought resilience measures as new eligible project purposes for some programmatic EI assistance authorities, and S. 4367 includes a new multistate programmatic EI assistance authority for water-related environmental infrastructure to address acid mine drainage. In addition, some provisions would alter nonfederal cost shares. For instance, H.R. 8812 would decrease Section 219 EI assistance nonfederal cost shares from 25% to 10% for projects benefitting economically disadvantaged communities, and S. 4367 would amend some programmatic EI assistance authorities to provide the same cost-share reduction.²¹ EI assistance provisions in these bills are further presented in **Appendix C**.

Funding for Environmental Infrastructure Assistance

Although the President’s budget request typically does not include funding for EI assistance, including for FY2025, Congress has regularly funded EI assistance through USACE’s Construction account in annual Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies appropriations acts. Congress also has funded EI assistance through supplemental appropriations. At times, Congress has provided EI assistance funding based on Member requests (i.e., earmarks) and/or as *additional funding* for USACE to allocate in a work plan. **Table 1** summarizes EI assistance funding information from FY2020 through FY2024; the sections below provide further details and analysis of the funding in these fiscal years.

²⁰ Section 311 would authorize assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure to address acid mine drainage, including projects for centralized water treatment and related facilities.

²¹ An *economically disadvantaged community* in these provisions is defined pursuant to Section 160 of WRDA 2020. The Acequias Irrigation Systems EI assistance authority already includes a 10% nonfederal cost share for projects benefitting economically disadvantaged communities. Section 311 of H.R. 8812 and Section 304 of S. 4367 would change the federal cost share for a reconnaissance study to 100%.

Table I. Funding for Environmental Infrastructure Assistance, FY2020-FY2024
(\$ in millions, not adjusted for inflation)

	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024 ^a
Total EI Funding	\$100.0	\$100.0	\$299.5	\$168.5	\$197.7
CPF/CDS Funding	NA	NA	\$86.5	\$130.5	\$179.8
Work Plan Additional Funding	\$100.0	\$100.0	\$13.0	\$18.0 ^b	\$17.9
Supplemental Funding	—	—	\$200.0	\$20.0	—
Number of Funded EI Authorities	27	21	46	34	44
Number of CPF/CDS Items ^c	NA	NA	25	33	48

Source: CRS, compiled from USACE Construction Work Plans (FY2020-FY2024), Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA; P.L. 117-58), USACE’s IIJA FY2022 spend plan, and P.L. 117-180.

Notes: CPF/CDS = Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending. EI = environmental infrastructure. NA = Not Applicable. Work plans may list multiple line items and projects, including CPF/CDS items, under one EI authority.

- All EI funding for FY2024, including both CPF/CDS items and allocations in the work plan, were funded using IIJA appropriations.
- Division N, Title IV of P.L. 117-328 provided \$18.0 million in emergency appropriations for USACE to allocate to EI assistance authorities in a work plan.
- Multiple CPF/CDS items may be funded under a single EI authority.

FY2020 and FY2021 Appropriations

Prior to the 112th Congress, Congress generally funded specific EI assistance authorities through direction in report language accompanying appropriations acts. During the 112th-116th Congresses, when moratorium policies limited earmarks, Congress specified a funding amount for all EI assistance as part of the “additional funding” provided by Congress above the President’s budget request. Reports and explanatory statements accompanying appropriations acts directed USACE to develop a work plan allocating additional funding, including the EI assistance funding, to projects within a certain timeframe (e.g., 60 days).²² In addition, Congress provided guidance on how the Administration was to use the EI assistance funds. For both FY2020 and FY2021, Congress provided \$100.0 million in additional funding that USACE allocated among EI assistance authorities in the Construction work plan. In those fiscal years, Congress did not provide supplemental or emergency appropriations for EI assistance.

FY2022 Through FY2024 Appropriations

In the 117th and 118th Congresses, the annual appropriations process allowed for Members to request funding for geographically specific projects, which were referred to as Community Project Funding (CPF) in the House and Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS) in the Senate. In FY2022-FY2024, Congress funded CPF/CDS requests for EI assistance and directed USACE to allocate additional funding for EI assistance in work plans. During these fiscal years, supplemental appropriations also funded EI assistance.

For FY2022, the explanatory statement accompanying Division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117-103), recommended \$99.5 million in annual appropriations to fund EI assistance, including (1) \$86.5 million to fund 25 CPF/CDS items and (2) \$13.0 million

²² USACE work plans are available at USACE, “Civil Works and Budget Performance,” <https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Budget/#Work-Plans>.

that USACE allocated to five EI authorities in its FY2022 Construction work plan.²³ Division J, Title III, of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA; P.L. 117-58) also provided \$200.0 million in FY2022 Construction appropriations for EI assistance authorities, which USACE allocated in its FY2022 IIJA Construction spend plan as required by that act.²⁴

In FY2023, Congress provided \$168.5 million for USACE EI assistance authorities. The explanatory statement accompanying Division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-328), included recommendations to fund 32 CPF/CDS items for EI assistance that totaled \$130.5 million.²⁵ In addition, Division N, Title IV, of P.L. 117-328 provided \$18.0 million in emergency appropriations for USACE to allocate to EI assistance authorities in a work plan; USACE allocated this funding to 13 authorities in its FY2023 Construction work plan.²⁶ Further, for FY2023, Division A, of the Continuing Appropriations and Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-180), provided \$20.0 million in emergency appropriations for EI assistance, which USACE allocated to Section 219(f)(167) of WRDA 1992, as amended, for water and wastewater infrastructure in Jackson, MS.²⁷

The FY2024 President's budget request included \$5 million for EI assistance; this was the first time an Administration had requested EI assistance funding.²⁸ In FY2024, Congress funded \$197.7 million for EI assistance through use of prior-year IIJA appropriations, including (1) \$179.8 million to fund 48 CPF/CDS requests and (2) \$17.9 million that USACE allocated to eight EI authorities in its FY2024 Construction work plan.²⁹

Analysis of Funding from FY2020 Through FY2024

From FY2020 through FY2024, 34 states with EI assistance authorizations received funding from annual appropriations and supplemental appropriations (**Figure 1**). CPF/CDS requests in FY2022, FY2023, and FY2024 resulted in the funding of several EI assistance authorities for the first time. Twelve states, 4 territories, and the District of Columbia, all with at least one EI assistance authorization, did not receive funding from FY2020 through FY2024.

Funding from FY2020 through FY2024 supported projects under EI assistance programmatic authorities, Section 219 authorities, and the Acequias Irrigation Systems authority. Over these fiscal years, funding in a fiscal year for specific Section 219 EI assistance authorities ranged from \$20,000 to \$23.8 million. For programmatic EI assistance authorities, funding in a fiscal year

²³ The explanatory statement accompanying Division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117-103), is available at <https://www.congress.gov/117/crec/2022/12/20/168/198/CREC-2022-12-20-pt1-PgS7819-2.pdf>.

²⁴ Congress provided no direction in the act on which EI assistance authorities to fund. See CRS Insight IN11723, *Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Funding for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Civil Works*, by Anna E. Normand and Nicole T. Carter, for more information on USACE IIJA funding and required reporting.

²⁵ The explanatory statement accompanying Division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-328), is available at <https://www.congress.gov/117/crec/2022/12/20/168/198/CREC-2022-12-20.pdf>.

²⁶ See FY2023 Construction Work Plan at <https://usace.contentdm.oclc.org/utills/getfile/collection/p16021coll6/id/2303>.

²⁷ Correspondence between CRS and USACE on January 4, 2023.

²⁸ Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, "USACE 2024 Civil Works Budget Press Conference," March 9, 2023; USACE, *FY2024 Civil Works Budget of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Press Book*, March 2023, <https://usace.contentdm.oclc.org/utills/getfile/collection/p16021coll6/id/2317>.


²⁹ The act directed USACE to allocate \$1.43 billion from unobligated and unallocated prior-year IIJA Construction appropriations to fund projects listed in the Construction table of the explanatory statement. In its FY2024 Construction spend plan, USACE identified prior-year IIJA Construction appropriations as funding all line items labeled as environmental infrastructure assistance, including ones receiving "additional funding."

ranged from \$100,000 for the Lake Tahoe Basin Restoration authority in FY2023 to \$44.0 million total for the Western Rural Water authority in FY2022.³⁰

Work plans, spend plans, and explanatory statements provide limited information on the type of projects and work to be accomplished under these authorities from the appropriations provided by the acts. The documents may include multiple line items of funding that are under one EI authority. These line items may be for different projects pursuant to one authority or for work in different states pursuant to a multistate authority. Some funding line items may fund multiple projects under that line item.

³⁰ FY2022 funding for the Western Rural Water authority was totaled from multiple funding line items in the FY2022 Construction work plan and FY2022 IJA Construction spend plan.

Figure I. Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Funding by State
(FY2020-FY2024; nominal dollars)



Source: CRS, using USACE work plans (FY2020-FY2024); the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA; P.L. 117-58); the FY2022 spend plan released January 19, 2022; and P.L. 117-180.

Notes: Includes both annual appropriations and supplemental funding. Twelve states, four territories, and the District of Columbia, all with at least one EI assistance authorization, did not receive funding from FY2020 through FY2024.

Considerations for Congress

Adding, Amending, or Deauthorizing EI Assistance Authorities

A consideration for Congress may include whether to add, amend, or deauthorize EI assistance authorities and, if so, the process to enact such changes. During the earmark moratorium in the 112th-116th Congresses, Congress only amended existing EI assistance authorities, including adding counties and states to authorities. In contrast, WRDA bills in the 117th and 118th Congresses included both new and amended EI assistance authorities. Most of the EI assistance provisions in these latest WRDA bills were proposed through Member submissions to the committees.³¹ Future Congresses may debate whether to further address EI assistance requests through amending existing EI assistance authorities and/or providing new authorities, and whether to do so through requests from Member offices or an alternative process.

When determining whether to amend or add EI assistance authorities, Congress may consider various aspects of these authorities, such as geographic area, authorization of appropriations, purposes, and cost sharing. For instance, EI assistance provisions in WRDA 2022 and in the WRDA 2024 bills vary widely in the authorization of appropriations and eligible geographic areas, and they include new eligible purposes for EI assistance. Congress is also considering amending cost sharing for EI assistance benefiting disadvantaged communities: H.R. 8812 would decrease the cost share for Section 219 EI assistance, and S. 4367 would decrease the cost share for some programmatic EI assistance authorities. Further, Congress may consider the distribution of EI assistance authorities across states and regions. WRDA 2022 expanded the geographic scope of EI assistance authority to include all or some parts of Delaware, Guam, Hawaii, Massachusetts, and Washington, which previously did not have EI authorities. EI assistance authorities are still limited in many states (e.g., covering only a certain city, county, or region of the state) and remain completely absent in Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, Rhode Island, and American Samoa.

Congress also may consider whether to deauthorize EI assistance authorities. For some locations, multiple EI authorities apply. For example, there are multiple authorities applicable to Los Angeles County—two specific to the entire county and a state-wide authority. Some EI assistance authorities have not received funding in recent years, and many EI assistance authorities have never received funding. Some of these unfunded authorities may no longer reflect a current EI assistance need or may no longer have a nonfederal entity interested in sponsoring the nonfederal responsibilities (e.g., cost share, operation and maintenance). However, if some of these currently underutilized authorities remain authorized, USACE may still be able to provide assistance for future EI projects in these authorized locations without having to reauthorize the assistance. For instance, Congress reauthorized two EI assistance authorities in WRDA 2022 that were previously deauthorized through the deauthorization process enacted in WRRDA 2014.

Funding EI Assistance Authorities

Although Congress regularly funds USACE EI assistance, Administrations had not requested funding for the EI authorities until the FY2024 President's budget request, possibly indicating

³¹ For example, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's instructions for Member proposals for WRDA 2022 stated, "Members may submit up to a total of five (5) requests for the authorization of new, project-specific environmental infrastructure authorities, or the modification of existing environmental infrastructure authorities." Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, *Instructions: Member Electronic Submissions to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for Consideration in the Water Resource Development Act of 2022*, January 2022.

that some prior Administrations had considered EI assistance to be a relatively low priority for USACE. Some in Congress also have considered whether EI assistance activities belong in USACE. For example, a proposed amendment to the FY2017 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill would have eliminated funding for EI assistance. Those in favor of the amendment argued that these activities were primarily nonfederal responsibilities, supported by other federal programs, and were outside of USACE's traditional missions.³² The amendment did not pass.³³ Other federal programs may provide assistance to similar water projects on a competitive basis using established criteria (e.g., the Environmental Protection Agency's state revolving funds, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's small watershed loans).³⁴ Assistance from some of these programs is not limited to specific geographic areas. These programs may also differ from EI authorities by leveraging funding to provide financial assistance mainly as loans, while USACE EI assistance is cost-shared (mostly at 75% federal). EI assistance may also include design and construction assistance from USACE staff (in addition to funding). Congress may consider how much funding to provide USACE for EI assistance versus to these other programs that may address similar water infrastructure needs.

The increase in authorization of appropriations for WRDA 2022 USACE EI assistance authorities totaled \$6.6 billion, more than doubling the amount of authorized appropriations for USACE EI assistance. In recent fiscal years, appropriations for EI assistance have ranged from \$100.0 million to \$299.5 million.³⁵ In future appropriations bills, Congress may consider how much EI assistance to fund and how much of that funding is for Member requests (i.e., CPF/CDS requests) versus for additional funding for USACE to allocate to authorities. For FY2023, 77% of EI funding was for CPF/CDS requests, and in FY2024, the percentage increased to 91%. Congress may continue to prioritize funding for EI assistance via CPF/CDS requests or choose to provide a larger portion of EI funding through additional funding for USACE to allocate in a work plan.³⁶ Further, a consideration for Congress may be whether, and if so, how to prioritize funding EI authorities. For instance, the explanatory statement for FY2024 appropriations directed the majority of additional funding for EI assistance to support multistate authorities.

Oversight of EI Assistance Activities

Another consideration for Congress may be approaches to conducting oversight of USACE EI assistance activities.³⁷ Oversight actions could include requiring reporting information on EI assistance policies and execution. Public information on USACE's EI assistance activities is limited. USACE budget justifications provide information on USACE studies and projects included in the budget request; but because USACE usually does not request EI assistance funding, budget justifications usually do not include information on these authorities. Some USACE district webpages provide some information on USACE EI assistance authorities,

³² Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016, *Congressional Record*, vol. 162, No. 64 (April 26, 2016), p. S2429.

³³ Chamber Action, *Congressional Record*, vol. 162, No. 64 (April 26, 2016), p. D428.

³⁴ See CRS Report R46471, *Federally Supported Projects and Programs for Wastewater, Drinking Water, and Water Supply Infrastructure*, coordinated by Jonathan L. Ramseur.

³⁵ \$200 million of the FY2022 total funding of \$299.5 million was from IJJA appropriations, and IJJA appropriations were used to fund \$197.7 million of EI assistance in FY2024.

³⁶ In H.Rept. 118-580, the House Committee on Appropriations reminded USACE that environmental infrastructure projects are eligible to compete for the additional funding provided under "Other Authorized Project Purposes." This would be in addition to additional funding provided under "Environmental Infrastructure."

³⁷ For more information on potential oversight mechanisms, see CRS Report RL30240, *Congressional Oversight Manual*, coordinated by Ben Wilhelm, Todd Garvey, and Christopher M. Davis.

including through project factsheets and EAs.³⁸ Other USACE district websites do not provide information on EI assistance authorities and current projects in their districts. USACE publishes model project partnership agreements that cover many EI assistance authorities,³⁹ but CRS could not identify further policy guidance (e.g., a USACE engineering regulation) on USACE’s EI assistance.

In 2019, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) studied how USACE allocated funding for Section 219 EI assistance. In its report, GAO found USACE was not following any national criteria or policy in funding these projects, despite congressional guidance provided in explanatory statements and conference reports accompanying enacted appropriations laws.⁴⁰ Following GAO’s report, Section 137 of WRDA 2020 directed the ASACW to develop specific criteria for evaluating and ranking individual EI assistance projects, while specifying certain considerations that should be included in the criteria. In addition, the section directed the ASACW to submit with USACE’s FY2022 budget request, and with every other subsequent budget request, a report that identifies the ASACW’s ranking of individual EI assistance projects for the ASACW to carry out. Subsequent budget requests have not included this information. As of July 2024, USACE had not released any criteria or reports pursuant to the provision.

Congress may also examine how efficiently the EI assistance funds are spent on projects and how effective the funded projects are in accomplishing their authorized purposes. The 2019 GAO report on EI assistance only analyzed Section 219 assistance for FY2013-FY2017.⁴¹ Congress may be interested in further analysis of this issue, extending to all EI assistance authorities and fiscal years since FY2017.

³⁸ For example, see USACE Philadelphia District & Marine Design Center website, “Southeastern PA Environmental Improvements Program,” <https://www.nap.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/SE-PA-Environmental-Improvement-Program/>; USACE Digital Library, “Section 219 Northeast Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program, PA,” <https://usace.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p16021coll11/id/615/>; and USACE Walla Walla District, *Environmental Assessment, City of Dayton Water System Improvements Project, Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999*, Dayton, Idaho, April 2024, https://www.nww.usace.army.mil/Portals/28/Final_Dayton_595_EA_042424.pdf.

³⁹ Model agreements are located under the “Environmental Infrastructure” heading at USACE, “Model Agreements and Templates,” <https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Project-Partnership-Agreements/>.

⁴⁰ U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Army Corps of Engineers: Process for Selecting Section 219 Projects for Funding Could Be Strengthened*, GAO-19-487, June 13, 2019, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-19-487>.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

Appendix A. Examples of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities

Congress has authorized and amended USACE environmental infrastructure (EI) assistance in omnibus authorization laws, often titled Water Resources Development Acts (WRDAs), and in appropriations acts. Below are examples of EI assistance authorities that have been enacted into law. More EI authorities, as amended, may be located in the statute compilations maintained by the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives.⁴² Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (WRDA 1992; P.L. 102-580), as amended, includes the majority of EI assistance authorities. The excerpt below of Section 219 is abridged for brevity. Other examples include the following:

- a non-Section 219 EI project authority—Acequias Irrigation System (Section 1113 of WRDA 1986 [P.L. 99-662] as amended), and
- EI programmatic authorities—
 - for a restoration example, Lake Tahoe Basin Restoration (Section 108, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 [Division C of P.L. 108-447]),
 - for an example of regions within a state, Southern and Eastern Kentucky (Section 531, WRDA 1996 [P.L. 104-303], as amended), and
 - for a multistate example, Western Rural Water (Section 595 of WRDA 1999 [P.L. 106-53], as amended).

Section 219, WRDA 1992, as Amended⁴³

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

- (1) the service would require the use of a new technology unavailable in the private sector, or
- (2) a solicitation or request for proposal has failed to attract 2 or more bids or proposals.

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of projects for which assistance is provided under this section shall not be less than 25 percent, except that such share shall be subject to the ability of the non-Federal interest to pay, including the

⁴² The Office of the Legislative Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives, “Statute Compilations,” <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/comps/>.

⁴³ The Congressional Research Service (CRS) included the main provisions of this authority but omitted most geographic specific provisions for brevity. See **Appendix B** for a list of all Section 219 geographic provisions. For the full Section 219 authority, as amended, see the statute compilation for WRDA 1992 at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/COMPS-2982/pdf/COMPS-2982.pdf>.

procedures and regulations relating to ability to pay established under section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

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

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

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

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

(5) **JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.**—Provision of an alternative water supply and a project for the elimination or control of combined sewer overflows projects for the design, installation, enhancement, or repair of sewer systems for Jackson County, Mississippi.

....

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for providing assistance under this section \$30,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for providing construction assistance under this section—

(1) \$57,500,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(5);

(5) \$75,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(2);

...

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

(1) **ATLANTA, GEORGIA.**—The project described in subsection (c)(2), modified to include watershed restoration and development in the regional Atlanta watershed, including Big Creek and Rock Creek.

(10) **EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—\$52,000,000 for water supply, wastewater infrastructure, and environmental restoration projects in the counties of Accomack, Northampton, Lee, Norton, Wise, Scott, Russell, Dickenson, Buchanan, and Tazewell, Virginia.

(B) **CREDIT.**—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), towards the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

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

(12) **CALUMET REGION, INDIANA.**—

(A) IN GENERAL.—\$120,000,000 for water related infrastructure projects in the counties of Benton, Jasper, Lake, Newton, and Porter, Indiana.

(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit, in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), towards the non-Federal share of the cost of the project the cost of planning and design work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project before the date of the partnership agreement for the project.

(13) CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—\$2,000,000 for water related infrastructure in Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

(21) BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA.—\$90,000,000 for water related infrastructure for the parishes of East Baton Rouge, Ascension, and Livingston, Louisiana.

...

(405) MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.—\$4,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management (including combined sewer overflows), and resource protection and development, in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, Wisconsin.

Section 1113, WRDA 1986, as Amended⁴⁴

ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM.

(a)(1) The Congress finds that the irrigation ditch systems in New Mexico, known as the Acequia systems, date from the eighteenth century, and that these early engineering works have significance in the settlement and development of the western portion of the United States.

(2) The Congress, therefore, declares that the restoration and preservation of the Acequia systems has cultural and historic values to the region.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall carry out, without regard to economic analysis, such measures as are necessary to protect and restore the river diversion structures and associated channels attendant to the operations of the community ditch and Acequia systems in New Mexico that—

(1) are declared to be a political subdivision of the State; or

(2) belong to an Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

(c) INCLUSIONS.—The measures described in subsection (b) shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) ensure greater resiliency of diversion structures, including to flow variations, prolonged drought conditions, invasive plant species, and threats from changing hydrological and climatic conditions; or

(2) support research, development, and training for innovative management solutions, including those for controlling invasive aquatic plants that affect acequias.

(d) COST SHARING.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out the measures described in subsection (b), including study costs, shall be 25 percent, except that in the case of a measure benefitting an economically disadvantaged community (as defined by

⁴⁴ Although Section 1113 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986; P.L. 99-662), as amended, was enacted before other environmental infrastructure (EI) assistance provisions, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has provided funding for the authority using appropriations Congress has specified for EI assistance.

the Secretary under section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note)), including economically disadvantaged communities located in urban and rural areas, the Federal share of the cost of carrying out such measure shall be 90 percent.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the measures described in subsection (b) \$80,000,000.

(f) **PUBLIC ENTITY STATUS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall consider the historic Acequia systems (community ditches) of the southwestern United States as public entities, if these systems are chartered by the respective State laws as political subdivisions of that State or belong to an Indian Tribe within the State of New Mexico.

(2) **EFFECT.**—The public entity status provided under paragraph (1) shall allow the officials of the Acequia systems described in such paragraph to enter into agreements and serve as local sponsors of water-related projects of the Secretary.

Section 108, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005, as Amended⁴⁵

LAKE TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “Lake Tahoe Basin” means the entire watershed drainage of Lake Tahoe including that portion of the Truckee River 1,000 feet downstream from the United States Bureau of Reclamation dam in Tahoe City, California.

(b) **Establishment of Program.**—The Secretary may establish a program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Lake Tahoe Basin.

(c) **Form of Assistance.**—Assistance under this section may be in the form of planning, design, and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Lake Tahoe Basin—

- (1) urban stormwater conveyance, treatment and related facilities;
- (2) watershed planning, science and research;
- (3) environmental restoration; and
- (4) surface water resource protection and development.

(d) **Public Ownership Requirement.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **Local Cooperation Agreement.**—

(1) **In general.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **Requirements.**—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **Plan.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State and Regional officials, of appropriate environmental documentation, engineering plans and specifications.

⁴⁵ Lake Tahoe Basin Restoration is an example of an EI assistance authority with an environmental restoration focus, but USACE has provided funding for the authority using appropriations Congress has specified for EI assistance.

(B) Legal and institutional structures.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) Cost sharing.—

(A) In general.—The Federal share of project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 75 percent. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) Credit for design work.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of planning and design work completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project.

(C) Land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided by the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of project costs (including all reasonable costs associated with obtaining permits necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project on publicly owned or controlled land), but not to exceed 25 percent of total project costs.

(D) Operation and maintenance.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) Applicability of Other Federal and State Laws.—Nothing in this section waives, limits, or otherwise affects the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for the period beginning with fiscal year 2005, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Section 531, WRDA 1996, as Amended

SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary may establish a program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in southern and eastern Kentucky.

(b) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water related environmental infrastructure, environmental restoration, and resource protection and development projects in southern and eastern Kentucky, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, surface water resource protection and development, and small stream flooding, local storm water drainage, and related problems.

(c) PUBLIC OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(d) PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a project cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with such assistance. Notwithstanding section 221(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b(b)), for any project undertaken under this section, with the consent of the affected local government, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) PLAN.—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities development plan or resource protection plan, including appropriate plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Total project costs under each agreement entered into under this subsection shall be shared at 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by such interest before entering into the agreement with the Secretary.

(C) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN FINANCING COSTS.—In the event of a delay in the reimbursement of the non-Federal share of a project, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest and other associated financing costs necessary for such non-Federal interest to provide the non-Federal share of the project's cost.

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

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed under an agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 100 percent.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as waiving, limiting, or otherwise affecting the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1999, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, together with recommendations concerning whether or not such program should be implemented on a national basis.

(g) SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “southern and eastern Kentucky” means Morgan, Floyd, Pulaski, Wayne, Laurel, Knox, Pike, Menifee, Perry, Harlan, Breathitt, Martin, Jackson, Wolfe, Clay, Magoffin, Owsley, Johnson, Leslie, Lawrence, Knott, Bell, McCreary, Rockcastle, Whitley, Lee, Boyd, Carter, Elliott, Lincoln, Bath, Rowan, and Letcher Counties, Kentucky.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000.

(i) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—Not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer projects under this section at Federal expense.

Section 595, WRDA 1999, as Amended

WESTERN RURAL WATER

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section:

(1) **RURAL NEVADA.**—The term ‘rural Nevada’ means—

(A) the counties of Lincoln, White Pine, Nye, Eureka, Elko, Humboldt, Pershing, Churchill, Storey, Lyon, Carson, Douglas, Mineral, Esmeralda, and Lander, Nevada;

(B) the portions of Washoe County, Nevada, that are located outside the cities of Reno and Sparks; and

(C) the portions of Clark County, Nevada, that are located outside the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson and the unincorporated portion of the county in the Las Vegas Valley.

(2) **RURAL UTAH.**—The term ‘rural Utah’ means-

(A) the counties of Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Tooele, Morgan, Summit, Daggett, Wasatch, Duchesne, Uintah, Juab, Sanpete, Carbon, Millard, Sevier, Emery, Grand, Beaver, Piute, Wayne, Iron, Garfield, San Juan, and Kane, Utah; and

(B) the portions of Washington County, Utah, that are located outside the city of St. George, Utah.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Secretary may establish a program for providing environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in Arizona, Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming.

(c) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**-Assistance under this section may be in the form of—

(1) design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development in Arizona, Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming, including projects for—

(A) wastewater treatment and related facilities;

(B) water supply and related facilities;

(C) environmental restoration; and

(D) surface water resource protection and development; and

(2) technical assistance to small and rural communities for water planning and issues relating to access to water resources.

(d) **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may provide assistance for a project under this section only if the project is publicly owned.

(e) **LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for design and construction of the project to be carried out with the assistance.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall provide for the following:

(A) **PLAN.**—Development by the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal and State officials, of a facilities or resource protection and development plan, including appropriate engineering plans and specifications.

(B) LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES.—Establishment of such legal and institutional structures as are necessary to ensure the effective long-term operation of the project by the non-Federal interest.

(3) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of project costs under each local cooperation agreement entered into under this subsection shall be 75 percent. The Federal share may be in the form of grants or reimbursements of project costs.

(B) CREDIT FOR DESIGN WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for the reasonable costs of design work completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Secretary for a project.

(C) CREDIT FOR INTEREST.—In case of a delay in the funding of the non-Federal share of the costs of a project that is the subject of an agreement under this section, the non-Federal interest shall receive credit for reasonable interest incurred in providing the non-Federal share of the project costs.

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

(E) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of operation and maintenance costs for projects constructed with assistance provided under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section waives, limits, or otherwise affects the applicability of any provision of Federal or State law that would otherwise apply to a project to be carried out with assistance provided under this section.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the program carried out under this section, including recommendations concerning whether the program should be implemented on a national basis.

(h) ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance under this section shall be made available to all eligible States and locales described in subsection (b) consistent with program priorities determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria developed by the Secretary to establish the program priorities.

(2) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—In selecting projects for assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to a project located in an eligible State or local entity for which the project sponsor is prepared to—

(A) execute a new or amended project cooperation agreement; and

(B) commence promptly after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016.

(3) RURAL PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall consider a project authorized under this section and an environmental infrastructure project authorized under section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-580; 106 Stat. 4835) for new starts on the same basis as any other similarly funded project.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, to remain available until expended—

- (1) for the period beginning with fiscal year 2001, \$800,000,000 for Idaho, Montana, rural Nevada, New Mexico, rural Utah, and Wyoming; and
- (2) \$200,000,000 for Arizona.

Appendix B. Summary of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities

Table B-I. Summary of Environmental Infrastructure Assistance Authorities

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Section 219 Project Authorities		
Colonias Along the U.S.-Mexico Border	Section 219(c)(18) as modified by (e)(9), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Alabama	Section 219(f)(274), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$50,000,000
St. Clair, Blount, and Cullman Counties, AL	Section 219(f)(78), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Crawford County, AR	Section 219(f)(79), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Eastern Arkansas Enterprise Community, AR	Section 219(c)(20) as modified by (e)(11), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Chandler, AZ	Section 219(f)(275), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$18,750,000
Marana, AZ	Section 219(c)(19) as modified by (e)(10), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$27,000,000
Pinal County, AZ	Section 219(f)(276), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$40,000,000
Tempe, AZ	Section 219(f)(277), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$37,500,000
Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, CA	Section 219(f)(80), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Alameda County, CA	Section 219(f)(278), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Aliso Creek, Orange County, CA	Section 219(f)(81), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Alpine, CA	Section 219(f)(77), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Amador County, CA	Section 219(f)(82), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Arcadia, Sierra Madre, and Upland, CA	Section 219(f)(83), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$33,000,000
Bell Gardens, CA	Section 219(f)(279), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$12,500,000
Big Bear Area Region Wastewater Agency, CA	Section 219(f)(84), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Brawley Colonia, Imperial County, CA	Section 219(f)(85), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,400,000
Calaveras County, CA	Section 219(f)(86), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$13,280,000
Calimesa, CA	Section 219(f)(280), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,500,000
Cambria, CA	Section 219(f)(48), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,300,000
Compton Creek, CA	Section 219(f)(281), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,165,000
Contra Costa Water District, CA	Section 219(f)(87), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$23,000,000
Coronado, CA	Section 219(f)(71), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Desert Hot Springs, CA	Section 219(c)(23) as modified by (e)(12), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Downey, CA	Section 219(f)(282), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas, CA	Section 219(f)(88), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
East County, San Diego County, CA	Section 219(f)(283), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$70,000,000
East Palo Alto, CA	Section 219(f)(89), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
East San Joaquin County, CA	Section 219(f)(22), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Eastern Los Angeles County, CA	Section 219(f)(284), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Escondido Creek, CA	Section 219(f)(285), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$34,000,000
Fontana, CA	Section 219(f)(286), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$16,000,000
Harbor/South Bay, CA	Section 219(f)(43), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$70,000,000
Healdsburg, CA	Section 219(f)(287), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$23,500,000
Huntington Beach, CA	Section 219(c)(25) as modified by (e)(13), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Imperial County, CA	Section 219(f)(90), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Inglewood, CA	Section 219(c)(26) as modified by (e)(14), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Inland Empire, CA	Section 219(f)(288), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$60,000,000
La Habra, CA	Section 219(f)(91), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
La Mirada, CA	Section 219(f)(92), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Lancaster, CA	Section 219(f)(41), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,500,000
Lassen, Plumas, Butte, Sierra, and Nevada Counties, CA	Section 219(f)(74), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Lomita, CA	Section 219(f)(289), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,716,600
Los Angeles County, CA	Section 219(f)(93), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$103,000,000
Los Angeles County, CA	Section 219(f)(94), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Los Osos, CA	Section 219(c)(27) as modified by (e)(15), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Malibu, CA	Section 219(f)(95), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Marin County, CA	Section 219(f)(290), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$28,000,000
Maywood, CA	Section 219(f)(291), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Montebello, CA	Section 219(f)(96), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Monterey Peninsula, CA	Section 219(f)(292), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
New River, CA	Section 219(f)(97), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
North Richmond, CA	Section 219(f)(293), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$45,000,000
North Valley Region, Lancaster, CA	Section 219(f)(50), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$24,500,000
Norwalk, CA	Section 219(c)(28) as modified by (e)(16), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Ontario, CA	Section 219(f)(294), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$40,700,000
Orange County, CA	Section 219(f)(98), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Paramount, CA	Section 219(f)(295), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Perris, CA	Section 219(f)(100), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Petaluma, CA	Section 219(f)(296), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$13,700,000
Placer and El Dorado Counties, CA	Section 219(f)(73), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Placer County, CA	Section 219(f)(297), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$21,000,000
Port of Stockton, Stockton, CA	Section 219(f)(99), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Rialto, CA	Section 219(f)(298), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$27,500,000
Rincon Reservation, CA	Section 219(f)(299), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$38,000,000
Sacramento Area, CA	Section 219(f)(23), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$45,000,000
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, CA	Section 219(f)(300), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$50,000,000
San Bernardino County, CA	Section 219(f)(101), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$9,000,000
San Joaquin and Stanislaus, CA	Section 219(f)(301), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$200,000,000
San Ramon Valley, CA	Section 219(f)(42), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Santa Clara County, CA	Section 219(f)(102), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,500,000
Santa Monica, CA	Section 219(f)(103), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Santa Rosa, CA	Section 219(f)(302), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$19,400,000
Sierra Madre, CA	Section 219(f)(303), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Smith River, CA	Section 219(f)(304), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Southern Los Angeles County, CA	Section 219(f)(104), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
South Perris, CA	Section 219(f)(52), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$50,000,000
South San Francisco, CA	Section 219(f)(305), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$270,000,000
Stockton, CA	Section 219(f)(105), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$33,000,000
Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County, CA	Section 219(f)(106), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$375,000
Temecula, CA	Section 219(f)(306), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$18,000,000
Torrance, CA	Section 219(f)(307), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000
Western Contra Costa County, CA	Section 219(f)(308), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Whittier, CA	Section 219(f)(107), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$8,000,000
Yolo County, CA	Section 219(f)(309), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Arkansas Valley Conduit, CO	Section 219(f)(108), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Boulder County, CO	Section 219(f)(109), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Montezuma and La Plata Counties, CO	Section 219(f)(110), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Otero, Bent, Crowley, Kiowa, and Prowers Counties, CO	Section 219(f)(111), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Pueblo and Otero Counties, CO	Section 219(f)(112), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$34,000,000
Enfield, CT	Section 219(f)(113), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Hebron, CT	Section 219(f)(310), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,700,000
Ledyard and Montville, CT	Section 219(f)(114), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,113,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
New Haven, CT	Section 219(f)(115), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$300,000
New London, CT	Section 219(f)(311), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$16,000,000
Norwalk, CT	Section 219(f)(116), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Plainville, CT	Section 219(f)(117), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,280,000
Southington, CT	Section 219(f)(118), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$9,420,000
Windham, CT	Section 219(f)(312), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$18,000,000
District of Columbia	Section 219(f)(120), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Anacostia River, DC and MD	Section 219(f)(119), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Washington, DC	Section 219(f)(316), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Kent, DE	Section 219(f)(313), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
New Castle, DE	Section 219(f)(314), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Sussex, DE	Section 219(f)(315), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Charlotte County, FL	Section 219(f)(121), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$33,000,000
Charlotte, Lee, and Collier Counties, FL	Section 219(f)(122), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Collier County, FL	Section 219(f)(123), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Hillsborough County, FL	Section 219(f)(124), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,250,000
Jacksonville, FL	Section 219(f)(125), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Longboat Key, FL	Section 219(f)(317), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$12,750,000
Martin, St. Lucie, and Palm Beach Counties, FL	Section 219(f)(318), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000
Miami-Dade County, FL	Section 219(f)(128), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$190,250,000
Palm Beach County, FL	Section 219(f)(129), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,500,000
Polk County, FL	Section 219(f)(319), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Okeechobee County, FL	Section 219(f)(320), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Orange County, FL	Section 219(f)(321), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$50,000,000
Sarasota County, FL	Section 219(f)(126), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
South Seminole and North Orange County, FL	Section 219(f)(127), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Georgia (subset of counties)	Section 219(f)(322), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$75,000,000
Albany, GA	Section 219(f)(130), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$109,000,000
Atlanta, GA	Section 219(c)(2) as modified by (e)(5) and (f)(1), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$75,000,000
Banks County, GA	Section 219(f)(131), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Berrien County, GA	Section 219(f)(132), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Chattooga County, GA	Section 219(f)(133), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$8,000,000
Chattooga, Floyd, Gordon, Walker, and Whitfield Counties, GA	Section 219(f)(134), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Dahlonega, GA	Section 219(f)(135), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
East Point, GA	Section 219(f)(136), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Fayetteville, Grantville, Lagrange, Pine Mountain (Harris County), Douglasville, and Carrollton, GA	Section 219(f)(137), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$24,500,000
Meriwether and Spalding Counties, GA	Section 219(f)(138), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,000,000
Moultrie, GA	Section 219(f)(139), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Stephens County/City of Toccoa, GA	Section 219(f)(140), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$8,000,000
Guam	Section 219(f)(323), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
State of Hawaii	Section 219(f)(324), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$75,000,000
County of Hawaii, HI	Section 219(f)(325), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Honolulu, HI	Section 219(f)(326), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Kaua'i, HI	Section 219(f)(327), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Maui, HI	Section 219(f)(328), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Cook County and Lake County, IL	Section 219(f)(54), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000
Dixmoor, IL	Section 219(f)(329), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Forest Park, IL	Section 219(f)(330), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Lemont, IL	Section 219(f)(331), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,135,000
Lockport, IL	Section 219(f)(332), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,550,000
Madison and St. Clair Counties, IL	Section 219(f)(55), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000
Montgomery and Christian Counties, IL	Section 219(f)(333), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Will County, IL	Section 219(f)(334), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Calumet Region, IN	Section 219(f)(12), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$125,000,000
Indianapolis, IN	Section 219(f)(75), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,430,000
North Vernon and Butlerville, IN	Section 219(f)(141), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,700,000
Salem, Washington County, IN	Section 219(f)(142), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,200,000
Atchison, KS	Section 219(f)(143), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Central Kentucky	Section 219(f)(144), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Hazard, KY	Section 219(c)(3), WRDA 1992, as amended	—
Winchester, KY	Section 219(c)(41), WRDA 1992, as amended	—
Baton Rouge, LA	Section 219(f)(21), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$90,000,000
Iberia Parish, LA	Section 219(f)(56), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Lafayette, LA	Section 219(f)(145), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,200,000
Lafourche Parish, LA	Section 219(f)(146), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,300,000
Lake Charles, LA	Section 219(f)(147), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments, LA	Section 219(f)(148), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Orleans Parish, LA	Section 219(f)(335), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Ouachita Parish, LA	Section 219(f)(149), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Plaquemine, LA	Section 219(f)(150), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,000,000
Rapides Area Planning Commission, LA	Section 219(f)(151), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Shreveport, LA	Section 219(f)(152), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
South Central Planning and Development Commission, LA	Section 219(f)(153), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$12,500,000
St. Charles, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines Parishes, LA	Section 219(c)(33) and (e)(18), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$70,000,000
St. John the Baptist, St. James, and Assumption Parishes, LA	Section 219(c)(34) and (e)(19), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$36,000,000
Union-Lincoln Regional Water Supply Project, LA	Section 219(f)(154), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Fitchburg, MA	Section 219(f)(336), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Haverhill, MA	Section 219(f)(337), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Lawrence, MA	Section 219(f)(338), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Lowell, MA	Section 219(f)(339), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Methuen, MA	Section 219(f)(340), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Maryland	Section 219(f)(341), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$100,000,000
Boonsboro, MD	Section 219(f)(342), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Brunswick, MD	Section 219(f)(343), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Chesapeake Bay Improvements, MD, VA, and DC	Section 219(f)(155), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Chesapeake Bay Region, MD and VA	Section 219(f)(156), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$40,000,000
Cascade Charter Township, MI	Section 219(f)(344), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,200,000
Genesee County, MI	Section 219(f)(59), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,700,000
Macomb County, MI	Section 219(f)(345), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$40,000,000
Michigan Combined Sewer Overflows, MI	Section 219(f)(157), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$85,000,000
Negaunee, MI	Section 219(f)(60), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Oakland County, MI	Section 219(f)(29), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Rouge River, MI	Section 219(c)(4), WRDA 1992, as amended	—
Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District, MN	Section 219(f)(158), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$12,000,000
Central Lake Region Sanitary District, MN	Section 219(f)(159), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Garrison, Crow Wing County, Mille Lacs County, Mille Lacs Indian Reservation, and Kathio Township, MN	Section 219(f)(61), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$17,000,000
Goodview, MN	Section 219(f)(160), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Grand Rapids, MN	Section 219(f)(161), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Northfield, MN	Section 219(f)(346), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$33,450,000
Willmar, MN	Section 219(f)(162), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Centertown, MO	Section 219(f)(347), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,900,000
City of St. Louis, MO	Section 219(f)(348), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$45,000,000
St. Louis County, MO	Section 219(f)(349), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$45,000,000
St. Louis, MO	Section 219(f)(32), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$70,000,000
Saipan, MP	Section 219(f)(203), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Biloxi, MS	Section 219(f)(163), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Clinton, MS	Section 219(f)(350), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$13,600,000
Corinth, MS	Section 219(f)(164), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,500,000
Desoto County, MS	Section 219(f)(30), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$130,000,000
Gulfport, MS	Section 219(f)(165), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Harrison County, MS	Section 219(f)(166), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Jackson, MS	Section 219(f)(167), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$125,000,000
Jackson County, MS	Section 219(c)(5) as modified by (e)(1), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$57,500,000
Madison County, MS	Section 219(f)(351), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Meridian, MS	Section 219(f)(352), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Oxford, MS	Section 219(f)(353), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Rankin County, MS	Section 219(f)(354), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Cabarrus County, NC	Section 219(f)(191), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,500,000
Cary, Wake County, NC	Section 219(f)(192), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Charlotte, NC	Section 219(f)(193), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$14,000,000
Fayetteville, Cumberland County, NC	Section 219(f)(194), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Mooresville, NC	Section 219(f)(195), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Neuse Regional Water and Sewer Authority, NC	Section 219(f)(196), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Richmond County, NC	Section 219(f)(197), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$13,500,000
Stanly County, NC	Section 219(f)(64), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$8,900,000
Union County, NC	Section 219(f)(198), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Washington County, NC	Section 219(f)(199), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Winston-Salem, NC	Section 219(f)(200), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
North Dakota	Section 219(f)(201), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Devils Lake, ND	Section 219(f)(202), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,000,000
Lebanon, NH	Section 219(f)(37), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$8,000,000
Manchester, NH	Section 219(f)(355), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Bayonne, NJ	Section 219(f)(356), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$825,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Camden, NJ	Section 219(f)(357), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$119,000,000
Cranford Township, NJ	Section 219(f)(175), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Essex and Sussex Counties, NJ	Section 219(f)(358), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$60,000,000
Flemington, NJ	Section 219(f)(359), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,500,000
Jefferson, NJ	Section 219(f)(360), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$90,000,000
Kearny, NJ	Section 219(f)(361), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$69,900,000
Long Hill, NJ	Section 219(f)(362), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,500,000
Middletown Township, NJ	Section 219(f)(176), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,100,000
Morris County, NJ	Section 219(f)(363), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Passaic, NJ	Section 219(f)(364), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Paterson, NJ	Section 219(f)(177), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Phillipsburg, NJ	Section 219(f)(365), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,600,000
Rahway, NJ	Section 219(f)(366), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,250,000
Rahway Valley, NJ	Section 219(f)(178), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Roselle, NJ	Section 219(f)(367), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
South Orange Village, NJ	Section 219(f)(368), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,500,000
Summit, NJ	Section 219(f)(369), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Warren, NJ	Section 219(f)(370), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,550,000
Espanola, NM	Section 219(f)(371), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$21,995,000
Farmington, NM	Section 219(f)(372), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$15,500,000
Mora County, NM	Section 219(f)(373), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,874,000
Santa Fe, NM	Section 219(f)(374), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,700,000
Clark County, NV	Section 219(f)(168), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Clean Water Coalition, NV	Section 219(f)(169), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$50,000,000
Glendale Dam Diversion Structure, NV	Section 219(f)(170), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Henderson, NV	Section 219(f)(171), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$13,000,000
Indian Springs, NV	Section 219(f)(172), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$12,000,000
Reno, NV	Section 219(f)(173), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$13,000,000
Washoe County, NV	Section 219(f)(174), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$14,000,000
Babylon, NY	Section 219(f)(179), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Chenango County, NY	Section 219(c)(14), WRDA 1992, as amended	—
Clarkstown, NY	Section 219(f)(375), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$14,600,000
Ellicottville, NY	Section 219(f)(180), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Elmira, NY	Section 219(f)(181), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Essex Hamlet, NY	Section 219(f)(182), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Fleming, NY	Section 219(f)(183), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Genesee, NY	Section 219(f)(376), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$85,000,000
Kiryas Joel, NY	Section 219(f)(184), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Niagara Falls, NY	Section 219(f)(185), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Otsego County, NY	Section 219(c)(13), WRDA 1992, as amended	—
Patchogue, NY	Section 219(f)(186), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Queens, NY	Section 219(f)(377), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$119,200,000
Sennett, NY	Section 219(f)(187), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,500,000
Springport and Fleming, NY	Section 219(f)(188), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Wellsville, NY	Section 219(f)(189), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Yates County, NY	Section 219(f)(190), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Yorktown, NY	Section 219(f)(378), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$40,000,000
Akron, OH	Section 219(f)(204), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Brunswick, OH	Section 219(f)(379), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,510,000
Burr Oak Regional Water District, OH	Section 219(f)(205), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Cincinnati, OH	Section 219(f)(206), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Cleveland, OH	Section 219(f)(207), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,500,000
Columbus, OH	Section 219(f)(208), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,500,000
Dayton, OH	Section 219(f)(209), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Defiance County, OH	Section 219(f)(210), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Fostoria, OH	Section 219(f)(211), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Fremont, OH	Section 219(f)(212), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Lake County, OH	Section 219(f)(213), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,500,000
Lawrence County, OH	Section 219(f)(214), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Meigs County, OH	Section 219(f)(215), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Mentor-on-Lake, OH	Section 219(f)(216), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$625,000
Vinton County, OH	Section 219(f)(217), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Willowick, OH	Section 219(f)(218), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$665,000
Ada, OK	Section 219(f)(219), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,700,000
Alva, OK	Section 219(f)(220), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$250,000
Ardmore, OK	Section 219(f)(221), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,900,000
Bartlesville, OK	Section 219(f)(222), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,500,000
Bethany, OK	Section 219(f)(223), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,500,000
Chickasha, OK	Section 219(f)(224), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$650,000
Disney and Langley, OK	Section 219(f)(225), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,500,000
Durant, OK	Section 219(f)(226), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,300,000
Eastern Oklahoma State University, Wilberton, OK	Section 219(f)(227), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Guymon, OK	Section 219(f)(228), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$16,000,000
Konawa, OK	Section 219(f)(229), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$500,000
Lawton, OK	Section 219(f)(40), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Lugert-Altus Irrigation District, Altus, OK	Section 219(f)(230), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Midwest City, OK	Section 219(f)(231), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Mustang, OK	Section 219(f)(232), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,325,000
Norman, OK	Section 219(f)(233), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Guymon, OK	Section 219(f)(234), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$275,000
Weatherford, OK	Section 219(f)(235), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$500,000
Woodward, OK	Section 219(f)(236), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,500,000
Yukon, OK	Section 219(f)(65), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,500,000
Albany, OR	Section 219(f)(237), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Brookings, OR	Section 219(f)(380), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Lane County, OR	Section 219(f)(383), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Monroe, OR	Section 219(f)(381), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Newport, OR	Section 219(f)(382), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$60,000,000
Allegheny County, PA	Section 219(f)(66), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Beaver Creek Reservoir, PA	Section 219(f)(238), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Clinton County, PA	Section 219(f)(13), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Hatfield Borough, PA	Section 219(f)(239), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$310,000
Lehigh County, PA	Section 219(f)(240), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
North Wales Borough, PA	Section 219(f)(241), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,516,584
Northeast Pennsylvania	Section 219(f)(11), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Palmyra, PA	Section 219(f)(384), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$36,300,000
Pen Argyl, PA	Section 219(f)(242), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,250,000
Philadelphia, PA	Section 219(f)(243), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,600,000
Pike County, PA	Section 219(f)(385), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Pittsburgh, PA	Section 219(f)(386), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Pocono, PA	Section 219(f)(387), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$22,000,000
Stockerton Borough, Tatamy Borough, and Palmer Township, PA	Section 219(f)(244), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,000,000
Vera Cruz, PA	Section 219(f)(245), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,500,000
Westfall, PA	Section 219(f)(388), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$16,880,000
Whitehall, PA	Section 219(f)(389), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	Section 219(f)(246), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$35,000,000
Beaufort, SC	Section 219(f)(390), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,462,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Charleston, SC	Section 219(f)(247), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Charleston, SC	Section 219(f)(391), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,583,000
Charleston and West Ashley, SC	Section 219(f)(248), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$6,000,000
Crooked Creek, Marlboro County, SC	Section 219(f)(249), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
Horry County, SC	Section 219(f)(392), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$19,000,000
Lakes Marion and Moultrie, SC	Section 219(f)(25), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$165,000,000
Mount Pleasant, SC	Section 219(f)(393), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,822,000
Myrtle Beach and Vicinity, SC	Section 219(f)(250), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$31,000,000
North Myrtle Beach and Vicinity, SC	Section 219(f)(251), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$74,000,000
Surfside, SC	Section 219(f)(252), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$11,000,000
Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation (Dewey and Ziebach Counties) and Perkins and Meade Counties, SD	Section 219(f)(253), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$65,000,000
Athens, TN	Section 219(f)(254), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$16,000,000
Blaine, TN	Section 219(f)(255), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$500,000
Claiborne County, TN	Section 219(f)(256), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,250,000
Cumberland County, TN	Section 219(f)(24), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Giles County, TN	Section 219(f)(257), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Grainger County, TN	Section 219(f)(258), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,250,000
Hamilton County, TN	Section 219(f)(259), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$500,000
Harrogate, TN	Section 219(f)(260), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Johnson County, TN	Section 219(f)(261), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$600,000
Knoxville, TN	Section 219(f)(262), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Nashville, TN	Section 219(f)(263), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Lewis, Lawrence, and Wayne Counties, TN	Section 219(f)(264), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$2,000,000
Oak Ridge, TN	Section 219(f)(265), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Plateau Utility District, Morgan County, TN	Section 219(f)(266), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,000,000
Portland, TN	Section 219(f)(394), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,850,000
Shelby County, TN	Section 219(f)(267), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,000,000
Smith County, TN	Section 219(f)(395), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$19,500,000
Trousdale, Macon, and Sumner Counties, TN	Section 219(f)(396), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$178,000,000
Central Texas, TX	Section 219(f)(268), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
El Paso County, TX	Section 219(f)(269), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$75,000,000
Ft. Bend County, TX	Section 219(f)(270), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Duchesne, Iron, and Uintah Counties, UT	Section 219(f)(271), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$10,800,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Park City, UT	Section 219(c)(40) as modified by (e)(17), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Eastern Shore and Southwest Virginia, VA	Section 219(f)(10), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$52,000,000
Lynchburg, VA	Section 219(c)(16) as modified by (e)(7), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Richmond, VA	Section 219(c)(17) as modified by (e)(8), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
U.S. Virgin Islands	Section 219(f)(273), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$25,000,000
U.S. Virgin Islands	Section 219(f)(397), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$1,584,000
Bonney Lake, WA	Section 219(f)(398), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
Burien, WA	Section 219(f)(399), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Ellensburg, WA	Section 219(f)(400), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$3,000,000
North Bend, WA	Section 219(f)(401), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$30,000,000
Port Angeles, WA	Section 219(f)(402), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$7,500,000
Snohomish County, WA	Section 219(f)(403), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$56,000,000
Western Washington State, WA	Section 219(f)(404), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$200,000,000
Milwaukee, WI	Section 219(f)(405), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$4,500,000
St. Croix Falls, WI	Section 219(f)(76), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Northern West Virginia, WV	Section 219(f)(272), WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Non-Section 219 Project Authorities		
Jackson County, AL	Section 522, WRDA 1996	\$3,000,000
Environmental Infrastructure Assistance for Benton and Washington Counties, AR	Section 220, WRDA 1992, as amended	\$5,000,000
Demonstration of Waste Water Technology, Santa Clara Valley Water District and San Jose, CA	Section 218, WRDA 1992	\$10,000,000
Reuse of Waste Water in Santa Rosa, CA and Monterey County, CA	Section 217, WRDA 1992	\$5,000,000
Water Monitoring Station, MT	Section 584, WRDA 1996, as amended	\$100,000
Hackensack Meadowlands Area, NJ	Section 324, WRDA 1992, as amended	\$20,000,000
Acequia Irrigation System, NM	Section 1113, WRDA 1986, as amended	\$80,000,000
Programmatic Authorities		
Western Rural Water for Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, and Wyoming	Section 595, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$1,000,000,000
Lake Tahoe Basin Restoration, NV and CA	Section 108, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005, as amended	\$50,000,000
Ohio and North Dakota	Section 594, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$450,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Southeastern Pennsylvania and Lower Delaware Basin, PA, NJ, and DE	Section 566, WRDA 1996, as amended	\$70,000,000
Lake Champlain Watershed, VT and NY	Section 542, WRDA 2000, as amended	\$100,000,000
Alaska	Section 570, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$45,000,000
California	Section 5039, WRDA 2007	\$40,000,000
Los Angeles County, CA	Section 8319, WRDA 2022	\$50,000,000
Placer and El Dorado Counties, CA	Section 130, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004	\$40,000,000
Upper Klamath Basin, CA	Section 132, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004	\$25,000,000
East Central and Northeast Florida, FL	Section 5061, WRDA 2007	\$40,000,000
Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements, FL	Section 109, Division B of Appendix D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, as amended	\$200,000,000
Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District, GA	Section 5065, WRDA 2007	\$20,000,000
Southwest Illinois, IL	Section 5074, WRDA 2007	\$40,000,000
Southern and Eastern Kentucky, KY	Section 531, WRDA 1996, as amended	\$100,000,000
East Atchafalaya Basin and Amite River Basin Region, LA	Section 5082, WRDA 2007	\$40,000,000
Southeast Louisiana Region, LA	Section 5085, WRDA 2007	\$17,000,000
Northeastern Minnesota, MN	Section 569, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$80,000,000
Northern Missouri, MO	Section 8353, WRDA 2022	\$50,000,000
Mississippi	Section 592, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$300,000,000
Coastal Mississippi Wetlands Restoration Projects, MS	Section 528, WRDA 2000	\$10,000,000
North Carolina	Section 5113, WRDA 2007	\$13,000,000
Central New Mexico, NM	Section 593, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$100,000,000
Onondaga Lake, NY	Section 573, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$30,000,000
New York City Watershed, NY	Section 552, WRDA 1996, as amended	\$42,500,000
Southwestern Oregon, OR	Section 8359, WRDA 2022	\$50,000,000
South Central Pennsylvania, PA	Section 313, WRDA 1992, as amended	\$410,000,000
East Tennessee, TN	Section 5130, WRDA 2007	\$40,000,000
Texas	Section 5138, WRDA 2007, as amended	\$80,000,000
Dallas County Region, TX	Section 5140, WRDA 2007	\$40,000,000
Northern Wisconsin, WI	Section 154, Division B of Appendix D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, as amended	\$60,000,000
Northern West Virginia, WV	Section 571, WRDA 1999, as amended	\$120,000,000

Name	Authority	Authorization of Appropriations
Southern West Virginia, WV	Section 340, WRDA 1992, as amended	\$140,000,000

Source: CRS, using public laws and deauthorization lists (see lists published in 74 *Federal Register* 31713-31715, July 2, 2009, and in 81 *Federal Register* 16147-16153, March 25, 2016).

Notes: Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 = P.L. 106-554; Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 = P.L. 108-137; Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 = Division C of P.L. 108-447; WRDA = Water Resources Development Act; WRDA 1992 = P.L. 102-580; WRDA 1996 = P.L. 104-303; WRDA 1999 = P.L. 106-53; WRDA 2000 = P.L. 106-541; WRDA 2007 = P.L. 110-114; WRDA 2022 = Division H, Title LXXXI of P.L. 117-263. Congress provided no specific authorization of appropriations for assistance for Section 219(c) of WRDA 1992 authorities, but provided \$30 million total authorization of appropriations for design assistance for projects under Section 219(c). Congress amended some of the 219(c) provisions to provide specific authorization of appropriations for construction assistance. Thus, some of the 219(c) authorities in the table have a dash under the Authorization of Appropriations column. The table also does not include or reflect the amount of appropriations that have funded EI assistance authorities in the table.

Appendix C. EI Assistance Authorities in WRDA 2024 Bills

In the 118th Congress, the House and Senate passed WRDA 2024 bills—H.R. 8812 and S. 4367, respectively—which both contain provisions to add and amend EI assistance authorities.⁴⁶ **Table C-1** lists new Section 219 and programmatic EI assistance authorities that H.R. 8812 and/or S. 4367 would authorize, if enacted. The table also includes the authorization of appropriations that each provision would authorize. **Table C-2** lists EI assistance authorities—including Section 219 authorities, the Acequias Irrigation Systems authority, and programmatic authorities—that H.R. 8812 and/or S. 4367 would amend if enacted. The table summarizes how the provisions would amend the authorities. In addition, Section 302(c) of S. 4367 would amend the nonfederal cost share from 25% to 10% for Section 219 EI assistance projects that benefit economically disadvantaged communities and direct USACE to determine nonfederal cost shares based on the ability of nonfederal interests to pay such cost shares.

Table C-1. New EI Assistance Authorities in WRDA 2024 Bills

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Section 219 EI Assistance Authorities				
Buckeye, AZ	(f)(406)	\$12,000,000	—	—
Flagstaff, AZ	(f)(407)	\$5,000,000	(f)(408)	\$4,800,000
Glendale, AZ	—	—	(f)(406)	\$5,200,000
Page, AZ	(f)(408)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Sahuarita, AZ	(f)(409)	\$4,800,000	—	—
Tohono O’odham Nation, AZ	—	—	(f)(407)	\$10,000,000
Tucson, AZ	(f)(410)	\$20,000,000	(f)(409)	\$30,000,000
Winslow, AZ	(f)(411)	\$3,000,000	—	—
Adelanto, CA	(f)(412)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Aptos, CA	(f)(413)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Bay-Delta, CA	—	—	(f)(410)	\$20,000,000
Bishop, CA	(f)(414)	\$2,500,000	—	—
Bloomington, CA	(f)(415)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Butte County, CA	(f)(416)	\$50,000,000	—	—
California City, CA	(f)(417)	\$1,902,808	—	—
Carson, CA	(f)(418)	\$11,000,000	—	—
Cedar Glen, CA	(f)(419)	\$35,000,000	—	—
Colton, CA	(f)(421)	\$20,000,000	—	—

⁴⁶ On July 22, 2024, the House passed H.R. 8812 under suspension of the rules. On August 1, 2024, the Senate passed S. 4367 by unanimous consent.

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Culver City, CA	(f)(420)	\$10,000,000	—	—
East San Fernando Valley, CA	(f)(422)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Fresno County, CA	(f)(423)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, CA	(f)(424)	\$20,500,000	—	—
Grand Terrace, CA	(f)(425)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Hayward, CA	(f)(426)	\$15,000,000	—	—
Hollister, CA	(f)(427)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Indian Wells Valley, CA	—	—	(f)(411)	\$5,000,000
Kern County, CA	(f)(428)	\$50,000,000	—	—
La Quinta, CA	(f)(431)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Lake County, CA	(f)(429)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Lakewood, CA	(f)(432)	\$8,000,000	—	—
Lawndale, CA	(f)(433)	\$6,000,000	—	—
Lomita, CA	(f)(435)	\$5,500,000	—	—
Lone Pine, CA	(f)(434)	\$7,000,000	—	—
Los Banos, CA	(f)(436)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Los Olivos, CA	(f)(437)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Lynwood, CA	(f)(438)	\$12,000,000	—	—
Madera County, CA	(f)(439)	\$27,500,000	—	—
Milpitas, CA	(f)(440)	\$15,000,000	—	—
Montecito, CA	(f)(441)	\$18,250,000	—	—
Oakland-Alameda Estuary, CA	(f)(442)	\$30,000,000	(f)(412)	\$5,000,000
Oxnard, CA	(f)(443)	\$40,000,000	—	—
Patterson, CA	(f)(444)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Pomona, CA	(f)(445)	\$35,000,000	—	—
Rohnert Park, CA	(f)(446)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Salinas, CA	(f)(447)	\$20,000,000	—	—
San Benito County, CA	(f)(448)	\$10,000,000	—	—
San Buenaventura, CA	(f)(449)	\$18,250,000	—	—
San Diego County, CA	(f)(450)	\$200,000,000	—	—
San Luis Obispo County, CA	(f)(452)	\$5,000,000	—	—
South Gate, CA	(f)(451)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Stanislaus County, CA	(f)(453)	\$10,000,000	—	—

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Tijuana River Valley Watershed, CA	—	—	(f)(413)	\$10,000,000
Tulare County, CA	(f)(454)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Watsonville, CA	(f)(455)	\$28,000,000	—	—
Yolo County, CA	(f)(456)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Yorba Linda Water District, CA	(f)(457)	\$6,500,000	—	—
Lake Tahoe Basin, CA and NV	(f)(430)	\$20,000,000	—	—
El Paso County, CO	—	—	(f)(414)	\$20,000,000
Fremont County, CO	(f)(458)	\$50,000,000	—	—
East Hampton, CT	(f)(459)	\$25,000,000	—	—
East Lyme, CT	(f)(460)	\$25,000,000	—	—
Bethany Beach to Rehoboth Beach, DE	(f)(461)	\$25,000,000	—	—
Pickering Beach, Kitts Hummock, Bowers Beach, South Bowers Beach, Slaughter Beach, Prime Hook Beach, Milton, Milford, DE	—	—	(f)(417)	\$25,000,000
Rehoboth Beach, Lewes, Dewey, Bethany, South Bethany, Fenwick Island, DE	—	—	(f)(415)	\$25,000,000
Wilmington, DE	(f)(462)	\$25,000,000	(f)(416)	\$25,000,000
Broward County, FL	(f)(463)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Central Florida, FL	(f)(469)	\$45,000,000	—	—
Deltona, FL	(f)(464)	\$31,200,000	—	—
Longboat Key, FL	(f)(465)	\$2,000,000	—	—
Marion County, FL	(f)(466)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Osceola County, FL	(f)(468)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Oviedo, FL	(f)(467)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Central Coastal Georgia	(f)(470)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Coastal Georgia	—	—	(f)(418)	\$5,000,000
Cobb County, GA	—	—	(f)(420)	\$5,000,000
Columbus, Henry, and Clayton Counties, GA	—	—	(f)(419)	\$10,000,000
Dekalb County, GA	(f)(471)	\$40,000,000	—	—
Porterdale, GA	(f)(472)	\$10,000,000	—	—

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Burley, ID	(f)(473)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Belvidere, IL	(f)(474)	\$17,000,000	—	—
Calumet City, IL	—	—	(f)(421)	\$10,000,000
Dupage County, IL	(f)(475)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Fox River, IL	(f)(476)	\$9,500,000	—	—
German Valley, IL	(f)(477)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Lasalle, IL	(f)(478)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Rockford, IL	(f)(479)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Savanna, IL	(f)(480)	\$2,000,000	—	—
Sherrard, IL	(f)(481)	\$7,000,000	—	—
Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS	—	—	(f)(422)	\$35,000,000
Brownsville, KY	(f)(482)	\$14,000,000	—	—
Monroe, LA	(f)(483)	\$7,000,000	—	—
Point Celeste, LA	(f)(484)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Easthampton, MA	—	—	(f)(423)	\$10,000,000
Franklin, MA	(f)(485)	\$1,000,000	—	—
Winthrop, MA	(f)(486)	\$1,000,000	—	—
Milan, MI	(f)(487)	\$3,000,000	—	—
Southeast Michigan, MI	(f)(488)	\$58,000,000	—	—
Elysian, MN	(f)(489)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Le Sueur, MN	(f)(490)	\$3,200,000	—	—
Byram, MS	—	—	(f)(424)	\$7,000,000
Columbia, MS	(f)(491)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Diamondhead, MS	—	—	(f)(425)	\$7,000,000
Hancock County, MS	(f)(492)	\$7,000,000	(f)(426)	\$7,000,000
Laurel, MS	(f)(493)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Madison, MS	—	—	(f)(427)	\$7,000,000
Moss Point, MS	(f)(494)	\$11,000,000	—	—
Olive Branch, MS	(f)(495)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Pearl, MS	—	—	(f)(428)	\$7,000,000
Picayune, MS	(f)(496)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Starkville, MS	(f)(497)	\$6,000,000	—	—
Canton, NC	(f)(524)	\$41,025,650	—	—
Fairmont, NC	(f)(525)	\$7,137,500	—	—
Murphy, NC	(f)(526)	\$1,500,000	—	—

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Robbinsville, NC	(f)(527)	\$3,474,350	—	—
Weaverville, NC	(f)(528)	\$4,000,000	—	—
New Hampshire	—	—	(f)(429)	\$20,000,000
New Hampshire (Belknap, Carrol, Hillsborough, Merrimack, Rockingham, Strafford Counties)	(f)(500)	\$25,000,000	—	—
Belmar, NJ	(f)(501)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Cape May, NJ	(f)(502)	\$40,000,000	—	—
Cape May County, NJ	—	—	(f)(430)	\$10,000,000
Colesville, NJ	(f)(503)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Deptford Township, NJ	(f)(504)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Lacey Township, NJ	(f)(505)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Merchantville, NJ	(f)(506)	\$18,000,000	—	—
Park Ridge, NJ	(f)(507)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Washington Township, NJ	(f)(508)	\$3,200,000	—	—
Bernalillo, NM	(f)(509)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Bosque Farms, NM	(f)(510)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Laughlin, NV	(f)(498)	\$29,000,000	—	—
Nye County, NV	—	—	(f)(431)	\$10,000,000
Pahrump, NV	(f)(499)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Storey County, NV	—	—	(f)(432)	\$10,000,000
Carmel, NY	(f)(511)	\$3,450,000	—	—
Dutchess County, NY	(f)(512)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Kings County, NY	(f)(513)	\$100,000,000	—	—
Mohawk River and Tributaries, NY	(f)(514)	\$100,000,000	—	—
Mount Pleasant, NY	(f)(515)	\$2,000,000	—	—
New Rochelle, NY	—	—	(f)(433)	\$20,000,000
New York County, NY	(f)(517)	\$60,000,000	—	—
Newtown Creek, NY	(f)(516)	\$25,000,000	—	—
Orange County, NY	(f)(518)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Ramapo, NY	(f)(521)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Rikers Island, NY	(f)(522)	\$25,000,000	—	—
Sleepy Hollow, NY	(f)(519)	\$2,000,000	—	—
Ulster County, NY	(f)(520)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Yorktown, NY	(f)(523)	\$10,000,000	—	—

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Apple Creek, OH	(f)(529)	\$350,000	—	—
Ashtabula County, OH		—	(f)(438)	\$1,500,000
Bloomington, OH		—	(f)(435)	\$6,500,000
Brooklyn Heights, OH	(f)(530)	\$170,000	—	—
Chagrin Falls Regional Water System, OH	(f)(531)	\$3,500,000	—	—
City of Akron, OH	—	—	(f)(436)	\$5,500,000
Cuyahoga County, OH	(f)(532)	\$11,500,000	(f)(434)	\$5,000,000
East Cleveland, OH	—	—	(f)(437)	\$13,000,000
Erie County, OH	(f)(533)	\$16,000,000	—	—
Huron, OH	(f)(534)	\$7,100,000	—	—
Kelleys Island, OH	(f)(535)	\$1,000,000	—	—
North Olmsted, OH	(f)(536)	\$1,175,165	—	—
Painesville, OH	(f)(537)	\$11,800,000	—	—
Solon, OH	(f)(538)	\$14,137,341	—	—
Stark County, OH	(f)(540)	\$24,000,000	—	—
Struthers, OH	—	—	(f)(439)	\$500,000
Summit County, OH	(f)(539)	\$25,000,000	—	—
Toledo and Oregon, OH	(f)(541)	\$10,500,000	—	—
Vermilion, OH	(f)(542)	\$15,400,000	—	—
Westlake, OH	(f)(543)	\$750,000	—	—
Stillwater, OK	(f)(544)	\$30,000,000	(f)(440)	\$30,000,000
Beaverton, OR	(f)(545)	\$10,000,000	—	—
Clackamas County, OR	(f)(546)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Washington County, OR	(f)(547)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Pennsylvania	—	—	(f)(441)	\$38,600,000
Berks County, PA	(f)(548)	\$7,000,000	—	—
Chester County, PA	(f)(549)	\$7,000,000	—	—
Franklin Township, PA	(f)(550)	\$2,000,000	—	—
Indian Creek, PA	(f)(551)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Pen Argyl, PA	(f)(552)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Cheraw, SC	(f)(554)	\$8,800,000	—	—
Chesterfield, SC	(f)(553)	\$1,200,000	—	—
Chesterfield County, SC	—	—	(f)(442)	\$3,000,000
Florence County, SC	(f)(555)	\$40,000,000	—	—
Lake City, SC	(f)(556)	\$15,000,000	—	—

Name	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations	New Section	Authorization of Appropriations
Tipton County, TN	—	—	(f)(443)	\$35,000,000
Tipton, Haywood, and Fayette Counties, TN	(f)(557)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Amarillo, TX	(f)(559)	\$38,000,000	—	—
Austin, TX	(f)(558)	\$50,000,000	—	—
Brownsville, TX	(f)(560)	\$40,000,000	—	—
Clarendon, TX	(f)(561)	\$5,000,000	—	—
Quinlan, TX	(f)(562)	\$1,250,000	—	—
Runaway Bay, TX	(f)(563)	\$7,000,000	—	—
Webb County, TX	(f)(564)	\$20,000,000	—	—
Zapata County, TX	(f)(565)	\$20,000,000	—	—
King William County, VA	(f)(566)	\$1,300,000	—	—
Potomac River, VA	(f)(567)	\$1,000,000	—	—
Chelan, WA	(f)(568)	\$9,000,000	—	—
College Place, WA	(f)(569)	\$5,000,000	(f)(445)	\$5,000,000
Ferndale, WA	(f)(570)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Lynden, WA	(f)(571)	\$4,000,000	—	—
Othello, WA	(f)(572)	\$14,000,000	(f)(444)	\$14,000,000
Programmatic EI Assistance Authorities				
Kentucky and West Virginia, KY, WV	—	—	306	\$75,000,000
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, OH, PA, WV	—	—	311	\$50,000,000
Western Washington State, WA	339	\$242,000,000	—	—

Source: CRS using H.R. 8812 and S. 4367.

Note: New Section 219 EI authorities are included in Section 340(a) of H.R. 8812 and Section 302(a) of S. 4367.

Table C-2. Amendments to EI Assistance Authorities in WRDA 2024 Bills

Existing Authority	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	Section	Provision Summary	Section	Provision Summary
Section 219 EI Assistance Authorities				
(f)(274) Alabama	—	—	302(b) (2)(A)	\$35,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(80) Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, CA	340(b) (2)(A)	\$20,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(86) Calaveras County, CA	340(b) (2)(B)	\$3,020,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(87) Contra Costa Water District, CA	340(b) (2)(C)	\$57,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Add other eligible service areas	—	—
(f)(93) Los Angeles County, CA	340(b) (2)(D)	\$25,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Correct reference to Santa Clarita Valley	302(b) (2)(B)	Correct reference to Santa Clarita Valley
(c)(27) Los Osos, CA	340(b) (2)(F)	\$8,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Add water infrastructure as an eligible purpose	—	—
(f)(101) San Bernadino County, CA	340(b) (2)(G)	\$15,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(52) South Perris, CA	340(b) (2)(H)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(313) Kent, DE	—	—	302(b) (2)(C)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(314) New Castle, DE	—	—	302(b) (2)(D)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(315) Sussex, DE	—	—	302(b) (2)(E)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(129) Palm Beach County, FL	340(b) (2)(I)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(e)(5) Atlanta, GA	340(b) (2)(J)	\$25,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(136) East Point, GA	340(b) (2)(K)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(F)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(323) Guam	340(b) (2)(L)	\$25,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(328) Maui, HI	340(b) (2)(M)	\$30,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(54) Cook County and Lake County, IL	340(b) (2)(N)	\$49,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—

Existing Authority	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	Section	Provision Summary	Section	Provision Summary
(f)(330) Forest Park, IL	340(b) (2)(O)	\$40,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(55) Madison and St. Clair Counties, IL	340(b) (2)(P)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Add “including stormwater” to eligible purposes	302(b) (2)(G)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Add “including stormwater management” to eligible purposes
(f)(333) Montgomery and Christian Counties, IL	340(b) (2)(Q)	Change the name to South Central Illinois Add 6 additional counties as eligible locations	302(b) (2)(H)	Change the name to include 6 additional counties Add 6 additional counties as eligible locations
(f)(334) Will County, IL	340(b) (2)(R)	\$6,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(21) Baton Rouge, LA	340(b) (2)(S)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(146) Lafourche Parish, LA	340(b) (2)(U)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(153) South Central Planning and Development Commission, LA	340(b) (2)(V)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(336) Fitchburg, MA	340(b) (2)(X)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(337) Haverhill, MA	340(b) (2)(Y)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(338) Lawrence, MA	340(b) (2)(Z)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(339) Lowell, MA	340(b) (2)(AA)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(I)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(340) Methuen, MA	340(b) (2)(BB)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(345) Macomb County, MI	340(b) (2)(CC)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(157) Michigan Combined Sewer Overflows, MI	340(b) (2)(DD)	\$75,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change the name to Michigan	302(b) (2)(J)	Change the name to Michigan
(f)(163) Biloxi, MS	340(b) (2)(EE)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(30) Desoto County, MS	340(b) (2)(FF)	\$40,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(K)	\$14,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(167) Jackson, MS			302(b) (2)(L)	\$14,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(351) Madison County, MS	340(b) (2)(GG)	\$12,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(M)	\$14,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.

Existing Authority	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	Section	Provision Summary	Section	Provision Summary
(f)(352) Meridian, MS	340(b) (2)(HH)	\$16,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(N)	\$14,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(354) Rankin County, MS	340(b) (2)(II)	\$12,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(O)	\$14,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(32) St. Louis, MO	340(b) (2)(JJ)	\$30,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(357) Camden, NJ	340(b) (2)(KK)	\$24,800,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(184) Kiryas Joel, NY	340(b) (2)(MM)	\$20,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(377) Queens, NY	340(b) (2)(NN)	\$70,800,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(207) Cleveland, OH	340(b) (2)(QQ)	\$23,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Remove reference to eligible location of Flats East Bank	—	—
(f)(206) Cincinnati, OH	340(b) (2)(RR)	\$30,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(P)	\$8,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(231) Midwest City, OK	340(b) (2)(TT)	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(Q)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
(f)(236) Woodward, OK	340(b) (2)(UU)	\$1,500,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(239) Hatfield Borough, PA	340(b) (2) (VV)	\$2,690,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(11) Northeast Pennsylvania, PA	340(b) (2)(XX)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change eligible purposes to “water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply”	—	—
(f)(243) Philadelphia, PA			302(b) (2)(R)	\$1,400,000 increase in auth. of approp. Add “water supply related infrastructure” as an eligible purpose
(f)(68) Phoenixville Borough, Chester County, PA	340(b) (2)(YY)	\$7,600,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change eligible purpose to “water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater infrastructure and water supply”	—	—
(f)(25) Lakes Marion and Moultrie, SC	340(b) (2)(ZZ)	\$70,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b) (2)(S)	\$67,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.

Existing Authority	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	Section	Provision Summary	Section	Provision Summary
(f)(393) Mount Pleasant, SC	340(b)(2)(AAA)	\$12,178,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(395) Smith County, TN	340(b)(2)(BBB)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(404) Western Washington State, WA	339(f)	Repeal the authority, including \$200,000,000 in auth. of approp.	—	—
(f)(405) Milwaukee, WI	340(b)(2)(FFF)	\$6,500,000 increase in auth. of approp.	302(b)(2)(T)	\$6,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.
Non-Section 219 Project Authorities				
1113 of WRDA 1986, as amended, Acequias Irrigation Systems, NM	311	\$10,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change the federal cost share for a reconnaissance study to 100%	304	\$20,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change the federal cost share for a reconnaissance study to 100%
Programmatic EI Assistance Authorities				
595 of WRDA 1999, as amended, Western Rural Water for Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico, Rural Utah, and Wyoming	340(b)(2)(EEE)	\$100,000,000 total increase in auth. of approp. Add “including natural and nature-based environmental infrastructure” and “drought and resilience measures” to eligible purposes	312	Add “entity declared to be a political subdivision of the State of New Mexico” to the definition of a nonfederal interest Change the nonfederal cost share for a project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community from 25% to 10%
594 of WRDA 1999, as amended, Ohio and North Dakota	340(b)(2)(SS)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. for Ohio	308	Change the nonfederal cost share for a project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community from 25% to 10%
542 of WRDA 2000, as amended, Lake Champlain Watershed, VT and NY	—	—	307	Change the nonfederal cost share for a critical restoration project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community from 25% to 10%
8319 of WRDA 2022, Los Angeles County, CA	340(b)(2)(E)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
5082 of WRDA 2007, East Atchafalaya Basin and Amite River Basin Region, LA	340(b)(2)(T)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
5085 of WRDA 2007, Southeast Louisiana Region, LA	340(b)(2)(V)	\$5,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—

Existing Authority	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	Section	Provision Summary	Section	Provision Summary
5113 of WRDA 2007, North Carolina	340(b) (2)(PP)	\$37,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
539 of WRDA 1999, as amended, Central New Mexico, NM	340(b) (2)(LL)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
552 of WRDA 1996, as amended, New York City Watershed, NY	340(b) (2)(OO)	Add consideration of “natural and nature-based infrastructure” to eligible purposes	—	—
8359 of WRDA 2022, Southwestern Oregon, OR	340(b) (2)(VV)	\$50,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Add Lincoln County as an eligible location	305	\$40,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change the name to Oregon Change the eligible location from Southwestern Oregon to Oregon
313 of WRDA 1992, South Central Pennsylvania, PA	—	—	303	Change the name to Pennsylvania Change the eligible location from South Central Pennsylvania to Pennsylvania Remove the requirement to consult with the SARCD Council for plan development
5138 of WRDA 2007, Texas	340(b) (2) (DDD)	\$120,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
5140 of WRDA 2007, Dallas County Region, TX	340(b) (2) (CCC)	\$60,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.	—	—
571 of WRDA 1999, Northern West Virginia, WV	—	—	310	\$30,000,000 increase in auth. of approp. Change the nonfederal cost share for a project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community from 25% to 10% Remove the program reporting requirement

Existing Authority	H.R. 8812		S. 4367	
	Section	Provision Summary	Section	Provision Summary
340 of WRDA 1992, Southern West Virginia, WV	—	—	309	<p>\$30,000,000 increase in auth. of approp.</p> <p>Change the nonfederal cost share for a project benefitting an economically disadvantaged community from 25% to 10%</p> <p>Add allowing the federal cost share to be in the form of grants or reimbursements</p> <p>Remove the program reporting requirement</p>

Source: CRS using public laws, H.R. 8812, and S. 4367.

Notes: Auth. = Authorization; Approp. = Appropriations.

Author Information

Anna E. Normand
Specialist in Natural Resources Policy

Acknowledgments

Andrew Spurgeon, CRS intern, contributed to legislative analysis for this report.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.