

***Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership
Steering Committee***

Facilitator: Margen Carlson

Note taker: Debbie Rick

Attendance: Dick Ecker, Terry Wright, Tim Smith, Curtis Tanner, Bernie Hargrave, Debby Hyde, Paul Cereghino, Mike Ramsey, Jacques White, Doug Osterman, Tom Eaton, Rich Doenges, Fred Goetz.

SRFB 2007 Grant Cycle Nearshore/Estuarine Design-Only Projects – Mike Ramsey provided the Steering Committee with a list of nearshore/estuarine design-only projects that are being submitted by Puget Sound Lead Entities for Puget Sound Restoration and Acquisition (PSAR) funds through the current SRFB grant funding process. In the 2007-09 Capital Budget, C 520 L 07, Section 3145 says, “*All estuary projects shall be submitted for review and coordination with the executive committee of the Puget Sound Nearshore partnership.*”

SFRB/PSP Review – The Steering Committee agreed that a simple table demonstrating overlap between SRFB and ESRP would provide for “coordination” as required under PSAR appropriations and document the process.

Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program – Paul Cereghino

Supplemental Funding Strategy – Paul provided the Steering Committee an updated ESRP Project list with project status categories, e.g. SRFB/ESRP Joint Funding, State Capital Fund, NOAA Nearshore Fund, Funded by Proviso, Preliminary Review for 2008 Request, and Not Reviewed.

We have sent out a request for supplemental information and are waiting for response. A review team from the IT surveyed projects for cases where funding would not be warranted. The following projects were to be “skipped” pending Steering Committee concurrence – some of these decisions involve a statement of policy:

Beaconsfield Bulkhead – this project is one we want to keep working with, however, due to change in scope the project available is not the project submitted. We don’t want to open the door to project substitution.

Dry Slough – this project is developed to reduce an ESA jeopardy opinion for a Skagit diking district. It seems inappropriate to provide public funds to allow a local entity to comply with federal law. Seeking guidance from NMFS.

Deepwater Derelict Gear – this project is not consistent with the process based restoration focus, and other sources of funds are available for derelict gear removal.

Elwha River Restoration – this project uses a tide gate to allow fish access to a delta marsh. The project does not restore delta process. The fish people aren’t ranking it well. It creates new

Steering Committee Notes – November 14, 2007

infrastructure in the path of the millions of cubic yards of sediment that will be generated through Elwha dam removal.

South Puget Sound Watertype Assessment – this is a variation on a protection action. A change in water type will result in different application of HPA that may protect function.

Twanoh Falls Bulkhead Removal – the project is funded for feasibility. Attendees at the SRFB site visit indicated that the community group was not aware that engineering and construction funding was being solicited for their site, if clear community support cannot be demonstrated the project should be skipped.

We are slowing down the pace to resolve strategy details concerning how the request will go forward given the state spending cap. *We would like the steering committee to comment on how these do-not-fund recommendations reflect on ESRP policy and position in Nearshore Restoration, specifically: ESA ‘mitigation’, derelict gear removal and water type assessment.*

2007 Report To Legislature – we are starting development of a glossy prospectus for ESRP, with the intent of incorporating PSNERP science as part of comprehensive and strategic nearshore protection and restoration approach. This will be used as part of a 2008 supplemental request and lay some groundwork for 2009-11 program funding. The following 2 page spreads are being developed:

- Summary/Introduction
- Nearshore assessment and analysis
- Collaboration under the Nearshore Partnership
- Project selection and portfolio building strategy
- Exemplary project profiles
- ‘Centerfold’ project list (river delta restoration/embayments/acquisitions)
- Toward the future

We are requesting quotes, factoids, and high-resolution images and photos from our partners by Dec 1 for inclusion in a Nearshore annual report.

Enhancement Policy – Following a good discussion of science opportunities through project funding ESRP provided NST and specifically the SAW with guidance on development of enhancements for shoreline armoring removal projects. We anticipate this is the beginning of a robust discussion in preparation for 2009-11 funding, and the beginning of defining an enhancement policy.

Prism/Nearshore Database – PRISM use will primarily be for tracking project performance, producing summary tables that can be fed into reports, and as a communication tool between proponents, ESRP, and stakeholders. At this point financial functions will be managed in CAPS and in Toni’s spreadsheets. We are finalizing a set of business rules for a stripped down

ERA Funding – There is an opportunity to receive funding in spring 2008 through an intra-NOAA RFP distributing \$800k nationally for enhancement of estuarine monitoring. We are

Steering Committee Notes – November 14, 2007

developing a proposal that would fund an engineer/scientist team to lead development of programmatic monitoring and management measure BMP resources that could be matched ESRP project enhancements and implemented through the 2009-11 round.

NOAA Partnership – NOAA leadership has agreed to initial project portfolio. Preparing for press release announcing funding and collaboration of Federal and State resources in funding nearshore restoration. NOAA is preparing a regional outreach strategy that may include elements related to Puget Sound Nearshore Restoration. **We are looking for a venue where a NOAA CRP Partnership funding announcement could be made.**

Contract Negotiation 2007

2007 CONTRACTING – Contract negotiation is winding down. Five projects are currently working through the DFW contracting office; four projects have final SOW waiting to go into contracts. Still waiting on a couple proponents. Will start working with contingency projects and earmarks.

LILY POINT – Current top priority for getting signature on the \$1,750,000 agreement. Whatcom Land Trust is currently \$460,000 short of the \$3,500,000 purchase price, but have secured sufficient funds to extend the end date of their Purchase and Sale Agreement to April 14, 2008, as specified in their agreement with the seller. TNC has begun moving toward securing the adjacent large parcel of equal merit.

PORT SUSAN DIKE REMOVAL – Final agreement is pending resolution of conflict between SRFB and PCJV regarding conceptual design of project (estuary vs. water fowl). Meeting scheduled in DEC in attempt to break logjam.

SMUGGLER'S SLOUGH – After working through realistic delivery schedules, final funding set at \$57,000 necessary to complete design, with option to build the East half of the project pending 2008 supplemental.

WOOD WASTE proposal has been received from DNR and is under review. Please provide comment by 11/23.

Contract Management 2006

RIVER DELTA MONITORING PILOT – Meeting scheduled Nov 21 to check progress, resolve scheduling and set up production schedule.

2006 CONTRACTS – Wiley, Qwuloolt (monitoring only), and DNR Nutrient Study at Skok will be extended. Smuggler's Slough will be extended with mod for additional engineering. Normandy Park Acquisition still in negotiation.

QWULOOLT channel restoration has been completed under cost. Monitoring end date will be extended. Modest savings on construction may be used for additional modeling run to inform dike removal alternative selection.

Action Items: What are future steps for ESRP (2009-11)? Focus on state legislature.

Wall Notes:

- How to reconcile additional supplemental funding to '07 projects before funding '08 projects (How to work through existing list)
- Documentation of the process (simple table).
- How to accommodate legislative desires with ESRP

Steering Committee Notes – November 14, 2007

- How to demonstrate ESRP is a good tool to support Corps Authority
- **Presentation from Alliance for Puget Sound Shorelines (Agenda Item Next Month)**

Leadership Council Presentation – Tim Smith

Debrief – November’s Leadership Council (Puget Sound Partnership)

Wall Notes:

- Providing benchmarks for the Action Agenda (Bernie/Curtis)
- Presentation to the Ecosystem Coordination Board
- Evaluate/Coordination of Puget Sound recovery efforts (time commitments)

Attached is a list of PS Partnership’s members with those highlighted that have a connection with the Nearshore Partnership.

Federal Caucus Report – Tom Eaton

Background: Ten federal agencies, ranging from the Army Corps of Engineers to the National Park Service, have signed on to a campaign to restore the health of Puget Sound. The ten signing partners are: US Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, US Fish & Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Department of Agriculture – Natural Resource Conservation Service, US Navy, US Geological Survey, National Park Service and the US Coast Guard.

Agency officials close to the new federal partnership indicate that by uniting in a “Federal Caucus” of natural resource, environmental health and land management agencies, each partner is committing to work towards a common problem-solving framework for restoring the Sound. Specifically, this new partnership is seen as a way to:

- Engage federal agency leaders to align available resources and programs to help support Puget Sound Recovery.
- Strengthen and enhance federal coordination of Puget Sound science, resource management, and recovery efforts and policies.
- Provide united leadership and support for Washington State and local governments working to protect and restore Puget Sound.

Tom reported that the top take away messages from visits to National Restoration sites were, 1) the federal office function should be to coordinate federal activities and co-locate with the state lead, 2) Should be thought of as a federal office not an EPA office, 3) Think about ten things that need to be done and organize federal assets.

2008 Conference planning – Bernie Hargrave

Background: PSNERP gets many requests to attend conferences and should develop a strategy for identifying critical conferences. *See Conference list attached. Draft preliminary criteria and/or a process for selecting which conferences are critical for the Nearshore Partnership to attend. This may help the StC develop a strategy for 2008 conferences and into the future.*

Steering Committee Notes – November 14, 2007

Purposes for attending:

Nat'l	Establish National Presence
Nat'l/Regional	Opportunities to Learn
Regional	Opportunities to Teach
	Peer Review
	Sell to new Partners
	Get new Voters (local community)
	Coordinate Overlap

These conferences the Steering Committee wants to pay attention to right away:

SeaFloor Mapping Workshop

Woods Hole, Maine

NST recon: listen

October 17-19, 2007

Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound Workshop

Fort Worden, WA

NST/StC/PMT coordinate overlap; Listen & Present

January 29- 21, 2008

American Waters Resources Association (AWRA) - **Send \$; Sends message; provide session or abstract.**

Riparian Ecosystems and Buffers: Working at the Water's Edge

Virginia Beach, Virginia

June 30-June 2, 2008

2008 Summer Specialty Conference Call for Abstracts

Abstract Submission Deadline: February 4th, 2008

PSNERP Work Plan – Curtis Tanner

Background: Describe changes to work plan. Informational. Review/revise, establish schedule. Agree to a schedule and process to gain Steering Committee approval.

Steering Committee discussion on Stage 3

Schedule agreed to:

December 10	Review draft
December 19	At Steering Committee have detailed discussion and review
January 16	Con't
Jan 28 – February 4	Summary Briefing Paper for Executive
February 6	Executive Committee

Federal Project Manager's Report – Bernie Hargrave

Fiscal Year '08 Continuing Resolution Authority (CRA) Execution: The current Continuing Resolution Authority period (extends to November 9th). Some are expecting CRA throughout the first quarter of FFY08. We have so far received funds for Corps salaries, the Charrette artist, and the first Anchor option for historic typology.

Artist Charrette Workshop: The workshop was held on October 18 with participation by about a dozen people. The artist is finishing his "composite" sketches that build on the workshop products. Bernie passed around the sketches that belong to the Nearshore Partnership now.

Steering Committee Notes – November 14, 2007

Typology Data Sets: SSHIAP has a plan to complete their QA/QC on the current conditions typology. The NST work group continues conversations with SSHIAP to develop a common method. We awarded the Anchor option to get started on historic typology to complement the current typology so that we can begin change analysis in early 2008.

Shoreline Armor Working Group: The team is beginning to shape their work plan. They are evaluating how they can support ESRP for bulkhead removal; use Seahurst Phase 2 as a seminal project; and develop a pilot restoration manual.

Water Resources Development Act of 2007:

2007 WRDA was passed. WRDA '08 is in development. PSNERP needs to be ready for 2009-11.

Wall Notes:

Use of (charrette) artwork in logo, etc. ~ future Steering Committee topic

Debby Hyde to coordinate with Washington SeaGrant to get permission from the artist.

Concerns about staff to work on setting goals and objectives

Need to clarify COE's requirements for undertaking restoration projects on private lands (easement and/or fee simple)

Nearshore Science Team – Fred Goetz

Science Morning: John Bower and Justin Holt (WDNR), “*Aquatic Lands, State Owned Aquatic Lands and Their Management*” (Kristin Swendaal and Michael Friese contributed policy perspectives) John Bower and colleagues presented history of tidelands (and bedlands) ownership, laws and regulation in the State, describing how ownership of tidelands to the state, through the equal footing doctrine, has always been a contentious issue. Extremely complex, with multiple classifications (harbor lines, 1st class tidelands, and 2nd class tidelands) and jurisdictions over state-owned aquatic lands (SOAL). Result is that case-by-case analysis is almost always necessary.

SOAL at statehood estimated to include ~2.93 million acres, including open coast but doesn't include land retained by tribes. Legislative Directives for SOAL Management involves four-part balancing test: (1) encourage direct public use; (2) foster water-dependent uses; (3) ensure environmental protection; and, (4) utilize renewable resources; a 5th unstated goal is to derive revenue generation through leasing (even though DNR doesn't have a fiduciary trust).

Discussion revolved around DNR taking a more comprehensive look at use of SOAL and application of balancing test. DNR has no authority to purchase lands, but they can be gifted, could be changed via legislation. Another major point revolved around how federal restoration action might occur on SOAL? There is no perpetuity with DNR leases of SOAL: can lease 2nd class tideland for up to 50 years, and aquatic reserve is 90-year designation. But, lease on land can be considered tenuous. It was suggested that restoration on SOAL would raise the bar for future use of the lands, as it is a condition of the lease to return the land in a condition no less than when you acquired it.

Steering Committee Notes – November 14, 2007

Bottom-line: PSNERP Implementation Team should understand impact SOAL will have on desired actions, but also opportunities to work with DNR to alter policies and even laws that would enhance restoration potential on SOAL.

PSNERP-SSHIAP Typology Hybrid/Change Analysis Metrics and Data Recovery (Jen Burke)

Jen provided update on SSHIAP-PSNERP typologies for Sound-wide change analysis. We are merging efforts to determine how well SSHIAP typology interfaces with Shipman typology? Overall they line-up well and map the same ‘thing.’ Some tricky interpretations will require finessing data sets, but hybrid looks feasible. Bottom line: overall goal is one typology, not competing typologies. Jen is also working with Anchor on first delivery order under USACE IDIQ. Data discovery task is complete. All datasets will be in a report available through the USACE website (likely not distributed until Change Analysis is completed).

Project Scale Monitoring and Adaptive Management (Ron Thom, PNNL-BMSL) Ron

summarized results of project-specific monitoring assessment designed to provide monitoring and adaptive management (AM) guidelines for use by those in evaluating individual restoration projects. He analyzed how many projects were meeting PSNERP monitoring and AM principles: concluded that project managers monitor (64%), but don’t have a great understanding of what AM is or how it is applied. Report includes an eight-component monitoring framework to address the most critical need: What do I absolutely need to know to maximize my ability to manage the project toward its goal?”

Human Dimensions Strategy for Restoration (Tom Leschine) General

discussion about PSNERP needing to conduct a social assessment: What do stakeholders think about nearshore restoration? What do they value in the current conditions? What is their desired future state? We would also benefit from an institutional assessment; as observed during DNR land tenure presentation (*Science Morning*, above), we need better understanding of institutional relationship between restoration actions and private land tenure.

Approach is to research what surveys have been done elsewhere about attitudes towards restoration, how does restoration get communicated? Options include pilot studies, focus groups, and market research. Literature review on selling of conservation plans. Depending on desired action, strategy for human dimension will vary, could target community leaders, or school children, or housewives. Most successful approach has been to find common interest between restoration action and individuals, example of promoting a mud management plan disguising a stream restoration action.

Next steps? PM would need a human dimension proposal. PM agrees that a need exists to better understand the human dimension, and the approach should start with identifying programmatic needs for stakeholder involvement.



Puget Sound Partnership

Puget Sound Partnership

Executive Management

Executive Director, David Dicks
Deputy Director, Cullen Stephenson
Budget Director, Jim Cahill

Puget Sound Leadership Council

The Leadership Council is the governing body of the Puget Sound Partnership. Its seven members are leading citizens chosen from around the Sound and appointed by the governor. Gov. Chris Gregoire named Bill Ruckelshaus the first chair. Founding members will serve terms of different lengths. Successors to the original council will each serve four-year terms.

Members:

Bill Ruckelshaus (chair)
Billy Frank, Jr., (Nisqually Indian Tribe)
Diana Gale, WA Public Works Board
Martha Kongsgaard, Philanthropist
Dan O'Neal, WA Transportation Commission
Steve Sakumam Sakuma Brothers Farms
Bill Wilkerson, WA Forest Protection Association; WDFW

Ecosystem Coordination Board

The Ecosystem Coordination Board's main role is to advise the Puget Sound Partnership's Leadership Council on carrying out its responsibilities. The Board is made up of 27 individuals representing specific interests around the Sound.

Members:

Representing the Action Areas:

Strait of Juan de Fuca
Steve Tharinger, Clallam County Commissioner
San Juan Islands
Bob Kelly, Nooksack Indian Tribe
Whidbey Island
Gary Rowe, *Skagit County Administrator*
North Central Puget Sound
Steve Bauer, *Kitsap County Board of Commissioners*
South Central Puget Sound
Ron Sims, King County Executive
South Puget Sound
Dan Wrye, Pierce County
Hood Canal
Teri King, Washington Sea Grant

Representing business interests

Samuel Anderson, *Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties*
Bill Dewey, Taylor Shellfish

Representing cities

Jeanne Burbidge, *Council member, Federal Way*

Ecosystem Coordination Board, continued

Representing counties

Kevin Ranker, *San Juan County Councilman*

Representing environmental interests

Kathy Fletcher, *Puget Sound Environmental Caucus, People for Puget Sound*

Jacques White, *Puget Sound Environmental Caucus, The Nature Conservancy*

Representing federal agencies

Robert Lohn, *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration*

Tom Eaton, *Environmental Protection Agency*

Ken Berg, *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service*

Legislative caucuses

Dale Brandland, *R, 42nd District / Whatcom County*

Phil Rockefeller, *D, 23rd District / Kitsap*

Christine Rolfes, *D, 23rd District / Kitsap*

Bob Sump, *R, 7th District*

Representing port districts

John Calhoun, *Port Commissioner, Port Angeles*

Representing tribal governments

David Troutt, *Nisqually Tribe*

Randy Kinley, *Lummi Tribe*

Dave Herrera, *Skokomish Tribe*

Representing Washington state agencies

Jeff Koenings, *Director, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*

Jay Manning, *Director, Washington State Department of Ecology*

Doug Sutherland, *Commissioner of Public Lands, Washington Department of Natural Resources*

Science Panel

The Science Panel provides independent scientific advice to the Puget Sound Partnership's Leadership Council. Its nine members were appointed by the council to four-year terms from a list of 15 nominees submitted by the Washington Academy of Sciences. The Partnership's executive director will designate a lead staff scientist to coordinate Science Panel actions and staff. More information will be posted on this Web page when it is available.

Members:

Joel Baker, University of Washington Tacoma

Guy Gelfenbaum, *U.S. Geological Survey*

Robert Johnston, U.S. Navy

Jan Newton, *University of Washington*

Timothy Quinn, *Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife*

Frank Shipley, *U.S. Geological Survey*

John Stark, Washington State University

Usha Varanasi, *National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration*

Katharine Wellman, *Northwest Economics*

Workshops, Conferences, Meetings

2008 Meetings, Workshops, & Conferences

Name/Sponsor	Location	Date
<i>Georgia Basin Puget Sound Research Conference</i> Biennial conference (2003, 2005, 2007, 2009)	Vancouver, BC	March 26-29, 2007
* <i><u>SeaFloor Mapping Workshop</u></i> NST recon - Listen	Woods Hole, Maine	October 17-19, 2007
<i>Estuarine Research Federation (ERF)</i> Biennial conference (2003, 2005, 2007, 2009)	Providence, Rhode Island	November 4-8, 2007
<i>American Fisheries Society (AFS)</i> <u>Advances in Fish Tagging & Marking Technology</u> Abstract Submissions due November 30th, 2007	Auckland, New Zealand	February 24-28, 2008
<u>North Pacific International Chapter - Annual General Meeting: Sound Management: Mountains to the Sea.</u> Instructions for submitting abstracts for individual oral and poster presentations will be announced in early December, with a deadline of January 15, 2008.	Bellingham, Washington	March 4-6, 2008
<u>AFS Annual Meeting</u> <i>Call for Papers began October 16, 2007, online</i>	Ottawa, Canada	August 17-21, 2008
<i>Restore America's Estuaries</i> <i>Proposals are due January 31, 2008. To submit a proposal for a dedicated session, presentation, or poster, complete the proposal form then submit your proposal online at www.program.estuaries.org.</i>	Providence, Rhode Island	October 11-15, 2008
* <i>Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound Workshop</i> NST/StC/PMT coordinate overlap; Listen & Present	Fort Worden, Port Townsend, WA	January 29- 21, 2008
<i>National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration</i> (2004, 2007 every three years)		
<i>Pacific Estuarine Research Society</i>		

2008 Meetings, Workshops, & Conferences

<u>South Sound Science Symposium</u>	Lacey, Washington	March 26, 2008
<u>Salmon Recovery Funding Board</u>		
<i>American Waters Resources Association (AWRA)</i>		
2008 Spring Specialty Conference	San Mateo, California	March 17-19, 2008
GIS & Water Resources V Conference Registration - Mail-in / Online		
* <u>2008 Summer Specialty Conference Call for Abstracts</u>	Virginia Beach, Virginia	June 30-June 2, 2008
Riparian Ecosystems and Buffers: Working at the Water's Edge Conference Registration - Mail-in / Online		
Abstract Submission Deadline: February 4th, 2008 Send \$; Sends message; provide session or abstract.		
2008 Annual Meeting	New Orleans, Louisiana	November 17-20, 2008
Sheraton Hotel New Orleans, Louisiana November 17-20, 2008		
2009 AWRA Spring Specialty Conference: Managing Water Resources and Development in a	Anchorage, Alaska	Spring 2009
<u>American Society of Civil Engineers</u>		
<u>Northwest Algal Symposium</u>		



Water Resources Development Act of 2007 Summary Document

INFORMATION PAPER

SUBJECT: Water Resources Development Act of 2007, as Passed by Senate and House of Representatives

PURPOSE: The purpose of this paper is to summarize the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

The Act is made up of nine titles which are summarized below. Total Federal cost of the bill is approximately \$22 billion.

Title I (approximately \$3.5 billion):

- Authorizes the Secretary of the Army (Secretary) to carry out 46 new projects for which the Chief of Engineers reports have been completed at a total cost of \$6.17 billion (\$3.57 billion Federal). Included in this section are several projects within the Florida Everglades --- Indian River Lagoon Project, Picayune Strand Restoration Project and the Site 1 Impoundment Project.
- Directs the Secretary to study and if determined appropriate, implement projects under various Continuing Authorities Programs (CAP). These provisions emphasize projects for which the Secretary has standing authority to study and implement.
 - 44 under Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (PL 80-858), as amended, Small Flood Damage Reduction
 - 18 under Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (PL 79-526), as amended, Emergency Streambank Protection
 - 21 under Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (PL86-645), Small Navigation
 - 7 under Section 1135, WRDA 1986 (PL 99-662), as amended, Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment
 - 43 under Section 206, WRDA 1996 (PL 104-303), as amended, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration
 - 8 under Section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (PL 79-727), as amended, Shoreline Protection
 - 1 under Section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, Snagging and Sediment Removal
 - 2 under Section 111 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1968 (PL 90-483), Prevent of Mitigate Damage Caused by Navigation Projects
 - 1 under Section 104 of the River and Harbors Act of 1958 (PL 85-500), Aquatic Plant Control.

Title II (approximately \$400 million):

- Includes 47 non-project specific provisions, including guidance and direction on certain aspects of the Civil Works program, including planning, independent review of Corps projects and mitigation for fish and

wildlife and wetlands losses. Additionally, there are provisions included which raise the annual programmatic limitations for several categories under the Continuing Authorities Program.

Title III (approximately \$3.1 billion):

- Includes provisions that modify specific projects currently authorized, including raising the authorization limits (902 limits) for approximately 20 projects, including important ongoing projects such as McAlpine Lock and Dam (Kentucky and Illinois), and Santa Ana River Mainstem, (California) and modifying numerous other projects.
- Includes declaration of nonnavigability for one area.
- Deauthorizes all or part of 46 projects

Title IV (approximately \$157 million):

- Authorizes, modifies or directs 87 project or location specific studies and 14 programmatic or regional studies. The programmatic/regional studies are John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program, Southwestern United States Drought Study, Delaware River, Eurasian Milfoil, San Francisco Bay, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Selineum Studies, Colorado, Upper Delaware River Watershed, Ecosystem Restoration and Fish Passage Improvements, Oregon, Walla Walla River Basin, Western Pennsylvania Flood Damage Reduction, Coastal Texas Ecosystem Protection and Restoration, Southwestern Utah, Ecosystem and Hydropower Generation Dams, Vermont and Debris Removal.

Title V (approximately \$4.5 billion):

- Authorizes new projects or programs as well as modifying existing projects and programs.
- It directs the Secretary to expedite completion of studies and if feasible, expedite construction of fourteen projects and directs expedition of studies for five projects.
- It adds or amends projects for environmental infrastructure improvements at a Federal cost of approximately \$2.2 billion. The cost-sharing allocations for all of the projects falling within this category are 75% federal and 25% non-federal.

Title VI (approximately \$95 million):

- Provides modifications and direction in carrying out the Florida Everglades Program. The Florida Everglades program is the largest environmental restoration undertaking in the United States.

Title VII (approximately \$5.8 billion):

- Relates to projects and programs in the Louisiana Coastal Area.
- It includes authorization for the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) program for environmental restoration
- It continues and modifies authorization for ongoing work in the New Orleans, LA vicinity to plan and construct a hurricane and storm damage reduction project to provide increased protection against hurricanes and storm events. The President recently announced the requirement for additional funds for this work in New Orleans.
- It establishes the Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Protection and Restoration Task Force
- It requires a report on the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet deauthorization to include ecosystem restoration and prevention of saltwater intrusion
- It includes construction of flood damage reduction projects in Lower Jefferson Parish
- It requires a report on modifications to provide 100-year level of protection for the Larose to Golden Meadow project area.

Title VIII (approximately \$4 billion):

- Provides authorization for improvements to the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System:
 - Includes close to \$2 billion for new locks at five locations on the Mississippi River and two locations on the Illinois River.
 - In conjunction, authorization is provided for approximately \$1.7 billion of environmental restoration measures; and
 - Includes approximately \$250 million for small scale, non-structural navigation improvements to the system.

Title IX (\$120 million):

- Provides authorization for a National Levee Safety Program. The Corps has begun conducting a survey and inventory of levees throughout the United States. The authorization provided in this section will allow the inventory and inspection of levees (to be cost-shared with non-Federal sponsors) to continue and also establishes a committee which will develop recommendations for a national levee safety program, including a strategic plan for implementation of the program.